

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 31 March 1982

The **SPEAKER (Hon. B. C. Eastick)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: HARP SEALS

A petition signed by 417 residents of South Australia praying that the House make representations to the people concerned to cease the slaughter of harp seals in Newfoundland and that such seal goods be banned from sale in South Australia was presented by Mr Glazbrook.

Petition received.

PETITION: CASINO

A petition signed by 153 residents of South Australia praying that the House not permit the establishment of a casino in South Australia was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. P. B. Arnold) on behalf of the Minister of Health (Hon. Jennifer Adamson)—

Pursuant to Statute—

1. Consumer Affairs, Commissioner for—Report, 1980-81.

QUESTION TIME

The **SPEAKER**: Before calling on questions, I indicate that any questions that would normally be directed to the Premier or the Minister of Health will be taken this afternoon by the Deputy Premier.

STATE CLOTHING CORPORATION

Mr BANNON: Can the Deputy Premier say whether it is a fact that the \$500 000 order for hospital linen to which I referred in this House in a question to the Premier on 24 March has gone, as I suggested it might, to the \$15 a week free enterprise work force of the New South Wales prisons, an action that has also lost the South Australian firm of Actil Ltd, of Woodville, an order worth about \$300 000? When I asked the Premier about this matter on 24 March, a matter vital to continued employment of workers at the State Clothing Corporation, Whyalla, it was not then certain whether the order had finally left South Australia. In his reply the Premier said, in part:

There is no getting away from the fact that the State Clothing Corporation in its operations takes away business from private enterprise, and is effectively stopping people with jobs in private enterprise getting the jobs they need.

He added:

There are just so many jobs, and the State Clothing Corporation is costing the potential jobs of other people in private enterprise.

I am now told that the order has been lost to Whyalla, the contract having gone to the Prisons Department of New South Wales. I am also told that a further order, this time

worth \$600 000, for nurses uniforms is destined to go to Victoria.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The State clothing factory was established by the Labor Party when in office. It has not been one of their great success stories, not to put too fine a point on it. I think we can put that in the rather extensive list of enterprises in which the labor Party sought to engage and which cost the taxpayer dearly. This Government when elected sought to put the business affairs of the State on a rather firmer footing than did our predecessors, and that is not propping State enterprises up at great expense to the general taxpayer of the State. I only have to cite the Frozen Food Factory as another case in point. When the question was last asked, I understand, the contract had not been let. I am not *au fait* of the position today. I will get a report and give it to the Leader. As to the policy in relation to supplying Government instrumentalities, obviously it is to everyone's benefit to see that the subsidies that are made available to State corporations and the like are not unreasonable.

LABOR PARTY POLICY

Mr OSWALD: Is the Deputy Premier aware of comments made by the Leader of the Opposition as a result of statements made in Melbourne last week by the Premier, how would Labor Party policy affect business in South Australia?

Mr Bannon: He's got something to read to us.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Judging by the feigned amusement of the Leader of the Opposition, the idea of members of one's Party asking questions when the Ministers have been forewarned is a new innovation to the House. We know perfectly well that the Opposition, when in Government, was well primed in relation to questions of this type whenever it had some information. Now, of course, Opposition members do not want to hear the answer because they know they will be embarrassed. The fact is that the honourable member was good enough to let me know that he intended to ask this question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on both sides of the House will assist the conduct of Question Time if, having heard a question asked, they listen to the answer.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member was good enough to tell me that he was interested in asking me this question, so of course it would have been rather obtuse of me not to come along with the relevant information. I am well aware of what the Leader of the Opposition had to say in regard to the Premier's remarks in Melbourne last week. It is perfectly obvious to me, too, that the Leader is desperately trying to hide from the public of this State and elsewhere just what A.L.P. policies are in relation to business enterprise, and what the business and industrial community of this State could expect if the A.L.P. was ever successful at an election at some future time. Let me correct the false impression that the Leader sought to portray to the public of South Australia. In his reaction to the Premier's speech, he said this:

There are just no facts in what he says.

That was the Leader of the Opposition referring to remarks the Premier made in Victoria about A.L.P. policy initiatives. In regard to taxation, the Premier stated:

The Labor Party would regulate its financial position by raising tax rates rather than cutting public spending.

The policy convention of the A.L.P. held last November decided as follows (and the Leader stated that these are not facts, but the Premier quoted from the recent A.L.P. manifesto):

Where possible, regulate its financial position by raising tax rates rather than cutting public expenditure programmes.

The Premier was accurately stating the position of the A.L.P. in relation to State taxes. In relation to industrial policies, the Premier pointed out that Labor would legislate to remove the penalties for strikes and lockouts and dispense with fees in any proceedings of the Industrial Court or Industrial Commission. The policy document states the following:

Legislation to remove penalties for strikes and lockouts . . .

That was a direct quote. It further states:

Dispense with fees in any proceedings of the Industrial Court or Industrial Commission.

That is a perfectly accurate reflection by the Premier of the policy document of the A.L.P. Regarding redundancies, the Premier stated that Labor would ensure that employees who are retrenched will get at least six months notice. The policy document states the following:

Minimum periods of six months notice should be given to employees to be retrenched.

That is an exact statement of A.L.P. policy. I am not debating these policies: I am refuting the absolutely incorrect statement by the Leader that the Premier was not dealing in the truth when he was reciting to these people just what was contained in A.L.P. policy statements. In regard to industrial democracy, the Premier said:

The A.L.P. in South Australia would legislate to force worker participation on employers. It would establish an industrial democracy unit and provide adequate funds and resources to the unions and other interested organisations to enable the effective implementation of industrial democracy. Labor would provide taxpayers funds to unions to implement worker participation.

The A.L.P. policy document states:

Labor declares that industrial democracy is an essential element in the need to establish democratic rights for the working people. A State Labor Government therefore will implement reforms in the employment relationship so that the working people are no longer the object of economic and work circumstances decided by other people. Labor will legislate to ensure that the working people, through their unions, will have an effective say in decisions that affect their work and lives in the work place.

The document also states that a State Labor Government will do the following:

Provide adequate funds and resources to the unions and other interested organisations to enable the effective implementation of industrial democracy.

That is an exact statement by the Premier of what is in the A.L.P. policy document. Regarding redistribution of income, the Premier stated:

A State Labor Government would undertake to redress the present imbalance in the distribution of resources by giving the highest priority to the redistribution of income, wealth and power. It would also ensure that the public sector would compete with the private sector.

The A.L.P. policy document states:

A State Labor Government will undertake to redress the present balance in the distribution of resources by giving the highest priority to the redistribution of income, wealth and power. Public enterprises will be established in sectors of economic and social importance where the demands of social equity, economic efficiency, economic growth or economic stability dictate they should be established.

It well behoves the Leader of the Opposition to start dealing in facts. It would be far better if the public was given accurate statements by the Opposition instead of a continual stream of misrepresentations, which have characterised this Leader of the Opposition since he assumed office. Any reader who came to terms with the A.L.P. policy document would know that it would spell disaster for the South Australian community, especially in these economic times. It ill behoves the Leader to seek to divert attention from these policy statements by simply peddling untruths.

POLICE COMMISSIONER

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Deputy Premier say whether it is a fact that Mr Ross Story, the Premier's chief political adviser and assistant, is or will be a member of the selection panel that will choose the next Police Commissioner for South Australia, and, if he is a member, does the Deputy Premier agree that the presence of a political appointee on such a panel is highly improper?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: To the best of my knowledge, Mr Story is not a member of the selection panel.

HILLS FACE ZONE

Mr GLAZBROOK: Will the Minister of Environment and Planning say whether the Government will consider reopening the inquiry into the boundary of the hills face zone? I understand that a number of parties made submissions to the original inquiry, but in some cases those submissions have since changed to such a degree that reconsideration of them is considered the only fair way of action being taken. Those involved have expressed the desire to see a just, fair and amicable solution found to their specific problems and thereby seek from the Minister the Government's consideration of the reopening of the inquiry.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Yes, the Government has decided to reopen the inquiry into the boundary of the hills face zone. I must point out at the outset that it will be a limited reopening, and I want to explain to the House how that has come about. Members would be aware that the previous Government initiated an inquiry, which was conducted by Judge Roder, into the hills face zone. Soon after we came to Government I informed the House of the progress of that inquiry and, when it was completed, Judge Roder's recommendations were accepted by the Government and have now been implemented in amendments to legislation and changes to regulations. Examples have been brought to my notice of cases where circumstances have changed in relation to people who made submissions to the previous inquiry, and so the inquiry will be again conducted by His Honour Judge Roder, and it will be limited to parties who previously made submissions to the original inquiry in 1980.

Circumstances have changed in some instances since the original submissions were made, and it is considered necessary that those submissions should be looked at. The Government believes that parties who made submissions originally should be given an opportunity to make a supplementary submission if their circumstances have changed, and these people will be invited by letter to do that. Supplementary submissions would have to set out in detail the changed circumstances, how it is proposed that the alleged boundary anomaly affects the land in question, and how it could be rectified. A public hearing in respect of any supplementary submission will take place if Judge Roder considers it warranted. Supplementary submissions and responses will be open to public inspection, and details outlining the inquiry will be published in advertisements in newspapers. To answer the honourable member's question, yes, the inquiry is to be opened in a limited capacity, and advertisements to that effect will be placed in the media shortly.

POWER SUPPLIES

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy enumerate to the House the actual quantities of low generating cost power that the Electricity Trust of

South Australia has available to meet the requirements of any industry that accepts the Premier's invitation to New South Wales industries to come to where the power is? Information available in the annual report of ETSA shows that the total generating capacity of ETSA is 2090 megawatts, made up in part of 1280 megawatts gas fired at Torrens Island, 330 megawatts at Thomas Playford on coal, and at Osborne 240 megawatts, of which 200 megawatts is on oil fuel generation.

The peak loading last winter, according to the ETSA Annual Report, was 1 455 megawatts, and allowing for necessary machine down time with respect to maintenance programmes, which must be carried out, it would appear that there is very little spare capacity at this time. In addition, I have been told that peak winter load times for ETSA often coincide with peak gas demand requirements of the Gas Company. The Gas Company has priority in the supply of gas, and already, I understand, on occasions a situation of such high draw-off has existed that there have been hazardous low pressures in the gas line.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: As a result of very good planning over the years, ETSA is in a far happier position than are the energy authorities in Victoria and New South Wales, which is under a Labor regime. We are all aware of the fact that not only is New South Wales having continuing power restrictions during its peak periods, as was the case right through the summer but, likewise, in the winter it faces a disastrous situation. Also, because much of its plant has become derelict, it is now down, and repairs and maintenance that have been neglected over the years as a result of some short-sighted Government leadership and industrial disputation mean that even workers are being denied work because that State cannot power its factories.

All this is accompanied by policies of a Government which is going to have a deficit of \$200 000 000 this year. The position in South Australia is far rosier on all of those counts. My understanding is that the installed capacity of ETSA is in excess of 2 000 megawatts, and I also understand that considerable excess capacity is available even at peak loads. We have a problem in the longer term, one which I am sure we will solve, but that problem is in relation to gas supplies, because the A.L.P. was short-sighted enough to sell our gas to New South Wales until the year 2006 and to secure gas supplies for South Australia only to the year 1987. However, the Government is addressing itself to that problem and, as I indicated to the House, I am having discussions and following all the options that are available to us to overcome that problem.

However, there is spare capacity available at ETSA at the moment, and this State has the capacity to accommodate manufacturing industry, which was adverted to in interstate advertisements. It would be a different situation if we were talking about an aluminium smelter or something that was a very large user of electricity; we would have to install a new power station if we were to accommodate something that is as electricity-intensive as, say, an aluminium smelter. However, the facts that I have given to the honourable member indicate the position at the moment: there is excess installed capacity over and above peak loading in South Australia at the moment.

