

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

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

EGG INDUSTRY STABILIZATION BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

ROSEWORTHY AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

PETITIONS: CASINO

Dr. TONKIN presented a petition signed by 286 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. DEAN BROWN presented a similar petition signed by 82 persons

Mr. LANGLEY presented a similar petition signed by 55 persons.

Mr. Langley, for Mr. JENNINGS, presented a similar petition signed by 68 persons.

Mr. SIMMONS presented a similar petition signed by 84 persons.

Mr. COUMBE presented a similar petition signed by seven persons.

Petitions received.

PETITION: ANDAMOOKA ROAD

Mr. GUNN presented a petition signed by 365 residents of Andamooka who urged the Government to upgrade the road between Pimba and Andamooka to make it passable in all weather, as at present the road was hazardous in wet or dry conditions and the tourist potential of Andamooka could not be realized unless an all-weather road was provided.

Petition received and read.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

ANNUAL LEAVE

In reply to Mr. COUMBE (November 1).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The estimated cost to the State as a result of the granting of annual leave loadings to Government daily-paid and weekly-paid employees for leave due and taken after July 1, 1973, is \$2 000 000 in this financial year.

HEALTH FUNDS

In reply to Mr. McANANEY (September 25).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Contribution rates and reserve funds of medical and hospital benefits in South Australia are regulated by the Commonwealth Department of Social Security. However, annual returns of those organizations that are friendly societies are made to the Public Actuary who keeps in contact with the societies from time to time as necessary. The present position with medical and hospital funds of friendly societies is that the reserves of the medical funds of four out of the

five societies have been extinguished, but contributions have been increased as from September 1, 1973, and, barring unforeseen changes in benefit levels, a slight improvement in the reserve position should show as at June 30 next year. The position in most friendly society hospital funds has also been a reduction in reserves caused by increased benefits without commensurate increases in contributions. However, the reserve position of hospital funds is stronger than that of medical funds. Again, recent increases in contribution rates should improve the position. The South Australian Government, however, has no information about the larger private health insurers that do not come under the Friendly Societies Act.

ESCAPED PRISONERS

In reply to Dr. TONKIN (November 1).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Both McDonald and Farnsworth were represented by counsel when they appeared in the District Criminal Court on November 5, 1973, having pleaded guilty to charges of escaping from custody. Each has been remanded for sentence.

NAIRNE HOUSING

In reply to Mr. WARDLE (September 27).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Housing Trust's letting section is holding five applications for rental houses at Nairne. These were lodged before the announcement of the 90 houses, and were as a result of activity for George Chapmans Proprietary Limited at Nairne. Employment categories for the people who will occupy the 90 houses at Nairne are unknown at present. There are 144 rental applications for houses at Murray Bridge, but it is considered that many may drop out before they are completely processed. The house sales section holds 23 applications, five of which are considered current, with two possibles. The balance of applicants have made no contact since lodging their application. The houses in Homburg Drive are all occupied, except for two single-unit houses, which are under offer of sale but as yet are not completed. They are expected to be ready for occupation in about two months.

MINISTERS

The SPEAKER: I have been informed that any questions that otherwise may have been directed to the honourable Minister of Works and the honourable Minister of Education this afternoon may be directed to the honourable Premier for his consideration.

MOTOR VEHICLE INDUSTRY

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier say whether he has determined what effect the Commonwealth Government's decision to freeze plans to restructure the motor vehicle industry will have on this vital industry in South Australia? In the leading article in the *Australian* today, under the headline "Whitlam shelves plans to reform car industry", it is indicated that the Tariff Board has been unable at this juncture to submit a report and that there will be a delay of about six months in submitting it. I acknowledge that it takes at least five years from the time of initial planning until the finished product goes on the market, and I appreciate that six' months within that five-year period may not present an overall difficulty to be met by the industry, but any delay in this matter' must have some influence on the workings of the industry and, as South Australia relies so heavily on the motor vehicle industry, I seek information from the Premier about the likely effect in this State.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not think that the industry in this State will be dismayed by the fact that

there will be a six-month delay in submitting the Tariff Board report.

Mr. Coumbe: There could be an effect in the long term.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, but the effects are not likely to be adverse to the South Australian industry, because it will have a further breathing period before being required to go in for some fairly agonizing reappraisals. I do not know of any plans in the South Australian industry that will be disadvantaged by this delay. In fact, so far as I am aware of plans in the South Australian industry, the industry will face no difficulty in the matter.

PUBLIC HOLIDAY

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Premier say whether the Government has yet made a decision on the application made to it to have Monday, December 24 next, proclaimed a public holiday? If a decision has not been made, will the Government take into account the fact that, as industry probably will close down on the previous Friday, the Monday will provide the main opportunity for workmen and their families to shop together for Christmas, and will the Government also consider and note the important aspect so far as housewives are concerned that availability of supplies of fresh food and perishables for Christmas could be gravely affected by the granting of December 24 as a public holiday?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The reply to the honourable member's questions are "No"; "Yes"; and "Yes".

INDUSTRIAL POLICY

Mr. HALL: My question is directed to the member for Florey. I ask him whether he is aware of the report published today that he and the Secretary of the United Trades and Labor Council (Mr. Jim Shannon) are to be asked to help redraft the industrial policy of the Liberal and Country League. Has the honourable member accepted such an invitation? If he has, will he be attending L.C.L. committee meetings and conferring with L.C.L. members of the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly in an attempt to improve their already rock-bottom image? In today's afternoon paper a report, headed "L.C.L. calls on union boss to help draft policy", states:

South Australia's trade union boss and a powerful member of the Labor Party hierarchy, Mr. Jim Shannon, is to be asked to help redraft the L.C.L.'s industrial policy.

The report further states:

The top trade union- experts in the State will be invited to join discussions on ways the L.C.L. can improve its policies and its image among unionists.

Mr. Millhouse: They must be desperate.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: The report then removes any doubt as to its proper base and states:

Mr. Becker said he planned to invite Mr. Shannon and the immediate Past President of the T.L.C. and A.L.P. member for Florey, Mr. Charlie Wells, to the committee meetings.

Mr. Becker very nicely went on to say:

They will not get attacked or ridiculed. We respect their points of view, even if we don't always agree with them.

Speculation in respect of whether the two men will accept the invitation is then referred to in the report. As the member for Florey has held, and still retains, an extremely important position in the South Australian Branch of the Labor Party, and as there is no doubt about the importance Of the position occupied by Mr. Shannon in the United Trades and Labor Council, will the honourable member say whether he knows of the report, whether he has accepted the invitation, and whether he will be attending committee meetings with L.C.L. members of the Upper and Lower Houses?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Goyder has directed a question to the honourable member for Florey. In calling on the honourable member for Florey, I point out that he is under no obligation to answer the question if he does not wish to do so, because the question is of a private nature.

Mr. WELLS: No; I have not received any such invitation from the member for Hanson. Of course, I have read the report in today's *News*. Further, I want it clearly understood that I am a dedicated member of the Australian Labor Party and of the United Trades and Labor Council. However, I can understand the dilemma in which Opposition Parties find themselves in this House—

Mr. Millhouse: The L.C.L., please!

Mr. WELLS: —because, with the possible exception of the Deputy Leader, who has been Minister of Labour and Industry, no member opposite knows anything whatsoever of the ramifications of the trade union movement.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WELLS: Therefore members opposite need advice. Indeed, Mr. Vial appears to be a super-optimist if he expects the trade union movement to help him in the formulation of L.C.L. policies. Surely, he must be aware of the violent anti-worker attitude of members opposite and in another place expressed during the past two or three weeks. As a result, any trade union would be violently opposed to any such assistance to the Opposition. Therefore, if I do receive such an invitation I shall reject it out of hand.

Dr. Eastick: Mr. Goldsworthy didn't.

Mr. WELLS: Some people believe that there may be a change in the attitude of the Liberal Party toward the trade union movement, but that is not correct, as is instanced by the policies in New South Wales of the Liberal Party, which intends to goad trade unionists.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot continue on that line.

Mr. WELLS: I apologize for that lapse, but I think that I must be permitted to answer the question. I have received no approach from the honourable member, and I think that the Executive Director of the Liberal Party in South Australia (Mr. Vial) is, as I said previously, a super-optimist if he thinks that the Labor movement in this State will help him in his efforts to oppress the workers further. This would never be done.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Florey is getting miles away from the mark.

Mr. WELLS: Perhaps I can return to the mark.

Mr. MATHWIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is the member for Florey speaking as boss of the trade unions or as a member of the Labor Party in this Parliament?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Florey was asked a question and, before calling on him, I pointed out that he was under no obligation to answer it but that, if he so desired, he had the right to answer it. He is answering it not as the trade union boss but as the member for Florey in this place. The honourable member for Florey.

Mr. WELLS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The position is as I have stated: the trade union movement in this State formulates a policy with no help from the Liberal Party and, of course, we would not help that Party in any way at all to drag it out of its present unhappy position wherein it does nothing about the trade union movement but resist any attempt to advance the welfare of the workers

of this State. My answer is "No"; if I am requested to attend any such meeting I will refuse such a request.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Does the member for Hanson intend to persevere with the invitation to the member for Florey and other prominent members of the Labor movement to help the L.C.L. formulate some policy on industrial matters? I can understand the desperation of the L.C.L. in seeking ideas on industrial matters, and indeed on any matters relating to politics, because it is at the moment bankrupt of such ideas. I heard with interest the interjection by the Leader of the Opposition—

The SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order during Question Time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I know, but it was significant.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order in referring to it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Apparently a Mr. Goldsworthy has accepted the invitation of the member for Hanson, and I assume that is Mr. Goldsworthy of the Shop Assistants Union against whose interests the member for Torrens asked a question earlier in Question Time. I do not know whether he consulted Mr. Goldsworthy before he put the question—

The SPEAKER: Order! Comments are not in order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course. The member for Florey was pretty straight from the shoulder in the answer he gave the member for Goyder and it is obvious that he will not in any way help his political opponents in the formation of its policy. Indeed, one would have thought the L.C.L. was in cloud cuckoo land even to think he would. Because of the answer of the member for Florey, I put the question to the member for Hanson whose brain-child this scheme is and who is in charge of it.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has asked a question of the honourable member for Hanson. In calling upon the honourable member for Hanson, I give the same advice as that which I gave when calling upon the honourable member for Florey. The member for Hanson is under no obligation to answer the question if he does not desire to do so, because it concerns an internal matter. Supplementary questions on this matter must have a direct bearing on the House of Assembly.

Mr. BECKER: I will answer the question briefly and I respect your remarks, Mr. Speaker. I thought the House would have had more important matters to discuss this afternoon than an article that appears in the press.

Mr. Wright: Aren't you embarrassed?

Mr. BECKER: There is no embarrassment attached to this whatsoever. We are looking at the possibility of establishing an entirely new committee within the L.C.L. to create a greater understanding and to improve our relationship with trade unions in South Australia. For many years, my Party has been accused of being anti-union and anti-unionist, but this is not the case.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BECKER: If we can use the brains of those in the community who have contributed much to the trade union movement in the State, we will do so in a way similar to that in which the State Government has used the brains of top men in business and commerce. If the Government is willing to do that, why should we not take similar action with regard to the trade union movement? We do not want to be accused continually of being anti-unionist, because that is not true. The whole idea behind this move is that we want to improve understanding and relationships in this area. This will not cut across the work of the industrial relations committee which we have already established and which is capably chaired by the member for Torrens. I can understand why questions have been

asked by members on the cross-bench, who are commonly known as Heckle and Jeckle, because this is certainly an embarrassment to them.

The SPEAKER: Order! Comments are out of order.

ENERGY SOURCES

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Development and Mines consider setting up a committee of inquiry into the long-term energy requirements and resources of this State? This is an especially pertinent time to raise this matter. Recent examples have been given to the community as a result of the petroleum strike and, more recently still, as a result of the activities in the Middle East which have resulted in a shortage of petroleum products throughout the world. This has brought into sharp relief what has been said by experts over many years, namely, that there is a limit to the use of petroleum products which will be in evidence some time within the next 20 to 30 years. The life of South Australian natural gas resources has been reportedly estimated at about 50 years, but even this in some quarters is considered to be a somewhat optimistic estimate. The member for Frome in this House recently raised the subject of developing solar energy to serve South Australia and, although I understand that a Commonwealth committee is in existence, the activities of the Commonwealth Minister for Minerals and Energy (Mr. Connor) demonstrate a great need for South Australia to look after its own interests.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD.: Although completely rejecting the suggestion in the final sentence of the honourable member's question concerning Mr. Connor, I should go on to say that I regard his suggestion as a useful one, and I will certainly have it investigated thoroughly indeed. The officers of both the Mines Department and the Industrial Development Division are acutely Conscious of this problem and are looking into it. As Minister, I am greatly interested in the possible search for new energy sources, including the considerable amount of proselytizing that has been conducted by Professor Bockris at Flinders University in regard to what he calls the hydrogen economy. I believe that all of these things have to be investigated thoroughly, and I will certainly give the honourable member's suggestion every sympathetic consideration.

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Transport say whether it is intended to provide concessional registration fees and other incentives to encourage motorists to buy electric cars when they become available? The development of electric cars is well advanced because of the long-term fuel crisis to which I have referred. Locally, significant work has been done at Flinders University, and I hope that electric cars will become available to the people of this State soon. Concessional registration fees and concessional electricity rates for recharging power undoubtedly would encourage use of these cars, for the general good of the community.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No provision now exists to charge other than the registration fees laid down in the Motor Vehicles Act. Any alteration of these fees would be a matter of Government policy and would have to be determined at the appropriate time.

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister say what research has been conducted into the long-term replacement of Adelaide's diesel-powered buses by electrically-powered buses? Trolley buses were used in Adelaide for some years and they were in great favour. Their movements were restricted, of course, by their powerlines and diesel buses were introduced to replace them because of the greater manoeuvrability of the diesel buses. Recent developments overseas indicate that electrically-powered buses

are now available almost to the market stage, and these buses would recharge at set points along the route or at the terminus of each trip. I ask the Minister whether any investigation has been made into acquiring this type of bus and, over a long term, replacing the diesel buses.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Planning and Development Branch of the Director-General of Transport has several research projects in hand and is fairly conversant with most, if not all, developments that have taken place. I cannot say what the branch may be doing regarding electrically-powered buses but I will seek the information and let the honourable member know.

CIGARETTE PRICES

Mr. OLSON: Can the Attorney-General indicate when, and the conditions under which, the retail prices of cigarettes to the public were altered? This morning a retailer (a constituent of mine) visited my office and said there had been no variation in the price of some cigarettes to the retailer. He said that two lots of 600 Wild Woodbine cigarettes, purchased from W.D. & H.O. Wills Limited on October 28 and November 5, 1973, cost \$11.41. When the price was queried with the representative of the firm, he said that the new prices would not apply until the old stocks in the warehouse had been sold. If this is the case, will the Minister find out why some retailers are charging the increased prices for cigarettes, thereby exploiting the public?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain a report on the matter.

MURRAY COD

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Fisheries say whether any prosecutions will be launched as a result of illegal cod being sent to the Adelaide fish market? Last Saturday's *Advertiser* contains an article (with a photograph) which states that officers of the Fisheries Department seized Murray cod at the Adelaide fish market. The article states that the closed season has been extended to November 30, 1973. It continues:

The Acting Director of Fisheries (Mr. A. M. Olsen) said yesterday that fishermen apparently had missed the announcement in the *Government Gazette* and the press.

People connected with the industry claim that insufficient notice was given about the closed season. For instance, on November 1 notice was given in the *Government Gazette*; I think that the Minister will agree that few fishermen read the *Gazette*. In addition, the *News* of November 1 contains an article headed "Murray Cod Will Remain Off-limits" which states the closed season has been extended to November 30, 1973. This was the only information available to fishermen to indicate that the closed season had been extended. I sincerely hope that the Minister will consider these facts when making a decision on the matter.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I agree with the honourable member that notice was short. I think that he will appreciate that the decision was made later than normal because of the unusual factors involved, the river being in flood. Accordingly, it has been decided that, because of the short notice involved with regard to this proclamation, no action will be taken to prosecute for breaches that may have occurred over the weekend. However, with regard to any failure to comply with the new proclamation after that date, the situation will be different.

POTATO PRICES

Mr. MATHWIN: As Minister in charge of prices, will the Treasurer urgently consider subsidizing the price of potatoes in South Australia. The price of potatoes has

now reached the new peak of 14c a pound for unwashed potatoes, and potatoes are still the staple diet for many people in this State. As great hardship is being caused, particularly to those with large families and those on fixed incomes, including pensioners, I ask the Treasurer to consider a subsidy.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Although it is highly unlikely that we would subsidize the price of potatoes, I will have the matter examined.

ROYAL VISIT

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier say what arrangements have been made for Her Majesty the Queen and Prince Philip to visit South Australia in March, 1974? I understand that the completion of publicity and other arrangements for certain events that will occur during the Royal visit are pending the final announcement of Her Majesty's itinerary. Can the Premier say what arrangements have been made?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Not now, but it will not be long.

GLENGOWRIE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. MATHWIN: In the temporary absence of the Minister of Education, will the Premier obtain for me a report on the future needs of Glengowrie High School? I understand that a report has been compiled on the expected future needs of this school. At present, the northern aspect of this fairly new school has two rows of small asbestos, prefabricated classrooms which, from the road, give the impression that the Engineering and Water Supply Department has moved in to effect temporary repairs. As this is a beautiful school, I ask that the report be considered soon.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will refer the question to my colleague.

TAILEM BEND RACING CLUB

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Attorney-General further negotiate with the South Australian Jockey Club to have answered the first part of a question that I previously directed to the Attorney in September? Although the Attorney was kind enough to give me a reply from the Chief Secretary, that reply did not answer the first part of my question. I immediately wrote to the Secretary of the South Australian Jockey Club stating that his time, the Minister's time and my time were far too valuable to be spent in dealing with information which, although it was appreciated, was not required by me, whereas I had not received a reply to the question I had asked. In reply, I received a curt note from the Secretary, who said that he acknowledged my letter concerning the Tailem Bend Racing Club. His letter continues:

As you are aware, I did supply a report on this to the Chief Secretary and I do feel it would be imprudent of me to now issue statements to individual members of Parliament.

Will the Attorney-General, through the Chief Secretary, ask the Secretary of the South Australian Jockey Club to reply to the first part of my previous question?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do not recall the first part of the question, but I think it related to racing dates. That being the case, as I pointed out to the honourable member in the reply, it is a matter for the South Australian Jockey Club as the governing body of racing and, if there is any difference of opinion about it, it is a matter between that club and the Tailem Bend Racing Club. It is not a matter for Government decision or Government policy. I should have thought that the matter would be resolved between the racing club concerned and the South Australian Jockey

Club. It is an internal matter relating to racing and not a matter in which the Government could make a decision or in which the Government really has a direct part. However, as the question was asked and a reply given, and as the honourable member contends that a part of the question has not been replied to I will again refer the matter to the Chief Secretary.

RAILWAY TAKE-OVER

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister of Transport report any progress on his negotiations with the Commonwealth Government about its intention to take over country railway services in South Australia?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not recall exactly the contents of the last report sought on this matter, but probably it was to the effect that a joint committee had been appointed, consisting of Commonwealth and State officers who were working on the preliminary draft and pinpointing areas in which resolution would be required. I understand that this committee has now virtually completed its work. Its report is being compiled and will soon be submitted to the Commonwealth Minister for Transport and me, following which there will be discussions at a Ministerial level.

COUNCIL RATES

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Local Government say whether it is intended to amend the Local Government Act in order to make it possible for ratepayers to pay rates by quarterly payments? I have received a letter from a council in my district (and naturally it would be from a council in a rural area) expressing concern about the costs involved in allowing ratepayers to pay quarterly. In its letter the council suggests that, if it is intended to amend the Local Government Act in this regard, an optional provision be included in the legislation. It is believed that in some industrial areas, or in areas in which pensioners reside, the quarterly payment of rates may be a help, but the council considers that if such provision were to apply to rural areas the administration costs to the councils would increase, and councils would eventually have to increase rates once again. Does the Minister plan to alter this Act to allow quarterly payments and, if he does, will he also include a clause allowing the *status quo* to remain?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If and when quarterly accounts operate in respect of local government, I would expect the system to operate on the basis that applies in the Engineering and Water Supply Department, namely, that a person has the option of paying water and sewerage rates either quarterly or annually, whichever method is chosen. I would expect the same provision to apply to council rates.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

Mr. DEAN BROWN: In the temporary absence of the Premier, can the Minister Assisting the Premier say whether, as a result of the Premier's announcement concerning the move of sections of the Agriculture Department to Monarto, it is intended to allow the Land Commission to acquire all or part of the department's land at Northfield for urban development? There seems to have been many conflicting statements made by the Government in relation to the move of the Agriculture Department to Monarto. First, I refer to the Premier's reply on October 23 concerning the Callaghan report and its recommendations on that move. The Premier said:

The Callaghan report on the reorganization of the Agriculture Department has not been completed. I know of no proposals from, that investigation in relation to this.

In that reply, the Premier claimed that the Callaghan report in no way was making any recommendation on the move to Monarto. Later the same day, in reply to a second question, the Premier said:

The question of the move to Monarto was discussed with Sir Allan Callaghan, and he will consider those measures in reporting to Cabinet.

On the one hand the claim is made that Sir Allan Callaghan will not be reporting on such a move and will be making no recommendations whereas, on the other hand, it is claimed that he will make recommendations. To clarify the situation (particularly concerning the future of the Agriculture Department at Northfield) will the Minister Assisting the Premier indicate whether the Government intends to use this land for urban development via the Land Commission?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: In the event that the land became available there is no doubt I would be interested, as Minister responsible for industrial development and housing, in considering how we could use the land. It is a piece of prime real estate under Government ownership, and we think we should put it to good use. My officers have investigated the possibility, but at present no decision has been made as to what will happen to the existing facility on the land. Until that decision is made it is not possible for me to consider what we might subsequently do with the land.

TEACHER RECRUITMENT

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In the absence of the Minister of Education, can the Premier obtain details of the campaign to recruit teachers in this State and overseas? A press report today states that, because of the increased funds expected to flow into the State from the recommendations of the Interim Schools Committee in Canberra, it should be possible to employ more teachers, and it is expected that a recruiting campaign will be conducted in this State and overseas. I should like details of the campaign, because it is important that we recruit people of quality to be employed permanently.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will ask my colleague to give the honourable member a full report.

HOMOSEXUALITY

Mr. GUNN: In the absence of the Minister of Education, will the Premier review the decision of his colleague to allow members of the Gay Activist Alliance to address school students, with the permission of headmasters? There has been much public comment about the decision of the Minister and the Government to permit these sexual deviates to peddle their views to the community, particularly to young children who are of an impressionable age.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: During the explanation of his question, the honourable member made a whole series of mis-statements of fact. The Minister of Education has made no decision whatever to allow members of the Gay Activist Alliance into schools.

Mr. Gunn: That's not what—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What the Minister of Education has reiterated is that questions of a controversial public nature to be discussed in schools are a matter for the autonomy of the schools themselves. The Minister explained fully to the House yesterday that, in dealing with matters of this kind, headmasters will consult with senior staff, parents, and senior students before matters of controversy are discussed in the schools. That remains the policy of the Government. The Government will give no directive in relation to controversial matters as far as schools are concerned. They are matters for the proper exercise of responsibility in those schools by the headmasters, parents'

associations, senior students, and senior staff, in consultation. This is the point of view that this Government and, may I point out to the honourable member, the Liberal Government in Victoria have taken. The Victorian Minister has maintained exactly the same stand, and the attempts by the honourable member and other people to stir something up on this score do him little credit, because he is attacking the responsibility of headmasters in this State and their ability to discharge their functions, and I think that that is disgraceful.

ESCAPED PRISONERS

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Attorney-General say when the House can expect to receive a copy of the report on the prisoners who escaped from the Adelaide showground? It is recognized that the inquiry being undertaken at present is limited and far below the requirements of the community in this State, and as an officer of the Crown Law Department is undertaking the inquiry I pose the question directly to the Attorney-General, appreciating that, if a reply must come from the Chief Secretary, the Attorney will in due course provide such a reply. I consider that we are at the stage where we must demand the truth of this whole matter and for that reason I seek early release of the information that is available.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The inquiry is a full and adequate one.

Dr. Eastick: By whose standards?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. L. J. KING: I prefer to adopt the standards of the professional man who is conducting the inquiry rather than the standards of the Leader of the Opposition. The inquiry is, and will be, full and adequate and a report will be made at the completion of the inquiry. I cannot say at present when the report will be issued, but I assure the Leader that it will not be issued before the courts have disposed of the charges against the two men who allegedly escaped.

SUPERANNUATION

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Premier now give the House further details regarding the Government's proposed Bill to amend the Superannuation Act? Yesterday, the Premier announced that there were several difficulties in regard to this matter and he intended to have talks yesterday afternoon with representatives of the Public Service Association and, possibly, the Superannuation Federation. Following those talks, can the Premier now give the House further information about the likely introduction of this important measure?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yesterday, Public Service Association officers again indicated to me what they had recently stated publicly, namely, that they had no quarrel with the Government but had had some differences with the other members of the Superannuation Federation about the working party's report. However, the officers asked that they be given an opportunity to consider a report from an independent actuary whom they had engaged to examine the proposals and to make further submissions to the Government next week through the Superannuation Federation. The federation has proposed some amendments to the scheme in two categories and these are now being examined by the Public Actuary. Two proposals for alteration are major, and they are, on the face of them, frankly somewhat expensive and considerably in excess of what has been done elsewhere in Australia. This must be a matter of discussion but I expect that we will have fruitful discussions next week and that we ought to be able soon to arrive at a decision which, although it may not satisfy everyone, will

nevertheless get general acceptance as to the proposals for superannuation. That would then allow drafting to be done in time to introduce the measure in February next year.