MARINO RAILWAY STATION

Mr SCHMIDT: Can the Minister of Transport say what action the State Transport Authority has taken to date in response to my representations, and what further action does it intend to take in relation to upgrading the car park and environs at the Marino railway station? Over a period, I have written a number of letters to the State Transport

Authority requesting that it clear the high weeds and upgrade the carpark area of that railway station, because it is situated on an area of land where there is an S-bend involving Newland Avenue and Scholefield Road, and those people using the railway station find it rather difficult to exit from the railway station because of the poor visibility of the S-bend.

More recently, when I was door knocking in the area, again the question was raised by residents as to whether something would be done to have this exit upgraded and to give people a better vision when exiting from the railway station and also to beautify the environs to compliment the existing residential area.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: On receipt of the honourable member's inquiry, the State Transport Authority had the weeds, etc., cleaned up in the car park that the honourable member has mentioned. The member for Mawson is quite correct: the S-bend does make it extremely difficult, if not dangerous, for the exit of traffic from that car park. So, the authority has identified the new piece of land on the other side opposite the present car park, which it intends to make into a new car park. This piece of land will not be subject to the same dangerous conditions as far as motorists are concerned. It is closer to the subway, anyway, and the existing gateway would still be used. I expect that we can have this car park finished before the onset of the winter rains.

AQUATIC CENTRE

Mr SLATER: Does the Minister of Recreation and Sport intend to make public the report and recommendations of the feasibility study into the aquatic centre? The Minister would be aware that there has been some public disquiet about the choice of the site of the former West End brewery. I have indicated that disquiet to the Minister by way of a letter and enclosed a petition of over 2 000 signatures seeking the justification for the decision to use this site and the assurance that the Adelaide Swimming Centre in the north park lands will not be affected by the proposed new aquatic centre in Hindley Street. In view of that concern, does the Minister intend to release the report of the feasibility study into the aquatic centre?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I have had correspondence from the member for Gilles on this matter and it is on my desk at the moment, together with a copy of the feasibility study report, which I will be pleased to let the honourable member have, although I have yet to decide whether it should be made public. If it is not to be made public the honourable member will have to have it on a confidential basis. However, the feasibility study certainly supports the location of the aquatic centre at the West End site, which the honourable member will notice. The only problem I have concerning the feasibility study is that it does anticipate that there would be a rather larger operating deficit for the aquatic centre at other sites than at the West End site. The Government does not accept that part of the feasibility study, because the Government is determined that there will not be a large operating deficit. Indeed, the Aquatic Centre Advisory Committee, which advises the Government, is looking at that very point at this stage. So, I will decide on that matter in the next couple of days. Certainly, the honourable member will get a copy for himself. I am very glad to acknowledge that the honourable member himself is in favour of the West End site and has said so on two occasions. In the House of Assembly Estimates Committee B, he said:

I believe that the city site will probably be the best for a number of reasons. The Minister has pointed out that the centre could be

tied up with other commercial ventures, and I believe this could be advantageous in regard to the cost of maintaining the new aquatic centre.

On the same day, he further said:

I personally favour the city site and ask the Minister whether he is likely to have any difficulty in persuading the Adelaide City Council of its suitability for such an aquatic centre.

It is almost as though the honourable member had already read the feasibility study.

Mr Slater: I was probably prophetic.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Yes, I read the honourable members words; I did not misquote him, to my knowledge. The important thing about the siting of the aquatic centre at the West End brewery site *vis-a-vis*, the North Adelaide centre (I am not saying other centres) is that the projected cost of covering the North Adelaide centre, which involves a fairly large area and would require a fairly high structure, is in the order of \$6 500 000, whereas we can construct a new aquatic centre at the West End site for just over \$8 000 000 (maybe \$8 500 000).

In effect, we would be getting two swimming centres for \$8 500 000, whereas if we cover the North Adelaide site we would have only one site for \$6 500 000. In fact, I understand that the present projected cost is more than \$6 500 000.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I am reminded by my colleague the Minister of Education that the Commonwealth Government is paying for half of this; the State Government will be paying about \$4 500 000 and the Commonwealth will be paying about \$3 750 000 towards the cost of the new centre. As I have told the House before, the \$3 750 000 is a much larger share of the total of \$25 000 000 allocated by the Commonwealth Government for the whole of Australia than would normally be expected on a population basis and that is something for which we should be grateful. The honourable member will certainly get a copy of the feasibility study, and I will decide in the next few days whether I will make it public.

MILLIPEDES

Mr EVANS: Can the Minister of Agriculture say what is the current situation regarding millipede research taking place in Portugal? Millipedes are a problem over a wide area of South Australia, but more particularly in the Adelaide Hills.

Mr Millhouse: They are creeping down on to the plains, though. I saw them last Saturday morning when I was running. By gum, they're coming right down to the foothills now.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr EVANS: In 1980 the Minister announced a joint programme between the State and the Commonwealth to investigate the biological control of the pest.

Mr Millhouse interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the member for Fisher please resume his seat. The honourable member for Mitcham wants to make sure that he does not get struck by a fate far worse than millipedes.

Mr EVANS: Part of that investigation involved the dispatch of an entomologist to Portugal, where the millipedes originated. It is realised that the identification of suitable biological controls, their testing and finally their introduction to South Australia is not a short-term project. The programme has been under way for some time, and the householders affected by the pest would like to know the current situation.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I recognise the honourable member's long-term interest in this subject, and I also note the member for Mitcham's itch. As the member for Fisher has said, the project is jointly funded by the Commonwealth and the State. The principal action being taken at the moment is the investigation of millipedes and the various agents which control them in Portugal, where the South Australian millipedes originated. This is being done by Dr G. H. Baker, who has been studying the situation since his arrival in that country in October 1980. He has found that overall the densities of millipedes in Portugal are very low compared with South Australia, and he reports that the destruction of their habitat through cultivation, wood gathering and grazing has had a marked effect on their numbers. He has surveyed some 600 sites in the north of the country and found the millipedes very scarce. While more abundant in the south, they are also relatively scarce in this region compared with the densities in the Adelaide Hills and on southern Eyre Peninsula.

Dr Baker has identified several biological control agents in Portugal. These are a nematode in the south of the country in a comparatively high rainfall area, a parasitic fly and two families of beetles. Specimens of the nematode have been sent back to Australia for further evaluation. The parasitic fly is comparatively rare, and this is thought to have been the result of drought conditions in 1980-81. This particular fly lays its eggs on the millipede and the larvae penetrate the body of the pest. The fly is widespread throughout Europe and may attack other millipedes.

Regarding predators, he has found that two different beetles feed on the millipedes. One of them, which was accidentally introduced into California, is now claimed to be effective in controlling the common brown snail in that locality. There are problems with the introduction of predators to Australia because they are less specific in their choice of hosts than parasites. Nevertheless, if there is a strong case to introduce them with minimal risk, they could be part of a further biological control programme.

As to the future, Dr Baker will spend at least this year in Portugal. His main activities are expected to be continuing to obtain more information on the parasitic fly, confirming the present indication that predators may be more important than parasites in controlling nematodes in Portugal, and surveying the Portuguese islands where the millipedes occur in some density, for biological control agents.

At the end of this year it is likely that Dr Baker will return to Australia and will be based at Northfield Research Laboratories. There he will continue his research into biological control, and his investigations into which agent offers the highest likelihood of success in South Australia. This will necessitate devising satisfactory methods for shipment to Australia of the various biological controls, their security in this country, and their culture in our climate. I stress that any biological control will have to be tested in Australia before release to make certain that it does not become a hazard to useful insects or other organisms.

THEBARTON HIGH SCHOOL

Mr PLUNKETT: My question is to the Minister of Education and concerns Thebarton High School.

Mr Randall: Are you going to close down again, are you?

Mr PLUNKETT: If the member for Henley Beach shuts his mouth for a while, he may hear something. When will the \$2 100 000 upgrading work at Thebarton High School commence and what is the estimated time that the work will take? The Minister, on 23 March, announced that Cabinet had approved the work and that it would commence as soon as possible. As all plans need to be redrawn, I

would like the Minister to give some indication that this work will begin immediately so that I can assure the parents, students and teachers at the school that there will be no further lengthy delays. I have received representations that indicate that it will be at least six months before the plans are prepared, let alone contracts let.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I do not have the precise dates here. I will undertake to let the member have them but, to the best of my memory, the expenditure and calling of tenders will take place fairly early in the next financial year, with expenditure incurred, I think running over 1982 to 1983, and possibly a little of the remainder into the 1983-84 financial year. Essentially, the \$2 100 000 will be spent during the next financial year, with a little carry-over into the succeeding year. I will give the honourable member precise dates in correspondence.

OUTDOOR ADVERTISING

Mr BLACKER: Will the Deputy Premier say whether the Government will establish an outdoor advertising, planning and policy committee comprising representatives of State Government, local government, the outdoor advertising industry, and the Chamber of Commerce, to recommend to Government a code of practice and equitable ways of controlling and managing the outdoor advertising industry in this State? I have been contacted by representatives of a major outdoor sign manufacturer who claim that, because of excessive bureaucratic indecision, their company has not been able to successfully gain approval to erect a 'national' sign for 18 months.

A national sign is one in which the advertiser would advertise on a national basis and usually refers to large signs such as are used by TAA and Ansett. I am advised that this indecision is predominant among metropolitan councils and corporations which fail to recognise the need and worth of advertising to general commerce. The representatives of the firm to whom I spoke advised me that that firm had cut its staff from 73 plus subcontractors to 43 and proportionately fewer subcontractors and that, unless the problem is rectified, it will have to move its manufacturing operations out of this State.

The establishment of a uniform code of practice and guidelines would enable the company to plan and work in harmony with the State Government and local government requirements and in accord with the requirements of commerce and industry. I am advised that the perfect example of the dilemma that the outdoor advertising industry is in and the constraints of bureaucratic bungling are explained by the fact that the large S.G.I.C. revolving sign cannot be placed on the new S.G.I.C. building. In fact, space has been leased from the former landlord in order to advertise. This causes confusion to the general public, who would naturally expect that the commission would be situated in the building that carries the S.G.I.C. revolving sign. In the interests of all concerned, will the Government take urgent action to implement workable guidelines as soon as possible?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I understand that there have been discussions between the Premier and the Minister of Environment and Planning, that this matter is well in train, and that the committee is being established.

PROTECTED SPECIES

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Environment and Planning say what action he has taken or will take in reaction to a communication that he would have received yesterday from pet shop proprietors in relation to

trading in protected species? I understand that from time to time, for quite proper reasons, protected species come into the hands of traders and can be sold, provided that there is approval from the Minister. In fact, the approval is usually delegated to the fauna inspectors so that the proprietor need only telephone the inspector to determine whether the sale can proceed.

It has further been put to me that an interstate conference is being held this week and that all inspectors are interstate. The proprietors have written to the Minister about this matter, because they stand to lose certain orders as a result of what has happened. The departmental response was that one inspector would be made available. It has been put to me that that inspector was being flown back from the conference at State expense in order to deal with this problem. People are concerned about the mess that seems to have resulted, and I am sure that they will appreciate some reassurance from the Minister.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I am not aware of the correspondence to which the honourable member referred, but he seemed fairly certain that I was supposed to have received that correspondence yesterday. Having been a Minister, the honourable member would know that it is not always possible for a Minister to catch up with communications on the same day as they arrive. He would also be aware of the number of dockets that come before a Minister. If the honourable member is so certain that the letter came before me yesterday, I presume that I will be able to note it this afternoon.

I am aware that some of the departmental inspectors are at that conference. I am certainly not aware, and I would find difficult to believe, that we are flying back an officer for the suggested purpose. This is a very complex matter, as the honourable member would know, and if that correspondence has come into my office, once I have had the opportunity to see it, I will certainly ask for a report from my Director-General and from the Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. I will provide the honourable member with a detailed reply.

STATE ECONOMY

Mr ASHENDEN: Is the Deputy Premier aware that the Leader of the Opposition has made certain statements this afternoon in relation to the State economy? A good deal of concern has been expressed to me about the comments that have been made by the Leader of the Opposition, and I would appreciate some clarification of the situation.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: With great pleasure, I would like to put the record straight once again, in relation to further misrepresentations by the Leader of the Opposition, as late as today. Among other things, he is claiming that South Australia is now going through more difficult times than those experienced during the depression of the 1930s.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Leader of the Opposition is so youthful and so inexperienced that he was not even a twinkle in anyone's eye during the depression, much less a person who lived through it or had any knowledge of it. Obviously, he has no conception of what conditions were like in the 1930s, when nearly 30 per cent of the work force was unemployed. Is he suggesting on that count that unemployment and dole queues are approaching the level of those of the 1930s and the depression? Mr Gloom or Mr Doom is now Mr Depression, desperately trying to depress the public of South Australia and to divert attention from the facts.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: His view obviously runs counter to that of rather more notable sources in the South Australian community. Let me refresh his memory on what Mr Rod Nettle, of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, had to say this week. In the *News* on Monday, he was reported as having said this:

We are very optimistic about South Australia's future and the signs are there of a recovery. We are growing at a faster rate than the other States, albeit from a much lower base and higher levels of unemployment. All our trends are up, not down.

The Leader cannot get away from the fact that the Government of which he was a part presided over the decline of South Australia from having the best rate of employment in the country to the worst at the time of the change of Government. Mr Nettle is saying that the signs are all encouraging.

Mr Hemmings: How much did you pay him?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: We know about the way in which honourable members opposite operate, but this Government does not operate in that fashion. The suggestions they make might be common to the way in which they care to do business, but it is not the way in which this Government does it. The Leader, as I said yesterday, attended the Japan-Australia seminar on Monday, and if he had his ears open—

Mr Bannon: Which is more than you did.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I read the lectures—

Mr Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I explained to the honourable member yesterday—

Mr Bannon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Premier will please resume his seat. I have already given warnings to members generally, and I had just concluded giving a warning to the Leader of the Opposition when the Minister of Industrial Affairs interjected. I ask Ministers as well as back-benchers to recognise the decorum of the House.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Obviously, the Leader of the Opposition was elated to think that I was leaving the meeting and he would have the field to himself. It seems that he has shown precious little profit from that experience if he did not listen to what the Japanese speakers had to say. I did them the courtesy of reading the speeches and discussing them with them later that evening. They said that all the signs in South Australia were encouraging to the Japanese and that there was increasing interest in the developments which this Government had managed to bring to a successful conclusion on behalf of the public in this State, namely, the Stony Point development and the Roxby Downs indenture, about which the Leader has yet to cast his vote. The Japanese were very interested in those matters. The *News* editorial yesterday would have been food for the Leader's attention if he had cared to read it. It said this:

In a time when the world economy is going through a lean phase, anything which can give a region a competitive edge has to be a big advantage, certainly, South Australia's edge is already starting to show.

Unfortunately, it is not showing to the blinkered Leader of the Opposition, who is going around with his eyes shut and his ears closed. The fact is that all the signs in this State are encouraging. I exhort the Leader of the Opposition to pay rather more attention to people in the community who are better informed than he is. Yesterday's *Financial Review* contained this comment:

South Australia is shaking off its poor cousin image in State politics.

It is a pity that it could not shake off its Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Langley: We will win next time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Spence has the call from the Chair.

ABORIGINAL WELFARE SERVICES

Mr ABBOTT: I direct my question to the Deputy Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Health, who represents the Minister of Community Welfare in another place. Can the Deputy Premier say whether the internal task force established within the Department for Community Welfare to study, and make recommendations concerning, the future directions of Aboriginal welfare services has yet been completed? If it has been, will the study be made public, and if not, will it be discussed with the Aboriginal PACT workers before any recommendation is implemented?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will obtain a report.

PARA HILLS ROADS

Dr BILLARD: Can the Minister of Transport give an assurance that moves currently being proceeded with by the Highways Department to undertake works that will reconnect two sections of Nelson Road, Para Hills, will not in any way prejudice efforts to have the early installation of the arterial connector between Tea Tree Gully and Salisbury along the alignment of Quarry Road, Para Hills?

The Minister will be aware of the efforts made over the past several years to secure badly needed arterial connectors between the two fastest growing regional areas of Adelaide, namely, Tea Tree Gully and Salisbury. Late last year I introduced to the Minister a deputation consisting of representatives of residents of the region who reside in the Murrell Road and Yatala Vale Road region, who were expressing their very great concern about the high levels of arterial traffic that those two council roads must bear. At that meeting the very strongly expressed view of residents was that they considered that the installation of the arterial connector along Quarry Road was of top priority, and, in fact, the only long-term solution to the traffic problems in the area. They also expressed the view that, if it came to a point of considering the relative importance of the Nelson Road reconnection or the Quarry Road arterial connector, those residents would prefer the Quarry Road connector. In light of the fact that it appears that the Highways Department is proceeding with the Nelson Road reconnection, I therefore seek that assurance.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: As the member for Newland correctly states, constituents in the area have had some worries about whether the work on Nelson Road, which has been programmed for some time and which was programmed for this year in the Highways Department works programme, would prejudice or delay the planning and work on the North East Road and Main North Road connector that is planned to go along the Quarry Road alignment. There is no question but that that is a very important connector, as the member for Newland has already said, and it is one to which we attach high priority.

I can give the honourable member a categorical assurance that the work on Nelson Road will not prejudice the commencement of construction of the Quarry Road connector. Of course, if the Nelson Road work had not been done, the money could not have been put aside for the Quarry Road connector, because the planning work on that connector has only just commenced, and that will take at least 12 months.

Obviously, the money that would have been saved by not doing the Nelson Road work would have had to be allocated to another road in the metropolitan region. However, I must point out that the work on Nelson Road will alleviate the concerns of some of the honourable member's constituents, especially those living in Murrell Road, because it will have the effect of taking some of the arterial traffic away from that road. I can understand the concern of his constituents in that area.

In brief, the honourable member has that assurance. The planning has started on the quarry road connector, and I hope that we should be able to announce a construction date some time in the next financial year.

YATALA LABOUR PRISON

Mr KENEALLY: Because the Government plans to change the visiting system at Yatala Labour Prison but still include restrictions on visits to an appointment card only basis, can the Chief Secretary tell the House what discussions have been held with prisoners and their relatives on this change in procedure? On 29 August 1981 it was reported in the *Advertiser* that the visiting system was to be altered, and I quote from that report:

Under another decision announced yesterday, visitors will be able to see prisoners by appointment instead of waiting in a queue. The department's Director, Mr W. A. Stewart, said 30-minute visits would be allotted at the same time each weekend to avoid queues. The system, supported by visitors to whom he had spoken during the prison officers strike, was expected to start by the end of the year. Prisoners had supported the idea. 'It is probably going to boost their ego,' Mr Stewart said.

I have received a letter from Mr Len Lehmann, convener of the South Australian Action Committee, which contradicts the departmental view, and I quote from the letter:

Contrary to a statement made by the Director of D.C.S. (Mr Stewart), the proposal is not welcomed by the majority of prisoners nor the family and friends of prisoners. Enclosed is the result of SAPAC's weekend survey of visitors, the weekend of 12 and 13 December. Adelaide Gaol was petitioned on the morning of the 12th and those persons who accepted the leaflet returned their response by mail, as did some visitors to Yatala. This was SAPAC's original intention but most of the visitors at Yatala were eager to sign on the spot. All but a handful of signatures came from adults, which then means opposition to the card system is overwhelming when one takes into account the number of persons who visited Yatala on that weekend. The petition from within the prison displays a clear opposition to the card system. When attacking relative importance to the petition it is important to keep in mind the difficulty involved—petitions are illegal inside South Australian prisons.

The petition from the prisoners has 155 signatures, and the petition from relatives and friends on that weekend has 365 signatures.

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: In the last few weeks I have asked my departmental officers to prepare a brief in relation to visiting rights and matters relating to visits at prisons. Coupled with that is the matter related to visiting facilities and, as I mentioned, a brief is currently being prepared for a new visiting facility at Yatala. A preliminary estimate of the cost involved is in the order of \$1 500 000. The subject nature of the honourable member's question will be taken into account when I review that brief which is being prepared for me by departmental officers.

MINING COMPANIES

Mr GUNN: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy make representations to those mining companies that hold exploration licences adjoining or close to the three opal fields in this State so as to make it easier for opal miners who wish to do prospecting for opals on those exploration leases? I

have been approached by constituents expressing interest to go on to those areas, but they have experienced some difficulties because the areas have already been allocated to companies to carry out exploration, and therefore permission is required from those companies. I should be pleased if the Minister could tell the House what approaches are necessary and whether his officers could have discussions with those companies to see whether suitable arrangements could be entered into to make things a little easier for my constituents.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I understand that satisfactory arrangements have been made in the past for opal miners to operate in this way. Discussions have taken place with companies whereby opal miners have been able to go on to their leases. I will be only too happy to take up the matter with the relevant officers in the Mines Department and see that those discussions are facilitated.

WINDANA NURSING HOME

Mr TRAINER: In the absence of the Minister of Health, because of some unfortunate circumstances, I direct my question to the Deputy Premier. Will he say whether a date has been set for the opening of Windana Nursing Home at Glandore? If so, in advising the House when that official opening will take place, will the Minister explain what final arrangements have been made regarding the management, funding and ownership of the nursing home? In doing so, can the Minister report back to the House tomorrow? I stress that the Deputy Premier or the Minister of Health should report if possible to the House tomorrow, because I understand that the House will be rising tomorrow for several weeks—

Mr Millhouse: For several months.

Mr TRAINER:—for several months, which would take the reply well past the probable opening date of Windana, and this is an issue with which I have been concerned for some time. I am particularly interested in what information the Minister can give the House as to who will operate the home, under whose management it will be placed, how funding will be provided for the home, and in whose ownership the plant and property will be vested. I am also interested to know whether these arrangements are a short-term proposition or whether a long-term solution has finally been formulated that will rectify the Windana Nursing Home scandal.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Ascot Park managed to ask about eight questions during the course of that rather rapid exposition. At the end of it he asked who will operate it and who will manage it. I wrote those two questions down and by the time I had written them down he had rattled off another half a dozen questions. The question with which he led off was when would the home be opened. The answer to that is that I do not know, but I am prepared to find out. I will get a report for the honourable member with all haste. If the report is available tomorrow he will get it tomorrow; if it is not, he will get it as soon as possible, and if the House is not sitting we will write to him.

POLICE ACCIDENT

Mr RANDALL: In the light of the tragic dual fatal accident involving two policemen in the early hours of Monday morning, can the Chief Secretary assure the House and the community that driving training undertaken by the South Australian Police Force is adequate to ensure the safety of the policemen involved in driving as part of their

regular duties? My electorate office has received several phone calls concerning this matter, some expressing concern about the activities that caused this unfortunate accident and others expressing sympathy to the families of these policemen who, in the course of their normal duties, were carrying out this pursuit. I believe that people in the community deserve to know that these policemen are well trained.

Mr ABBOTT: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. On 2 March I directed a question to the then Chief Secretary on this subject, and he promised to bring me down a reply. My question appears on page 3186 of *Hansard* of 2 March, but to date I have not received a reply.