SWANPORT DOCKYARD

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether he has recently discussed with the Minister of Transport the matter of the new dockyard for the Swanport area? If he has had those discussions, will he give the result of them? The press of October 17 contained a letter from the President of the Murray Bridge Field Naturalists Society, quoting Mr. Bakewell (Chairman of the steering committee) as having said:

The Highways Department destruction of Swanport reserve is a shocking example of bureaucratic indifference to the environment.

I presume that Mr. Bakewell made that statement, and that is the basis of my question.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I have had discussions with the Minister of Transport on this matter and those discussions are still continuing.

WHEAT BOARD

Mr. GUNN: Because of the importance of the Australian Wheat Board being able to maintain its independence and impartiality in its commercial dealings with its clients, will the Premier accept an amendment to be considered by this House if a similar amendment is accepted by the Commonwealth Parliament, and any other Parliament, to guarantee the independence of the Australian Wheat Board? For the first time the Australian Government (the Commonwealth Government, as it should correctly be called) has directed the Australian Wheat Board in respect of a commercial contract which the board entered into with one of its clients. Not only was the board directed in respect of the terms under which it could negotiate the sale of wheat: it was also directed as to prices. Many wheatgrowers are concerned that the Australian wheat-grower may be forced to carry a financial burden that should not be his responsibility. Because of the importance of this matter to the Australian economy, and to the people in general, will the Premier give this matter his support if it is brought before Cabinet for consideration?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. The situation clearly is that the Australian Government has a responsibility to maintain a stable wheat industry. I point out to the honourable member that the assistance from the Australian Government for wheatgrowers unable to sell their wheat has been sought and obtained in recent times. Further, if there is a public responsibility to support wheatgrowers in times of adversity, there is also a responsibility in respect of the public good on the part of the Australian Government to see that there is stability in the industry and that long-term contracts are available for the sale of wheat. Obviously the honourable member's question arises from pique at the success of the Australian Government in obtaining long-term contracts for the sale of wheat.

Mr. Gunn: That's utter rubbish.

The SPEAKER: Order!

WOMEN TRANSPORT WORKERS

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Transport say what is the Government's policy on the employment of women bus drivers, bus conductors, tram drivers and tram conductresses by the Municipal Tramways Trust? Further, what is the possibility of training women as drivers of diesel trains and, possibly, of the electric trains to be used on the new Christie Downs line?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: First, we do not have any conductors on buses now: they are all one-man operations. Therefore, it is pointless referring to those occupations, as the honourable member has done: indeed, I did not understand to whom he was referring, despite the title he gave them. The policy of the Government is clear and simple: we do not believe in sex discrimination of any sort and, if women are available, suitable, and acceptable, they would be employed in the same way and would receive—

Mr. Mathwin: The union won't allow that.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I thought that the honourable member wanted to know what was the Government's policy. If he wants to know what is the union's policy, I suggest that he direct his question to the secretary of the appropriate union.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with an amendment.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (COMMISSIONER)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its effect is to increase the maximum amount that can be lent by a friendly society to its members from \$1 000 to \$3 000, in each case. This amendment, which has been requested by a friendly society, has the support of the Public Actuary. Section 9a of the principal Act, the Friendly Societies Act, 1919, as amended, sets out the basis on which loans to members may be made and I commend it to members' attention. It will be found in the South Australian Statutes, 1956 volume, page 241. The increase in the maximum loan that may be granted under this section proposed by the amendment will clearly be of benefit to the borrowing members of the friendly societies.

Mr. RUSSACK secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADMINISTRATION AND PROBATE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 1. Page 1557.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the concept of this Bill, which puts the South Australian Public Trustee into a situation similar to that applying in Victoria, but I point out that there is a much wider interpretation of the powers available to the Public Trustee through these amendments than is the case in Victoria. For example, subject only to the consent of the Minister, the Public Trustee may "acquire land, either improved or unimproved, for use by the Public Trustee wholly or partly", the "partly" undoubtedly being to permit the lease of land in excess of immediate requirements "in connection with the execution of his powers, functions, duties and obligations under this Act". The Bill then provides the Public Trustee with the power to—

erect a building on the land so acquired or alter any existing building in such manner as the Public Trustee thinks fit . . .

However, I am really concerned with new section 118a (2) (b)), which states:

otherwise deal with any such land or building in a manner approved by the Minister.

This provides a great breadth of power, and is completely against the principle that applies in Victoria. I refer to the Public Trustee (Amendment) Act passed by the Victorian Parliament. Section 56A inserted by that Act provides:

(1) The Public Trustee may with the consent in writing of the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Minister—

this adds a further step to the procedure that will apply in South Australia—

first obtained apply any part or parts of the Common Fund referred to in section 56 for or in connection with either or both of the following purposes:

(a) The acquisition by the Public Trustee of land the whole or part of which may be used in connection with the duties powers and functions of the Public Trustee under this Act;—

that is similar to the provision in this Bill—

(b) The erection construction or alteration of a building on land referred to in paragraph (a) the whole or part of which may be used by the Public Trustee in connection with his duties powers or functions under this Act.

That is not unlike the provision to which I referred earlier. Further, the Victorian legislation (new section 56A (2)) provides:

The total amount applied from the common fund for the purposes of subsection (1) shall not at any time exceed the sum of \$5 000 000.

In other words, an upper limit is provided in Victoria which controls a purchase made by the Government, whether this be at the insistence of the Minister or following the Minister's suggestion to the Governor in Council. As no upper limit is provided here, I believe that the Attorney-General should be able to explain why the Government has not seen fit to introduce such a restraint. Whilst not denying my support for the measure, I believe that any matter involving excessive spending should be referred to Parliament. The \$5 000 000 provided in the Victorian legislation does not seem unreal to me. It has been indicated to me that it is important for this Bill to be passed without undue delay so as to cover a matter soon to be dealt with by the Public Trustee. However, again, I believe that every member requires to know why the matter to which I have referred should be left as wide as it is.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I have listened with as much attention as I could to the Leader's speech, knowing that he is the spokesman for the Liberal and Country League on legal matters, to try to follow any point that he may have had in his speech. As I could not really find any point, I may be covering something that the Leader intended to cover, and I am sorry about that. I do not quarrel with the idea of the Public Trustee's having his own building. I do not know that it is necessary but, if the Government considers that it is, that is all right. Therefore, I accept the principle of the Bill, but I am worried about a couple of other points, and I hope that the Bill will not be passed in its present form. I refer especially to clause 4 and to new section 118a, subsections (3) and (4). New subsection (3) provides that the Public Trustee "may apply moneys from the common fund for the purposes of subsection (1) of this section"; and new subsection (4), to which I shall refer in more detail in a moment, deals with interest.

This means, in effect, that the Public Trustee is being given power to borrow from himself, because the common fund (and I think there is even a definition of it in the Bill) comprises the moneys entrusted to the Public Trustee. They are moneys of which he is the trustee, therefore, for other people; they are other people's

moneys. The Public Trustee invests the moneys in the common fund at the best rate of interest, and so on, but he is a trustee of them, and I am not altogether happy with the principle of allowing the Public Trustee to invest trust moneys for his own purposes, and that is what new subsection (3) provides. I do not necessarily feel so strongly about a breach of principle as to vote against the proposal, although I point it out to the House. Whether or not the Leader had picked it up, I could not tell from his remarks, but I point it out, anyway, in case he did not. What I do not like, though, is the corollary of that power which is contained in new subsection (4), which provides:

The interest that shall be paid upon moneys so applied and the terms upon which they shall be repaid to the common fund shall be determined by the Minister on the advice of the Auditor-General.

That means that the Government can go to the Public Trustee and, for the purposes of buying or constructing a building, borrow money from the common fund and name its own rate of interest. I think that it is going too far to give the Government this great power over other people's money, because that is what it means. We have even gone as far as setting out explicitly that the Public Trustee is an instrument of the Crown. If it were not there before, it is certainly spelt out in precise terms now, and I think that is too much. I notice in his second reading explanation that the Minister said, referring to the moneys that the Public Trustee makes available or uses:

The interest to be paid on these moneys will be in line with comparable trustee investments.

So far so good. I believe that is right and that they should be, but I cannot understand why that has not been spelt out in the Bill if that is the Government's intention, and I believe it should be spelt out. Parliament has a responsibility to the beneficiaries, who are the owners of this money, to make sure that the rate of interest paid is a proper rate of interest, and I believe that the rate paid should be the long-term bond rate. In due course, I intend to move an amendment to ensure that that is so. It is apparently in line with the Government's intention but, of course, we do not know what will happen in the future. I think Parliament would be failing in its duty if it did not lay down precisely the rate of interest that should be paid on money being used, in effect, by the Government, for Government purposes (money which does not belong to it and of which one of the Government's servants, the Public Trustee, is merely a trustee). That is the substantive point I desire to make in speaking to the Bill, and I will take it further in Committee.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): I support the Bill. I think it is proper that the Public Trustee should acquire satisfactory offices to enable him to fulfil his proper function. I notice that provision is made in the Bill for money to be used from the common fund for the purposes of carrying out this project, and I point out to the member for Mitcham that real estate is a wise and sound investment from the point of view of equity. Properly within the city of Adelaide is certainly increasing substantially in value, and it should earn better than the bond rate of interest. It should earn a good rate of interest, probably much better than the rate of interest the Public Trustee can get for moneys invested in other securities.

On that basis, I think this is a proper Bill. I think what is intended is in the best interests of the Public Trustee, and no doubt the Government would benefit, because I assume the building will be occupied. The Public Trustee may already have an understanding with the Government about the occupancy of such a building if it is erected, and

this would guarantee a return on the money. This would be a proper investment for funds of this sort left or invested for profit with the trustee by people investing in, the common fund or by people whose money is in a common fund because their estate is administered on a long-term and continuing basis by the Public Trustee. I support the Bill.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): The Leader of the Opposition raised two points, as I understood his remarks. One related to new section 118a (2) (6), which he believes gives the Public Trustee powers greater than necessary. It is desirable that he should have those powers, and they can do no possible harm. One can never foresee what the ultimate fate of any building will be or what it might be necessary for the owner, acting properly as trustee, to do with the building. It may become necessary to sell the whole building. It may be that we would have a situation in which the Public Trustee, having acquired an existing building, would wish to erect a new building. He would then have to dispose of the old building: he may want to sell it, but the market at that stage may not be good and he may want to lease it, pending a better market price.

Where a public functionary is charged with the duties of Public Trustee under this Act, he has to be given the power to deal with the building as he thinks proper in the then existing circumstances. He is always bound by his obligation as trustee. It is not a question of its being a Government decision: his decision requires the approval of the Minister, but that does not mean he is subject to the direction of the Minister, because he has his obligation at law as a trustee which he has to discharge. There is no possible harm in having that power in existence, and I think it would be unfortunate to have to rush back to Parliament in some emergency to pass another Act to deal with a simple matter which can be foreseen and which ought to be left to the discretion of the Public Trustee at the time.

The Leader of the Opposition mentioned monetary limit. It seems to me that the question is not why we have not put it in but why the Victorian Parliament did put it in. It is a matter for the discretion of the trustee; he is the trustee of the funds. He has his obligations as trustee to handle them on behalf of the beneficiaries and ensure that their interests are protected. He has to use his judgment on how much of that fund he should invest in a building or in some other way, and it does not seem to me appropriate for Parliament in advance to fix monetary limits to the amount he can invest in a building. If we do that, we might as well fix limits to the funds he can invest in any security in which he is investing beneficiaries' money. I do not see any need or justification for it.

I have no objection to a provision that the amount to be credited to the fund as interest should be not less than the long-term bond rate. One would hope that it would be more than that: in fact, one would expect it to be more than that. If there is any concern about that, no harm can be done by saying that is the bedrock minimum. If the Public Trustee could not get the long-term bond rate out of a building, he ought not to have his money invested in it. I do not think this provision is necessary, as I think it is his clear duty as trustee. However, I do not want to haggle about that: let us put it in if there is any uneasiness about it.

Bill read a second time.

Tn Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Expenditure of moneys from common fund in the purchase of certain real property."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

In new section 118a (4) to strike out "The" first occurring and insert "Subject to subsection (5) of this section, the"; and to insert the following new subsections:

- (5) The rate of interest to be paid upon the principal from time to time outstanding shall be not less than the long-term bond rate.
- (6) In this section "the long-term bond rate" means a rate of interest payable in respect of a Commonwealth public loan having a currency exceeding five years being raised in Australia at the time the moneys are applied from the common fund, or if no such loan is then being raised, in respect of the Commonwealth public loan having a currency exceeding five years last raised in Australia prior to the application of moneys from the common fund.

I am glad to hear that my amendments have the support of the Attorney-General. Their purport is simply to provide that the rate of interest set out in new subclause (5) to be paid on the principal shall be not less than the long-term bond rate. I agree with what the Attorney-General said and with what I think the member for Mallee had in mind, although I could not fathom out what he said. At least this should be the return on the investment and, if the return is not as great as that, the building should not have been purchased. The amendments safeguard any possible abuse in the future by a Government fixing a rate ridiculously low and simply having the use of the money free or almost free.

Amendments carried.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I see in new section 118a (2) (b) the distinct possibility that the Public Trustee need not be housed in the premises he has purchased. In other words, he could conceivably become involved with several buildings over a period for the express purpose of leasing them, and there would be no requirement that he occupy any of them. Is this intended? I believe it is permissible under this section. I am concerned about this because it seems to me the Public Trustee could be given opportunities such as have been given or intended to be given to other commissions in this State recently.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): It is not intended that the Public Trustee buy or erect a building other than for his own occupation and for the letting of the balance. It may well be that in future the Public Trustee will make use of the common fund to construct a large building of which he will occupy only portion, the balance (as the member for Mallee foreshadowed) being occupied by other Government departments as tenants, paying a proper rental. This is to the advantage of the beneficiaries of the common fund because, as the member for Mallee has said, this is an excellent way of investing funds. It has an incidental value to the public at large because we are constantly in the position of having insufficient Loan funds to keep abreast of the demands for accommodation for Government departments, as a result of which a large area of office space occupied by Government departments is rented from private landlords.

It would be an advantage to the public generally if the common fund were available for this purpose to supplement Loan funds. However, the primary concern of the Public Trustee must be for the beneficiaries whose money is in the common fund. There is no intention of the Public Trustee's buying or erecting a building in which he will not have his own offices. I foresee that he may well in future (perhaps not immediately) use part of the common fund to erect a building of which he would occupy part, the balance being available as accommodation for other Government departments. I certainly see nothing

wrong with that, as I think it would be desirable. Nonetheless, the powers are necessary because a situation may arise in future where, having occupied a building, it may be necessary for the Public Trustee to leave it. He cannot be limited to a situation in which, once he leaves a building, he must dispose of it. If we got rid of new section 118a (2) (b), he would not even have power to dispose of that building. Once a person becomes the owner of real estate, he must have the necessary powers to handle it. Although I have indicated our intention, it is still necessary for the Public Trustee to have full legal powers to deal with the property he buys.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am indebted to the Attorney for what he said about using funds for what I consider to be a reasonable project: the building of a large block of Government offices. The possibility still exists for building in the Flinders Street and Gawler Place area. Substantial sums are available in the common fund that could be used for this purpose. I understand what the Attorney has said in an oblique way. Possibly funds from this source could be used for the purpose to which I have referred. Can the Attorney confirm or deny this?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do not want to say anything that would commit the Public Trustee irrevocably to any course. He has in mind an existing building in which he is interested. Whether anything will come of it, I do not know, but that is the immediate aim. One hopes that this legislation will remain indefinitely on the Statute Book. The situation may change, with the Public Trustee's becoming involved in constructing a large building designed not only for his own occupation but also for occupation by other Government departments. If that comes about, I think it will be a good thing for the beneficiaries with money in the fund as well as for the State generally.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope that, if such a project is brewing, it will be a long time before it goes ahead because, from a casual look around the city, it appears that there is a colossal amount of empty space in new buildings that have been erected by private enterprise. I should have thought that there was enough space around Adelaide for at least the next five years. I am rather glad now that the project we had in mind of an office building for the south-west corner of Victoria Square has not gone ahead. I know that the Government's plans for a hotel there do not seem to have got far either. Certainly, at present there is no call for erecting extra office space in Adelaide. I believe that it would be far more economic for the Government to rent space for its departments in a building which had been completed and never fully occupied or in a building which was being constructed now and which I could not believe would be occupied by tenants for a long time to come.

Clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CASINO BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 23. Page 1371.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): At the outset, I want to say that I have no argument about the real need for us to maintain constant employment in South Australia and to seek to improve the balance of industries, bearing in mind the fluctuation in markets for consumer durable products and the effect that this has on the work force. I also acknowledge that it is highly desirable to try to provide employment opportunities for people in country areas. However, I say positively that I do not believe

a casino will satisfactorily achieve any of those ends. Because of my attitude, I have no hesitation in opposing the Bill. I think it is apparent that it will not be possible to implement the provisions of the Bill, whether in their present form or in an amended form.

This issue has been charged with considerable emotion. It can be approached on the basis of the moral issues, social issues or environmental issues involved. However, at this stage I intend to deal with the financial aspects and to question the ability of the South Australian public to sustain a project such as this, although I am not suggesting that the South Australian public would be totally responsible for sustaining such a project. One of the premises on which the matter has been introduced is as a catalyst to an improved tourist involvement, and that a considerable sum would be available from other States and overseas once the casino project was implemented. From evidence available from Tasmania and overseas, however, it is apparent that there has not been the degree of external involvement that might have been considered desirable in the total concept. In Monte Carlo in 1920, 75 per cent of the total income of the State came from the casino, but today less than 4 per cent of the total income is derived from that source.

One of the major issues in that country has been the introduction of additional facilities adjacent to it and elsewhere in the world that have had the effect of siphoning off funds and people interested in such a venture. The result has been a marked increase in the amount of finance from local sources, but an overall reduction in the revenue available from the project. Concerning the Tasmanian project, evidence shows that about 80 per cent of the number of persons and money introduced into the Wrest Point casino is from Tasmania. Of the balance of 20 per cent (and I am advised it is a diminishing percentage), 55 per cent of it comes from Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia represent an additional 15 per cent, international involvement is 15 per cent (and of that more than half relates to funds from New Zealand), and from other sources (not necessarily defined) the involvement is about 15 per cent.

Although it is suggested that increasing funds will be made available, experience has shown that in a short time the maximum amount of finance comes from the local scene. If a casino were duplicated in South Australia it would compete for funds that now go to the Tasmanian casino with a detrimental effect on the Tasmanian undertaking, and we would find ourselves competing for the limited finance available. It has been suggested that a casino may be built in Queensland and one in New South Wales, and the funds available for the South Australian project may be further reduced, so that most of the money will have to be drawn from the South Australian public. It has been indicated that the casino is to be part of a total concept, and that additional funds will be available to the State from an increase in tourist activity and from the business undertakings that will benefit from the increased number of people visiting the State. This result would depend on whether the facility was a drawcard for people from other States and from overseas.

However, the Bill provides that this facility shall be established at a distance greater than 80 kilometres from Adelaide, but the casino must be established outside a city, so not only will the chance for persons to be employed there but also the ability of individuals to travel to the facility be markedly reduced. The suggestion that the casino will be part of a total tourist attraction will not be sustained unless other additional tourist facilities are avail-

able. Only a small percentage of people who come to this State will be interested in a casino, and we must attract people by providing other tourist facilities. The development of a project costing between \$10 000 000 and \$15 000 000 in a relatively isolated area of the State (whether at Wallaroo, Victor Harbor, Kangaroo Island, Port Lincoln, or elsewhere) is based on the fact that people will be interested not only in the casino but also in other tourist activities. However, we must realize that, in the areas that have been suggested as sites for the casino, there seem to be no particular tourist drawcards that will attract many people.

It has been indicated that many people visit the Hobart casino as observers and in order to say that they have seen it! There has been little draw by the casino as a tourist attraction to supplement other tourist facilities nearby. I am convinced that the same situation would apply here. I have no argument with the suggestion that a casino may improve the employment opportunities for South Australians, and it has been suggested that it would increase employment opportunities for people living in country areas. The amount of funds involved at Wrest Point is less than that suggested for the South Australian facility, but at that establishment 402 persons are employed on a permanent or casual basis. A small rural town in this State would have difficulty in providing that number of people. Several positions involved in the conduct of the casino are of a specialist nature. When we relate this (referring to the consumer durable area that has been mentioned in the second reading explanation) we have the additional problem of taking people no longer able to find employment in the consumer durable industries from their present places of residence, and the two circumstances do not blend.

The position is tenable only if the Government intends to have the casino near or involved with an area of maximum population. In Tasmania the 402 staff members are drawn from a population of 140 000 and my information is that it was difficult to obtain from that population the staff with the expertise required in some areas. It was necessary to bring people from other places for that purpose. The Director of the - Australian National Travel Association (Mr. O'Sullivan) has expressed interest several times in improving the use of our hotel and motel facilities. He has made several statements on the issue, suggesting that we have the opportunity to provide convention facilities and that the use of these facilities in association with the hotel-motel complexes will increase the use of accommodation facilities. In putting forward details about the convention concept, he states:

- (1) They must be within easy reach of other conference areas such as the Festival Theatre and the universities.
- (2) They need to be located within easy reach of high-class restaurants and night spots. This is particularly important for international and interstate conventions.
- (3) Access to the convention centre should be relatively easy.
- (4) There should be a number of suitable tourist attractions for one-day visits.

He has indicated that experience at Wrest Point and in other parts of the world shows that the same general criteria were used by the holiday-maker as by those interested in convention centre involvement. I bring this point forward only to stress that the total project requires access to several other facilities. If it is intended that people who are to be enticed to come here will use the casino facilities and other tourist attractions in the State, the distance of the casino from tourist attractions is important, and I cannot accept that the isolation of the

casino contemplated by the Government will allow the whole arrangement to be financially viable.

One may infer from that statement that I accept that the project should be undertaken in or near Adelaide. Obviously, to be financially viable, it would have to be located there, but even in those circumstances I could not and would not support the concept of a casino. I consider that many other aspects of the project are contrary to the best interests of this State. I have referred to the suggestion that we view this matter in relation to its financial advantage to the State. The monthly licence fee of \$2 500 (\$30 000 a year) and the percentage of profits that goes to the State Treasury do not, in my opinion, advance the case for a casino in South Australia, having regard to the competition that would prevail between a South Australian facility and facilities that exist or will be built elsewhere in Australia. The Commonwealth Grants Commission has been mentioned in relation to this matter, and the 1972 report of the commission deals at length, under the general heading of taxing and gambling, with a comparison between this State and the other States. Paragraph 4.67, which deals with the South Australian position regarding lotteries, states:

Therefore, it has made a favourable adjustment in recognition of South Australia's returning a below-standard proportion of the gross proceeds of ticket sales to subscribers by way of prize money.

The Grants Commission recognizes the lack of capacity on the part of the South Australian public to increase the return to the State Treasury from lotteries. Paragraph 4.69 of the report, which refers to the activities of the Totalizator Agency Board, states:

Its view is that the commission should take as the South Australian "base" not actual turnover but some larger figure. The commission has carefully examined the method of operation of the South Australian system and compared it with those of the other States. It has not been able to find any differences which would account for the lower turnover in South Australia. Information submitted by South Australia shows that in *per capita* terms South Australia presently provides more agencies than New South Wales and Victoria and telephone betting facilities which have been utilized to a greater extent than in the standard States. ... All things considered, the commission has decided to accept South Australia's T.A.B. turnover as indicative of its comparative revenue-raising capacity and to make a favourable adjustment for the above-standard tax rate which South Australia applies to T.A.B. betting.

This is again a recognition by the Commonwealth Government that the funds available from the tax and gambling sector in South Australia are less than in other States. Paragraph 4.71 refers to the commission's hearings in Adelaide in February, 1972, and paragraph 4.72 refers to hearings in Canberra in April of that year. In the subsequent paragraph 4.73 the Grants Commission indicates that it does not require South Australia and Tasmania to proceed with the introduction of poker machines, which could allow them to make up the leeway compared to the other States, especially New South Wales. I accept the Government's statement that in no circumstances will poker machines be part of the casino. The final comment of the Grants Commission (paragraph 4.74) is as follows:

It must be emphasized that in taking this view the Commission does not intend that its procedures should in any way influence any State in its revenue-raising policies.

This is important because of the way this legislation has been introduced. The commission is not telling the State that it must enter this area of revenue-raising activity. The report continues:

Any adjustments that it makes for differences between States in revenue-raising effort are intended as a means of isolating the budgetary effects of differences in effort from

differences in capacity in order that it may base its recommendations for special grants on the latter and not the former.

That is, it is the matter of capacity that is of great importance in the final issue. This Bill places much responsibility on the shoulders of the Minister in charge. I have listed at least 18 areas in which the Minister is responsible. Admittedly, the Minister undertakes such decisions in consultation with members of his departmental staff, but the Bill does not provide for a board to advise the Minister on the conduct of the casino. A special feature in overseas countries has been the establishment of a board to advise on the running of a casino. Clause 35 (1) (a) provides:

... the Minister may grant to the applicant ...

The decision of the referendum, therefore, is not necessarily final, because it is a Ministerial decision whether the results of the referendum will be proceeded with. The Minister will receive the licence fee and the tax; he will declare which games in the casino are legal; he will direct the licensee in respect of the conduct of the casino and vary any such directions, indeed, there is no clear indication in the Bill of how the casino is to be conducted.

Further, the Minister may consent to the transfer of the licence; under clause 46 (4), he may exempt any company from the category of a "foreign corporation"; he may declare any company to be a "specified company" (clause 50). Under clause 51 (1), the Minister shall declare exempt a specified company from the requirement that at least 40 per cent of the votes cast at a meeting be cast by persons other than holders of shares; he has the discretion to alter the provisions of the Bill requiring a certain percentage of persons to vote at a meeting; and he will receive notice of the voting procedures at a meeting of the specific company. The Minister is to require the secretary of the company to inform him of the voting procedures; he can declare the decisions of a meeting of a specific company to be without effect because of non-compliance with the legislation. The Minister has an overriding power in respect of the conduct of the meeting. The Minister may prevent the transfer of shares in contravention of the legislation, and he may require any person having information or documents to produce them; he may direct that excess foreign shares in a specified company be

disposed of or that they be vested in the Treasurer; he

may receive copies of documents forwarded to shareholders of specified companies and attend and speak at

any meeting of the specified company; and he may consent

to the institution of proceedings for offences under the legislation. I make these points because they hinge not on Cabinet or on Parliament but specifically on the Minister.

Undoubtedly, other aspects of the Bill will be referred to by other members. In respect of the vital financial situation, there is nothing here to indicate that a casino will be to the financial advantage of this State. I believe that this measure is not viable as it now stands. The possible alternatives resulting from amendments to the Bill to allow for the relocation of the casino are, against what I believe to be in the best interests of the people of this State. Indeed, we saw this afternoon the presenta-

tion of the eighty-second petition to this House. The 82 petitions represent the views of over 12 300 people, who are not in favour of a casino.

I believe that in respect of this matter every member will have further petitions or lists of signatures which were not presented to the House because they did not conform with its requirements. I do not support the Bill, either

in its present form or in the alternative forms that have been suggested.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): Members know that there is on the Notice Paper a motion, which I moved earlier, stating that in the opinion of this House a casino should not be established in South Australia. However, out of respect to the Government, knowing that this Bill was to be introduced, and to give members an opportunity to debate the Bill, I have not proceeded with that motion, which clearly states my views on establishing a casino in South Australia. I do not support the establishment of a casino in any part of South Australia, whether it be 80 kilometres from Adelaide or otherwise, and I am confident that the majority of people in my district hold the same view. When discussing this matter with younger members of my district (students in third and fourth-year high school classes, as well as in Matriculation classes and at teachers colleges) I was amazed to find that they, too, were opposed to this proposal and thought that it was a pretty poor way of trying to raise revenue for the State.

Indeed, the main argument used in favour of establishing a casino is that it will create employment and provide extra revenue for the State. I support the Leader's statement that it is likely that other States will build a casino. As I stated earlier, Victoria is considering the establishment of a restricted type of casino that will admit only those with sufficient credit or with an oversea visa. That would immediately eliminate from this State most oversea visitors, because if one examines the economics of the matter one acknowledges that, as South Australia does not have an international airport, most oversea visitors will patronize those casinos nearest where they disembark in Australia.

A Tasmanian Australian Labor Party Parliamentarian, whom for his own personal reasons I will not name, believes that Australia cannot support three or more casinos and that, if casinos are established in Victoria and New South Wales, Tasmania will suffer considerably. About 80 per cent of people patronizing the Tasmanian casino are residents of that State and, if one deducts from that figure only half the number of visitors to the State, one finds that only a small percentage of patrons are tourists. Compared to Tasmania, South Australia possibly has few tourist attractions, and I believe that the Tasmanian casino is too close anyway. A tourist may prefer to see the Tasmanian casino, travelling to a small island State, often called the Apple Isle.

It is pretty poor to say that operating a casino is a method of improving our State revenue, because most members will have in their districts electors who have suffered in some way through gambling. In this regard, the State carries the burden, and the \$30 000 that may be received in licence fees, plus other percentages, will not all be profit to the State. Some people will be relying on the State to help them recover from their experiences. Indeed, I believe that the State should help, but we should not create a situation in which more will be placed in this category. I am not denigrating other people, for members of my own family might be involved.

In addition, a distance of 80 kilometres from Adelaide is not a commonsense proposition when we are considering ways of conserving our energy resources and of preventing pollution. However that does not mean to say that I favour establishing a casino in Adelaide. Because of my present state of health, I will not delay the House any longer, but I do not support the establishment of a casino in South Australia and I reiterate that my views on this matter are recorded in a speech I made earlier to the motion to which I have referred. I oppose the second reading.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): This Bill can be debated on two grounds, the first dealing with the general logic of the proposal, and the second with its effects. Indeed, on the basis of the logic alone, I believe that the Bill can be defeated. The Bill proposes that a referendum should be held, asking the people of South Australia whether they are in favour of a casino in a specific place. The referendum will ask, "Do you approve of the establishment of a casino at . . . ?", the name of the town to be named. Surely, a referendum should be held for the purpose of deciding a principle: the people of South Australia should not have to make social and economic decisions for the State, for that is what Parliament and the Cabinet are for. A referendum is held to decide principles for our society as a whole. It is stated that the casino should be 80 kilometres from Adelaide, but why is that distance specified? It is certainly not specified for economic reasons.

Indeed, the people concerned have already stated clearly that for business purposes they would prefer to have the casino established in Adelaide. One can only conclude that we are afraid that a casino will have an adverse social effect on the people of Adelaide. If it does have such an effect, why should we let it have that effect on the rural community? For this reason also, the Bill should be defeated. The main argument advanced in favour of a casino in South Australia has been that it will attract tourists to this State. If the casino is more than 80 kilometres from Adelaide, it will not attract the largest possible number of tourists. The whole purpose of this Bill would then be defeated and it is illogical to carry on with a Bill that is not logical in trying to achieve the maximum possible benefit for this State. How many tourists would fly to Adelaide and then rent a car and drive 80 kilometres to a casino when they can fly direct to Hobart? It is totally illogical. The long drive would pose new threats to road safety. Whether people have been drinking or not, when driving back to Adelaide late at night they are at risk, and that is illogical.

I have been told by one of the possible developers that such a casino would require a staff of 300 people. They would not be 300 ordinary people: they would be 300 specialists with skills ranging from those of a chef to those of a croupier. Wrest Point casino had difficulty in obtaining the necessary staff. Will suitable people come to live in a South Australian country town? Obviously not. We would even have difficulty in getting them to come to Adelaide, let alone to some small remote country town. We can logically vote against this Bill.

Great claims have been made about the increase in tourism in Tasmania, and in Hobart in particular. I would not dispute those claims; they are probably reasonably accurate. However, South Australia could not expect the same boost to tourism. To start with, there will be two casinos instead of one, so we can expect only half the tourist advantage that Tasmania has already enjoyed. We can expect far less than half because we will have the casino over 80 kilometres from Adelaide. It will be far less than half as Tasmania has benefited because at this stage casinos in Australia are the current fad. It will not be long, however, before tourism to Hobart tends to fall away from its present optimum. It is high at present because every convention held in Australia is being held in Tasmania, if possible, to take advantage of the new casino. It is a popular fad at present. We all admit that, but that situation will not continue in the years to come. Obviously, by the time we have a casino in Adelaide the fad will have passed. If we are really interested in tourism (and I believe we are, because that is the main argument

put up in favour of this Bill), a decent convention centre should be built in Adelaide. I am talking of a large convention centre that could cater for 1 000 or 2 000 people.

Mr. Payne: What is the matter with the festival complex?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am talking of a convention centre including accommodation and suitable lecture halls. I agree that we have suitable halls in the festival complex—

Mr. Millhouse: Isn't that why we are building the international hotel?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am talking of a centre near the centre of Adelaide to cater for 2 000 people. I suggest that adjacent to Light Square would be a suitable site for such a convention centre, which needs to be close to high standard entertainment, but a casino 80 kilometres from Adelaide will not be. It has to have large convention halls which a casino in the country will not have.

Mr. Keneally: And a big bank nearby.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If we wish to attract tourists, as the proponents of a casino are claiming, we must get our priorities straight and build a convention centre before a casino. Wrest Point casino was opened on February 10 this year, so we have had only nine months in which to assess its social effects, and I should not like to accept either the case for or against a casino on overseas evidence. No scientist (and there are other scientists in this House) in his right mind would accept evidence of only nine months duration when trying to put forward a case to prove either adverse or favourable effects. Any scientist worth his reputation, when trying to collect social data for a large community, would require evidence over a minimum period of two or three years. In South Australia we should wait until this evidence is produced and then make our judgment whether there will be any adverse effects.

The benefits of such a casino to this State will be minimal. We are unsure of what the adverse effects will be and until we can clarify this, until we can minimize these effects, we should not establish a casino in this State. It is surprising how many young people in this State are opposed to casinos. The South Australian Young Liberal Council voted clearly against the establishment of a casino. A surprisingly large number of university students have expressed their opposition to the establishment of a casino and I am delighted that some trade unionists have expressed their opposition. For the reasons I have stated (that on the grounds of logic the Bill is astray and that we do not know at this stage what will be the social effects) I intend to vote against the Bill.

Mr. HALL (Goyder): It is interesting to hear the members of the Liberal and Country League spin a web to try to hide the traditional paternalism upon which the L.C.L. is built. Having spent 15 years here, I know truly when I hear it, without hearing it for very long, how this traditional paternalism manifests himself. One must recognize in the first instance that it will always deal with something other than the matter before the Chair. We have heard this again today. Some of us tried to listen to the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition, but I must say, putting it mildly, that it was largely unintelligible. When he talked about funding, we thought he was talking about the capital investment in the casino and it took us some time to realize he was really talking about the daily betting turnover of the casino. The last thing the Leader wanted to discuss was the real subject matter of the Bill. The member for Davenport has used the worst arguments of paternalism. He is frightened of the people. Although he said, just before

he sat down, that all the people to whom he had spoken were against a casino, he was frightened of their opinion at a referendum. If the member for Davenport and the Leader are so convinced that people do not want a casino, why are they frightened of public opinion? The answer is that they believe that people will vote in favour of a casino, as I believe they will.

I have been through all this travail before. I went through it in the case of the Totalizator Agency Board and in the case of the lottery. I have looked up the speech of Sir Thomas Playford on one of these social issues and, although it is far more intelligible than the speeches of the Opposition members who have already spoken (and that is not surprising), otherwise it is identical. In 15 or 20 years time, remaining members of the L.C.L. will make the same sort of speeches when social changes are proposed. The diminishing proportion of L.C.L. members will continue to try to lead the majority, which does not like them anyway, in a paternal manner. The arguments are that a casino is not morally good, and that it will not work anyway, because it is not financially viable. The very members who will say this will take their gold pass, go to Tasmania, and visit the casino there. Even the member for Gouger used his gold pass to visit the casino in Tasmania, although he did not put any money across the tables to help pay for it. Members will use their gold pass and enjoy the sights in Tasmania. This is good enough for them, but it is not good enough for the people whom they represent, whom they would lead by the hand.

The position gets worse. We are dealing with whether there should be a referendum, whether the people should get a say. The action of members here is that they will enjoy a virtual referendum on the issue but will deny a referendum to their constituents by voting against the Bill. We are deciding now whether the 700 000-odd voters of South Australia should be able to say whether they want a casino. The Leader and the member for Davenport have said that the people are not capable of deciding this. That is the only interpretation that can be placed on their remarks and on the remarks of any member who opposes the referendum. I qualify that statement to the extent that I concede that a member could hold the principle that he does not believe in a referendum. Although I do not agree with that view in all cases, I agree with it sometimes. However, I do not agree with the principle in this case. That is a defensible position to take, but it is the only defensible position that I allow in this argument.

In this case, I believe there is a perfectly proper question that the people can be asked. Australia now has its first legal casino, which is working well in Tasmania and attracting much interest throughout Australia. It is within the province of State Governments to decide whether or not they will allow casinos and under what conditions. Therefore, this question has agitated many people in the community. No member can do better than make a personal assessment of what the public thinks about a casino. I believe that the majority will vote in favour, although others may believe they will vote against the casino. There is no properly conducted opinion survey that helps in this regard. I believe that the public of South Australia should be able to have a say about this new form of gambling that would be established in their midst if they voted in favour of it. I disagree most vehemently with those members who say paternally that the public is not fit to express an opinion on the location and establishment of a casino. I believe people are fit and competent to express an opinion.

Obviously, those members who have spoken so far are frightened of the democratic process. They treat their

constituents as under-age children that are not fit to have an opinion. However, to defeat this Bill will only be a delaying action. We can look at all the social changes that have occurred in the last two decades (particularly in the last decade) to see that these are only delaying actions in which members become involved. We hear on the grapevine that the Bill will be defeated because there is perhaps not more than one member on this side who will vote for the Bill and there are a few members on the Government side who will join this paternalism: (and I spread my criticism to cover them) and defeat the second reading.

The Hon. L. J. King: And your colleague?

Mr. HALL: I would say that the Liberal Movement is divided 50-50, which is a jolly sight better arrangement than applies to the L.C.L. which, according to the grapevine, will be 100 per cent against.

The Hon. L. J. King: Do you spread your criticism to your colleague?

Mr. HALL: He can take criticism and give it, too. Members who have spoken compound their attitude, as they have made contradictory statements on other occasions. On August 29, the Leader of the Opposition was reported as saying that a compulsory referendum should be held to find out whether South Australians wanted a casino. What is this Bill about? One wonders about the Leader's wish for a compulsory referendum, in view of his attitude towards voting in this House. In August, the Leader wanted a compulsory referendum of South Australian voters to ascertain their views on a casino.

Mr. Chapman: Not at a specified place.

Mr. HALL: The honourable member is an expert on casinos; I am sure he will enlighten the House about them. He has no moral objection, as I will soon show by quoting his remarks. I take it that he will object to the provision relating to the location of the casino or say that it would not be viable. When the Leader of the Opposition made his statement, the Leader of the Opposition in the Upper House (Mr. DeGaris) said that he personally opposed the establishment of a casino. I wonder whether that was what was decisive in the Leader's changing his view and now opposing the holding of a compulsory referendum to find out what the people think. The Leader also said that he would move to amend any Government Bill in order to provide for a State-wide referendum; he said he would initiate a referendum. Therefore, if a Bill to establish a casino had been introduced without provision for a referendum, one would have expected the Leader to amend that Bill to provide for a referendum. He also said:

I believe the people of the State should be given the opportunity to express their views in the form of a referendum. ... On the information available I would oppose the passage of this legislation until it has been tested with the public.

In all public statements on the question of a casino the Leader of the Opposition has said that his decision would depend on the acceptance or rejection of the proposal as a result of a referendum. At page 1032 of *Hansard* this year, the member for Eyre is reported as saying:

This is a Government proposal and the Government Should give the people of the State the opportunity, at a referendum, to exercise their democratic right.

The member for Glenelg also espoused a referendum when he said:

I believe that the people should have the opportunity at a referendum to say whether they want a casino, whereas the Premier intends to hold a referendum after a site has been decided.

The honourable member qualified himself, but I cannot understand his qualification. Major political Parties are represented on the Industries Development Committee, so that a site is to be selected by an impartial and non-political body in that sense.

Mr. Mathwin: The cart before the horse!

Mr. HALL: The honourable member is wrong. Not only is a principle involved (and members of the public can refuse it by referendum) but also details of the site are to be placed before them. Instead of voting on the principle, the public can vote on the principle and on the site, so that it is doubly privileged by the provisions of this legislation. I do not have to emphasize the point that a significant number of those who have not approved of a casino at first sight have said that the public should have a say in this matter. Certainly enough members have stated that they will oppose the Bill and go back on what they have said: they will resile from their previous viewpoint and change their minds. This change has been caused by the number of petitions they have received. I think I have had longer experience in this House—

Mr. Venning: It won't be much longer now!

Mr. HALL: No, nor will the honourable member be here much longer. I assure him that his opponents will receive more than enough preference votes to put him out of this place. For many years in this House I have seen L.C.L. members unduly influenced by those who petition them. If an L.C.L. member receives a petition with 300 or 500 signatures on it, he believes that the petition speaks for the people of South Australia. I have seen that happen many times. I have known a prominent statesman in this House who has said that he had in his bag 10 000 reasons why we could not have 10 o'clock closing in South Australia. My retort was that the sooner he took the bag away and burnt it the better we would be. There was enough influence in those 10 000 signatures to keep the L.C.L. on the rails and for it to oppose any social change!

Signatures on a petition are sufficient to suffocate any Opposition move for social change. I hope Government members will not join their opponents in their attitude. I am not arguing whether we should have a casino or not. I know that I would vote in favour of a casino at this stage, provided that it was to be placed on a sensible site. I reserve my final opinion until details of a site have been placed on the referendum voting paper. However, I will not campaign for others to vote one way or the other: it is their decision, and I want them to make it without influence from me. I respect anyone's views for or against the casino. That is what the whole thing is about: to obtain a decision from more than 50 per cent of the people without pressure being applied to them. It does not matter in the end if the majority decision is accepted: that is the only democratic way of making this decision.

I hope that Labor members will not be misled by the Opposition's viewpoint, and I invite them to study the *Hansard* debates on a social question, particularly in the 1965-66 volume. I ask Government members not to be misled, as I was in one of the decisions I made. I voted against a referendum to establish a lottery, because I believed that, for economic reasons, the lottery would harm South Australia and would not be viable because there would not be enough support to maintain it. What fools we were! The lottery has been a resounding success; it is used by most South Australians, I am sure; and, as far as I know, it has harmed no-one. It is unobtrusive and provides a little lift of emotional enjoyment for those involved in the slight flutter in which they engage. I ask

Government members not to be misled by the attitude of Opposition members, because all we are doing is giving the public the right to have a say in this matter.

There was a time when I took the view that every decision that should be made for the public should be made in this House by its elected members. I still hold that view on most questions, but I believe that a genuinely different view has developed amongst the public regarding social issues. Whatever happens in this House, there will be much dissension in the community. Those who oppose the casino will say that Parliament foisted a whole social change on them against the will of the majority if the Bill is passed. If the Bill is lost those who want a casino will say that we are living in the last century. A referendum on the issue will solve the problem. I know of no better way in which to tackle a social question involving gambling or drinking. There was a time when I was completely convinced that that was the wrong attitude, and I voted against the lottery referendum.

I cannot be accused of being a coward, but I have changed my opinion. I am completely in support of a referendum in this type of issue, and I believe I would be supported by an overwhelming majority of people in South Australia. I hope that no Government member will change his mind about this matter and follow the attitude of most Opposition members. I believe the public will applaud all members if they are allowed to have their say on this matter.

I now refer briefly to the location of the casino. There should not be a restriction limiting the casino to or from any part of South Australia. The expenditure that would be involved to have a small scaled-down casino in a country area would probably be about \$2 000 000, whereas a large complex in the metropolitan area, including a convention centre as the member for Davenport has mentioned, would cost from \$10 000 000 to \$15 000 000.

One does not need to be a student of economics to know that a casino outside the range of easy travel from Adelaide would need to be many times smaller than one in a capital city. Hobart is having difficulty accommodating the visitors to the casino as well as providing the accommodation needs that existed before the casino was built. In terms of the standards for people who would use a casino, no accommodation in the smaller country centres in South Australia at present would be suitable, so a casino in a country area would need to be much smaller and much more restricted than would be required by the people that we want to attract from other States and from overseas.

An amendment in my name removes any restriction about the location and leaves that matter to the good sense of the committee to evaluate the proposals and place its findings before the people for a decision. The House should understand the economic aspects and realize the importance of the decision on that amendment. I should not like to say whether the casino should be in the country or in the city, but I think Carclew is vacant at present and that would be a magnificent site near the city and with a view of our beautiful park lands, although I do not know whether it would be big enough. The committee should not be denied opportunity to consider all aspects.

I ask this House not to impose its views on the public. Whatever the complexities, unknowns and guesses, the people of South Australia would like to express an opinion in the matter. If we asked the people whether they wanted a referendum, they would say "Yes". I am not referring here to the pressure groups, although I do not reject them. Anyone should be able to approach the Parliament by petition or in any other way, but the pressure groups

usually emphasize only one point of view and do not speak for members of the general public who do not take such a hard-line stand.

I ask the House not to rely on the one hard viewpoint that has governed so many members in the 15 years during which I have been in this House, and I ask some of the members on this side to reconcile their viewpoints. They will go to the casino and enjoy it. Possibly, they will decide to go again, with all the facilities that membership of this House provides to enable them to get there. Therefore, I do not know how those members can sustain a view that the public should not be allowed to express an opinion in the matter. I ask members to be honest and to realize that it is a matter not of our saying whether we want a casino but of the people saying whether they want one. I also ask members to consider what has been the result of attitudes taken in the past and to consider the reasons why some decisions have been made. Members should not be misled: they should vote for a referendum on the issue.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Members of the Liberal and Country League and the Australian Labor Party doubtless will rejoice that on this issue the Liberal Movement is split wide open, right down the middle. I must say, in fairness to the member for Stuart and other members opposite, that they will make less of an issue of it than the L.C.L. Only this afternoon, the member for Hanson said that we were known as Heckle and Jeckle. That was the first time I had heard that.

Mr. Keneally: Do you know which is which?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, and I suppose that that depends on point of view, but what I have said will give the member for Hanson satisfaction, and we expect to hear from him in the debate. I oppose the second reading. I consider that the speech made by the member for Goyder this afternoon was the most powerful I have heard in support of the Bill. I do not say that merely because he and I are in the same Party.

Mr. Venning: He didn't convince you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: For the edification of the member for Rocky River, I say that the member for Goyder came closer to convincing me than the Premier did in explaining the Bill. There is much to be said for a referendum on any subject, but that is the weakness in the argument put by the member for Goyder. We can say that of almost any matter, and on some matters we in this House must decide. That is our responsibility and the reason why we have been sent here. Whether this is one of those issues is a matter of judgment. In the judgment of the member for Goyder the issue should go to a referendum, whereas in my judgment we in this place should make the decision.

We have now come to the head counting, and the *News* has done it for us this afternoon. There is no point in any member's making a long speech on the pros and cons and I will state as briefly as I can why I oppose the second reading. I do not consider that a strong case has been made out in favour of a casino and I would need to have a strong case put to me before I changed my point of view.

I emphasize that I do not say that my mind could not be changed, and the remarks I have made about the speech by the member for Goyder probably show that. However, at present, having in mind the arguments put forward by the proponents of this measure, I am not convinced. The Premier had only two arguments, so far as I could see from his explanation. The first concerned employment and the second was about ensuring that in

country areas we used tourist development to obtain security of employment. I suppose both matters come down to one argument. The establishment of a casino might help some country area of the State. Although I do not intend to develop this argument, I have grave reservations on moral grounds, both direct and indirect, about the establishment of a casino. It is a matter of conviction, and we all have our own convictions on this matter. I have reservations, and those reservations have not been overcome up to the present. The greatest weakness in the Bill is the insistence by the Government that the casino must be located away from the metropolitan area of Adelaide. Even the Premier had to admit in his second reading explanation that there will be disadvantages associated with such a project; indeed, he said "(and there will be some)". If there were nothing wrong with having a casino, why cannot the casino be established anywhere? That it must be located away from the main centre of population, the centre where most of the customers are, makes me wonder why we should not expect it to be located near the centre where most of the customers are available to allow for the marketing of the product. I believe that this shows that even the Government has some reservations about the project. In fact, this is an admission at least as eloquent as any admission that could be made in words. To me, it is a fatal objection to the proposal now being considered.

If we were to pass the second reading (and I had made up my mind on this point long before the head count had been done for us), I would certainly support the amendment foreshadowed by the member for Goyder. If we are going to have a referendum on this question, and if we are to have any genuine choice at all, qualifications should not be inserted in the Bill to cut out what is the most obvious venue for a casino.

The Bill itself is extraordinary. Indeed, it is one of the first Bills I have ever seen dealing with a topic such as this, yet it does not anywhere define a casino. There is no definition of a casino at all. In the interpretations laid out in clause 4, there is no interpretation or definition of the word "casino". The nearest we get to it is that an "authorized game" means a game, for the time being, an authorized game under section 39 of this Act". I now refer to clauses 39 and 40. Clause 39 (1) provides:

The Minister may, from time to time, by notice published in the *Gazette* declare any game, not being a game played with a poker machine—

whatever else happens, we shall not have a poker machine—

to be an authorized game for the purposes of this Act . . . Of course, there is power to vary that declaration. I believe the Bill has been carefully and deliberately drawn so as not to define "casino". We are simply giving the Minister of the Crown the right to say what games shall be played in these places or in this place and what games shall not be played. Again, I believe this is a grave weakness of the Bill.