The SPEAKER: In line with the direction of the Chair, I will check the matter before deciding whether the question may go forward.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT OFFICER

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Education say what advertising for the new position of Deputy Director-General of Education was undertaken, what applications were received for that position, and who comprised the committee that decided the nomination that was finally successful? Members will recall that recently I predicted that Mr John Mayfield would receive the new Deputy Director-General's position within the department, and that has now come to be true. I understand that there is some criticism within the Education Department about the extent to which other applications were sought for this position, and people are anxious to know who made the decision, how many applications were received and what advertising took place, so that these people will know that the position was, in fact, available.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: To the best of my knowledge, the advertisements were placed in State and national newspapers. The advertisements were approved by the Public Service Board. The selection panel would have comprised the Director-General of Education, I believe a senior member of the Public Service Board, Dr Derek Scrafton (Director-General of Transport), and I believe Hedley Bachmann was also one of the selection panel.

Mr Keneally: Ross Story?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Mr Ross Story was never at any time considered, nor indeed has he been considered for any other selection panel of which I have been aware. That would be the biggest furphy of all time, and it represents the honourable member's intellect, not mine. As to the number of applications for the position, a considerable number of applications were received. There was a final short list of three, and I believe that a nomination has gone forward. I believe that the period during which appeals can be lodged is due to expire soon but I am not aware whether any appeals have been lodged. No final recommendation will be made public until those appeals, if any, have been lodged, have been considered and the final nominee has been made known to the Minister of Education.

POLICE ACCIDENT

The SPEAKER: With the indulgence of the House, I indicated that the question asked by the honourable member for Henley Beach would be reviewed. I am satisfied that the matter raised by the member for Henley Beach did not include the specific question raised by the member for Spence in relation to power steering. It did in fact relate to the loss of two policemen's lives earlier this week, and therefore it had no reference whatsoever to the question

that the honourable member for Spence asked on 2 March. Again, with the indulgence of the House, I will allow the Chief Secretary to answer the question asked by the honourable member for Henley Beach.

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: I am sure that the House would join with me in expressing condolences to the families of those two young men who died tragically earlier this week in the pursuit of their duties. As a result of the incident, I did seek details in relation to procedures. However, as the matter will be one of pending court procedures, it is somewhat *sub judice*, and I do not wish to discuss in detail those procedures. Suffice to say that I am satisfied, on the advice that has been given to me, that procedures devised by the department ensure that due regard is given to public safety and interest. I emphasise that each such incident has to be assessed individually, and I believe on that advice that training programmes provide a proper basis for the implementation of those procedures as laid down by the department.

OMBUDSMAN ACT

Mr MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to allow Notice of Motion: Other Business No. 10 to be taken into consideration forthwith.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole, I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

Opposition members: Yes, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham will return to his seat. The honourable member for Mitcham, of his own volition, lost the opportunity to proceed further by way of speaking to the motion. He was not asked by the Chair to sit; he sat of his own volition.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): The Government is not prepared to allow the suspension of Standing Orders to proceed. The Premier has explained to the House, probably in the absence of the member for Mitcham—

Mr Trainer: This will give a new meaning to Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Ascot Park has directly reflected against the Chair. I ask him to withdraw unconditionally or he will be named.

Mr TRAINER: I withdraw, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I was just observing that the member for Mitcham obviously was not present when it was explained to the House.

Mr Millhouse: I know exactly what's happened, and I know the stupid excuses that the Premier gave for not going on with it. They're no longer valid, because he's gone overseas.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The fact that the Premier has gone overseas has not altered the train of events and circumstances which the Premier outlined. That is that the Government is seeking further information from the Ombudsman and from the departments with which the Ombudsman has stated he had some difficulty. When that information is to hand and when those inquiries are complete, the Government will be in a position to make some judgments in relation to the Ombudsman's allegations. Until those investigations are completed it would be perfectly untimely and fruitless to pursue the honourable member's motion. The Government has no intention of interrupting the business of the House to pursue this red herring of the member for Mitcham.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Millhouse (teller), Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, and Whitten.

Noes (22)—Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs O'Neill and Wright. Noes—Mrs Adamson and Mr Tonkin.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Motion thus negated.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS) BILL

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to require members of Parliament to disclose certain pecuniary and other interests, and for purposes incidental thereto. Read a first time.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill seeks to provide the mechanism whereby pecuniary interests of members of Parliament are recorded on a register so that persons with a legitimate interest can be assured that on any particular matter before Parliament a member of Parliament or his family does not have a conflict of interest or, if he does, that conflict is disclosed. The Bill is intended to balance the public's right to be assured that members of Parliament are acting honestly and diligently with the legitimate rights of members and their families to privacy in their own affairs. The Bill should be seen to be in addition to the Standing Orders of the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council relating to pecuniary interests, and to sections 49 to 54 of the South Australian Constitution Act. Both Standing Orders require a member of Parliament to disclose a direct pecuniary interest in any matter which is before the relevant House.

The Constitution Act deals broadly with conflicts of interest relating to contracts with the Crown and holding an office of profit under the Crown. This Bill seeks to complement these existing safeguards in the Constitution Act and in the Standing Orders. The Bill should also be viewed in the overall context that South Australia has been free from any problems relating to conflicts of interest. This is to the credit of the members of Parliament in this State, but is no reason for inaction or complacency. The Riordan Committee reported to the Commonwealth Government in 1975 that there should be a register of pecuniary interests controlled by the President of the Senate and the Speaker and that members of the public have access only on establishing to the satisfaction of the President or Speaker that a *bona fide* reason exists for such access. A later Commonwealth committee, chaired by Sir Nigel Bowen, recommended the adoption of a code of conduct by each House of Parliament. This code of conduct was to require that in any Parliamentary debate, committee or communications with another member, a member disclose any relevant pecuniary interests. As yet the Commonwealth has not debated

these matters. The South Australian Government has studied these reports but has decided to tackle the question in another way to ensure that the proper balance between public reassurance and privacy of Parliamentarians is achieved.

The case for a full public disclosure of the financial affairs of members and their families has never been established in South Australia. Full public disclosure presents the very real prospect of selective use of information for purely political purposes which are neither legitimate nor proper. There is the prospect of a member's financial situation being misrepresented, and the information abused. Whilst members of Parliament should expect to be accountable for their actions, they should also be spared having every aspect of their private lives exposed to that sort of behaviour.

Under the Bill, members will be required to submit an annual return to a Registrar who will be the Presiding Officer in each House of Parliament, identifying their income sources and other financial interests and those of their immediate families (that is, spouses, so far as the information is known to the member, and children under 18 years of age). Matters which require disclosure include any income source or financial benefit during the preceding 12 months greater than \$500, interests in any real property, interests in incorporated or unincorporated bodies and trusts, and any travel undertaken out of the State during the preceding 12 months the cost of which was not wholly met from public moneys or by the member or his family. Members will need to disclose that they and their immediate families have had the use of any real property not owned by themselves during a substantial part of the previous year, as well as any liability exceeding \$10 000.

Members of Parliament, or any member of the public, will be able to apply for a certificate as to whether or not in the Registrar's opinion and on the information in the register a particular member or member of his family has an interest relating to any specific matter before Parliament. The Bill thus provides the machinery to reinforce the existing safeguards requiring disclosure of conflicts of interests on matters on which members are voting in the Parliament.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows; clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 sets out definitions of expressions used in the measure. Clause 4 provides that every member of Parliament is required to furnish a return in the prescribed form identifying certain pecuniary and other interests of the member or a member of his family. Under subclause (1), the return is to be lodged with the Registrar, that is the Speaker of the House of Assembly or the President of the Legislative Council (according to the House to which the member belongs), before the expiration of one month after the member first becomes a member and thereafter in the month of July in each year. Under that subclause, the return is to identify, first, any income source from which the member, or a member of his family, has derived during the preceding 12 months a financial benefit exceeding in amount or value \$500.

An 'income source' is defined under clause 3 as being, in the case of a person who is self-employed, the trade, business or profession in which the person is self employed in any other case, the person or body of persons from whom the financial benefit is derived. Secondly, the return is to identify any prescribed body in which the member, or a member of his family, has a relevant interest. 'Prescribed body' is defined by clause 3 as a corporation, an unincorporated body formed for the purpose of securing profit, or a trust. Subclause (2) of clause 3 provides that a person has a relevant interest in a corporation if he is an officer

of that corporation or has a relevant interest (as defined for the purposes of the Companies (Acquisition of Shares (South Australia) Code) in not less than 5 per cent of any class of shares issued by that corporation. Under subclause (2) of clause (3), a person has a relevant interest in an unincorporated body if he is an officer or member of the body or is entitled to share in any profits secured by the body. Under that subclause, a person has a relevant interest in a trust if he is a trustee or beneficiary under the trust (including, in the case of a discretionary trust, a person named as an object under the trust). Thirdly, the return is to identify any real property in which the member, or a member of his family, has any interest. Fourthly, where the member has undertaken any travel during the preceeding period of 12 months the cost of which exceeded \$500 and was not wholly met from public moneys or moneys of that person or a member of his family (including a child of his or his spouse over the age of eighteen years), the return is to identify the person who met or contributed to the cost of the travel.

Fifthly, where the member or a member of his family has had the use of any real property during the preceding period of 12 months, not being property in which the person has an interest, the return is to identify the person who conferred the right to use the property. Finally, where the member or a member of his family has a liability of an amount exceeding \$5 000, the return is to identify the person to whom the member or member of his family is liable. Under subclauses (2) and (3) of clause 4, the member may provide further information in a return and at any time notify the Registrar of any variation in information included in his previous return.

Clause 5 requires each Registrar to keep a register of information furnished pursuant to clause 4. The Registrar is to ensure that no person other than himself or a member of his staff is to have access to information included in the register. Subclause (4) makes it an offence for any person to make a record of, divulge or communicate or make any use of any information contained in a register except in the performance of any duty under this Act or except in relation to any part or aspect of information disclosed by the Registrar pursuant to the clause. Clause 6 provides for the Registrar to certify, upon application by a member of Parliament, or any member of the public, whether, in his opinion, having regard to the information contained in the register, a specified member of Parliament, or a member of his family, has an interest in a specified matter forming part of the business of the House of which he is a member. A certificate of a Registrar is to be issued within two sitting days after a request lodged by a member of Parliament and, in any other case, within seven days after the lodging of the request. A member is to be given a copy of any request relating to him and the certificate issued in response to the request. Each Registrar is to keep a record containing the prescribed information in relation to requests lodged with him.

Clause 7 provides that where a member of Parliament, without reasonable excuse, fails to furnish such information as he is required to furnish under the measure or furnishes information that is to his knowledge false or misleading in a material particular, he is to be guilty of contempt of Parliament and may be dealt with accordingly. Clause 8 provides that proceedings for an offence against the measure are to be disposed of summarily. Clause 9 provides for the making of regulations.

Mr BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

CARRICK HILL VESTING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Carrick Hill Vesting Act, 1971. Read a first time.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this Bill is to widen the permitted uses for Carrick Hill, Springfield, in terms of the Carrick Hill Vesting Act, 1971. In June 1970, Sir Edward Hayward and the late Lady Ursula Hayward agreed to make separate wills bequeathing the property known as Carrick Hill, Springfield, the house and its contents to the Government of South Australia. The property was to pass into the hands of the State on the death of both partners, who each had an equal share in it. The partner who died first was to have a life interest in the entire property. Both Sir Edward Hayward and Lady Ursula Hayward executed wills which carried out the intent of the deed. Lady Ursula Hayward died in August 1970. Sir Edward Hayward has continued to live in the property.