Several meanings of the word "casino" are given in the dictionary. The word has been thrown about in the community and in this House as a place where gambling of one sort or another is carried on. Is the casino to be for gambling exclusively, or will other things be allowed? Are we to have dancing, music, dining and drinking in association with the casino? Are massage parlours to be attached?

Mr. Keneally: You wouldn't want that—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What is meant here?

Mr. Payne: What do you want?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the honourable member looks at my amendment he will see that I believe we should define in some way what we mean by "casino". Because of the way the Bill has been drawn, it is almost impossible to put a definition in the Bill, yet I believe one belongs there, possibly in the long title. What can a casino be? In Murray's *Oxford English Dictionary* three meanings are provided in the main work and a fourth meaning is provided in the supplementary work. The first three definitions are as follows:

(1) A pleasure-house, a summer-house (in Italy).

(2) A public room used for social meetings; a club-house; especially a public music or dancing saloon—that is not the meaning required here—

(3) A game of cards.

Again, that is not what we want either, but it is getting closer. In the supplement to Murray (and this is coming to it) the fourth definition is as follows: "a building for gambling, often with other amenities". What are the other amenities? I have already posed that question and had a bit of a ribald reply from the member for Stuart. I refer to the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*, as follows:

Casino: public music or dancing or gambling room; an old card game.

Clearly, the dictionary definition of the term is an imprecise one, and I believe a great weakness in the Bill is that we do not define precisely what we mean by "casino". Certainly, if it is going to a referendum, we do not want to have another fiasco like that in respect of the shopping hours referendum. Surely, the people would want to know what we are talking about. However, for reasons of its own, the Government has left that out.

What are the motives of the Government in introducing this Bill? I cannot help thinking that the qualifications that have been applied have been applied deliberately to ensure that the casino is not a goer. I believe that the Premier and his Ministers want it both ways: they want to be able to say that they are in favour of the casino, but that it has been turned down. Indeed, to introduce a Bill with such an enormous qualification really makes me doubt the genuine intention of those who have introduced it.

The Hon. L. J. King: That argument is based on the assumption that we are courting the public.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It has left me perplexed.

The Hon. L. J. King: Your theory has left me perplexed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is not important what the Minister thinks about my theory. I just wonder what are the motives of the Government in introducing such a measure. The only other thing I wish to say (and it is to some extent in reply to my good colleague the member for Goyder) concerns petitions and popular feeling on this matter. I have had hundreds of signatures on those wretched little forms (and I have told Keith Smith what I think about them) that he had circulated among church people in South Australia, especially among Methodists. The forms were so badly designed that it was almost impossible to determine the names and addresses on them. I have told him to come to see me next time he wants to circulate a petition if he wants to ensure that the form is decently set out so that members can acknowledge the representations received.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I know he is in the gallery, and I know he will not mind my saying this here. Indeed, I have received hundreds of these and, although I do not believe for a moment that they are decisive, I can only say to my friend from Goyder that I have received only

one representation from the other side, and that was from a business concern. I do not believe there has been any popular demand for a casino in South Australia. Until it was announced that the Bill would be introduced, this was a dead issue. Therefore, although this is a matter of judgment, I do not believe that public opinion is in favour of a casino in South Australia, and I say that whether or not a Gallup poll was conducted on the matter. I oppose the second reading but, if it passes, members will have to examine the Bill and undertake some of the major surgery that is so beloved of Liberal and Country League members in another place.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): Reluctantly, I am inclined to agree with the member for Mitcham. Like other members, I have tried in the last six months to assess the benefits that might accrue to the State if a casino was established, especially in relation to the tourist development potential, and to compare this with the many petitions that have been signed by people who claim that the establishment of a casino could encourage an increase in crime and destroy what they describe as the quality of life in this State.

I am one of the members, to whom the member for Goyder referred, who took advantage of the opportunity to see the Wrest Point casino in May, not for the ulterior purpose to which he referred but because I wanted to see the Situation for myself. I then formed an opinion, which I will express shortly. I am not convinced by the arguments advanced by those who have submitted petitions and who claim that criminal activity is associated with Wrest Point casino. Although there are arguments for and against this matter, Wrest Point casino, which is in its infancy, has not been operating long enough for anyone to assess the detrimental social effects that it may have on the community.

The proprietors of Wrest Point casino would probably admit that, despite the upsurge in tourism in Tasmania, the local people make that casino a viable proposition. Also, as the member for Davenport said, Wrest Point casino is still a novelty. I therefore believe that, if a casino is established in South Australia on a site more than 80 kilometres from the General Post Office, its viability will be reduced. It is obvious that the viability of Wrest Point casino depends largely on local patronage. It was apparent to me, as a patron, that at midnight, 12.30 a.m. or 1 a.m. people were still entering that casino, which indicated that they were local people.

Mr. Keneally: And that you were up too late.

Mr. SLATER: That may be so. It would be discriminatory to establish a casino 80 kilometres from the metropolitan area and, indeed, it would disadvantage people in this State compared to, say, visitors from other States and overseas. Wallaroo has been referred to as a likely site for the establishment of a casino. However, as the member for Davenport also said metropolitan residents who had patronized the casino, including its refreshment section, could be returning home in the early hours of the morning and one could imagine the dangers associated with the return journey, particularly on the Port Wakefield Road, which has such a bad road safety record.

I refer now to the personnel required to run the casino. I understand that at Wrest Point there has been a tremendous turnover of specialist staff. With due respect to people living outside the metropolitan area (I refer again to Wallaroo), it has been stated that a casino would stimulate employment in the area in which it was established, but I doubt whether these local people could be trained. I refer, for instance, to female croupiers. It is obvious that

one would need certain qualities to fulfil this position. As these people would have to be obtained from the metropolitan area or elsewhere, this would not assist employment in, say, the Wallaroo area if a casino was established there. However, it could assist in a subsidiary sort of way in relation to unskilled employment.

There has not been a great public demand for the establishment of a casino in this State. On all possible occasions, I have taken the opportunity to ask people what is their attitude regarding the establishment of a casino. Many times people have been either non-committal or opposed to it, but only in a few instances have they been in favour of it. My view on the matter has therefore been guided by the attitude of these people. Last Thursday, at a Labor Party meeting held in my district, I indicated my attitude to the establishment of a casino and referred to some of the factors that I have enumerated today. As not one person saw fit to contradict my views, I believe that I am expressing the attitude of my constituents. Only one member, apart from the Premier, who introduced the Bill, has been in favour of establishing a casino in South Australia.

My only other point is that my opposition to the establishment of a casino, apart from considering that it is not viable, is based not only on moral or practical grounds but also on the ground (and I am sure members opposite will not share this view) that nothing more completely epitomizes monopoly capitalism than does a casino, which is based on one thing only—profit. I suppose that another term that could be used is “greed”. The very essence of the operation of a casino is to make money. In fact, South Australia has had in Grenfell Street a casino for many years, and I refer to the Stock Exchange. However, the Parliament has not had many petitions against that casino. Fortunes can be decided in a casino by the roll of a dice, the turn of a card, or the spin of a wheel; the basis is the profit motive. There is no doubt that the whole purpose of a casino, whether at Wallaroo, Victor Harbor, Andamooka, or Adelaide, would be to promote the interest of wealthy tourists, a discriminatory purpose indeed. Therefore, I oppose the second reading.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I oppose the Bill. I will not canvass the arguments that have been put forward in what I consider to be a good debate. When I knew that many members were to speak in this debate, I thought it might be dreary. However, I believe it has been conducted on a high plane. Only the member for Goyder sought to introduce personalities, and I do not think he gained much by doing so. He said that he had had a change of heart about the matter of government by referendum, now believing that a referendum was necessary only in the case of a social question but that otherwise we should be willing to make up our own minds. It seems ludicrous to me that we should ask the people for an opinion about social questions, going to the expense of a referendum, which is about the same as the expense of conducting an election, just to find out views on these questions. If we are charged with making laws which, in our judgment, are for the benefit of the people, I cannot see any valid reason for differentiating between social and other questions that are of considerable importance in the life of the community. We are charged with finding out the facts and telling the people about them, if they do not already know them. Then we must legislate to the best of our ability.

The member for Goyder also referred to the matter of paternalism. A passing reference was made to a former statesman, whom I am not ashamed to name as Sir Thomas Playford and who was attacked often for his paternalism.

This criticism came to a head on the matter of the State lottery. I reject this type of argument. Perhaps Sir Thomas was not in sympathy with the general will of the people on the matter of the lottery, but I am convinced that in his own mind he considered that what he was doing was in the best interests of the people. I am willing to respect a man who has that sort of courage of his convictions. I respect the present Premier for being against the introduction of poker machines in this State. However, he could be accused of paternalism. In his judgment and the judgment of others, poker machines lead to social evils. When any judgment is made on social questions, we can be accused of paternalism. I am certainly willing to make up my mind and to listen to arguments; I will listen to anyone who has a submission to make. I am willing to make up my own mind, as was Sir Thomas Playford and as are members on both sides of the House. For the life of me, I cannot see any advantage in having frequent recourse to referenda simply because the matter involved is a social matter.

The member for Gilles said that he believed he was reflecting the view of people in his district. In opposing the Bill, I believe we reflect the view of most people. In doing so, I am sure I reflect the view of people in my district, which includes what was the Angas District, people in that district having voted against the State lottery at that referendum. I believe that the State lottery had far wider appeal than has a casino. People do not have to travel for miles and enter into a different sort of environment to take part in a lottery. The gambling involved in a lottery is usually small. People do not become impoverished by betting heavily; in fact, they enjoy the flutter. I have not had an opportunity to see the casino at Hobart. For my education, I will go there, but I will not go there, as the member for Goyder suggested, because I am an inveterate gambler.

The Hon. L. J. King: If you win a buck or two, that will be all right, too.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will not place myself in the position to win a buck or two. People who have been to the casino and watched people gambling say that it is a serious business. I will find out for myself what the situation is at that casino. Nevertheless, I submit that a casino is a completely different kettle of fish from a State lottery. I am convinced that a casino is not in the best interests of the people of the State. While I was overseas, I did not have a chance to look at casinos. In other countries, the type of casino varies. Apparently, in London the gambling houses are so discreet that one cannot believe they exist.

However, the type of casino envisaged for South Australia is obviously the Wrest Point type. From a distance, I saw one or two of this type overseas, although I had no opportunity to study them in detail. Although I do not give much credence to Gallup polls, all the indications are that the public is not in favour of a casino. The member for Mitcham said that he had had only one submission in favour. I think that all members have received a submission in favour from a business concern that is interested in establishing the casino. That submission refers to an interview with Superintendent Shepherd on the television programme *Weekend Magazine*. The points extracted from this interview impinge on the question of the location of the casino. The reference is as follows:

He considers the city location has allowed the establishment of an international hotel and convention centre in conjunction with the casino. The city location facilitates monitoring of the casino and adds to the quality of police control of the operation.

The only document we have received acknowledges the fact that police control is necessary, and it is facilitated by having the establishment near the centre of the city and also allows the fringe benefits that are claimed to accrue from the establishment of a casino. That opinion rather condemns the idea of having a casino 80 kilometres from Adelaide. In his second reading explanation the Premier undertook to place material before the House, when he said:

Later, I shall circulate to members the information I have obtained about casinos in Europe, and I suggest that, in considering this Bill, they should read that material and also the report on the only casino so far operating in Australia, that at Wrest Point.

I have not received that material and I understand other members have not received it, either. Perhaps this has been an oversight, but I would require far more convincing evidence than has been presented to me in this debate or elsewhere before I would vote for the establishment of a casino on the lines provided in this Bill. A clause provides that a fee of \$5 000 will be charged to companies for submitting plans before they know whether or not there is to be a casino. That provision seems to be grossly unfair, but I am not interested at this stage in canvassing various clauses. I do not believe I need say any more at this stage.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): This afternoon we have learned that if one puts steel in the fire and gets it hot enough it will bend. I refer to comments made by the member for Goyder in this debate. The honourable member spent some time trying to convince members that there should be a referendum. It is surprising to me to hear the honourable member speak in that way, because only a few months ago he told me that this is the place in which decisions are made, that this is the place in which members of Parliament decide for the public, and that referendums are a waste of lime. I cannot support his comments at this stage. I refer to *Hansard* of August 18, 1970, in which appears the report of the debate on the shopping hours referendum. At that time the member for Goyder said:

There we find the reason for the referendum. The climate was not good when the Government put its hand out of the door and started to act on shopping hours. There was constant revulsion against restrictions and the Government had to change its policy within two and a half months of the election.

Instead of maintaining a policy of "no extension", it is now planning to ask the people whether they want a change. So, the Government is unloading the responsibility on to the people.

Within three years, it seems that the member for Goyder has adopted an opposite view. The beginning and end of the Government's case for a casino is that it will afford some lift to our State Budget. Before I comment on the Bill, I should like to quote from an article by Max Harris on September 2, when he said:

A casino creates employment. It certainly does, for professional croupiers, bar-girls, "hostesses", bouncers, stand-over merchants, chefs, waiters, and scullery-maids.

I wonder how many of the country towns of South Australia outside the 80-kilometre limit have people seeking employment in those categories! The establishment of a casino in South Australia is described by the Premier in his second reading speech as "merely a generating factor of a major tourist complex". I believe the casino portion of such major complexes is a degenerating and demoralizing factor in such places of entertainment. I do not wish, however, to pursue an extremist view on the moral aspects in particular. I agree that the establishment of major tourist complexes of international standard is desirable in every State in the general promotion of the tourist industry. In South Australia, where we have natural resources of

world recognition, there is ample opportunity to expand the tourist industry without entering the field of gambling practices to do so.

I have spoken on this matter previously and again, briefly, raise the point that the establishment of a casino in South Australia is not merely providing for an extension of the ordinary present gambling facilities: instead, it is proposed to introduce a new type of gambling where the patron has less than a 50/50 chance of winning: in fact, where the machines are geared to favour the house in a place where the whole atmosphere is designed to destroy the concentration of the patrons.

Mr. Keneally: You obviously lost!

Mr. CHAPMAN: I assure the member for Stuart he is quite wrong. By good luck and good fortune, certainly not by good management, I came out of the place in pocket, which is contrary to the general rule. For example, much play has been made of the point that there will be no poker machines in South Australia. There is little difference between poker machines and roulette wheels. Poker machines are known as "one-armed bandits" and, as far as I am concerned, roulette croupiers are "two-armed bandits". The card wheels of a poker machine revolve in a perpendicular direction whereas the roulette wheels revolve horizontally. In both cases the machines are fixed or geared for the house, so it necessarily follows that, purely by machinery design, the betting is odds on. We all know that in South Australia we already have a type of odds-on betting within our lottery system, the profits of which are directed to charity, whereas the profits from a casino, certainly from the Wrest Point casino and, I imagine, from the proposed casino in South Australia, will be directed to the house operators: and at least a proportion of those profits will go directly out of the State in the interests of permitted oversea investors.

Recently, we have heard the Government expound its views on speculating real estate agents, when it was claimed that they were exploiting home-owners and young couples in this State. Now, the Government, after telling us how wrong it was to allow those "rogues" to exploit the public and within days of our hearing those criticisms, comes forward with a proposal to allow an even worse, and more dangerous, group to suck the community dry of its hard-earned and much needed wages.

Speaking on this part of the Bill, which I believe is important as it deals with a referendum, I suppose it is some consolation that the Bill proposes to have such a casino established outside the immediate reach of the metropolitan multitudes. That part of the Bill in itself, I believe, is an admission that such gambling practices are undesirable and clearly outside the interests of the people generally. The Premier is virtually saying, "We do not want it in the city of Adelaide so let us park it out in the country at least 80 kilometres from the General Post Office, where it will not affect or destroy the city environment, and get what we can from the touring public."

Little concern is expressed for those country people who may not want a casino in their districts but who will not have an opportunity of saying whether or not it should be there. In any major town or site outside the 80-kilometre limit in South Australia, the whole community of that town or the area surrounding that site may oppose the establishment of a casino, but the 800 000 people of Adelaide may agree to it. It may be against the wishes of those people directly concerned, who are then faced with a facility desired by others. The framework of the Bill in this regard is unfair, for the wishes of those people directly concerned are not considered.

The Premier, when explaining the Bill on October 23, 1973, said that the proposal for the granting of a casino licence in South Australia stemmed from two matters. In the first instance, he sought to gain a balanced, secure, and at the same time diversified form of employment in South Australia to ensure that those people employed were least affected by the fluctuations in the markets of consumer durable products. On the one hand, only recently the Government was promoting worker participation in industry. On the other hand, it is now saying it cannot let the workers be affected by the fluctuations of the output of those industries. The Government cannot have its cake and eat it, too.

In relation to the public support for a casino, apart from receiving acceptable petitions containing more than 1 050 signatures, I have also received many letters and unacceptable petitions from constituents both within and outside my electoral district. However, altogether I have received only three items of correspondence that have supported a casino in South Australia. On the basis of the disapproval that has been clearly expressed by people within and without my district and on the basis of my own views on the subject, I cannot and will not support the establishment of a casino in South Australia. That being the actual issue before the House, although it is clouded in other terms in the Bill, I oppose the second reading.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): During the earlier debate on the motion concerning a casino, I spoke at some length on this matter. I therefore do not intend to cover again all the points I raised at that time. The first decision to be made is whether a casino should be established in South Australia. Following consideration of this matter and following a visit to Wrest Point in Tasmania, I oppose the Bill. It has been stated that a casino should be established for the purpose of providing employment opportunities, increasing revenue and expanding tourism. These purposes could possibly be attained, but I am sure that there are detrimental aspects that have not been considered in connection with this matter. In the *Bulletin* of February 10, the day the Tasmanian casino was opened, an article headed "We're the Top of the Big-Time Gamblers" states:

Australians are now spending about \$3 358 000 000 a year in the three main forms of legalized gambling—poker machines—

I am glad that this Bill does not provide for them in South Australia—

racing (either with T.A.B.'s or bookmakers) and lotteries. Nobody can calculate how much more is spent on illegal gambling. Legal gambling means an enormous rake-off in taxes—almost \$200 000 000 a year into their coffers, plus fines imposed on those caught illegally gambling. Small wonder then when the U.S. magazine *Sports Illustrated* did a round-the-world check it was discovered that Australians are top of the international gambling score-card, spending per head of population \$160 a year on legalized gambling, far ahead of Americans with \$90 per head, New Zealanders \$50 and British \$30.

The establishment of a casino in South Australia would introduce a new concept of gambling here. Because the casino at Wrest Point has been quoted as an example by those who support the Bill, I believe that I am justified in making a comparison. I see a big difference between the Tasmanian casino and the casino proposed for South Australia. The Wrest Point casino is in the city of Hobart, but the casino proposed for South Australia would be established in a country area. Consequently, it would not have the same chance of success as has the Tasmanian casino. I accept that some of the objects of establishing the Tasmanian casino have been achieved:

the casino is controlled very well, taxation is being raised for the Government, and tourism has been increased. However, a warning has been issued by the Commonwealth Minister for Tourism and Recreation (Mr. Stewart). In the *Tasmanian Mercury* of October 31 an article headed "Bandwagon Worry" states:

State might lose initiative—Minister: "I would be very disappointed to see the State's initiative taken away by other States leaping on to Tasmania's casino bandwagon," the Federal Minister for Tourism and Recreation (Mr. Stewart) said in Launceston yesterday. Mr. Stewart, who was in Launceston to meet deputations asking for aid on tourist and recreation projects proposed for the area, told a press conference that Tasmania had done very well in getting the casino established. "I think the casino will mean a lot to the State in the future. However, I would be disappointed to see Tasmania's initiative taken away by other States," he said.

If other casinos are established in Australia, only a certain amount of money can be spent in them; consequently, a share would be taken from the Tasmanian casino and from any other casino as future gambling houses were established. It has been claimed that tourism has increased rapidly in Tasmania. In the *Tasmanian Mercury* of October 31 an article headed "Business Again Booming in Motels" attributes the following statement to the President of the Motel Federation of Australia Limited (Mr. A. Luby, of Victoria):

Although most accommodation houses suffered a downturn in business last year, things picked up and started to escalate this year.

I therefore suggest that we cannot attribute the escalation in tourism in Tasmania wholly and solely to the casino, because there has been an upsurge in tourism throughout Australia this year. Of course, the moral and sociological aspects must be considered. It has been suggested that these aspects should be played down and that there is unwarranted emphasis on them but, as they have been brought forward, I should like to quote from an article in the *News* of October 31. The report refers to a statement made by the Acting Tasmanian Police Commissioner (Mr. Knowles), as follows:

Mr. Knowles said today he did not think the casino should be blamed for the death of the men. "The two men who committed suicide were heavy gamblers and had been almost all their lives," he said.

I emphasize the following paragraph:

The casino might have provided the straw that broke the camels back, but they would have found other ways to gamble if it had not been there.

Need South Australia provide this last straw? The report continues:

All the casino has done is make gambling more convenient and provide a quicker way to lose money.

The Acting Police Commissioner admitted in this report that the casino provided a more convenient way for people not to gain money but to lose money. As the member for Alexandra said this afternoon, the odds are against the player, and all gambling institutions come out on the winning side. The member for Mitcham has referred to the definition and interpretation of "casino", and I wish to add only that the modern concept of the word is "a building for gambling, often with other amenities". If ever a casino is established (and I hope that it is not), I hope the amenities provided will be acceptable. The Bill requires the payment of \$5 000 with any application to establish a casino. Because of this provision a person would want to be assured that his application had a reasonable chance of succeeding. Indeed, I believe the payment of \$5 000 represents a wager and is indicative of the inherent gambling interests involved in the project itself. Clause 39 provides:

(1) The Minister may, from time to time, by notice published in the *Gazette*, declare any game, not being a game played with a poker machine, to be an authorized game for the purposes of this Act and the Minister may by a subsequent notice published in a like manner amend or vary any such declaration.

The Minister, after making his decision, can by notice in the *Gazette* declare any other form of gambling game acceptable, whether it be two-up or any other game, apart from poker machines. To those members who have suggested that a referendum is desirable, I point out that the referendum only seeks approval for the establishment of a casino in any one place. However, the people are denied any real information in this regard.

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

Mr. RUSSACK: In consideration of the procedure to be adopted, and taking account of the referendum, I level the criticism that, if there is to be a referendum, it should be the first event to take place, not the last. Also, I consider that the question should not have been, "Do you approve of the establishment of a casino at . . . ?", but whether the general public of South Australia would approve of the establishment of a casino in South Australia. Should the Bill pass the second reading, I will comment on other matters in Committee. I oppose the Bill. Although we cannot accept that a Gallup poll is foolproof, it does present some guide as to the thinking of the public. On September 5 in the *Advertiser* there appeared the result of a survey in South Australia which had recorded that 58 per cent of the people of this State were opposed to the establishment of a casino.

It is all very well to look back after an event, but in this case we must look before the event and make a decision on this Bill. Further, a survey was conducted by News Limited, which reported that "50 per cent of replies so far received in the poll said that South Australia should not have a casino". The *News* went on to say:

Some people suggest the casino be built in an outback area, such as the Simpson Desert.

I suggest that apart from the 50 per cent who had given a straightout reply others had suggested they did not want a casino in the closely populated areas of the State. I suggest, too, that the poll conducted by the *News* was a little bit loaded, because it asked:

Where do you think South Australia's casino should be? It then named six centres, and at the bottom it said:

Tick the square which you consider is the most suitable site for the casino and post your coupon to "Casino Poll". People must have known what they were doing, because in the line provided many wrote "Nowhere", and so we had the result that more than 50 per cent were not in favour of a casino in South Australia. Because of this, and because of my personal views which have been substantiated by evidence in my district, I have submitted to this House petitions containing 1 357 signatures and in addition, on the small yellow forms that have been suggested, I have forwarded to the Premier 303 names, making in all nearly 1 700 signatures of people in my district who oppose this move. This is a considerable percentage of the electorate and I realize that those who have not raised their voices perhaps will accept whatever is decided by this Parliament. I oppose the second reading.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I believe one should approach any Bill to be decided on conscience grounds with the inherent respect for the conscience of others that one asks for oneself. Therefore, I hope I will show a moderation of approach and demonstrate no emotionalism. I first want to make clear that I have no doubt whatever as to the good conscience of the Premier in introducing this Bill or as to

the excellent administration record of this Cabinet. Therefore, I have before me, in making this conscience decision, a formidable task not lightly resolved. One must in conscience weigh all the facts with sense and reason and speak accordingly.

The question is, "Should I, in good conscience, but with a well-informed conscience, vote for the second reading?" and my answer is, "No, I will not vote for the second reading." To explain this, I must canvass the grounds carefully and, I hope, factually. I look first at the grounds in favour of the establishment of a casino. These grounds can be put on, broadly, six bases: first, that the casino will be a tourist attraction; secondly, that it will be a direct revenue attractor to the State; thirdly, that it will be an indirect revenue attractor to the State via the Grants Commission in the sense that the State may receive money that it would not otherwise have received; fourthly, that there will be spin-off effects from the casino itself; fifthly, that there will be employment created in the construction, maintenance, and operation of the casino; finally, that there may be an opportunity of shoring up (if I can use that word) an economically non-viable community (for example, Wallaroo) through an operation such as that suggested.

As against that I must weigh the following factors: first, as to the question of tourist attraction, I must ask myself factually whether this is likely to be a tourist attraction economically viable under current Australian conditions. My answer is, "No", on two grounds: first, that the Bill itself provides for a location site more than 80 kilometres from Adelaide. If there is to be a casino, then its location site is all important. Even those who advocate the construction of a casino, and in particular the A. V. Jennings Industries Development Group, which has written to all members (as I understand it, at great length) can see this much—if it is to be a tourist attraction and an economically viable one, it must be within the city of Adelaide, and not 80 kilometres from the city. Secondly, I must consider the overall situation. Is it plausible and logical to say that, with the tourist attractions Sydney and, to a lesser extent, Melbourne, already provide for American tourists, and with the Wrest Point casino already in operation, these three considerations in themselves cancel out the possibility that the proposed casino will be economically viable? My answer again is, "Yes, these factors do seem to me to cancel out its viability."

So far as spin-off effects of expenditure are concerned, I would be the first to appreciate that, granted that the casino was established in Adelaide and had other features apart from gambling to offer (for instance, the provision of a licensed convention centre and possibly a hotel and other features), this might follow. However, I consider it most unlikely that visitors even from other States or overseas would travel the distance to Adelaide, which unfortunately has not an international airport, and then travel the extra distance by motor car to reach a resort of this kind. I do not support the establishment of a casino in South Australia but, were I to do so, I would say that the only hope of an economically viable casino would be if it was in Adelaide.

I turn now to the question of the alleged benefits in employment. In terms of construction benefits, these are undeniable but short-lived; in terms of maintenance benefits, these are undeniable but limited; and in terms of operational benefits these are undeniable but perhaps not spread so much that they would have the impact on the South Australian work force that is claimed for them. Finally,

dealing with the question of the shoring-up of an economically non-viable community on humanitarian grounds, as in the case of Wallaroo, I find it difficult to see that this would help the situation at all.

The protection proposed in the Bill is that of a referendum and also an extremely intricate provision to prevent foreign ownership (and I shall refer to that soon). I find the referendum unjustified in terms of cost and, in terms of dangers, as having self-evident dangers such as were shown at the shopping hours referendum. Let us assume that the committee examines the proposals of the promoters and decides upon a proposed area at least 80 kilometres from Adelaide, as it must be. One could then be faced with the situation that the vast majority of South Australians voted for the establishment of a casino in a region whose population had voted heavily against it or, alternatively, the vast majority of people could vote against the establishment of a casino in a particular region, whereas the population of that region favoured it. The shopping hours referendum, if nothing else, showed the danger of dealing with particular localities through general referendums.

I turn now to some specific provisions in the Bill and refer particularly to Part II, which deals with the basis of applications. I make quite clear that I do not oppose the second reading of the Bill on moral grounds: I am not opposed to betting in any form. I oppose it on purely practical political grounds and in pragmatic terms. If one considers clause 6 (1) (d) and then considers the experience in Tasmania, the dangers become somewhat evident. That clause provides:

The committee shall consider every application lodged under and in accordance with section 5 of this Act and in the consideration of each such application the committee shall have regard to . . . the likelihood that substantial control over the operations of the proposed company will be exercised by persons resident in Australia. I know that a later part of the Bill deals in detail with matters that could achieve this objective, but I want to refer to correspondence received from the A. V. Jennings group and also to an independent assessment that I have carried out into the factual position at Wrest Point. I want to do this to show the dangers that lie here.

However, before doing so, in terms of the moderation that I said would characterize my speech, I want to make clear that, whereas I was extremely suspicious of the motives of the two persons who promoted this correspondence, after meeting them on Monday and Tuesday last, I was convinced of their *bona fides* in the sense that they did not intend any deliberate misleading of members of Parliament, whilst at the same time making quite clear that they were part of the development group of A. V. Jennings Industries and, to that extent, had a clear interest in the matter. One must then examine their correspondence carefully. The first letter that I have on file was dated October 30, and I think all other members also received that letter. The third paragraph states:

We and our partners—
and I stress the words "and our partners"—

Federal Hotels Limited are keenly interested in the development and operation of a major hotel-casino complex in this State and we are concerned at what is clearly misleading information provided to members by the South Australian No Casino Committee.

That was the first letter that I received from the company. Following that, I had a conversation last Monday with two representatives of the company and I put to them that my research showed that, in fact, Federal Hotels Limited, having gained control of Wrest Point, had disposed of its interest in the matter substantially and, in fact, in majority

terms to foreign companies. I gave an opportunity for A. V. Jennings to reply to that, and an extremely interesting situation then arose. The next letter was dictated on November 6 (yesterday) and is headed "A. V. Jennings Industries Development Group, November 7, 1973, dictated November 6." It was directed to me personally. Having dealt with the equity holding of A. V. Jennings, it proceeds to deal with the question of Federal Hotels Limited and states:

(3) One copy of the annual accounts of Federal Hotels Limited and subsidiary companies as at January 30, 1973, together with similar information for City and Suburban Properties Limited, compiled at July 31, 1971, is supplied.

This second company is relevant because of what I will say later. The letter continues:

(4) Federal Hotels Limited holds 69 per cent of Australian National Hotels Limited, which operates the Wrest Point complex.

(5) In September, 1973, City and Suburban Properties Limited, already a substantial shareholder in Federal Hotels Limited, made an offer for and subsequently acquired 72 per cent of the fully-paid and 84 per cent of the partly-paid shares in Federal Hotels Limited. A list of directors of City and Suburban Properties Limited is attached.

It continues, most significantly, as follows:

We are not satisfied with the conclusiveness of the information provided herein and will forward more precise information to you after further research. Our data collection to date has been inhibited by the public holiday in Melbourne, where the head offices of the two companies are located.

In the meantime, I have received the following information, copies of which I have available to prove my point. I set it out in detail. First, I will state what its effect is, because the technical company complexities are so great that an impossible situation has been created for any member of the public who wants to know the true situation regarding Federal Hotels Limited. The effect of this is that, having gained control of the Wrest Point casino, Federal Hotels Limited sold out to Australian National Hotels Limited and, in doing so, complied with the provision of the Tasmanian legislation concerning foreign ownership and control. However, it effectively circumvented the spirit of the legislation. The ultimate destination of the profits of the casino is as follows: to Stanley Ho and Fung King Hey, about 31 per cent; and to Hambros Bank, Central Merchant Bank, Philadelphia National Bank, and Banque Worms, about 10 per cent to 11 per cent between them. Therefore, 42 per cent of its profits are disposed of, circumventing the whole spirit of the Tasmanian legislation regarding foreign interests. These Asian interests receive their share directly as shareholders, and the other companies depend on the distribution of the profits of City and Suburban Properties Limited.

There are a series of interlocking company groups. A. V. Jennings Industries (Australia) Limited has no association with Federal Hotels Limited that can be established. The Wrest Point casino, originally owned by Federal Hotels Limited, is now owned by Australian National Hotels Limited. The latter issued additional shares to Asian interests, which now own 69 per cent of the shares. Federal Hotels Limited is being taken over by City and Suburban Properties Limited, which, like Federal Hotels Limited, is part of the Ipec group. City and Suburban Properties Limited is owned mainly by Ipec, but 12 per cent of the shares have been sold by Ipec Insurance to Hambros Bank, London, and Australian Finance and Investment Company Limited. Some 85 per cent of the latter company is owned by Hambros Bank, London, Central Merchant Bank, South Africa, Philadelphia National Bank,

United States of America, and Banque Worms, France. All of this is backed up by documented evidence.

If that is not bad enough, we are faced with the following situation. By reference to the Sydney Stock Exchange report, I know that the Australian National Hotels company has currently approved an offer made by Hanover Holdings Limited and the Kornhauser family (Chevron, Melbourne) to buy 10 000 000 shares in that company at a net price that Australian National Hotels Limited would have received from the proposed placement with the Hong Kong group. The net result of all this is certainly to highlight the comment made in the letter dated November 6, as follows:

We are not satisfied with the conclusiveness of the information provided herein—

that is, from Jennings—

and will forward more precise information to you after further research.

My point is that this documented evidence, which I am willing to table, has been taken from the Sydney Stock Exchange records. The Tasmanian legislation regarding foreign ownership and control has been circumvented by a series of interlocking and complicated company exchanges so as to provide the balance of foreign holding and profit receipts in a series of merchant banks overseas and also in Asian hands. Mr. Speaker, is it in order for a private member to table material of this kind?

The SPEAKER: It is not the usual procedure. Is the material of a statistical nature?

Mr. McRAE: It may or may not be. It is a series of documents taken from the Sydney Stock Exchange records.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member seek leave to have them incorporated in *Hansard*, or to table them?

Mr. McRAE: I seek leave to table them, Sir.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot do that, but he can seek leave to have them incorporated in *Hansard*.

Mr. McRAE: No, Sir, that is not satisfactory. They are of great complexity. However, I will make them available to members. Following the letter dictated on November 6, I then received a letter dated November 7, which must have been dictated on the same date, since it clearly differentiates from the letter from A. V. Jennings Industries (Australia) Limited, dated November 6, as follows:

The attached information was obtained from the Secretary of the Federal Hotels Limited, Melbourne, Mr. B. P. Mockler. I trust that this detail and the material we have already forwarded to you will give you a clear picture of the financial situation and standing of the consortium of companies.

I now seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it the document headed "Federal Hotels group, summary of share ownership".

Leave granted.

FEDERAL HOTELS GROUP—SUMMARY OF SHARE OWNERSHIP

Australian National Hotels Limited, which owns and controls the Wrest Point International Hotel/Casino in Hobart, has a paid-up capital of \$4 660 017 in 25 878 984 20c shares, both fully and partly paid-up, with equal voting rights. Federal Hotels Limited owns 58.34 per cent of the shares. A further 16.58 per cent is owned overseas. The company's assets have a book value of approximately \$10 000 000, and there are no overseas borrowings, and is a subsidiary company of Federal Hotels Limited. Federal Hotels Limited has a paid-up capital of \$7 840 521 in 21 757 968 50c ordinary shares, both fully and partly paid-up, and 112 616 \$2 preference shares, fully paid-up. All shares have equal voting rights. Overseas shareholding is less than 2 per cent.

City and Suburban Properties Limited recently acquired a 50.8 per cent holding in Federal's ordinary shares and made an offer for the balance, which is now closed, and the company has now announced its entitlement to ordinary

shares as slightly more than 90 per cent. Federal Group assets exceed \$20 000 000, and it has no overseas borrowings. It is a subsidiary company of City and Suburban Properties. (The former name of City and Suburban Properties was Buckingham Holdings Ltd.) This company has a paid-up capital of \$4 730 440 in 8 315 424 50c ordinary shares and 1 145 456 50c preference shares. The outside shareholding is approximately 9.3 per cent, practically all held by Hambros Bank. Group assets exceed \$12 500 000, and there are no overseas borrowings.

That document is completely contradictory to the tabulated information from the Sydney Stock Exchange. I say all this merely to indicate the sort of problems involved. People are extremely conscious of the danger of foreign involvement in this sort of enterprise. What has happened at Wrest Point is that, contrary to the undertaking given to the Tasmanian Government, Federal Hotels Limited, by a series of complicated, interlocking and devious moves, has placed control outside of Australia.

I know that our own Bill, placed before this Parliament, has a most complex series of provisions that seek to cover the situation. However, since my time is drawing to a close, I merely make the following observations, with moderation: first, as any lawyer would know, the more complicated a provision, the easier it is to circumvent it (and in this respect I need merely to refer to the Income Tax Assessment Act). Secondly, I refer to clause 82 (2) and (3). The validity of clause 82 (2), which refers to acts or omissions done or made outside of this State, is questionable, and clause 82 (3), which purports to extend the whole Part to all persons other than corporations, whether residents in this State or not and whether Australian citizens or not, is in my view totally invalid.

Having weighed up the factors in favour of the casino and those against it, I oppose the second reading. I have made it clear that I do so not on moral grounds. I am gravely concerned at the difficulty that could face this State notwithstanding the great amount of effort that has gone into drafting the foreign control parts of the Bill. The Tasmanian experience has shown how this can be circumvented. Notwithstanding the attempts in this case, I have no doubt that they would be circumvented again. The following statement was made by Professor Cressey, a Professor of Sociology in California, in a radio broadcast:

Let me answer the question indirectly. I worked for President Johnson's commission, and worked in organized crime and have been working in it in the United States on a research level for half a dozen years, and on the basis of that you know we have a lot of difficulty because off-track betting and football pools and such things as that are illegal, and I would now legalize them in the United States, but I would never legalize casino gambling. And I think that the noise that I hear around Australia about "Let each State have its own kind of casino" is ridiculous. I think that you're getting yourself into problems that you don't know anything about—and should know. That is, if you look at the last half-dozen instances in which casino gambling has been legalized, organized criminals have captured the whole thing within a year. And this is Cuba before the revolution, it's Las Vegas in Nevada, it's Haiti, it's the Bahamas, and most recently England. In England, Scotland Yard, working with the F.B.I., met American-organized criminals at Heathrow Airport in London and turned them back—wouldn't even let them in the country—and they still captured the whole thing within six months. I think Australians are doing an ostrich thing—they've got their head in the sand pretending that if they get this casino gambling it'll be different here. But I don't think it will be.

That is my view. In the short term, I do not believe there will be a rash of organized crime in South Australia, but in the long term there will be organized casino gambling

on a large scale. That is the only way in which sufficient revenue can be appropriated to this State to make this proposition attractive. Once this sort of operation is in action, big organized crime moves in. For example, we can consider the position in Sydney, not in the short term, but in the long term. At the Mandarin Club, which is a highly respectable club, Mafia machines suddenly appeared on the scene (I saw them) without any explanation for their appearance. The only conclusion that can be drawn is that organized crime had had an effect on the management of that club.

I want to be moderate; I am not attempting to sensationalize at all. I do not believe that in the short term organized crime would take over, but in the long term there is the grave danger which has been faced in other countries and which is likely to be faced in Australia. I oppose a casino because it is difficult to control ownership, and I cannot see a real tourist attraction outside Adelaide. I find it difficult to reconcile having a casino and not having poker machines, because the roulette wheel is equally as mesmeric as the poker machine. Finally, there is the long-term experience overseas. It is on these grounds that I oppose the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I oppose the Bill. I commend the member for Playford on the way he has delved into the situation of casinos, informing the House of deep-seated aspects that would not necessarily come to the notice of average people. I commend him for his investigations and for the attitude he has taken in connection with the legislation. I oppose the establishment of a casino in South Australia. I do not wish to consider whether a casino should be at Wallaroo or somewhere else: I oppose casinos straight-out. Although I have not had an opportunity to visit areas where casinos have been established, I have been able to glean much information from the many articles published on the effects of these enterprises.

I was amazed this afternoon to hear the member for Goyder condemning members, particularly members on this side, for taking the view expressed in petitions. I believe this is a valid attitude to hold, considering the interest in the matter taken by people who signed petitions and sent them to their members. Over a period in this Chamber, I have heard the member for Goyder advocate voluntary voting. Under such a system, people who are sufficiently interested go to the poll and vote; similarly, those who sign petitions and send them to members are those who have sufficient interest to do so. I am amazed that the honourable member should have expressed that view. I have presented to this Chamber several petitions from people in my district. I have forwarded direct to the Premier yellow petitions (about which we heard a little from the member for Mitcham) containing many hundreds of signatures. In addition, I have received letters from the Methodist Church, the Young Men's Christian Association, and the Bishop of Willochra opposing the casino. On the other hand, I have received only one letter in favour, and that was from a business interest.

I make no bones about my attitude with regard to a casino. I have my personal view on the effect of a casino on the community. I am strengthened in this view by the opinions expressed in the petitions and in the letters from the churches and the Y.M.C.A. These organizations are concerned about the welfare of the people of the State and are endeavouring to assist people who are in various kinds of trouble.

As other members wish to speak, I do not want to take up much time. I oppose the Bill. I will do all in my power to see that South Australia is not landed with something whose effect we should consider, not on the short-term basis but, as the member for Playford said, on the long-term basis. On these grounds, I oppose the establishment of a casino in South Australia.

Mr. CRIMES (Spence): I support the second reading. That may sound paradoxical, as I oppose gambling in principle. However, I believe that if a casino were established it would only be a small facet of a largely gambling society. There is a principle in our society that some people are opposing this evening. Opportunities for gambling exist in a respected institution, which the member for Gilles, in his spirited speech against the Bill, referred to, and that is the Stock Exchange. That is an ideal place for gambling, and it is gambling, in effect, on the destinies of people. If we look further, we see people who gamble with that which affects their homes and domestic lives; I refer here to real estate. We have that situation in business generally. Strangely, I noticed only this evening this exhibited in a very small way when I passed a place known as the Pancake Kitchen. I assume one can get a good meal there and much excellent business is done there. So, lo and behold, gambling is exhibited when the Omelette Oven is established right next door, so that gambling permeates the very fabric of the kind of society in which we dwell.

There are opportunities for it in so many spheres in this society of ours. There is, of course, the racing industry. One can cast one's mind back to what occurred yesterday and the interest that was shown in that important event by members of this House. So, if we look around, we see the principle that is being opposed this evening well embedded in every facet of society. We may not like it but it is a practical thing existent in our lives. Because of this, it is not for me to decide for other people what they require or believe they require, whether it be right or wrong, in the society in which we live. I believe in the essence of this Bill, and the essence is that the people should be allowed to choose whether they require a casino to be established in South Australia. We would not be asked to decide an issue like this if we truly dwelt in a rational and civilized kind of society because, if we did dwell in that kind of society, gambling and the exploitation that we associate with it would be a thing of the past and there would not be an issue like this presented to us.

However, we do not dwell in an ideal kind of society. Where the people apparently desire the kind of society that surrounds them and, perhaps ignorantly, approve of it, we must look to see whether there is a fundamental, good, and decent principle that exists in that society. When I say "that society", I mean this society of which we are irrevocably a part. That principle is the principle upon which this House has been established; it is the basis of this House, it is the basis of our life. It is (and I hope it is recognized by us all) democracy. That being the case, that our opinions must be registered in a democratic manner, I am not prepared to play God and tell the people what they shall or shall not do. I agree entirely (and this is strange, coming from my lips) with the comment made by the member for Mitcham on the speech made by the member for Goyder. The member for Mitcham said that that was the best speech he had ever heard the member for Goyder deliver, and I agree with that.

Mr. Chapman: You're joking.

Mr. CRIMES: I am not joking—I agree with the democratic principles which were excellently espoused by him.

Perhaps it was a rare occasion for him in regard to this Bill. I am not prepared to accept that which was condemned by the member for Goyder—the Playfordian paternalism of the L.C.L. The Playfordian principle, which was adequately expressed on the occasion when it was mooted that there should be a lottery for South Australia was, "I shall decide what is or what is not good for the people."

That attitude does not appeal to me in the least. I am not prepared to say of any principle that is put before the people that it is "poison in the hands of the people" because, when one makes that declaration and in effect says "I cannot trust the decision of the people", that can indicate only contempt for the people of the State, and that is not a contempt I am prepared to share. In a society such as we have, which so far is not fundamentally democratic, we should seek every possible opportunity to extend the democratic principle, and particularly we should seek to extend this principle to matters where there is a strong possibility of organized pressure groups giving a false impression of the pros or cons of a majority opinion on an issue. If we do not adopt this attitude and we accept the views of those people who are opposed to this Bill, surely it extends the possibility that we shall have in this State more and more government by organized pressure rather than government by the people through their representatives, where controversial social issues are concerned.

I do not intend to go into the technicalities or the details, the dots and the commas, of this Bill. They have been adequately dealt with by all the members who have spoken so far. But I say there is a principle involved in this, a principle that, strangely, was strongly espoused by the member for Goyder. Whether or not he was sincere, he was right this evening in what he said. Therefore, I say, in conclusion, "Let the people decide this issue" and, when I say that, I am saying nothing more and nothing less than "Let democracy prevail". I support the Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): At the outset I make clear that my personal views on the establishment of this type of gambling den, a casino, are fairly flexible. However, I believe I must take into consideration the views of those people who are my electors and have taken the trouble to contact me, by letter, by telephone, or by petition, on this matter. They have proved that they are vitally concerned so I must, as I represent that district, take notice of what they say. There is no doubt from the many letters I have received, from the hundreds of signatures on petitions I have had, and from the many phone calls made to me, that the people in my district do not wish a casino to be established. Therefore, as I said earlier, I must take that into consideration. It is my duty to speak on their behalf in this Parliament.

If we look at the second reading explanation of this Bill (with which I do not agree), at page 1368 of *Hansard* we see:

First, it is necessary for us constantly to seek to gain a balance of employment in the State, a diversity of employment, and a security of employment to ensure that those people employed are to the least extent possible dependent on fluctuations in the markets of consumer durable products, because it is on that basis that this State has previously faced real difficulties in maintaining security of employment at a level to which all sections of political Parties, I believe, would subscribe.

I do not completely agree with that part of the explanation, and I certainly do not agree with the paragraph relating to the establishment of a casino to aid the development of tourism. The tourist potential of a casino is really a gimmick, because the development of tourism does not depend on a casino in any way. When people

are considering whether to visit a country they are not influenced very much by the existence of a casino in that country.

Would the Premier have us believe that people go to the south of France primarily to gamble? Would anyone suggest that the Agha Khan and all the film stars who live in the south of France do so because of the gambling facilities in Monaco? Before the Second World War and since that war I visited Monte Carlo and I went into the gambling casinos out of sheer curiosity. In the casinos I saw dowager old ladies sitting around the tables with their systems and marking their cards as the wheel was spun. Of course, such people were not normal tourists. Most tourists who visit a place do so because of its historic interest, its wide open spaces, its landscape, or its unpolluted air. In Switzerland, the greatest country in the world for tourists, there are very few casinos; people go there because of the good, clean air and the beautiful scenery. Some countries that rely on tourism have no gambling casinos at all. Thousands of people visit Ireland simply to kiss the blarney stone, not to try their luck at *chemin de fer*.

Mr. Nankivell: How long is it since you were there?

The SPEAKER: Order! International politics are not involved in this Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN: Actually, Liverpool is known as the capital of Ireland because there are more Irishmen in Liverpool—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not make insinuations about the Speaker.

Mr. MATHWIN: There has been a great clean-up of the many casinos in the United Kingdom. If a casino was established in South Australia the revenue would be derived mainly from South Australians; of course, the revenue could well be redistributed to non-South Australians. The Tasmanian casino has tutors who leach the people how to gamble. An article in the April, 1973, issue of *Tourism Australia* states:

Colour films shown in guests' rooms on the closed-circuit television channels include instruction programmes on the games played in the casino. The hotel/casino General Manager, Mr. P. Daetwiler, said, "We fully realize many people have never seen casino gambling games and this could make them hesitant. We want to help them overcome this by making them acquainted with the rules and terminology. We want them to know there are no hidden rules and that the games are straightforward."

Very few people who visit the United Kingdom do so to gamble; most people who visit that country do so because of the traditions of the old country and because of its beauty in the spring. This Bill puts the cart before the horse. Clause 11 (2) provides:

For the purposes of this Part, the prescribed question shall be—Do you approve of the establishment of a casino at *here is to be inserted the place specified by the committee in its recommendation under subsection (1) of section 8 of this Act*?

That is a loaded question. The member for Goyder said that he could not understand my reasoning when I spoke on a motion relating to establishing a casino moved by the member for Fisher. The member for Goyder said that he could not understand why I would not support a referendum or why I said in my earlier speech that the question was loaded. Consequently, I shall repeat my explanation. I liken clause 11 (2) to any district in South Australia that urgently needs a public lavatory. People will say, "We want a toilet in this district." Everyone will agree that there is a great need for a toilet in that area, yet everyone will say, "We want a toilet, but don't you put it in front of my house." The same applies

in respect of a telephone booth, a letter box or a bus stop. People will say, "Don't put a bus stop in front of my house, because all the kids will sit on the fence on their way home from school and they will throw rubbish into my garden."

This clause represents the same attitude: it is a loaded question and it is unfair. If the committee decided that there should be a casino at Wallaroo, the people of Victor Harbor, Kangaroo Island, Mount Gambier or anywhere else who could possibly be next in line would look at the matter in the same light. They will say that it is a good idea to have a casino at Wallaroo and they fear that, if they do not say "Yes", it will be located near them. Many people have contacted me in respect of this matter. They have considered the matter seriously and have sought to register their disapproval when the opportunity arose; indeed, there have been about 698 to one in opposition to a casino. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. SIMMONS (Peake): Generally, the standard of speeches in this debate has been above the usual standard in this House. First, I should like to pay a tribute to the member for Playford who made a most reasoned and reasonable speech on this subject. Secondly, in respect of members opposite, I refer to the contribution by the member for Goyder, who was the most forceful speaker on the other side, if not the most thoughtful. As a Government member I have enjoyed the farrago and the tirade of abuse that we have come to expect from him, and I will miss the honourable member when he goes next year. My only wish is that he could continue until March, 1976, to depart in other circumstances. Most of his arguments about referenda have already been answered by his erstwhile colleagues. However, I have been interested to see how the honourable member has changed his views on several matters, which he admits, although in other ways he has not changed; indeed, he is still a strong supporter of gambling, and I suppose this befits someone who has gambled his Government, his leadership and has just stopped short of gambling his seat.