Carrick Hill was built by Sir Edward before World War II and consists of a sandstone Elizabethan style mansion of two storeys with lead mullioned windows plus an attic which has not been lined. Whilst the exterior may be described by purists as mock Tudor, the interior has been constructed by the reuse of much genuine Elizabethan material from England. For example, the staircase came from the Earl of Anglesea's home and is a magnificent structure, and the great hall was designed to take it. Many of the downstairs rooms are panelled with genuine sixteenth century panelling. The furniture downstairs is Elizabethan. The contents of the house are extremely valuable and include, in the opinion of a former Director of the Art Gallery of South Australia, the best collection of paintings in private hands in Australia. There are also numerous sculptures.

In her will, the late Lady Ursula Hayward specified that, upon the State accepting the gift, certain conditions were laid down. These were:

(a) that after the death of my said husband the said residence and grounds and such of the said furniture, contents and articles as shall be considered suitable shall at all times be used and maintained

- (i) as a home for the Governor of the said State, or
- (ii) as a museum, or
- (iii) as a gallery for the display of works of art, or
- (iv) as a botanical gardens or partly for one and partly for another or others of such purposes.

The proviso was that the State would remit succession duties by paying an equal sum to the trustees. It was therefore necessary to pass the Carrick Hill Vesting Act to comply with legal requirements laid down in the Public Finance Act. In the vesting Act the uses for the property were restricted in section 4 to the State holding and maintaining Carrick Hill as a residence for the Governor. The Bill was assented to on 5 August 1971.

The Carrick Hill property is situated 7.2 kilometres south-east of the G.P.O. in the Adelaide foothills with a frontage to Fullarton Road and adjoining Springfield on its northern boundary; that is, it is just to the south of the suburb of Springfield. It comprises almost 40 hectares (97½ acres) with one-third of the area lying within the hills face zone. An area of 15½ hectares of the property was considered unsuitable for subdivision by the Carrick Hill Committee,

due to the steep nature of the terrain. About 22 hectares of land which partly adjoin the Springfield estate is suitable for subdivision except for about 12 acres, which is the site of a former quarry. The remaining 2.4 hectares (6 acres) is an area of ornamental Elizabethan type garden surrounding the house.

It subsequently became apparent that the house would not be big enough for use by the Governor, at least as the official Government House, and that additions would spoil the structure. Sir Edward suggested to the Premier that the property should not be used as a residence of the Governor as previously arranged but become a nature park, whilst the house could be used for receptions and exhibitions. In March 1974 the Dunstan Government appointed a small committee, comprising Mr D. C. Rodway (Chairman), Dr J. K. Ling and Mr R. D. Hand, to report to the Premier on the most appropriate utilisation and development of the property, Carrick Hill, upon its being vested in the Crown. The committee compiled a significant report which examined possibilities relating to the property as a whole and also in relation to various uses for particular areas of the large grounds (97 acres).

The purpose of the present Bill is to widen the purposes for which the property could be used in terms of the Carrick Hill Vesting Act without, however, extending those purposes beyond what is allowable under the terms of Lady Ursula Hayward's will.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows: clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 repeals and re-enacts section 4 of the principal Act. The new section expands the purposes for which Carrick Hill may be used by the Government along the lines outlined above.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PLANNING) BILL

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Building Act, 1970-1982, the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976-1981, the Coast Protection Act, 1972-1978, the Geographical Names Act, 1969, the Highways Act, 1926-1982, the Land and Business Agents Act, 1973-1982, the Local Government Act, 1934-1982, the North Haven Development Act, 1972-1979, the Planning Act, 1982, the Real Property Act, 1886-1982, the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act, 1932-1978, the South Australian Heritage Act, 1978-1980, the Tea Tree Gully (Golden Grove) Development Act, 1978-1981, and the West Lakes Development Act, 1969-1970; and to repeal the Red Cliff Land Vesting Act, 1973. Read a first time.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

Following the enactment of the Planning Act, 1982, it is necessary to make consequential amendments to a number of Acts of this Parliament. This Bill makes those consequential amendments. In the main, the Bill changes references to the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1981 (to be repealed) and creations of that statute to references to the Planning Act, 1982 and creations of the statute. Separate systems of development control created for the City of Adelaide by the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976-1981 and for Golden Grove by the Tea Tree

Gully (Golden Grove) Act, 1978-1981 have been preserved. A detailed explanation of clauses follows.

The Bill amends the Building Act, 1970-1982 so that references to the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1981 (now repealed) will be read as references to the Planning Act. It amends the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976-1981, so that the separate system of development control created by that Act is preserved. It also amends the Act so that references to the Planning and Development Act are omitted. It amends the Coast Protection Act, 1972-1978 so that references to the Director of Planning and the Planning Appeal Board, established by the Planning and Development Act, will be read as references to the South Australian Planning Commission, and to the Planning Appeals Tribunal created under the Planning Act.

The Bill amends the Geographical Names Act, 1969 so that the definition of the 'metropolitan area' which relies on the Planning and Development Act definition will be replaced by the definition of 'metropolitan Adelaide' as defined in the Real Property Act Amendment Act. It also amends the Geographical Names Act so that a reference to the Director of Planning, an office created by the Planning and Development Act, is now read as a reference to the Chairman of the South Australian Planning Commission, an office created by the Planning Act.

The Bill amends the Highways Act, 1926-1982 so that a reference to the Planning and Development Act is now read as a reference to the Planning Act. It amends the Land and Business Agents Act so that references to the Planning and Development Act are omitted. It amends the Local Government Act, 1934-1982 so that a reference to the Planning and Development Act in respect of the delegation of powers under that Act to a committee of the council is replaced with a reference to the Planning Act and the Real Property Act Amendment Act. The Bill amends the Local Government Act so that a reference to planning regulations or planning directives made under the Planning and Development Act in respect of a definition of a 'zone' is replaced by a reference to a zone, precinct or locality in the 'development plan' constituted under the Planning Act. It amends the Local Government Act so that references to the Town Planning Act, 1929, the Planning and Development Act and the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act in respect of the width of roads and streets are omitted.

The Bill also amends the Local Government Act so that references to the State Planning Authority, established under the Planning and Development Act, are read as references to the South Australian Planning Commission, established under the Planning Act. The Bill amends the North Haven Act 1972-1979 so that a reference to planning regulations made under the Planning and Development Act is omitted and so that a reference in the indenture to planning regulations is construed as a reference to the corresponding provisions of the development plan constituted under the Planning Act. The Bill also amends the North Haven Act so that provision for the application of certain sections of the Planning and Development Act is omitted. References to the Planning and Development Act and the Local Government Act in respect of section 18 of the North Haven Act are omitted.

The Bill amends the Planning Act so that the powers, functions, duties and obligations of matters referred to in section 5 (2) of that Act, for example, the consideration of applications under the Planning and Development Act which may be current at the time the Planning Act is proclaimed, may be undertaken by the South Australian Planning Commission in place of the State Planning Authority. This is in effect a transitional provision. The Bill amends the Real Property Act, 1886-1882 so that terminology used in section

223md of that Act is consistent with the reference to the South Australian Planning Commission.

The Bill amends the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act, 1932-1978 so that references to the office of the Director of Planning, created under the Planning and Development Act, are read as references to the South Australian Planning Commission, created under the Planning Act. The Bill amends the South Australian Heritage Act, 1978-1980 so that the references to the Planning and Development Act are omitted. The Bill amends the Tea Tree Gully (Golden Grove) Act, 1978-1981 so that the system of development control provided by that Act is preserved. It also amends the Act so that references to 'sub-division' and 're-subdivision' are read as 'division'.

The Bill amends the West Lakes Development Act, 1969-1970 so that a reference to the Planning and Development Act in respect of the definition of 'allotment' is read as a reference to the Real Property Act, 1886-1982; a reference to the Planning and Development Act in section 15 (17) is read as a reference to the Planning Act or the Real Property Act; and a reference to the Planning and Development Act, the Local Government Act or in 'any other law' in respect of the corporation's roadmaking is read as a reference responsibility to 'any other Act or law'. The Bill also amends the West Lakes Development Act so as to preserve the ability of regulations under the Act to prevail where there is an inconsistency with the Planning Act or Part XIXAB of the Real Property Act.

The Bill amends the West Lakes Development Act so that references in respect of appeals to the authority or council are omitted and a reference to the Planning Appeal Board is read as a reference to the Planning Appeal Tribunal. The Bill also amends the Act so as to provide that the rules under the Planning Act shall apply to the practice and procedure of the Planning Appeals Tribunal in respect of an appeal. The Bill repeals the Red Cliff, Land Vesting Act 1973. This Act vests certain land in the State Planning Authority, a body created by the Planning and Development Act. As the scheme of the Act has already been achieved, the Act can be regarded as *functus officio*. Land vesting in the State Planning Authority will automatically vest in the Minister from the date of the commencement of the Planning Act.

Mr HEMMINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

OFFENDERS PROBATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (1982)

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN (Chief Secretary) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Offenders Probation Act 1913-1981. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The object of this small Bill is to delete reference to the office of Director of Correctional Services and to substitute the more flexible expression of 'permanent head', the terminology used in the recently passed Correctional Services Act. As everyone is now well aware, it is proposed that the newly created office of Executive Director will have the position of permanent head of the Department of Correctional Services, and it is therefore necessary to vest certain statutory functions and duties under this Act in that office.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Act upon proclamation. Clause 3 defines 'permanent head'. Clauses 4 to 7 (inclusive) delete all references to 'Director' and substitute the passage 'permanent head' wherever necessary.

Mr KENEALLY secured the adjournment of the debate.

JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (1982)

Second reading.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The present procedures under which a person may be bound over to keep the peace are grounded in ancient common law and, in a number of respects, do not provide an adequate remedy against violent and threatening behaviour. This Bill seeks to replace the existing procedures with a system for the obtaining of restraining orders against persons whose violent or threatening behaviour constitutes a threat to others. The Bill will have particular relevance to situations of domestic violence where the inadequacies of the present law have been found to be particularly acute.

In 1979, a Domestic Violence Committee was set up to investigate the necessity for reform of the law which bears upon the occurrence of violence in a domestic situation. The committee's report indicates that there is grave concern for many women and children who appear to be trapped in violent and threatening situations but appear to be unable to achieve adequate legal redress. The recommendations of the committee focused upon legislative reform which would provide immediate protection and prevent further harm. The Government believes that this is a constructive approach in which elements of punishment and retribution will be subordinated to the more positive aspects of achieving a solution to a difficult situation.

Since the work of the committee related purely to domestic violence, the Government has varied a number of the recommendations in order to arrive at legislation of more general application. This will not, however, detract from the impact of the legislation on situations of domestic violence. To afford adequate protection in such situations is obviously a primary object of the Bill.

It is hoped that the amendments proposed in the Bill will provide a more effective remedy and speedier enforcement. The complaint may be made by the person affected by the violent behaviour or by a member of the police force. In order to cater for situations of emergency, the complaint may be made and heard on an *ex parte* basis, but, in that event, the defendant must be summoned and given the opportunity to show cause why the order should not continue in force. The order will not continue in force after the conclusion of the hearing to which the defendant is summoned unless the defendant does not appear at that hearing in obedience to the summons or the court having considered the evidence of the defendant and any other evidence adduced by him confirms the order. In deciding whether an order should be made excluding the defendant from his usual place of residence, the court must consider the effect of the exclusion or non-exclusion of the defendant on the accommodation needs of persons affected by the proceedings and also the effect upon children of, or in the care of, those persons. The onus which a complainant must satisfy in order to obtain an order is an onus based upon the balance

of probabilities; in other words, he is not required to satisfy the difficult criminal onus of proof beyond reasonable doubt. Any party may apply at any time to the court for variation or revocation of an order.

If a person against whom an order has been made contravenes or fails to comply with the order, then he will be liable for imprisonment for up to six months. Rather than the complainant being required to issue a fresh complaint as applies under the peace complaint procedure (in order than a peace order might be enforced), this Bill provides that the person suspected of a breach may be arrested without warrant and brought before the court to answer the allegation. This must generally be done within 24 hours of his arrest.