In respect of the three members who took the trouble to visit Tasmania (admittedly on their gold pass) to observe the casino in operation, I believe this is most praiseworthy of a member of Parliament. If ever there was a use for a gold pass, these three members have put it to proper use to inform themselves first hand on a topic they knew was coming up for debate in this House. On this matter, I have received the greatest number of communications from my constituents since my election to this House. I have received dozens of letters, many telephone calls and several petitions, some of which were in a suitable slate to be presented to this House, and others of which did not comply with Standing Orders.

Unlike the situation concerning other social issues we have debated in this House, there was not one communication from people holding the opposite view. That statement is incorrect in so far as, like other members, I did receive recently a communication in favour of the casino, but that was from a party that I understand has a definite financial interest in gaining a licence to operate what it obviously expects to be a most profitable enterprise. The motive of personal gain, however, is not a motive that I find acceptable. Although many people took the trouble to communicate their views to me, saying they opposed the establishment of a casino, many more people would support the establishment of a casino.

Certainly, they did not support it to the extent that they bothered to let me know of their support, but I am grateful to all my constituents who took the trouble to communicate

with me and to express their wishes, because I always take such views into account. Just in case the member for Goyder thinks he made a point, I point out that I had given this matter long and serious consideration before these communications started coming in. For example, on August 27, I wrote to a constituent, as follows:

I thank you for your letter of August 23, informing me of your views on the establishment of a casino in South Australia. I appreciate that there are certain advantages to the revenue of the State, both directly and through an increased grant from the Commonwealth Grants Commission, and that a casino may be of some advantage to our tourist industry. Nevertheless, I find it hard to believe that these advantages would offset the disadvantages to the residents of South Australia and particularly of the area in which the casino might be situated. Therefore, although I have not as yet seen the Bill, my present inclination is, certainly, to vote against it.

That was my opinion over two months ago, and I have repeated it many times since. Indeed, I have answered several dozen letters and I still hold that opinion. As I stated in that letter, there are arguments in favour of a casino, and they are mainly financial and economic. In order to explain why I reached my conclusion, I will now refer to some of these arguments. First, in speaking to a private member's motion on this subject some time ago, the Premier slated:

It will have an immediate and direct beneficial effect on the State's finances.

This cannot be denied. Indeed, I pointed this out to the opponents of a casino. They must accept that the failure of this Bill to pass this House (and I believe it will fail) will reduce the amount of revenue available to the Treasurer to spend on other socially desirable projects. I reject the argument that these revenue gains will be swallowed up by increased social welfare payments, because those advancing that argument are vastly overstating their case. Undoubtedly, there will be a gain to the revenue of the State from a successful casino. There will be a further gain to the revenue of the State through increased grants from the Grants Commission, and this cannot be denied.

The people of South Australia must accept this loss as part of the price they must pay if they decide to do without a casino. If we lose this revenue, we must make every effort to get the most effective use from the resources we do have, and I will pledge myself to that end. I said this loss of revenue would be part of the price; there will be other economic losses if the casino is not established. In introducing this measure, the Premier mentioned the need to gain a balance, a diversity, and a security of employment. He also said in *Hansard* on October 23:

Secondly, it is desirable to ensure that in country areas we use tourist development to obtain security of employment, that we ensure effective decentralization by making certain that there are stable employment opportunities available in developing country areas, and that country areas which have a Tourist potential do not constantly lose their natural increase in population from the birth rate to the cities in the constant drift into more and more central urbanization within Australia.

I completely agree with those objectives and I believe that a casino more than 80 kilometres from the city would contribute toward those ends. Although I realize that a casino, if there is one, may not be established in Wallaroo, such an area would probably be the best site for it, and Wallaroo is desperately in need of a stimulus to employment, so there would be an immediate gain in that direction. There would also be a further secondary effect: the old multiplier concept where the primary infusion of employment in a particular enterprise would generate further jobs in industry serving that enterprise, such as accommodation, catering, sporting, and so on. Hence, the Premier suggested

a projected investment of from \$10 000 000 to \$15 000 000 from an initial investment in the casino of about \$500 000.

I accept the argument, although I greatly doubt the figures. Economic gains there will be, however, on the establishment of a successful casino. If a casino is set up, there will be tremendously strong vested interest, involving not only the licensee of the casino but also the Government, to see that it is successful. Indeed, every effort will be made to make it a goer. If there are these economic gains, what can be said against the proposal? First of all, I doubt whether the new character of a resort embracing a casino would be compatible with the existing character of the area. As the member for Gouger said earlier in a very thoughtful speech on the private member's motion:

Although it might be possible to incorporate Welsh and Cornish history into the architecture, it would be impossible to incorporate the Cornish and Welsh tradition and character in the concept of a casino into the area.

That is very true. This applies to other potential sites where the Government and the Premier already have made great and fairly successful efforts to develop the local charm and character of certain areas to make them more attractive to tourists. If we were to try to impose a casino-type atmosphere on those areas, we would destroy the good work put into developing their local charm.

Secondly, there will be economic losses to the general public owing to rises in land and living costs. I am informed that buildings around Wrest Point have soared in value and that accommodation costs in Hobart have increased enormously in recent months. I base this on the observations of a relative who was there for some months earlier in the year and who has now gone back and has had to find accommodation, at greatly increased prices, much farther from Hobart than he was able to find previously.

Accommodation prices have soared considerably and, in addition, the casino complex is buying nearby land, no doubt for future expansion, thus further increasing prices. These are economic effects which we can well do without and which I would hate to see imposed on us in Adelaide, particularly in view of the difficulties in this Parliament of getting some effective support to control land prices. Thirdly, certainly there must be some major contribution by the State towards the infrastructure of the area in which the casino is to be situated. There will have to be improvements in communications, including roads and airfields, if the necessary patronage is to be attracted from far afield.

I do not believe that we would be able to run this on the support of wealthy people from other States and overseas; the casino would be largely supported by the people from the Adelaide metropolitan area and areas such as Port Pirie and Port Augusta if, in fact, the casino were built somewhere near Wallaroo. There will be extra public servants, police, and so on, necessary to service the enterprise. I am not so silly as to suggest that these extra costs would eliminate gains, but they would in fact reduce them. I believe I have established what I said in my letter to a constituent which I read earlier, namely, that there will be some benefits, both financial and economic. At this time, then, I should say why I have decided to oppose the measure. Let me deal with the moral issues. I may disappoint many of those people who received letters from me, and who would otherwise approve of my attitude, by saying that I am trying to decide this issue without reference to moral considerations.

I do this not because I believe they are unimportant but because they are subjective. I do not want to impose what must be a product of my own upbringing and conscience on others who just as reasonably hold different views. In turn, I do not want to have the latter imposed on me. I applied this principle to the abortion debate. I resisted the attempts of a sincere minority to impose its will on me and, through me, on the mass of the people. I believe the only people entitled to oppose the casino on purely moral grounds are those who forswear all forms of gambling—and I do not. For example, had I been asked, I would have been pleased to have my annual interest in the Melbourne Cup yesterday. About once a year I enjoy a day at the races, and I generally manage to lose a few dollars.

Many years ago (and the member for Spence might be distressed to hear this) I lost a small sum on the Stock Exchange. I have an occasional ticket in the State lottery and I manage to win a few small prizes—unfortunately, not enough to be able to retire. Finally, I have one distinction in this Parliament: I am one of the few members to have made money at fantan. An explanation of that, I was stationed in Hong Kong in 1966 for a few months and I went across to Macao, where there are casinos (a fixed one and a floating one). I visited both places, which are busy enterprises making a great deal of money and run almost entirely on the Chinese who go there from Hong Kong. The Chinese are inveterate gamblers and they go to Macao because the Hong Kong authorities have enough brains not to establish casinos in that colony.

I went in to see the strange game of fantan, which had always been played up as being a vicious form of gambling. However, it seemed to me quite innocuous and about as complicated as two-up. I was intrigued to see a Chinese gentleman sitting in a corner of the room looking carefully at the board and the other players. Obviously, he had much money there and he could not decide how to bet. Because of that, I thought that the game must have been more complicated than it seemed to me. To me, the mathematics seemed to be simple. A person could make an even money bet and get back his stake and the same amount less 5 per cent, which went to the bank, or he could bet on one of four and get odds of three to one. That seemed to me to be all right mathematically.

However, when I saw the Chinese man, I stopped before I placed the bet. Finally, I invested \$10 in Hong Kong money (about \$1.50) and came out winning \$9.50 Hong Kong on the deal. I thought that, if I could lose 50c to the bank on a winning even money bet and lose all my money when I lost, it was time to get out. Honourable members will see that I have gambled quite a few times and in a few places. I am not a big gambler, but there is no difference in principle between my gambling and the gambling by many people who would bet much more because they could afford to, in their scale of values. That is their business.

I am not objecting to the Bill on the grounds of moral issues, but I consider the measure undesirable because of several social objections. The Premier has admitted that there will be disadvantages attached to the setting up of a casino, and I think this is significant. The number of suicides attributable to Wrest Point casino has been greatly overstressed. Some may well have occurred as a result of some other form of gambling or for some other reason. The amount of crime associated with the Wrest Point casino, so far at least, has been slight, but what will develop is as yet unknown. I intended to quote the statement by Professor Donald Cressey, Professor of

Sociology at the University of California. The member for Playford has beaten me to that, but I think the professor's statement is worth leading.

What impressed me about the gentleman was that he made a statement on radio one evening about the prisoners who had escaped from Wayville showgrounds, when people were becoming very agitated about the matter. He expressed the opinion that, from his experience, these prisoners were merely waiting to give themselves up: they had had enough, realized the consequences of their action and would give themselves up. Then, within an hour or two, a news flash stated that the prisoners had done just that. It seemed to me that the professor was proved right on that occasion and that, because of his experience, as set out in the statement that the member for Playford has read, was entitled to be listened to with respect. The professor stated:

I think Australians are doing an ostrich thing—they have got their head in the sand pretending that if they get this casino gambling it will be different here, but I do not think it will be.

Rev. Keith Seaman then asked the professor:

So, from your experience and as an individual, you would say "No casinos"?

Professor Cressey replied:

Yes, I would say "No casinos".

That is good advice from a person who has been mixed up with this business in a major way for many years. I consider that, if this Bill passes into law, the Premier will make every possible endeavour to ensure that there is a difference between the Las Vegas type of situation and the Adelaide type or the European type that he has mentioned, where there is a single casino subject to strict regulations.

However, I do not consider that we will always be able to maintain that same sort of control. The member for Playford has shown how smart people can get around regulations relating to oversea control and, despite the effort that has gone into this Bill to try to ensure that that does not happen here, I think it will happen. I consider that, despite the best endeavours by the authorities, undesirable consequences will attach to the establishment of a casino in South Australia. I wish to refer now to a statement by a lawyer made in a court of law. I always distrust lawyers, but the *News* of October 24, containing a report from Hobart headed "Casino Seen as Crucible of Tragedies", states:

A lawyer described Wrest Point casino as a crucible from which tragedies will be thrown up.

The lawyer was appearing in the Hobart Criminal Court for a retired public servant who was facing 21 charges involving false pretences. The charges that the man had admitted comprised eight of having obtained \$1 900 from a Hobart hotel, one of having obtained \$300 from a bank, and three of having attempted to obtain a total of \$1 100. All charges involved valueless cheques. The lawyer told the court that the man had retired early because of ill health and had come to Hobart to see Wrest Point casino. The lawyer also told the court:

When the community saw fit to sanction a casino in Hobart, it should also have realized the need for caution when cashing cheques for strangers.

This danger is an inevitable consequence of a casino. Regardless of how well regulated a casino is, I consider that economic pressure to get customers will force down the controls on it. More and more people who otherwise would not bet will go there. Many members have the idea that a casino is a place where people in dinner suits and bow ties or in long glittering gowns go to throw away money .that they can afford to lose. However, I have been

assured that this is not the case at Wrest Point. The general standard of dress has fallen there.

If a casino is to be more than 80 kilometres from Adelaide, those conducting it will have to use every potential customer to make it work, and more and more people will be drawn into this enterprise. I believe in supporting progressive moves. In the past few years we have made many advances in this State to obtain a more secure and more responsible society, but I reject the charge of paternalism that the member for Goyder has levelled at those who oppose this legislation. In my view, the argument put forward from the other side of the House that it is paternalistic to ban poker machines is quite fallacious. There is little difference between a casino and poker machines because both can create an addiction to gambling by many people to an extent that they cannot afford. The result of the establishment of a casino, if not tragedy in the sense of suicide, will be economic ruin for many people. For these reasons, not on moral grounds, and recognizing that in voting against this measure I may be reducing the chance of this State's obtaining some financial and economic gain, I oppose the Bill.

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): I, too, oppose this social Bill, on which I should like briefly to express my views. Representing a large district, and finding it difficult to ascertain the views of my constituents, I am obliged to heed the submissions that I have received for and against a casino. I have received about 500 submissions opposing the establishment of a casino in this State, whereas I have not received even one submission supporting it. It could be argued that the people who favour the establishment of a casino do not take the trouble to tell their member, whereas those who oppose the measure always inform their member accordingly. Although that could be so, how can an elected member of this House know the wishes of his constituents if they do not come forward and make submissions to him? In those circumstances, it is up to the member to decide accordingly, as I have decided, to oppose the Bill. I sent the following reply to all the letters and petitions submitted to me:

Your letter is to hand protesting about the establishing of a casino in South Australia. First of all, I would like to point out that at the present time I have an open mind on this particular matter. I feel too many members of Parliament express their own personal views, whereas they should weigh up the arguments for and against, and also take into consideration the number of submissions that are made on these various controversial social matters. I always maintain that I represent the electorate and, therefore, it is not right for me to use my personal views in voting on matters of this nature. If the overwhelming majority of submissions are against the casino, I will most certainly take this into consideration when the Bill comes before the House.

My own personal views are against the establishing of a casino because I feel there are plenty of avenues for gambling in this State at the present time, and the method of gambling in a casino is far more of a temptation than other forms of gambling that we have and, if I had to express my own personal views on this matter, I would most certainly oppose any such measure. Up to date, the overwhelming majority of submissions have been against the establishing of a casino, and it would appear at the present time that I will be opposing any such measure. However, my mind is still open on the matter until such time as I have heard the various submissions that will be put forward on this matter.

Personally, I am not opposed to gambling. Indeed, I have always maintained that, if a man works hard for his income and if he is in a financial position to gamble, it is his prerogative to do so. However, if he has a wife and children at home who are going without, he should abstain from gambling. There are various forms of gambling,

such as horse racing. However, people attend race meetings not only for the purpose of betting but also to witness the spectacle of horses racing. Most people would agree that it is a spectacular sight to see well-trained horses racing. Trotting and dog racing are also spectacular.

It has been argued that, if it eventuates, this casino will put additional revenue into the Government coffers. Although this is generally agreed, it will happen at the expense of other forms of gambling that also bring revenue to the Government. I refer, for instance, to lotteries, bookmaking, the Totalizator Agency Board and, more recently, cross-lotto. It is interesting to note that the profit from the Lotteries Commission, which goes into the Hospitals Fund, has not risen in the same proportion as has the profit on T.A.B. Lotteries and T.A.B. were both introduced into this State within one month of each other in 1967 and, during the six years that lotteries have been operating, the annual revenue that has gone into the Hospitals Fund from this source has increased by only \$167 000. However, there has been a phenomenal increase in T.A.B. revenue over that period. Indeed, annual revenue from this source has increased by 93 per cent in only four years. Therefore, if a casino was established in South Australia, I consider that the Government would receive revenue from it, but only at the expense of revenue from other forms of gambling, such as T.A.B. and lotteries.

A recent Gallup poll showed that only a certain sum was available for gambling and that 85 per cent of the people who gamble in this State bet \$5 and less. If one went to a casino with only \$5, one would not get far in an evening. The T.A.B. turnover increased by \$9 000 000 last year, \$1 400 000 of which was allocated to racing, compared to the previous year's allocation of \$1 100 000. This resulted in about \$3 000 000 in stamp duty and other charges going into the Government coffers. The Totalizator Agency Board is a far greater employer of labour than a casino would be, particularly as the former employs country people in its various agencies throughout the State. However, a casino would employ people in only one area.

It has also been argued that a casino would have tourist potential. Having done much louting, I know that of the tourists who visit various countries only a few do so for the sole purpose of betting at a casino. As our casino would, if established, be over 80 kilometres from Adelaide, I am sure that those few people would, when they arrived in Adelaide and found that they had to travel that extra distance to get to the casino, soon lose their enthusiasm.

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): I, too, oppose the Bill, which would grant a single casino licence in South Australia. I do so, as a member of the Government, after considering the matter, because I must do what I consider is right. My reasons for opposing the Bill are two-fold. First, I believe the casino will not be a financially viable proposition; that is my chief reason for opposing it. If I could be convinced that it would attract a continual stream of tourists to South Australia, provide permanent employment for many people, and have a direct and beneficial effect on the State's finances and economy, I might support it. However, I am not convinced that these results will be forthcoming. Admittedly, the only casino so far operating in Australia at Wrest Point in Tasmania is successful from all the points of view to which I have referred. However, I doubt whether people who go to Tasmania (and they are principally from the Eastern States) would

travel to South Australia, let alone travel another 80 kilometres (50 miles) after arriving in Adelaide. The position will worsen if casinos are established in other States. Although no such projects are proposed at present, I am sure that some will soon be heard of. Without support from other States and countries, a casino in South Australia would fail. Moreover, once casinos are established in the Eastern States, the patronage at Wrest Point will fall off considerably, and what is now a successful venture may prove to be not so successful.

Secondly, I do not believe that the people of South Australia are ready to accept a casino at this time. Some people to whom I have spoken, who were strong supporters and advocates of the establishment of the Totalizator Agency Board, legal betting on dogs, the State lottery, and the extension of drinking hours (and I point out that I, too, supported all those proposals when they were before the House), are sceptical about this proposal. Other members have said that they have received many petitions. I have not received a lot of petitions. I find that in the main people in my district have no strong views on the subject one way or the other. Those who normally support legislation of this type are sceptical on this occasion, taking this view mainly because of the adverse criticism given to Wrest Point by people who oppose it on moral grounds. Although I respect that point of view and although I am not a gambler myself, except for an occasional lottery ticket, I do not support that view on this occasion.

I believe that the local people who would gamble at the casino would be those who are already gambling on horse-racing, trotting races, dog races, cross-lotto, lotteries, and the Stock Exchange—all legal forms of gambling. In addition, they could be involved in unlawful gambling such as two-up, dice, and card games, such as poker. Gambling in all these forms will continue, whether or not a luxurious gambling complex in South Australia is established. I point out that, although I have no strong views on this subject, at this time I oppose the granting of a casino licence in South Australia for the reasons I have given.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I oppose the Bill. I have been rather impressed with the standard of the debate so far. One would have imagined that, with all the press publicity and mounting pressures in the community, there could be hysterical comments with much dramatizing of the issues involved. However, this has not been the case and, generally speaking, the discussion has been on the basic principles involved. The Premier has supported the Bill, saying that he regards the casino as a revenue earner, but I doubt that this would be the case. Although the State might now gain some revenue from a casino (and previous speakers have questioned this, having regard to the expense involved in obtaining that revenue and the failure to obtain revenue from other sources of gambling), we would lose just as much, if not more, as a result of the increased social service payments necessary to provide for destitute families that fell victim to this venture. The fact that it is proposed that the site of the casino be at least 80 kilometres from Adelaide is a wholesale admission that there are doubts about the desirability of a casino. By stipulating this requirement, the Government is approaching the subject with tongue in cheek. It is admitting that, as there are some doubts, it is better to put the casino in a country area. It has chosen not to put it in the metropolitan area where the population would really count.

The member for Spence supported the second reading, saying that the casino was just another form of gambling. Surely we have enough opportunities now for gambling

to make it unnecessary to embark on another. With people crying out for additional wages, can it be argued that there is sufficient finance available to justify another form of gambling? The two propositions do not add up. The member for Spence said that the member for Goyder was right to support a referendum. I believe that the member for Goyder was wrong, because if we pass the Bill and allow a referendum it means that we have already sanctioned the principle of a casino. It would then not be a question of whether South Australia should have a casino but rather of where it should be. As that is the principle involved, I do not believe we should allow the Bill to proceed further. The Premier decided to deprive the people of the right to decide whether or not to have a casino. He has framed the Bill in such a way that the question that would be put to the people would concern whether the casino should be established at a certain place.

The question of a casino has to be decided for or against, but there is no decisive basis on which the proposal can be judged, any decision on the subject being speculative. Each side can present a case with confidence, but no-one has decisive facts. In fact, the group that favours this project is admitting that it is willing to gamble on the welfare of the community. We know that there is a risk that someone can be hurt by a casino. I do not think anyone would say that no-one would be hurt. This is the risk that those who favour the proposition are taking. They are willing to gamble on someone's welfare. The person concerned may not be a close friend or someone known to them, but there will be a victim, and it may be his family that suffers. Those who are against this proposal are not game enough to stick out their necks and say that they are willing to gamble with someone else's life or family.

Already, we have had terms such as "paternalistic" attached to those who oppose this Bill. There is nothing wrong with names. I am happy to have those names attached to me rather than be accused of aiding and abetting the personal, moral, and economic degradation of certain sections of the community and, more to the point, the breakdown of at least some families. As soon as someone, be it a child, a wife, or a husband, becomes affected, the problem is no longer a personal one: it leaves the realm of the individual and the choice of the individual and, once it gets to the family or to an outside source, it becomes a public problem.

As politicians, we have a responsibility to protect those who through no fault of their own have been deprived of the benefits that should normally be theirs. A child is entitled to a certain part of its father's pay packet. The father should be able to provide for his child. Should the father lose his pay through indulging in a form of gambling, that child is deprived and becomes a public responsibility. We have a responsibility to the public to protect man from his own folly. Some of the legislation passed in this Parliament is designed for that very purpose, to protect man from himself. Real estate, pyramid selling, and consumer protection legislation is all designed to protect man from his own folly.

We have had mention of the public opinion polls, and this Bill has been debated publicly in the press, so many of its aspects need not be repeated. Earlier this session, I presented from my own district a petition representing 1 472 persons. Since then, I have had several hundreds of other names on petitions that were not acceptable to the House as they were not completely in accordance with Standing Orders. In all, I have been contacted by about 2 000 people. This represents only about 20 per cent of

my constituents so I cannot say that on that basis alone I can judge the whole feeling in my district. On the other hand, not even one person has written to me, telephoned me, or come into my office to tell me personally that he favours a casino. In my travels and in my going around shows trying to judge public feeling, I have come across only two people who favour a casino. Therefore, with about 80 per cent of the people in my district I have not had direct contact, but public debate on this issue has been such that those people know that there is mounting pressure from the anti-casino groups. They know that the tide is turning against them. If they want a casino, they know they will have to do something about it.

It has been amply demonstrated here this evening that only a very few people have actually come forward and said, "Yes, we want a casino." That certainly indicates that the people, and particularly those in my electoral district, do not favour this proposal. If there is a need for a casino and there is enough money for the average man to be able to afford to spend money on this form of gambling, perhaps the average individual earnings are more than adequate now and there is no justification for wage increases. The two go hand in hand, but people will deny that we can make that point. However, if there is surplus money, why the need for wage increases? If there is a need for wage increases, what justification is there for another means by which a man's money can be squandered?

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): I support the Bill. As a starting point for any arguments I may present, I say that, unlike many members who have so far spoken, particularly those opposing the Bill, I intend to speak to the Bill. Members who have preceded me in this debate in opposing the measure have, as far as I can see, spent much time discussing gambling, morals and other factors not necessarily associated with the Bill. Certainly they are not part of the Bill. Just in case it may be thought by any member or any reader of *Hansard* that I have anything to hide in this area by saying I intend to stick to the Bill and not talk too much about gambling, morals, and so on, I make clear unequivocally to all concerned that I have gambled before; I sometimes gamble now; and no doubt I shall gamble in the future. At the same time, I point out that I am not here to promote the idea of gambling: I am simply saying that I recognize that it is one facet of the many that go to make up what is called human character in our society.

Before I devote my arguments to specific parts of the Bill, I want to take a little time to mention one or two of the impressions I have gained in following the debate so far, from the remarks made by members opposing the Bill. I have found that, apparently, many members in this House in future intend to moderate the demand for work to be done within their electoral districts. At least, that is what I understand they have said, when they have neglected to mention the fact that in opposing the Bill they are prepared to vote against a measure that could increase moneys available for expenditure on State business. That is one impression I have gained from those members. I assume that, since they are prepared for the State to operate with less money than perhaps might be available should this Bill be passed, they also intend to moderate their own behaviour in seeking money for schools and other necessary Government works in their districts.

Getting down to specific speakers who have preceded me on this matter, there was the Leader of the Opposition, who exercised his perfect right to oppose the Bill. As

far as I could see, he said he had no confidence in two groups of people in South Australia. One group was the voting population, because he did not appear to believe that, if the voting population of this State was able to have its say in this matter, it would come to what he would regard as the right conclusion. He is prepared to nip this thing before it even gets off the ground; he is not prepared to support it to a later stage, which still would not necessarily commit this State to the construction of a casino. He is not even willing to let it go that far.

Mr. Venning: He takes heed of his electors.

Mr. PAYNE: I have some contact with the electors in my district, too. The electors who have contacted me on this matter have been very circumspect. Rev. Trevor Oates, of the Colonel Light Gardens Methodist Church, telephoned me when this matter was first mooted. He said that he wished to register a protest about the matter and that he intended to organize what other protests he could among the people of his congregation. I do not say this in any critical way; I simply report that that is an action taken by one of my constituents to acquaint me with his views. He has every right to do that, and I have not ignored the views expressed. The Leader is not willing to let the matter go to the people so that they can have a say.

The second group of people in whom he does not have faith is the Industries Development Committee, which is to be charged with the responsibility of investigating this matter, should this Bill pass. Two members of the Leader's own Party are members of the committee, and it does not appear to be biased or loaded in any way. Consequently, I would have expected the Leader to place some reliance on the members of that committee. This Bill vests those members with additional responsibility and power so that they can obtain any information that they wish to obtain. Evidently the Leader does not have confidence in members of his own Party.

Dr. Eastick: I have full confidence in them, but they have more important work to do.

Mr. PAYNE: For some devious reason the Leader does not want the people of this State to have their say, but surely he could have trusted those members of his own Party who are members of the Industries Development Committee.

Mr. Keneally: He knows their background better than we do.

Mr. PAYNE: That may account for it. Most of the speakers who have opposed the Bill have been so wrapped up in the moral question and in their emotions about gambling that they have not really examined the Bill itself. Very few such members have referred to clause 6, which clearly shows that all of the fears that have been expressed so far do not really have any substance at all. The Industries Development Committee is given wide terms of reference that allow it to arrive at a considered opinion. Clause 6 provides that the committee shall have regard to:

(a) the material and other resources available to the applicant for the construction and operation of the proposed casino;

(b) the prospects of the commercial success of the proposed casino . . .

Some members have said that the casino may not be a financial success. The Leader of the Opposition said that it was not viable as an issue. However, the large number of members who have spoken on the matter indicates that an issue certainly exists. Wherever one looks in clause 6 one finds a provision that takes care of the fears expressed by members who have opposed the Bill. Clause 6 provides that the committee shall also have regard to:

(e) the likely effect that the establishment of the proposed casino will have on the physical and social environment of the area in which it is proposed the casino will be established . . .

Several members adverted to this aspect in developing what they thought was a good case in opposition to the Bill, but the provision I have quoted clearly requires the committee to examine the proposition in the light of the very aspect referred to. Some members have discussed the employment opportunities that may be created in the area of the casino; one member thought that it would be bad to have too many jobs created in a given area. It was suggested that it might be awkward if not all the jobs could be filled. However, most workers I know are happy to get work and to have a reasonable choice of employment so that they can take home a crust to the family.

We have heard a good deal of, perhaps, genuine misunderstanding, and possibly an unwillingness to allow the measure to proceed, a desire to cut it off as soon as possible. Some members have allowed their judgment to be clouded somewhat in presenting the arguments they have brought forward. One would think there were no specific requirements in clause 6 which, in subclause (1) (i), provides that the committee shall consider:

Such other matters, whether or not of the same kind as the foregoing, which, to the committee, seem relevant to the consideration of any one or more of the applications.

If the committee received more than one application, it could consider factors not already listed. The Premier, is to be commended on the type of Bill put before the House, setting out actual requirements for the committee to keep in mind all the time while deciding what the position will be.

Some members who have spoken so far could be misguided. The Bill does not say anywhere, "Here is a casino." It simply says, "Here is a Bill to have a committee look at the proposition and bring down a considered decision." Why are people saying we should not have a casino? We are not getting one yet, even if the Bill is passed. A member is entitled to say where he stands on the matter, and I appeal to those members who have opposed the measure to re-examine their case. Why get out the axe when we can get the fire going with last year's kindling? Why chop it off before it has started? We should never be afraid of an idea. Some people who have opposed the measure think that, if they prohibit something they do not like, it will go away.

Mr. Mathwin: Part of the argument is that it has tourist potential.

Mr. PAYNE: The honourable member has already spoken once on the measure. I do not want to be diverted, because this point is difficult to make. People who oppose things and who support and bolster their opinion by saying, "If it is prohibited we will not have it", must understand that that idea does not hold water. On world issues, if proof were ever needed, one has only to cite the case of prohibition of liquor in the United States of America. All members should take the trouble to inform themselves on these matters, and my remarks are addressed equally to members on my own side who oppose the measure. If members do not want to examine what has already happened in history, they are selling themselves short in not using the information that should be available to help them make up their minds. In the United States, paternalistic people, who thought it was their job to decide what was best for others, decided that prohibition was the answer, but all the evils they had associated with alcohol were not merely doubled or trebled but magnified a

hundredfold by difficulties that arose from prohibition. No member could deny this. Some members who are opposing the measure do not want this aspect of gambling to be considered, nor do they want to consider the other ideas that go along with it, such as increased revenue, a possible improvement in tourism, a gain in employment, and so on.

Mr. Mathwin: Why cut out the poker machines?

Mr. PAYNE: It has been my observation that, when the member for Glenelg finds himself in difficulties, he puts on an urbane smile and tries to make a few interjections in an effort to divert the speaker. I do not suggest that he uses these tactics only on me: he uses them on others. However, I will not be diverted by what is only a part of the issue. The real issue at stake is whether this proposition will be suppressed before it has been considered properly. People who oppose the idea cannot get away from that. Will they let the matter be investigated fully and a reasoned decision brought down, or will they insist on knocking the measure on the head before it gets under way? That is the proposition. The provisions of the Bill are simple: do we have a committee with proper responsibility in which we can place our trust, as the members are pur colleagues? They will have power to gain full information on the matter. Members must ask themselves if they will give the committee this opportunity or whether they will blindly suppress the whole concept by voting the Bill out at this stage.

I have shown my position in saying that I am not promoting gambling. I am speaking of a proposition in a Bill which allows for a reasonable approach to a matter on which many people have certain views. Whether the people will be allowed to have their say, and whether the committee to be established under this Bill should be allowed to carry out its responsible task, are matters that are up to every member of this House. Certainly, those who have spoken in opposition to the Bill so far have not, in my opinion, properly put the question to themselves before making their position known.

In declaring that I fully support the Bill, not on gambling or moral issues, degeneration, regeneration or anything like that, but only in respect of what is dealt with by this Bill, I remind honourable members that that is what they must take their stand on, and it is what they have to vote on. I urge members to support this Bill at the second reading, as I intend to do.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I oppose the second reading. Although I normally agree with the previous speaker when we sit together on an important committee of this House, this is one matter on which we will disagree. The honourable member fooled and fiddled with the mechanics of the Bill in the short term without expressing his opinion in respect of the long-term situation. He referred to what the committee will examine. Of course we have faith in the members of the committee. Its members will have to decide what will exist in our community in the future. Every member knows of the type of person coming to him seeking assistance and the background circumstances involved, and it would be most shortsighted of members to look only at the activities of the committee and the research involved before a decision was made, rather than considering what the outcome of the establishment of a casino would be in this State.

It is unfortunate that the Bill is loaded and is not a straight-out referendum to be placed before the people of South Australia in respect of whether they agree or disagree to the establishment of a casino. I object strongly on this point. People in South Australia have opinions on this matter and would like to express them. I agree with the

member for Glenelg who stated strongly that this issue, if it comes before the people, will be one that they will be able to shrug off and say that, as the casino is not to be built in their district, they could not care less. The people of Mount Gambier or Renmark will say, "If they want a casino at Wallaroo, let them have it, as long as it is not at Mount Gambier or Renmark." I believe this is what many of my constituents at Murray Bridge might say. A sad aspect of the Bill is that it is loaded and is not a straight-out question for the people of South Australia to decide. It does not involve a democratic vote in respect of what they want and what they do not want.

Further, I disagree with the previous speaker who said that we should be looking at the details of the Bill. This matter goes much further than just the mechanics of clause 6 or clause 5. These clauses would be discussed in the Committee stage, anyway, if the Bill passes its second reading. The Bill is not democratic in respect of the people of this State making their decision. It is loaded and the people are asked only if they want a casino at a given locality. This is wrong because, as there is to be a referendum, the people should be taken into the Government's confidence and able to express their point of view:

I also disagree with the preliminary comments of the second reading explanation of the Premier when he based his argument for the establishment of a casino on employment and tourist development. There has not been sufficient information given by anyone to convince this House that such arguments can be justified. In respect of a diversity of employment, this is negligible in the tourist development of the State. Further, I do not believe it is nearly as important as much of the development that should take place in developing normal tourist attractions. Indeed, every local government area is crying out for funds to develop and modernize existing tourist attractions, and greater importance should be given to such tourist development.

If we are to develop our tourist attractions, I point out that the casino is involved in the question of fixing our priorities. Indeed, if \$11 000 000 or \$12 000 000 were to be spent on buildings, on bricks and mortar, I would dearly love to have it spent in my district. The Minister informed me today that there are 144 people in my district waiting for Housing Trust houses. This is the situation existing in a country town as small as Murray Bridge, where it is impossible to house people living in caravans, shacks, and all sorts of sub-standard houses. That we are unable to meet that demand has its own social repercussions: it has a detrimental effect on family relationships, which is currently a great problem in our community.

In respect of development and employment, I do not believe the Minister has made a case at all. Further, each honourable member has a responsibility to those who elected him. Like other members, I had received many petitions, telephone calls and other communications that all members have received. If the expressions of opinion by my electors are any guide, the people are not in agreement at present with the establishment of a casino in South Australia.

I consider that the debate has been conducted sensibly, as was the case also when this House discussed the abortion legislation in 1969. It is interesting to note that, when a social issue is before the House, members apply themselves diligently, sensibly, and conscientiously. That proves to me that much of our discussion of Bills is based on politics and much time is wasted. I think all members will agree that there is much waste of time in politicking in this House, but on social issues members apply them-

selves diligently and conscientiously, as we have seen in this debate. I oppose the second reading.

Mr. DUNCAN (Elizabeth): I will vote against the second reading of the Bill. I think most things that can be said about the Bill have been said, but I dissociate myself from statements by members who have expressed a moralist or wowseryish point of view. I am particularly opposed to that type of thing. In general, I support the right of people to gamble within the necessary limits. However, I do not think that about \$16 000 000 should be spent in what I consider to be a most wasteful way. If people are rich enough or foolish enough to gamble, let them play two-up in the streets or parks if they want to.

We should not use millions of dollars worth of scarce resources for projects such as a casino. I base my opposition to the Bill on the view that this type of development is completely undesirable because of the world scarcity of resources at present. The debate so far has seemed to me to be more like a debate that would have taken place in the 1950's, because no member has linked the matter of a casino with the great ecological problems facing the world at present. It is regrettable and unfortunate that this is the case, because I consider that the ecological issue is the most vital one facing South Australia, Australia, and the world.

We only have to look around us to see the sorts of shortages that are occurring already, indicating that many of the things that the ecological doomsday men, as they have been called, have been saying. One matter that has received little consideration is the shortage of paper. Members know that there is a shortage of Government stocks, but there has been little reference in the press to the paper shortage. Nevertheless, I consider that this is the start of the problems that we will face because of the shortage of resources.

The member for Murray has said that he would prefer to see many other types of development rather than a casino, and I should like to discuss with him the extent to which he thinks the State will be able to develop. We must start looking carefully at the whole question of development and find out where we are going, because soon the resources necessary for development or overdevelopment of the State will not be available, and we must have this in mind when considering the establishment of a casino.

By spending \$16 000 000 on a completely useless and unproductive enterprise, we are not facing responsibilities as we, as members of Parliament in South Australia, should be facing them. The types of resource needed for a \$16 000 000 project are many. For example, there is a brick strike at present, and obviously bricks would be needed for the project. My second point is the philosophy behind the building of a casino. It has been suggested that the revenue of the State will increase as a result, and I think that that is a fair claim.

However, if we build a casino, I assume that we will build it so that all those who think they can afford to gamble will be able to spend their money. The State of South Australia should not support such activities, because the project is based on the completely false premise that there will be more money to spend on these things. We talk about maximizing the standards of living of people, and, if we tried to average the standard in Australia of the mass, it would probably require a lowering of the standard of living. The resources are not available to enable everyone to be able to gamble to the extent necessary to make a casino a success, and for that reason the House should act responsibly and not support the Bill.

Wherever a casino was built, it would completely destroy the natural environment of the area, regardless of all the statements made about environmental impact studies. The debate so far has been one that one would have expected to hear before the ecology argument became fashionable, and it is most unfortunate that the question of the environment has not been raised in the debate before this time. Members opposite could well turn their minds to this matter when they are considering the whole question of development. There will not be enough resources to go around in future, and the whole matter of development will have to be reconsidered. That is, basically, why I oppose the Bill. The areas of the State that will benefit from this legislation are limited. Over-development has already occurred in many areas, and I do not want to see any more development of this type occurring in South Australia.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): This has been a most interesting debate and, like other members, I have listened with much interest to opinions expressed by members on both sides of the House. As the member for Murray said, it is not often in this House that we hear a free expression of opinion by members. When we do, the standard of debate is generally far better than it is normally when we are debating matters of a political nature. I make it clear at the outset that I will not support the second reading, the reasons for which I will give briefly. I do not agree that we should necessarily enter into an enterprise solely because it will increase the State's revenue by \$1 500 000. That is not a sound argument when one considers the cost to the people of this State of providing that extra revenue. After all, with a Budget such as this State has, \$1 500 000 is, to use a colloquial term, peanuts.

If the Government wants extra revenue, why does it not do what other Governments have done, and set up its own casino? I refer to what the member for Spence said, and I ask why we should assist good Socialists to become decadent capitalists and encourage the growth of monopolistic and capitalistic enterprise. That is what is envisaged in the Bill, and it is contrary to the philosophy of the member for Spence and his colleagues. I also listened to the member for Mitchell, who argued that there is no reason for not having something unless it has been tried and, if there is a chance that it can be tried, that should happen. I could think of all sorts of entertainment which are now prohibited but which might be licensed, if we extended the honourable member's argument a little further. Being one of the members of this House who have been privileged to see casinos in many parts of the world, I know that a casino is not a tourist attraction.

Mr. Keneally: Why did you go there, then?

Mr. NANKIVELL: The question is well put and I am pleased to answer it: I went out of curiosity, but not to spend money as a tourist. And a tourist who will not spend money is no good to an enterprise like this! I had to show my passport to gain entry to the casino in Monte Carlo, and what did I see? I saw many people standing around tables looking at a few people who were obviously as committed to gambling as a drug addict is addicted to drugs. I will not accept that there is any difference in creating a situation in which people become addicted to gambling or some other form of vice so that we can dissociate peddling this sort of thing from peddling drugs, which all members in this place say is such a terrible crime.

Macao has been referred to this evening. As the member for Peake said, the people who gamble at Macao travel there by hydrofoil from Hong Kong because there is no casino at Hong Kong. There is no casino at Hong Kong because its Government does not see any need to

raise money in this way. Although there is evidence that it could make money from this source, that Government will not reduce itself to this level. Although there is no casino in Singapore, there is one in Kuala Lumpur, where a sensible policy obtains. One must deposit \$200 (Malaysian) when one enters the casino and, when one has spent all one's money, they return one's deposit and tell one to go home. This is a protective mechanism that is employed in a casino that already exists.

In the last 12 months this Government has taken great pride in the consumer protection legislation that it has introduced. We have been trying to protect people from themselves, yet here we are creating a situation in which people will be encouraged to spend money that is not, as the member for Elizabeth said, freely available because of the limited resources that can be spent in this way. If money is spent in this way it cannot be spent in other avenues. I say categorically that we will not attract tourists to South Australia solely to gamble. If the Government wants to raise money from this source, why has it not got the guts to introduce its own casino legislation and build one here in Adelaide, and not say that someone will be given a licence to build a casino 80 kilometres from Adelaide? I agree with the member for Goyder that the reference to 80 kilometres should be struck out from the Bill, as it is just a red herring in this exercise.

Regarding creating employment, I do not believe there is any employment potential in a casino itself. Most of the people working in a casino are engaged not by the casino itself but by ancillary interests. Surely this is an important aspect. We in this State need some of our other resources to be developed. Indeed, plenty of places could be developed as tourist attractions. If we want to attract tourists to this State we must provide attractive facilities for them. However, they will not come here specifically to gamble, and they will not go to a certain place solely because it has a casino. If a casino is at a certain place they may go there, as many have done, out of curiosity, to see those who are addicted to gambling and who cannot help themselves.

Mr. Keneally: What about T.A.B.?

Mr. NANKIVELL: The honourable member would realize that T.A.B. does not create the same atmosphere. Has he been to West Point?

Mr. Keneally: No.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Then the honourable member should go to one of these places and see for himself the atmosphere that surrounds the gambling tables. Those involved become compulsive gamblers and their conscience or pride seems to prevent them from withdrawing when they have made large losses; they are sure they will recover if they continue. However, that does not apply in a T.A.B. agency, and the honourable member cannot relate the one to the other. This Bill, on which arguments on both sides of the matter have been advanced, has been extensively debated. I do not want to canvass further the matters that have been raised by my colleagues or Government members. However, in no circumstances will I support the second reading.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I oppose the second reading. As my action on this occasion may appear to be inconsistent with my actions on similar occasions in the past, I think I should explain why I am voting against the Bill now. First, I will not vote in favour of a referendum in any circumstances. The people in our districts who elect us should have confidence in what we do. Why should we have a referendum on an issue such as this, when we have passed 50 Bills this session, some

of which are likely to affect the freedom of people by providing so-called protections? We have passed legislation that has embodied the paternal attitude that people are not capable of buying a motor car without our looking after them.

In this case, the Premier has indicated that he does not think a casino is altogether a good thing by saying that it must be a certain distance from Adelaide. If I was going to support a casino at all, I would support the establishment of a casino in Adelaide and not in the country. Under the Bill, people will have to go 80 kilometres to the casino. As they will be full of joy and perhaps something else, they may have difficulty in getting back home. It is absolutely ridiculous to have such a provision; it is treating people as though they were children.

Parliament has a certain responsibility to keep up with what people want and with what they are doing. I am not bound entirely by the opinion in my district, as there are different opinions in various parts of the State. Although there is a certain opinion in a member's own district, he also has to take the wider view and determine what people throughout the State think about an issue. One reason why we are on this side of the House is that in the past some of our members have taken the parochial view and have considered only how their own dog box is affected. Members must take a broader look at issues. However, not one person in my district has asked me to vote in favour of the casino, and this is entirely different from the position when we were considering T.A.B., which the people wanted.

Mr. Nankivell: But two companies have written to you, and they want it.

Mr. McANANEY: Yes, but I was talking about people in my district. At the time I had to vote on the T.A.B. legislation, people could make a bet at any hotel in South Australia. At that stage, people did not go along with the law relating to betting on races. As people broke the law, the Government had the responsibility to do something about the situation. As there is little demand for a casino and no interest in the matter, I cannot see why I should support this legislation. I have been in Monte Carlo, and the casino there was the most miserable place I have been in. I went there in the afternoon. The only people gambling were women with haggard faces who were noting on paper how many times red or black had come up and checking the numbers. This was a place of misery and not a place of joy and happiness, and I have been in places where there has been joy and happiness. I can see nothing in favour of this proposal for a casino.

It has been said that Gallup polls give no indication of what a vote at a referendum will be, but I do not go along with that entirely. Before we had the lottery referendum, which I opposed, I think that the Gallup poll showed that almost 90 per cent of those contacted favoured a lottery. The vote at the referendum was 10 per cent less than that. However, in Liberal districts people voted against the lottery because they thought that, by doing so, they were voting against the Frank Walsh Government. Therefore, they voted differently from the way in which they would have voted had politics not been involved. Gallup polls now indicate that only a minority in South Australia favours a casino. I emphasize that I do not think the majority should say that the minority cannot do something. However, I get back to the point that, as I believe there is no demand for a casino in South Australia, and as this type of gambling is not taking place at present, I do not think we should allow a casino at this stage.

Despite what has been said about viability, I think that a casino would be a financial success. In this House

previously, members said that a lottery would not make money and that people did not want it. On so many occasions it has been said that projects would not be viable. The casino would be viable. The member for Mitchell claimed that it would be a dreadful thing to oppose a casino because if one were established it would result in \$1 500 000 more money for schools. I think that is a weak argument, because if people do not spend money at a casino they must have that money to spend on something more useful. I think that possibly in five years or 10 years, if there are casinos in all other States, people may want a casino here. South Australia demanded T.A.B. when every other State in the Commonwealth had it. Of course, it could be argued that, when all other States had a casino, a casino in South Australia would not pay. At present, there is no demand for a casino, and no-one is breaking the law by betting in this way. Therefore, I think that my attitude on this occasion in opposing the Bill is consistent with the attitude I have taken on previous occasions.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): I support the establishment of a casino. Of course, this is a social issue, and we have dealt with many social issues in recent years. The introduction of lotteries and T.A.B. and the liberalization of the State's liquor laws legalized practices that had previously been carried on illegally in this State.

Mr. Venning: Do you favour poker machines?

Mr. BURDON: If the honourable member goes to Tasmania he will probably make a point of going to the Wrest Point Casino. When he goes to New South Wales I have no doubt that he plays the poker machines. When we South Australians go to Tasmania we visit the casino, and on a visit to New South Wales we invariably play the poker machines, yet we object when it is suggested that these facilities be provided in South Australia. As the Bill provides only for the Industries Development Committee to make a recommendation on the site of the casino and for a referendum then to be held, the people will have the final say on this matter. We are providing ample opportunity for the people of this State to indicate their wishes. The tourist potential of a casino in this State is tremendous; it is fully supported by the South-Eastern Region of the National Travel Association.

At this stage, I suggest to the parties concerned in the consideration of this Bill that, if eventually a casino is given the green light, consideration should be given to a membership fee of between \$50 and \$200 for clients on a regular annual basis, and there should be a fee of \$1 or so for a visitor as an honorary member who may be on a sightseeing tour or may wish to visit such a casino; whether as a player or merely as a visitor would be for that person to decide. I have not been as fortunate as some members who have spoken in this debate, who have said they have been to Monte Carlo and to the casinos in the Far East or in Europe. In certain casinos overseas a membership fee is charged; it is a custom adopted in some American States and is something we may well consider following if it is decided that a casino should be established in this State.

We have heard a lot about the social hazards of such a move. We do hear and have heard of the problems of gambling in some shape or form down through the years. While I personally do not, except on rare occasions such as the Melbourne Cup (and I understand other people do likewise), have a flutter, as fancy dictates—

Mr. Chapman: Did you win?

Mr. BURDON: No, I did not win, as usual. I rarely do have a win. It should be the responsibility of the individual to make that decision: he should not be told by

me what he should or should not do. Whether I backed a winner on this occasion or back one in the future is beside the point. It will be for the member for Alexandra to decide which side he is on in considering this Bill; he will have to decide whether he is on the right side or the wrong side.

Mr. Keneally: The honourable member can go to Tasmania any time he likes, but he does not want anyone else to go there.

Mr. BURDON: Although the honourable member for Alexandra will probably vote against the Bill in this House, he would probably take the first opportunity to visit a casino or play the poker machines when in New South Wales. I make clear that there is nothing in this Bill to suggest that poker machines will be introduced into this State. I assure the member for Alexandra that I personally will oppose their introduction.

Mr. Chapman: If you support roulette wheels, what is the difference?

Mr. BURDON: The fate of this Bill will not rest on Party lines. As members have said during the course of the debate, it will be decided by the members of this House, who will vote according to their conscience. In my own area, I have, received some 200 objections in the form of petitions presented to this House, and I have received some 50 other objections on forms that I could not present to this House. Other members, too, have received such forms. I have also received personal representations from substantial groups supporting the idea of a casino.

Mr. Venning: How many?

Mr. BURDON: I think the representations in favour of a casino would about equal those opposed to it, if the honourable member wants to know. The views of those people who have objected and of those people who have expressed themselves to be in favour of a casino have been considered by me, as I have indicated to all those people who have contacted me. As other members have contacted their constituents, I have done likewise. However, some of the things that have been said in opposition this evening have always been said in arguments against a casino. Having listened to many speakers this evening, I think that the argument is that a casino should not be established within 80 kilometres of Adelaide. Many are agreed that a casino could be established somewhere in the North of the State. That is something which a committee appointed by this Government will consider and which eventually will be decided by a referendum.

The people of South Australia must realize that, if they are to compete on a comparable basis with the rest of Australia, money must be obtained from some source. We cannot bury our heads in the sand and believe that money will be handed to us. If South Australia lags behind in methods of raising revenue that have been used in the Eastern States, it has been made clear to the people of South Australia and to successive Governments here when they have approached the Commonwealth Government, of whatever political complexion, that the stock reply is, "You people must go back to your State and examine your revenue-raising methods. If you put your revenue-raising methods on a basis comparable to those of the other States, we will consider your application for additional funds." It has been said many times during the course of this debate that the members of this House should decide the issue. I believe we should give the people of this State the opportunity to decide it. All members have a responsibility in this and should at least support the second reading of this Bill. If they do that,

some of the objections to certain clauses in the Bill, including the one relating to the referendum, can be carefully considered and possibly amendments can be framed in an endeavour to satisfy all sections of the community.