Both the frequency and degree of violence occurring in domestic situations must be reduced. The Government hopes that by ensuring that the law is available to protect persons from harm and increasing public awareness of the remedy then much can be achieved to improve the circumstances under which many people presently have to exist.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 repeals the present provisions of the principal Act dealing with binding over to keep the peace and substitutes a new section. Subsection (1) of the proposed new section 99 sets out the grounds on which a restraining order may be made. These are as follows:

(a) that—

(i) the defendant has caused personal injury, or damage to property;

and

(ii) that the defendant is, unless restrained, likely again to cause personal injury or damage to property;

(b) that—

(i) the defendant has threatened to cause personal injury or damage to property;

and

(ii) the defendant is, unless restrained, likely to carry out that threat;

or

(c) that—

(i) the defendant has behaved in a provocative or offensive manner;

(ii) the behaviour is such as is likely to lead to a breach of the peace;

and

(iii) the defendant is, unless restrained, likely again to behave in the same or a similar manner.

Subsection (2) provides that a complaint may be made by a member of the police force or a person affected by the impugned behaviour. Subsections (3) and (4) deal with the right of the court to act on an *ex parte* basis. Subsection (5) requires the court in certain cases to have regard to the effect of a proposed order on the accommodation needs of the parties and on any children who may be affected. Subsection (6) makes contravention of the order an offence. Subsections (7), (8) and (9) provide for the arrest of a person suspected of an offence under subsection (6) and the manner in which he is to be dealt with. Subsection (10) provides for variation or revocation of orders. Subsections (11) and (12) provide for the Commissioner of Police and interested parties to be informed of orders, or the variation or revocation of orders, under the new provision.

Mr McRAE secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2) (1982)

Second reading.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment and Planning): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

In most other countries the primary condition of the franchise is citizenship, but in Australia this is broadened to include non-citizen British subjects. This anomaly has caused a great deal of justified resentment amongst non-British migrant groups and was adverted to as a matter requiring urgent reform in the Galbally report.

The Commonwealth has now moved to correct the anomaly in so far as it arises under Commonwealth electoral laws (see Statute Law (Miscellaneous Amendments) Act, 1981). It is obviously desirable that corresponding reforms of the State electoral laws should be introduced and should be brought into operation as soon as possible. I am sure that the proposed reform will be enthusiastically received by the ethnic communities. The Bill will contain a saving provision to protect the position of British subjects who are non-citizens but who are presently enrolled either as Commonwealth or State electors. The Bill also provides for a fresh election to be held where an election for the Legislative Council is avoided or fails and repeals a number of obsolete provisions.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 repeals and re-enacts section 11 of the principal Act. The effect of the re-enactment is to remove material that is now obsolete. Clause 4 provides that where an election to supply vacancies in the membership of the Legislative Council is avoided or fails a fresh election shall take place as soon as practicable after the date of the former election. Clause 5 deals with the qualifications for membership of the Legislative Council. The reference to a qualifying age and to the fact that a member must be a British subject is removed and a new paragraph is inserted providing that qualification for election to the Council is to be based upon entitlement to vote at an election for the Council. Clause 6 removes obsolete material from section 19.

Clause 7 removes obsolete material from section 32. Clause 8 provides that in order to be qualified to vote at an Assembly election the prospective voter must be an Australian citizen rather than a British subject. However, the qualification of a British subject who is presently enrolled as a Commonwealth or State elector is preserved. Clause 9 removes the voting qualification based on military service. This is largely irrelevant following reduction of the voting age to 18 years. Clause 10 repeals the second and third schedules which are now obsolete.

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

TRUSTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill makes two important amendments to the Trustee Act, 1936-1980, in relation to investment of trust funds. The Bill provides that commercial bills of exchange which have been accepted or endorsed by a bank should be an authorised trustee investment. At the moment Section 5 (1) of the Trustee Act provides that a trustee may invest any trust funds in his hands (*inter alia*)—

(d) with any dealer in the short term money market, approved by the Reserve Bank of Australia as an authorised dealer, that has established lines of credit with that bank as a lender of last resort.

There is no provision which enables a trustee to invest in this form of investment with banks.

Local government brought this to the attention of Government. At the moment, local council loan funds are supplied substantially by the banks which look for reciprocal business. By excluding councils from investment with bills with banks, they are forced to accept a lower return from bank deposits and use higher yielding non-bank investments. They are therefore put in the position of jeopardising their loan programmes. It is anomalous that trustees can invest in the short term money market with authorised dealers but not with banks. The endorsement or acceptance of a bill of exchange by a bank gives the same level of security to that investment as if it were a deposit with that bank. The amendment will benefit all trustees while in no way diminishing the security of trustee investments.

The other amendment relates to protection for trustees lending up to the total value of the property on which the loan is secured. Protection from a claim for breach of trust is currently given by section 10a of the principal Act. The justification for the protection is that repayment of the loan must be insured by the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation established under Commonwealth legislation. Proposals have been made to change the nature of the corporation so that it is owned and controlled privately. If this occurs, it may cease to be an appropriate insurer for the purposes of section 10a. The proposed amendment will allow responsible insurers to be prescribed by regulation for the purpose currently served by section 10a. This will widen the number of insurers a trustee can choose from and will cater for any problem that may arise in relation to the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 5 of the principal Act. The new paragraph that the clause inserts into subsection (1) of section 5 will enable trustees to invest trust funds in the purchase of bills of exchange that have been accepted or endorsed by a bank. To add to the security inherent in such an investment, the paragraph requires that the bill mature not later than two hundred days after the date of purchase. Clause 4 makes a consequential amendment to section 7 of the principal Act.

Clause 5 inserts a new subsection into section 10 of the principal Act. The new subsection will take the place of section 10a which is repealed by clause 6 of this Bill. Even where a trustee has power to invest trust moneys by lending them on security, he may be guilty of breach of trust if the value of the property on which repayment of the loan is secured is not sufficient to properly secure the sum lent. The purpose of section 10 (1) is to protect trustees from the liability where the loan does not exceed two-thirds of the value of the property on which it is secured.

Section 10a went further and allowed a trustee to lend up to 100 per cent of the value of the property securing the loan if repayment of the loan had been insured with the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation. The new provision fulfills the same function but provides for insurance with

any insurer that has been prescribed by regulation. Clause 6 repeals section 10a of the principal Act.

Mr McRAE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 4 March. Page 3346.)

Mr HEMMINGS (Napier): I have long had an interest in the South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission, as I am what could be called an ethnic. Members of my Party have bestowed upon me the honour of allowing me to respond as Opposition spokesman. It is very important that the Bill be given a speedy passage, because it is vital. I congratulate the Attorney for introducing this Bill, although it has been said that this is the only responsible piece of legislation that he has introduced since this Government came into power. The Hon. Mr Sumner in the other place adequately summed up the attitude of the Opposition to this Bill. He made a great contribution, and the first paragraph of his speech was as follows:

I cannot think of anything to say about this important Bill, beyond the fact that whether it is necessary or not has not really been demonstrated. If our agreeing to it makes the Government happy, we will agree to it.

He then went on to say a lot more, but that statement really sums up our attitude. If the Government really wants the Bill to go through and if it believes that the Bill is important, we are only too happy to accommodate the Government. I support the Bill.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment and Planning): I thank the Opposition for its support of the Bill, because it is important legislation. I would like to correct the record. The member for Napier commented in glowing terms about the Attorney-General, and I point out that the Attorney-General is a very responsible Minister in this Government, and I am glad that the Opposition recognises that. I presume that what the honourable member said was not meant seriously. However, I point out to the honourable member who has enlightened the House with his wordy comments that the Attorney did not introduce this Bill: the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs introduced it.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CONSUMER CREDIT AND TRANSACTIONS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 30 March. Page 3683.)

Mr McRAE (Playford): I support the Bill.
Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ST JUDE'S CEMETERY (VESTING) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 24 March. Page 3503.)

Mr HEMMINGS (Napier): The Opposition supports this Bill. It is rather pertinent that we are talking now about coming to the aid of a church and a cemetery but, as soon as I sit down, we will be discussing another matter which

perhaps would have upset the patron saint, St Jude, and that is the subject of the casino.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not going to canvass that subject at this stage.

Mr HEMMINGS: No, but I think it is significant that we are talking about a cemetery named after a saint who did so much to help the poor and disadvantaged when, in 10 minutes time, we will be discussing the erection of a casino that could cause more problems in the community than even St Jude could have contemplated. I do not intend to speak for long on this subject, but I am pleased to see that, as a result of the passing of this Bill, the columbarium wall will be saved, and that the cemetery will continue to be used by the descendants of William Voules Brown, who died on 29 January 1893, who originally made the land available for the purposes of the cemetery, and whose descendants are to have certain burial rights in relation to the cemetery. That is a very good point.

I should like to correct the Attorney-General and my colleague the Leader of the Opposition in another place, who described St Jude as the patron saint of hopelessness. In fact, St Jude was the patron saint of the hopeless, those people who had been plunged into the depths of despair, and he lifted them up so that they could face life again. My colleague the member for Playford was misquoted in the other place, and I suggest to those learned gentlemen that, as St Jude lifted the hopeless, they should lift their game if they are to talk about patron saints. We support the Bill. In Committee I shall raise some pertinent questions, but I am sure the Minister will be able to give me the information I require.

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): This Bill has been a long time in coming, and I support it. I have had much experience in this area, because—

Mr Slater: Are you a grave digger in your spare time?

Mr MATHWIN: I was referring to the corpses and by inference to the Labor Party. I was saying that the City of Brighton and St Jude's Church have tried to solve this problem over a long period. The matter was very complicated. When I was Mayor of Brighton we tried to get hold of one of the properties held by St Jude's Trust, on Brighton Road, but that took many years. We found that some of the trustees were scattered all over Australia, while others had died, and it was difficult to take any action. However, after nearly 20 years, the situation was settled. I am glad to see that the situation in relation to the cemetery and the land next to it which is owned by the church has been settled so that the land can be handed over to the Brighton council which, in return, will look after the cemetery, which is in a very dilapidated state.

Mr Millhouse: I am sorry to hear that. I have an uncle buried there.

Mr MATHWIN: He is resting in peace. It is very peaceful, but it is dilapidated, and has been for some time. I suggested to the Department for Community Welfare that, when community work orders were brought in for juveniles, they could have been employed in renovating the cemetery. The council agreed to this, but unfortunately the offer has not been taken up. I think the project would have been a good one for young delinquents, who could have done something worth while in society, and possibly the site of the work would have brought them back to some reality.

Mr Hemmings: It would be better to get them employed.

Mr MATHWIN: Perhaps it would be better to get the member for Napier employed, but surely he has some ideas about trying to get a job for himself if he wants one. Having read the report of the Select Committee, I would offer a few words of caution. The council will take over an area of vacant land, but residents, mainly older people, senior citizens

of the city, live in units nearby. It has been suggested that the council intends, when it gets the land, to put up a stadium. That project was mooted by one of the people who gave evidence to the Select Committee, but I suggest that such a step could cause problems for those who live in the vicinity.

Of course, if a stadium is built there will be a lot of night activities and people coming and going in cars could cause a lot of concern to people who live in the area. Some people who live near me came to see me in relation to the matter and I advised them to either write to the Select Committee or give evidence. However, upon reading the evidence I noted that this did not happen which I put down to the fact that those people would have been extremely nervous about doing so and it was probably too much of a challenge to them to come to Parliament House to give evidence in relation to areas about which they were worried.