We have heard it said here this evening that we, as members of Parliament, should decide this issue. I believe that we have a responsibility to take this Bill past the second reading stage so that we can try to correct what members have called anomalies in the Bill. The previous speaker said that he would not support the second reading; he said that now is not the time for a casino, but he also said that South Australia should have a casino in five years time. A similar argument was used in Western Australia in connection with the establishment of a Slate insurance office there, and the same type of argument has been used in Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania. It is never the time if one does not want to do something. Within five years, three or four casinos may well have been established elsewhere, and it will probably be too late then to establish one here.

In connection with tourist potential, I point out that the South-East is one of the most spectacular parts of Australia, and it is more than 80 kilometres from Adelaide. Further, the South-East is midway between Adelaide and Melbourne, and tourists can enjoy the scenery and facilities that already exist in that part of the State. The member for Mallee said that the State should provide its own casino, but other members have said that this should be undertaken by private enterprise, and that is what this Bill provides for. We cannot have it both ways. The member for Mallee said that while on his overseas trip he visited many casinos. Many overseas tourists visit casinos out of sheer curiosity. I will support the second reading of this Bill, and I hope that other members do so, too.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): Tonight members will be voting on the basis of their convictions, not on the basis of Caucus decisions. I make clear that 100 per cent of the representations I have received on this matter have opposed the establishment of a casino in this State, and I intend to vote against the second reading of this Bill. Parliament has been asked to debate this Bill without having all the necessary information at its disposal. In his second reading explanation the Premier promised to supply to the House information about the operation of overseas casinos, but he has not done that. All the people who desire to establish a casino complex (and that is what it would be) in this State should have been asked to provide full details of their proposals, so that all members and all interested citizens might know exactly what was proposed.

This is such an important matter that it has become an emotional issue in the community. Feelings are running high in many circles. Consequently, Parliament should make an informed decision. I do not believe that Parliament should reject out of hand a proposition that might involve \$15 000 000 or \$16 000 000 being invested in the community. If private enterprise has that much money to spend and if it is not permitted to spend it in South Australia, it will be spent elsewhere. Since this is such an important matter the people of South Australia should be given the right to say "Yes" or "No" to the question whether they want a casino.

I do not believe I should vote in a certain way simply because I do not participate in gambling. I should not say, "You, the people of this State, are not permitted to gamble because I do not like gambling." If we are to look at this matter realistically we should give the people the right to vote "Yes" or "No". That is one of the

basic reasons why I oppose the Bill. I make clear that we should not put a loaded question to the people. We have already seen what happens when the Government tries to be smart and puts a loaded question to the people. We have seen the chaos that occurred following an earlier referendum, which was a waste of the taxpayers' funds. Parliament has been asked to vote on this measure with one hand tied behind its back. Clause 11 will involve the people in a situation similar to that which occurred at the time of the referendum on shopping hours.

I do not believe that this is the last occasion on which Parliament will discuss this matter. I think that in future it will be put before Parliament again and I hope that, on the next occasion on which this House is asked to consider such a measure, Parliament will be properly informed and the people will be given the right to choose for themselves whether or not a casino should be established in South Australia. If a Bill were put before this Parliament at any time and if the question to be asked of the people involved a clear reply of "Yes" or "No", I would support a referendum. I believe certain issues should be decided by way of referendum, although many of my colleagues do not follow that line. However, I belong to a Party that allows its members to exercise their rights and freedoms, and I intend to do that. This is an issue of such importance that we should not rush into a decision.

Many arguments have been advanced to support the theory that such legislation would encourage gambling, but I do not think that is the case. People have only a certain amount of money to spend, and if it is spent on one form of gambling it cannot be spent on another. Parliament should not act in a shortsighted or arbitrary manner, because we are discussing not merely the establishment of a casino but of a large complex that would employ many people. I do not believe the Bill is in the proper form, and therefore I will not vote for it. Many of my constituents have approached me on this matter, most of whom have been entirely opposed to the establishment of a casino. Some of my constituents wanted me to arrange a deputation to the Premier, because they had a proposition to put to him, and I was happy to lead that deputation. The Premier was quite right in telling these people they would have to make proper submissions to the Government, but, when people have gone to great trouble and in some cases have spent much money in having submissions prepared, it is wrong that Parliament and the people should not have the opportunity to scrutinize those submissions. I oppose the second reading.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I have few remarks on this Bill, but I believe it is the duty of every member in this House to make his views known before voting. I intend to vote against the second reading. I have received many submissions against the establishment of a casino in South Australia; I do not count the one submission in favour of it, because I believe the same submission was made to every other member, and if it has been counted in one other district I will not count it in mine. Few people in the community actively want a casino; many do not care very much whether or not there is a casino. However, a considerable body of opinion does not want a casino in South Australia, and those people have taken the trouble to make their views known. I respect their opinions, and I believe a member of Parliament must vote in the House as he sees the situation. It is one of the refreshing things about this debate that members are able to make up their own minds in

this Chamber. It is a member's responsibility to do this, and his constituents, if they wish, can take the appropriate action at the next election. If they have not elected a member who can make up his mind, and if they disagree with him, they will take that action.

I oppose the Bill because I have serious doubts whether or not a casino would be financially viable. It has been said that it will provide employment for members of the community, but this depends entirely on its financial viability. It is said that a casino will attract tourists who will leave behind them money that will enrich the coffers of South Australia. I do not think this is possible. I think we are not going to attract tourists who will leave money, but that the only people we have any show of attracting are the professional gamblers who seek out gambling facilities and who will come to gamble and possibly lose their money.

Whom are we kidding if we think those professional gamblers will come all the way to Adelaide and then move on to Wallaroo or elsewhere just because a casino has been established there? They could use gambling facilities elsewhere without the inconvenience of having to travel 80 kilometres to a casino removed from the capital city. They are professionals, not tourists. For this reason I do not think that we will attract the professionals, who will not tolerate that inconvenience. Therefore, we have to depend on South Australians. If this proposition is to be financially viable, it must depend on South Australians to provide most of the money. In oversea countries barriers are put in the way of local people who want to go to casinos. In many cases it is necessary for patrons to deposit their passports and pay an entrance fee. No-one can pretend that an 80-kilometre limit, which is proposed, will be any barrier to the involvement of South Australians, and I do not consider that it was intended to be so.

Mr. Keneally: That's not the maximum.

Dr. TONKIN: It is the minimum in this case. I think the member for Elizabeth made the reasonable point that South Australians do not have money to throw away. We cannot waste money on non-productive resources and, if it is necessary to fix an 80-kilometre limit, presumably to protect South Australians, obviously the people proposing this project must accept that there is some risk to South Australians generally. I do not think that the 80-kilometre limit is practical or that the proposition would be financially viable without the support of South Australians. If there was no such limit, a casino would present a risk to the community, and I consider that those who drew the Bill fully realize this. I oppose the measure.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I ask whether the people of South Australia really want a casino. They have had ample opportunity to express their views and most of the material that members have received has opposed the establishment of a casino here. The remainder of the community has had opportunity to make representations but I have not received representations in support of a casino. As many people have expressed total opposition to the measure, the views of those people must be considered seriously. In 1968, much lobbying and many representations took place by many people in relation to a measure introduced by the member for Mitcham to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. The position then was totally different from the position now, because on that occasion the literature and representations that we received were evenly divided.

This Bill provides for the Industries Development Committee to consider applications for a casino licence and to make a recommendation to the Government, when a referendum would be held on whether the people agreed to the building of a casino at the place recommended.

South Australia has a voting population of between 700 000 and 800 000 and, as Wallaroo, for example, has a population of 2 000, the vote of the people in Wallaroo would not be significant in deciding whether a casino should be established in that town.

A similar position would apply to Victor Harbor, the north shore of Lake Bonney, or anywhere else in the State. In relation to a proposal to establish a casino in a small community, the people in that community would have virtually no say about whether they agreed with the proposal. If a casino were to be established in Adelaide, the referendum would be a fair indication of whether, by and large, the people wanted a casino.

I do not necessarily oppose the measure on moral grounds: being involved in primary production, especially fruit-growing, I am probably one of the biggest gamblers in this State. As this Bill is drafted, it gives the people of a small town where a casino is to be established virtually no say in the matter, and the 2 000 or 3 000 residents of that town may be completely and utterly opposed to the project. I do not consider that there is any real demand for a casino at present, and we do not know what the future holds. If the casino is proposed purely from a revenue point of view, surely this must not be a determining factor. The member for Mitchell has said that schools would suffer because of the loss of possible revenue, but I cannot accept that he really thinks that that is so, because if he does he is putting schools low on the Government's priority list. Projects at the bottom of the priority list probably are not as important as schools, and I do not think that the honourable member's argument was valid.

The member for Mitchell has also said that prohibition in the United States of America did not work. Does he suggest that we should legalize other practices in this State merely because they are going on? As the member for Mallee has said, many practices are lucrative, but that does not mean that we should legalize them. If there is a future demand for a casino, that is a different matter. Had there been a need or demand, I am sure representations would have been made by the people accordingly.

Mr. Keneally: You did not get much representation against it.

Mr. ARNOLD: On a percentage basis, there is no comparison, and figures have been produced by other members. As I do not believe there is a call or a need for a casino in this State, I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Development and Mines): One of the advantages of rising at 11.10 p.m. is that practically everything that could be said has been said, and one has the excuse of being mercifully brief. I rise with much reluctance and a certain feeling of sadness, because of the way I know in advance that I will vote on the second reading. The Premier has introduced this Bill with the best of intentions.

Mr. Millhouse: It's a pity he did not say what his intentions were.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: In trying to bend over backwards to suit those people who have raised objections to this measure, he has probably ensured, albeit unwittingly, that if the measure passes this House the casino will not be a successful commercial venture. Many safeguards have been written into the legislation. They are logical and rational safeguards; requiring some answer from those who would, despite the safeguards, want to vote against the Bill. Various members, especially Opposition members, but also my own colleagues, have referred to the fact that this is a free debate and that this is not a Party issue. Indeed, I have noted the high standard of the debate

resulting from that fact. But I wish I could be so sure about the non-Party component of the vote we are about to take. For example, if it transpires that every member of the official Opposition votes against the Bill, while on other grounds I might welcome such a vote, nonetheless it would appear to be somewhat of a coincidence that this should happen. Further, I am aware that a prominent member of the front bench opposite wrote to constituents in his district stating that the Liberal Party intended to vote against this Bill. Those were the words used.

Mr. Hall: Will you use the words "Liberal and Country League" rather than Liberal Party?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I thought I said "the official Opposition" earlier. However, it is in respect of that component of the Opposition that I am addressing my remarks at present. That statement was made in letters to constituents. I am not denying the right of that honourable member to make that statement; indeed, I am not denying the right of the major Opposition Party to come to such a decision. However, if that is what is happening, let us have no hypocrisy about free votes, and the like, in this place.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Surely they will not all vote against it!

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: We shall see.

The Hon. L. J. King: Having all independently come to the same decision!

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: That would not happen. In respect of our constituents, I refer to what the member for Glenelg said, namely, that he had approached the matter with a completely open mind, yet he then went on to talk about "gambling dens". This did not seem to me to be expressing any sort of open mind. He said he did not mind one way or the other, and by "open mind" perhaps the honourable member meant open like a colander or a filler. The member for Glenelg went on to say that he did not have any strong preferences in this matter and that he would therefore move according to pressure received from his constituents.

Two or three other members opposite have referred to pressure received from constituents. However, I make clear that it is not from any pressure I have received from my constituents that I am casting my vote in the way I intend to cast it. I am consciously aware that there is no formal procedure whereby the local member can accurately gauge opinion in his district, although I have heard jokes about a certain Independent member who probably got together with a few people in the lounge bar of a hotel in his district as a means of gauging the opinion in the district. Other members would probably be more strenuous in their efforts to gauge opinion.

Further, we all know that, in respect of any matter whatsoever, the anti's are usually far more violently vocal than are the pro's. Apart from the merits of the measure and who happens to be right, there will always be a section of the population which, because it approves of what is happening, believes that there is no need for its voice to be raised. By the very nature of the process we are undergoing, it will be those people in opposition to the matter who will raise their voices, and this is one of the defects we have in the democratic process. Sometimes we get to (the stage where virtually no-one is speaking for what may be the majority opinion. Therefore, it is those who have certain reasons for being in opposition to a measure whose voices are raised the loudest.

I have probably received fewer objections from my constituents than have most members. I am not sure why this is. Possibly, it is because of the high component of United

Kingdom migrants in my district who have different social attitudes to this matter. I do not quarrel with their right or, indeed, with their political preferences, which are invariably in my favour. Also, because it is a young district, young people may have different ideas on this matter, too, but I am not sure on that, and I point out that the three youngest members on the Government side are among those signifying their intention to vote against the Bill.

Mr. Gunn: And also on this side.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: There is no clear signal from my district, nor would I feel in a matter such as this that it would be proper that I should take overwhelming notice of whatever signal might be coming my way. My attitude is simply this: I am a peculiar mixture of left-wing Socialist and old-fashioned Methodist, and I find in this matter that my background in both areas inclines me to vote the same way. As a Socialist, I am opposed to erecting a temple to the capitalistic ethic. As a Methodist, I am generally opposed to gambling. At the same time, I am aware that the gambling instinct, which we are not likely to eradicate easily, is written into the very fabric of our society. Furthermore, our economic system contains a large capitalist component and, indeed, it will continue to do so for a long time. Any reformist Party must learn to live with it and use it as best it can for its own objectives. I cannot imagine that in the short term it is able to eliminate it completely. These basic backgrounds that I have are not in themselves sufficient to induce me to vote against this measure.

In the long run, all I come down to is simply this: it seems to me that in the history of these matters in other countries (and I cannot prove to the satisfaction of members that the same will obtain here) elaborate gambling facilities provide some sort of financial underpinning for organized racketeering. It has not always involved gambling exclusively: it has sometimes involved prostitution, and in America, for a peculiar 15-year period, it involved alcohol. Nevertheless, it seems that organized racketeering cannot live on the overt types of illegal activity that attract the attention of the newspapers, such as, for instance robbing banks and that sort of thing. A more steady flow of income seems necessary to provide a living for those who are from time to time engaged in these other more exotic activities. This could happen here; I do not know. I am not convinced that we have eliminated completely the possibility of such a thing happening here.

When it was announced that a referendum would be held on this matter, given that the Bill emerged from the Parliamentary process, I realized that this question would be difficult to answer, because how does one deny to the people the right ultimately to decide?

I raise two points regarding the referendum. First, I refer to the nature of the question we will ask. It will be a general question. As a result of the investigations conducted by the Industries Development Committee, and the decision that that committee must make, which decision will be incorporated in the question, the focus for the referendum will tend to be on the pros and cons not of establishing a casino but of a site that will have been designated as a result of that investigation. I submit that that is asking the wrong question. My second point, which in some ways weighs more heavily with me, is this: initially, it was possible for the Government to say, "Whoever establishes this facility will do so entirely at his own financial risk, and no Government money will be involved in the venture." Now, given a favourable vote in this place and at the referendum, it will be possible for the people to say, "The Government did put money into the

venture; it put \$100 000 into it" (that being the cost to the taxpayer of the referendum).

It is a peculiar circumstance when a Minister of Development and Mines signifies his intention to vote against a proposal for a significant development within the State which would no doubt provide revenue to the State and also a significant increase in employment in an area that needs such an increase. However, for the reasons I have already enumerated, it is necessary that I do so.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The debate has covered many matters, which can be confined to about five main issues. Some members, although certainly not many, have referred to the moral issue involved in the introduction in South Australia of an additional gambling facility. Those members are in the minority. Most members have said that they did not raise a moral issue on this matter but that there was some other reason for their voting against the second reading. Regarding whether there is morality in gambling, I should have thought that members of the community had already decided that matter. The community has made available, under control, facilities for gambling within the State, and this measure contains proposals for a form of gambling, the control on which was indeed considerably more stringent than the controls that presently exist on other gambling facilities in the State. I realize that some people in the community take the paternal attitude that they should prevent other people from engaging in activities in which they themselves would not consider indulging. However, I do not think that point of view is generally taken in the community and, indeed, it should not be accepted by this House.

Dr. Eastick: What about poker machines?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is clear that there have been grave consequences, as a result of the introduction of poker machines, which separate that activity from other forms of gambling. However, the same social results are not seen from other forms of gambling as are seen from poker machines, which seem in the case of many people in the community, particularly the less well off, to be a form of addiction. In these circumstances, it seems to me that, in introducing this measure, it would not be generally acceptable in the South Australian community for us to build into our revenue process something that many people in New South Wales would like to abolish if they could.

Mr. Goldsworthy: The same applies to a casino.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It does not. For instance, there is no sign that roulette wheels anywhere in the world have led to the same form of addiction as have poker machines. I point out that casinos are not new in the world, and that in Southern Europe they are not confined solely to Monaco. Indeed, they exist widely in Europe at present, and they do not produce the social results that honourable members opposite have said occur in relation to Las Vegas. They are properly controlled and do not produce the social results that poker machines produce in New South Wales; nor indeed do they produce the accession of many people who are engaged in the nefarious activities of profiteering and racketeering, of which honourable members have spoken.

It seems strange that, whenever a subject of this type is raised, people confine themselves to a few examples and do not examine the generalities. However, I went to the trouble of obtaining material concerning casinos in Europe, and the results of which people speak regarding Las Vegas simply do not occur; nor do they occur in relation to the casinos in Germany, Italy or France. Members have been

given only selective evidence by the opponents of casinos. Most members have not turned their attention to these matters. Many have referred to the financial viability of the project. They have chosen to say they will vote against the project on the grounds that they assume at this stage that there is no financial viability in the project, when in fact there are proponents for the project who say that they are able to make it financially viable. Further, the Bill provides that there be an investigation by a proper committee of this House into the financial viability of the project.

Dr. Eastick: Not over 80 kilometres from Adelaide.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The arrangement in the Bill is that the matter can be investigated. If the Industries Development Committee finds that there is not a project that is financially viable, it will not make a recommendation for a licence. Members are saying that, before there is an investigation, they know what they cannot know: that the project is not financially viable. That is absurd. In fact, several of these statements made in the House in this debate are contrary to statements made by those members previously. The Leader has obviously been searching around for some reasons (no matter how much they contradict the previous reason he has given for his attitude on the matter) to vote against the Bill.

Dr. Eastick: You'll have to do better than that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader has already been dealt with (and I think effectively) on that score by the member for Goyder. The next matter raised has been that somehow or other, by holding a referendum of all people in the State, we are depriving local people of an effective voice in the matter, but I point out to members who have raised that argument that the Industries Development Committee has to take into account the views of the local citizenry before making a recommendation for a licence, so it is simply not true that local people will not be consulted or not have their voice heard on the matter. There is nothing in that argument. The member for Playford spoke about foreign control, producing some statement as to the result of his investigations into shareholdings in the Wrest Point Casino.

Mr. Venning: He did well, too.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, except that he failed to do what he promised the House he would do and that was to deal with the foreign control measures in the Bill; he did not deal with them. If in fact his researches are correct, under the provisions of the Bill the Treasurer can require in any such case that the foreign shareholdings be sold, there being complete power for him to do that. That matter was not dealt with at all in the debate.

The last matter raised was the business of the incursion into South Australia of racketeers as a result of this project. We are told that we will have in South Australia, under a controlled casino facility, the racketeers who are now rife in Sydney. I just do not understand that situation. The racketeers are rife in Sydney where casinos are illegal, under a Liberal Government what is more. Sydney has wide-open racketeering and gambling facilities that exist with the prohibition in law that they should exist. We are then told that by not altering the law in South Australia but by maintaining the kind of law that exists in New South Wales we will not have those people here, but by bringing in a controlled gambling facility, which would not then allow the kind of competition that leads to the standover rackets and racketeering that occurs in Sydney, we will produce the situation that exists in Sydney. That does not make sense. The fact is that, in most areas where

casinos have been established on a controlled basis, there has not been the kind of racketeering to which members have referred. A proposal in South Australia is for a situation nothing like that which exists in Las Vegas, where the protection rackets occur simply because there may be competition between the different forms of gambling ownership.

What then is being ignored in the whole of this debate is what can obtain to the benefit of the State. It has been suggested that the facilities in Hobart have reached their peak of return to the State of Tasmania and that, if any facility is established elsewhere, that will reduce the return in Tasmania. No-one has had a look at the reports of the tourist ventures in Australia to adduce that kind of argument. In fact, submissions were made to South Australia on the basis that one of the problems of Tasmania in reaching its peak in tourist attraction in this venture is that in providing tourist facilities for people who come from overseas it is unusual to attract people who are coming to a certain terminal point, and that there would be added attraction to Tasmania by establishing an additional facility here. That is why the same people who were involved in the establishment of the Wrest Point casino sought that there should be an additional facility here. They did not see competition: they saw an advantage to their existing business. In the decentralization of tourist facilities and the provision of stable employment from that decentralization, with a facility of this kind we could get in a country area an investment of \$15 000 000 in tourist facilities, with only \$500 000 of that going into the casino itself. The provision of that kind of accommodation and those facilities could provide real and stable employment in a decentralized area. I do not believe that is something this State can afford to pass up.

Moreover, I do not believe we should lightly pass up the additional revenue to this State, because we need every additional basis of revenue we can legitimately get. For all those reasons, I believe the second reading should be passed. If it is not passed, that is the end of the matter in South Australia at this stage. However, I forecast that, if it is not passed now, at some stage in the future (it may be 10 years hence) the situation in South Australia will change and the members who now refuse this measure because of their fears of electoral results (fears which I think are misplaced) will in this case, as has proved to be the position in other cases, take a different view in due season.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (16)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, Burdon, Crimes, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Hall, Harrison, Keneally, King, Langley, Olson, Payne, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (23)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, and Dean Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Chapman, Coumbe, Duncan, Eastick (teller), Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hopgood, Mathwin, McAnaney, McRae, Millhouse, Russack, Simmons, Slater, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Corcoran, Jennings, and McKee. Noes—Messrs. Evans, Nankivell, and Rodda.

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Second reading thus negatived.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (WEIGHTS)

In Committee.

(Continued from November 6. Page 1599.)

Clause 4—"Speed limits for certain vehicles"—which the Hon. G. T. Virgo had moved to amend by striking out "ninety" and inserting "eighty".

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): I seek leave to withdraw my amendment.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

In new section 53 to strike out subsection (1) and insert the following new subsections:

(1) A person shall not drive a motor vehicle (other than an omnibus) at a speed in excess of eighty kilometres an hour where the gross vehicle weight of the motor vehicle, or the gross combination weight of the motor vehicle and any vehicle drawn thereby, exceeds four tonnes.

Penalty: Not less than twenty and not more than one hundred and fifty dollars.

(1a) A person shall not drive an omnibus, or a motor vehicle carrying more than eight passengers, at a speed in excess of ninety kilometres an hour.

Penalty: Not less than twenty and not more than one hundred and fifty dollars.

This amendment is in accordance with the attitude expressed by the Australian Transport Advisory Council last Friday. If all the Ministers in their respective States carry out their expressed intentions, we shall have complete uniformity in this regard throughout Australia, on the basis of commercial vehicles of more than four tonnes gross weight travelling in non-urban areas at a maximum speed of 80 km/h, and buses and vehicles carrying more than eight passengers travelling at a maximum speed of 90 km/h.

Mr BECKER: I appreciate the Minister's point. In the interests of road safety, it was said that a feature of the Bill would be uniformity. This will achieve that. If we do not have a uniform speed limit throughout Australia, we shall remain in the present situation. For that reason I support the amendment.

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the speed of 90 km/h be uniform throughout Australia?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Yes.

Mr. BLACKER: I support the amendment, although there is an anomaly here, because it appears that a truck-load of pigs is more important than a bus load of people.

Mr. HALL: I am interested in the official attitude to the enforcement of these speed limits. At the moment it is fair to say that, although there are some prosecutions, one seldom passes a transport that is observing the legal speed limit. On Monday evening I passed some vehicles that were travelling at 65 m.p.h. (104.7 km/h). Such speeds can often be observed on long stretches of road. We all know that the present speed limit is unrealistic.

Generally, transports are exceeding by far even the new speed limit that has been set, but I am not suggesting that it should be higher. Will the Minister ask that steps be taken to see that the speed of vehicles is kept within the limit provided in the Bill? What amount of effort will be undertaken to police the speed limit?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Commissioner of Police is the chief law enforcement officer of this State, and I do not think he would appreciate the honourable member's suggestion that he is not carrying out his duties. He is a very competent officer.

Mr. HALL: It is typical of the Minister to turn any logical question into an attack on the questioner; that is something to which we have become accustomed. I am not reflecting on the Commissioner of Police but, with the resources at his disposal, it is not possible for him to police the speed limits completely. I am simply asking whether the Minister will advocate a stricter policing of the speed limits, and I do not want my remarks to be misconstrued.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 10—"Repeal of sections 145 to 148 of principal Act and enactment of sections in their place"—reconsidered.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO moved:

In new section 145 (1) to strike out "Part" and insert "Act".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport) moved:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): We recognize the need for uniformity and we accept the principle of the Bill in the interests of road safety. I consider that members received the Minister's assurance that the problems experienced in connection with split-bogie weighing will not occur. Whilst I would have preferred this to be covered in the Bill, I accept the Minister's assurance that the situation will be dealt with administratively.

The SPEAKER: Order! On the third reading the honourable member cannot introduce any new matter. He can speak to the Bill only as it came out of Committee.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.56 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, November 8, at 2 p.m.