Therefore, I am now expressing their concerns in the hope that the council and those who will be responsible will heed my remarks about that block of land and the concerns of people who live so close to it. Those residents have been there for some time and, if the land is to be used for a stadium, it will be a complete change of land use. Mr J. A. Crawford presented evidence to the Select Committee on behalf of the council. Mr Crawford was the mayor and is presently an alderman of the council. He stated, as reported at page 10 of the evidence:

Regarding the vacant land owned by St Jude's Cemetery Trust, the council believes that it should have the right, if it takes over the cemetery, to use that land for whatever purpose it sees fit, provided it was a community use. That is still our objective. While no fixed plans have been made at this stage, we hope to raise the funds to establish a community hall, a stadium, or a sports hall on that land, because it is so centrally located to transport, to the local schools, and to the shopping centre. From council's point of view I believe that that would be a proper use of the land for public purposes.

Whilst I agree in some respects with the alderman, I would suggest to him that some consideration must be given to those people who live so close to the area. In fact, I think that probably a better use for the land would be open space, because Brighton, like many other parts of the metropolitan area, has a great shortage of open space for organised sporting activities: there is a great shortage of football ovals, hockey pitches, lacrosse pitches, netball courts, and so on. I would think that these types of activity on this area of land would be more desirable for residents living so close to it.

I understand that the council has also given consideration to the matter of a local kindergarten moving there which, indeed, would be more suitable for it than the area where it is placed now, that is, right on Brighton Road. For an area of land close to residents, that would be a far better proposition than that which was first indicated by Alderman Crawford. As reported at page 11 of the evidence, Mr Crawford further stated:

As there seems to be a reduction in the working week with more people having additional recreation time, we believe we should provide a facility to enable the public to use their time productively. The council did inspect several other stadiums at Happy Valley, Blackwood and Tea Tree Gully and could judge the general community need for such things. The community would suffer severely if we did not proceed with that purpose.

I presume from that statement that the council has its heart set on a stadium-type building. The Hon. C. J. Sumner asked Mr Crawford:

Is there likely to be any pressure to maintain it as an open space?

Mr Crawford replied:

There has been no comment to the council. It is located just off the junction of Sturt Road and Brighton Road, behind the hotel. In regard to open space for general recreation purposes such as ovals, we have three major sporting centres in our small council

area as well as several open reserves. We are looking to the use of that land to provide a covered facility for local people.

With due respect to the alderman, I point out that there is still a great shortage of ovals within the City of Brighton and other parts of the metropolitan area. There are always football teams and the like trying to find areas on which to play organised sports. Indeed, the Brighton Hockey Club has been using the Minda Home area for many years and the Brighton High School Old Boys Football Club has been using the Dover Street oval, which is a council-cum-Education Department oval. Also, there is only one soccer area, which is at Seacliff, which the Brighton Soccer Club uses. Therefore, it is evident that there is a great need for an open-space area. Mr Sumner went on to ask:

Has the council's proposition been floated?

Mr Crawford replied:

Not at this stage, because funding is of concern. We have had preliminary discussions with the department, but we have not fixed any plan. If funds cannot be raised and it does come into our hands, it will remain as it is until funds are available. I hope funds can be raised within two or three years of our acquiring it.

That appears to be another problem with which the council is faced. In regard to the comment by my honourable, learned friend, the member for Mitcham, about the condition of St Jude's, let me refer to a comment made by Jim Crawford, who stated as reported at page 13, in part:

At the moment the cemetery is in a downtrodden state; it is a disgrace. I feel for the trustees but I understand their situation.

Therefore, there is no doubt that that is the situation at St Jude's.

Mr Millhouse: Why don't you arrange a working bee and do it yourself?

Mr MATHWIN: As I said when I commenced my speech, I tried to interest the Department for Community Welfare—

Mr Millhouse: I heard all that. Why don't you get out with a pick and shovel and clean it up?

Mr MATHWIN: The Department for Community Welfare's involvement would be far better. It would do some good and it might save some young people from getting into further trouble if that were used for community service orders work. I was very disappointed that the department did not see fit to take up that offer. I went through the evidence very closely: a lot of evidence was given on behalf of the trustees by Michael Bowering, who is one of the trustees of St Jude's. The Hon. C. J. Sumner asked:

As trustee or member of the congregation of St Jude's, have you any knowledge of what the council intends to do with the section that they will now get for public purposes? Do you have any objection to what they propose?

Mr Bowering replied:

When I asked the Town Clerk, he said they were going to build a resource centre. I said, 'What is that?' and he said, 'I don't know.' I doubt whether they will use it as open space.

So, Mr Bowering did not think that it would be used for open space, either. I hope that the council reassesses and rethinks the situation, because of the points that I have outlined, namely, the problem concerning older people living in units so very close to this area which is to be taken over by the council. I think the Bill tidies up the situation that has gone on for so long and it will certainly help the St Jude's church and it will certainly be of great assistance and relief to St Jude's to have the responsibility for the maintenance of the cemetery placed in the hands of the Brighton City Council. Therefore, I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Burial rights of members of Voules Brown Family.'

Mr HEMMINGS: I think it is commendable that any person who is a descendant of William Voules Brown should

be allowed to be interred in the cemetery. Can the Minister give any indication of whether there is any information on how many descendants of William Voules Brown are at present living, and have adequate arrangements been made so that there is sufficient space to bury those people in this cemetery?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I understand that Geoffrey Voules Brown could have been asked to institute inquiries to see who was the possible tenant entail of any assets left in the J. A. V. Brown, the first, entailed estate. That was regarded as a fairly long shot but it was thought to be helpful in regard to the future use of the Voules Brown graves. In actual fact, the recommendation of the Examiners of Titles was that such action was unnecessary and so the present Bill was approved by the committee appointed. I do not think there will be any real problem. In fact, there is plenty of room should any unlikely emergencies such as the one described by the honourable member arise.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

TRADE MEASUREMENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health):

I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This short Bill provides for the abolition of the Trade Measurements Advisory Council. This body was established under section 13 of the Trade Measurements Act, 1971-1976, with the function of advising and counselling the Minister on any matter related to trade measurements policy in the State. With the enactment of the Trade Standards Act, 1979, the advisory council has ceased to have any function in relation to packaging matters. The council has met only twice in each of the last two years and an examination of the business of its meetings suggests that there is little practical purpose to be served by retaining a formal advisory body in the area of trade measurement standards. The Government believes that for the future it will be more appropriate to consult with industry groups and local government on an informal basis as and when the need arises.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 deletes from section 3 a reference to the heading of the division of the principal Act under which the advisory council is established. Clause 3 deletes from the definition section definitions related to the advisory council. Clause 4 repeals Division I of Part III which provides for the establishment of the Advisory Council.

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

CASINO BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 March. Page 3682).

Mr SLATER (Gilles): One never ceases to be amazed at the surprises that occur in political life. On the Notice Paper of this House there is a private member's motion that I moved in July last year to establish a Select Committee

to inquire into and report on the implications of the establishment of a casino in South Australia and what effect a potential casino may have on the tourist industry in this State. That motion has been partly debated and is still on the Notice Paper.

The Bill that we are debating today, which was introduced by the Government, is basically proposing to do the same, that is, to set up a Parliamentary Select Committee to examine the casino issue. One might ask, first of all, what motivated the Government to introduce this Bill. A press report in the *Advertiser* last Saturday by the political journalists for that newspaper, Grant Nihill, is fairly close to the truth. The article is entitled, 'The casino shuffle', and I quote part it, as follows:

For some time now this Government has been alienating voters; it has courted big business and investment with some flair, but rarely has it taken heed of the more social needs—or even whims—of the people.

When it has sought to legislate in areas directly affecting the man in the street, it has done it to inhibit him—random breath tests and the on-the-spot fines debacle being two prime examples.

Concern at the need to 'humanise' the Government was highlighted by a meeting of Ministers and their advisers last month and the clear message from that meeting was that moves should be made to convey to the electorate an image of a Government more attuned to its populace.

So it was a satisfied Premier Tonkin this week who, along with his Minister of Recreation and Sport, Mr Wilson, was able to announce a legislative initiative which will very likely clear the way for the establishment of a casino in this State.

Significantly, the announcement, which caught the Opposition and the press by surprise, came a day after the Government introduced into Parliament changes to licensing laws to allow Sunday hotel trading in tourist areas.

Notwithstanding the correct realisation that the Government had to do something to be seen to look less conservative, less inhibiting, the Liberal investment ethic has still held.

That is to say, the Government is clearly anxious to ensure that the investors it constantly says are beating a path to its door are not obstructed by a 'no casino' situation in any development proposals these investors might have for South Australia.

There is not any doubt that the Government's electoral prospects have shown some decline in Gallup Polls over recent times, so the proposal to initiate measures that may be seen to be progressive social legislation, I believe, is quite out of character with the general philosophy and, indeed, certainly out of character with previous experience of the Liberal Party on this issue. It is obvious that the introduction of the Bill caught not only the Opposition but also the press and some of the Liberal Party back-benchers, because a very critical press release issued by the member for Mallee quite obviously implied that he knew nothing on the move to introduce this particular measure.

I also understand that quite a number of back-benchers on the other side did not know that the Government was going to seek leave to introduce a Bill to initiate a casino in South Australia. The member for Mallee, even though I do not agree with the greatest part of his press statement, is certainly entitled to his views. As a member of the Government, he was certainly entitled to know what the Government had in mind in relation to a casino in this State. I have had a question to the Premier on the Notice Paper for the past month asking whether the Government intended to establish a casino in South Australia, and that question was not answered. It has now been answered by the introduction of this Bill. I believe that the Government has taken this step in an endeavour to alleviate its declining political stocks. We all are aware that it will be a conscience vote on each side of the House. I have made perfectly clear that I believe—

Mr Randall: Which way are you going to vote?

Mr SLATER: It is not a question of which way I am going to vote; I have made my position clear. I am going to vote for the measure to go to a Select Committee. The important thing for this House is the way in which the

member for Henley Beach will vote. Today we will know for sure which way he is going to vote. By moving a private member's motion in this House I have made clear that I believe we ought to establish a Select Committee to investigate this matter. I will be supporting the referral of the Bill to a Select Committee.

I believe that, because of the public interest and the controversies that surround this subject, it should be investigated by an in-depth study, and the best way to do this is by way of a Parliamentary Select Committee. I believe that that would give an opportunity to individuals and organisations who support or oppose the concept of a casino in this State to give written or verbal submissions to the Select Committee. This would also give an opportunity for members of the Select Committee and members of the House to be more informed on the casino issue. In his second reading speech the Minister said:

The Government is introducing this Bill into Parliament to facilitate debate by the members on the issue, and I expect that all Parties will be voting according to their own conscience on the matter. Certainly, the issue will be treated as one of conscience by the Parliamentary Liberal Party.

The Minister of Recreation and Sport can be assured that the matter will be treated as a conscience vote on this side of the House.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I thought I said that.

Mr SLATER: No, you said:

Certainly the issue will be treated as one of conscience by the Parliamentary Liberal Party.

I am not pleased at the intended composition of the Select Committee. If it is to be a genuine conscience vote I believe it is proposed to have seven members on the Select Committee, and it is indicated that the Minister desires that those seven members will comprise four Government members, two Opposition members and one independent member. On a matter of this kind, when it is truly agreed that it is to be a matter of conscience, a greater proportion of members of the Opposition than members of the Government might favour the referral of the Bill to a Select Committee. So, I believe that we are entitled to have equal representation on that Select Committee. I hope that the Minister gives that every consideration.

I was disappointed to see in the press today that he says that he is not going to resile from his position. He has also stated that there is a precedent for his action in regard to the Prostitution Bill Select Committee. I accept that, but I say that that was a matter at large, but that in this concept we are dealing with a Bill. The Bill does not restrict the Select Committee to the contents of that Bill, but gives the opportunity to extend that to a wider field so that all the matters associated with a casino can be investigated. Again, I indicate my disappointment at the Minister's refusal to accept the proposal to have on the Select Committee three Opposition members, three Government members and the Independent member for Semaphore. I believe that the Independent member for Semaphore has shown interest in this matter by moving a Bill previously and should be on the Select Committee. It is fair and reasonable to suggest that that ought to be the composition of the Select Committee.

Even though this measure has been introduced by the Government, I believe that the reasons for its introduction are still somewhat obscure. In his second reading speech the Minister referred to surveys of public opinion. He quoted from a Peter Gardner poll which he used as an indicator of the survey. He indicated that 53.6 per cent responded in favour of the State Government allowing a casino to operate in South Australia; 36 per cent was opposed to a casino; and 10.4 per cent was undecided.

Surveys and Gallup polls are always subject to a degree of fluctuation.

I know that the Gallup poll conducted by another group of persons who are somewhat expert in their field of gathering information, namely, the Morgan Gallup poll, is somewhat at variance with the figures quoted in his second reading speech yesterday by the Minister. The Morgan Gallup poll analysed figures State by State. The poll, which was taken in late September and early October last year, shows that in South Australia 50 per cent of the people surveyed were in favour of a casino, 37 per cent were against and 13 per cent were undecided. That is at variance with the figures quoted yesterday by the Minister in his second reading speech.

I believe that this matter ought to be regarded as being non-political and non-partisan, and for that reason I believe that the Opposition ought to be given equal representation on the Select Committee.

Some members may remember the debate on the casino issue that took place in 1973, when the then Government proposed legislation for the establishment of a casino in this State. That legislation was not carried by the House, and I was one of the Government members who, on a conscience vote, voted against the issue. I want to make clear that I did not vote for the measure at that time because I did not believe that it was a practical or viable proposition, particularly having regard to the suggestion that the casino should be situated 80 km outside the metropolitan area of Adelaide. That was one of the major reasons, so I am on public record in regard to this matter. I exercised a conscience vote on a previous occasion, and I exercised it against the wish of my Party at that time because I honestly believed that it was the right thing to do in 1973.

There is no doubt that revenue to the State will accrue from a casino operation. Let us examine the Tasmanian Government's profit from Wrest Point Casino at Hobart. It is not an insignificant sum. I will quote figures showing Tasmanian Government revenue from casino profits at Wrest Point and casino tax and licence fee, based on 30 per cent of gross profit for the first three years of operation, and 25 per cent thereafter. Casino operation at Wrest Point began in February 1973, and from that time until June 1973 revenue to the Government was \$683 000. In the years 1973 to 1974 it was \$1 650 000; in 1974-75 it was \$1 856 000; in 1975-76 it was \$1 655 000; in 1976-77 it was \$2 020 000; in 1977-78 it was \$2 084 000; in 1978-79 it was \$2 600 000; and in 1979-80 it was \$2 836 000.

Those figures clearly indicate that the sum involved is not insignificant. On the other hand, we must also consider the alleged harmful effects that gambling or a casino might have on an individual, and on the community generally. I refer to a press release issued at the time of the early casino operation in Hobart by the Acting Commissioner of Police in Tasmania, Mr Knowles. This press release dated 13 September 1973, is headed, 'Police Chief debunks pessimists who fear casino-induced crime,' and states:

Latest statistics emphasise the very low incidence of crime generated by the Wrest Point Casino, the Acting Commissioner of Police (Mr Knowles) said today. He stated further: 'Since opening in February this year, the casino has had an estimated 359 000 visitors. This was nearly the population of Tasmania. Probably upon this basis the pessimists forecast a crime-wave, but events have proved them entirely wrong.'

Mr Knowles then stated that in the last financial year 12 000 offences were reported for the State, whereas in the seven months of operation, only 69 offences were committed at the casino. A substantial number of these were minor offences such as 'souvenired' cutlery and glassware. Only two disturbances occurred where police action was required.

That significant statement was made by the Acting Commissioner of Police in Tasmania at that time. To my knowledge, there have been two in-depth studies into the social

effect of gambling. One was conducted in New Zealand and the other in the United Kingdom. I refer to extracts from the United Kingdom Royal Commission on Betting, Lotteries and Gaming, which states:

We are left with the impression that it is extremely difficult to establish by abstract arguments that all gambling is inherently immoral, without adopting views as to the nature of good and evil which would not find general acceptance among moralists. Our concern with the ethical significance of gambling is confined to the effect which it may have on the character of the gambler as a member of society. If we were convinced that, whatever the degree of gambling, this effect must be harmful, we should be inclined to think that it was the duty of the State to restrict gambling to the greatest extent practicable. This point of view was put to us by some witnesses, but we do not think that it can be established either by abstract argument or by an appeal to experience. It would be out of place to discuss here the abstract arguments, but from our general observation and from the evidence which we have heard we can find no support for the belief that gambling, provided that it is kept within reasonable bounds, does serious harm either to the character of those who take part in it, or to their family circle and the community generally. It is in immoderate gambling that dangers lie, an individual or a community in whose life gambling plays too prominent a part betrays a false sense of values which can not but impair the full development of the personality or the society.

The final paragraph of this report is extremely significant:

We are led by all the evidence we have heard to the conclusion that gambling, as a factor in the economic life of the country or as a cause of crime, is of little significance and that its effects on social behaviour, in so far as these are a suitable object for legislation, are in the great majority of cases less important than has been suggested to us by some witnesses. We therefore consider that the object of gambling legislation should be to interfere as little as possible with individual liberty to take part in the various forms of gambling but to impose such restrictions as are desirable and practicable to discourage or prevent excess.

I want members to note that they are the words of the United Kingdom Royal Commission into the social effects of gambling. It is important, if our committee is set up, that it is able to investigate all aspects and points of view, to ascertain whether there are harmful effects to the individual, and to study the possibility that the Australian situation may differ from that in the United Kingdom and New Zealand. One does not know this. I would like assurance that this Select Committee will have an opportunity to investigate the social implications of a casino in this State. That must be a prime consideration in any of the committee's deliberations.

I understand that the terms of reference will be sufficiently wide, even though we are dealing with a specific Bill, to investigate all the social implications that may occur in regard to the effects of a casino in this State. It is not important to canvass greatly the provisions of this Bill, because it is proposed that it will go to a Select Committee, which will report back any amendments that might be necessary, and will thoroughly examine the issue. A proposal in the Bill relates to setting up a casino tribunal. Opinion expressed to me supports even stricter control over any casino operation. I believe that any casino should be under strict control.

Any casino established in this State should not be operated by private entrepreneurs but administered by a Government commission. We have an example in South Australia of a commission that has acted very effectively in the gambling field—the South Australian Lotteries Commission. There is a very strong body of opinion in the community and perhaps in this House that a Government commission should be set up to administer the casino. I am not particularly enthralled with the proposals in the Bill in regard to a casino tribunal. That suggestion is rather limited in its scope, and it does not go far enough to provide strict control. I ask members of the Select Committee (whoever they may be) and other members to consider that proposal.

I go a little further by saying that there are provisions in Tasmania relating to the control of management, if it is run by private enterprise, and to the control of foreign shareholdings in specified companies. The Casino Company Control Act of 1973 covers directors and foreign shares. The matter has been approached in a slightly different way on the apple isle of Tasmania. Even though I do not decry the fact that the casino operates effectively and that the Government has made revenue from the situation, I believe that we would do better to seriously consider the establishment of a casino commission.

At present there is a casino in Tasmania operating at Wrest Point, and I understand that the casino at Launceston will come into operation shortly; in the Northern Territory, there is a casino at Alice Springs, a limited casino operation in Darwin, and I believe that the casino at Mindil Beach will be operating in the near future; and there are proposals for two casinos in Queensland. The question arises whether we can afford not to have a casino in South Australia, and we must consider very carefully the viability of its operation. We may ask ourselves whether, as there are now so many casinos throughout Australia, the casino will attract sufficient tourists to be a viable proposition. I believe it will.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: That would be one of the things that the Select Committee would consider.

Mr SLATER: Certainly. I am only canvassing the possibilities in this matter. The Select Committee will have the opportunity to consider that important aspect. As I said previously, I did not support the 1973 legislation, because the casino was to be sited outside the metropolitan area. I do not want to be involved—

The Hon. Peter Duncan: If you and I had supported it, the numbers would have been sufficient to carry it.

Mr SLATER: Exactly. As I said before, we exercised our conscience vote in that case, and we will do so on this occasion. The viability of the project is important, as is siting. I do not want to get caught up in the many proposals that have been advocated through the press. Rather wild and extravagant plans have come forward for a casino. Those proposals will be assessed when and if this House passes the required legislation. That matter must first go through the required processes. I believe that a number of the proposals are extravagant and premature. I do not want to canvass who should be the successful applicant.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: No-one knows.

Mr SLATER: No-one knows, but they are all trying to get in on the ground floor.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: We don't know that no-one knows. That's the problem.

Mr SLATER: That may also be the case, but I do not want to become involved in that argument. I believe that the casino should be sited in an area that is attractive not only to tourists but also to local patrons, thus providing the opportunity to promote the casino and make it a success. For instance, the casino at Wrest Point is ideally sited. It has become a major tourist attraction and, as I will show later, it has had a significant influence on the Tasmanian tourist industry. I do not want to get involved at this stage in who should have the site, but I do believe that it should be sited in a locality that is attractive to the clientele.

We must examine very carefully all aspects of a casino operation, and I believe that a Select Committee is the only way in which that can be done. As is often acknowledged by members on both sides, the tourist industry is now and will become even more so an important part of the economy of this State. We must examine carefully the need for a more sophisticated night life that will attract tourists to this State, from both interstate and overseas. I trust that, in exercising her conscience vote on the matter, the Minister of Tourism will recognise this fact. I refer again to the

Tasmanian experience, because that is the best and probably the only basis on which we can make an assessment. Benefits have accrued to the tourist industry in Tasmania through the operations of Wrest Point. An article appearing in the *Launceston Examiner* as far back as 1978-79 illustrates the point I am trying to make about how Tasmania has benefited considerably from the casino operation. Under the heading '55 000 000 boom to State tourism', it stated:

The Wrest Point hotel-casino is officially recognised as giving the Tasmanian tourist industry its greatest single boost. In the year of its opening, Tasmanian tourist figures jumped by 22.03 per cent.

This is based on tourist industry calculations that on average each guest staying at Wrest Point would have spent at least \$100 outside the hotel during their stay. It includes taxis, restaurants, drinks, tourist coaches and souvenirs. There have been 552 000 guests at the hotel since February 1973, staying a varying number of nights.

Tasmania's Director-General of Tourism, Mr Grey Hulton, has praised the effect on the tourist industry. He said that in the year prior to 1972-73, the State's tourist figures were experiencing a slow but steady growth.

'Tasmania was really awaiting the arrival of a catalyst to give some impact to the industry,' he said. 'The Wrest Point hotel-casino was that catalyst. In 1972-73, which included the start of Wrest Point's operations, there was a 22.03 per cent increase in visitors to the State, compared with the previous year,' Mr Hulton said. The increase has been continuous.

In addition, there has been a spin-off to other aspects of tourism, on which I will not dwell at any great length, but it is fairly significant. I want to mention briefly the Bill introduced in this House by the member for Semaphore and to indicate, as I did in speaking to that Bill, my belief that, even though the concept had some merit, it could not have been supported by members at that time, because the Bill gave members of this place the option of being the licensing authority, and I saw dangerous implications in that. With due respect to the member for Semaphore, I did not think that the Bill could have been amended effectively. I think the Minister agrees with me, because he made the point yesterday in his second reading explanation. I believe that the member for Semaphore, who has indicated his interest in this matter, should be on the Select Committee.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: How long do you think the Select Committee should sit?

Mr SLATER: What sort of question is that for the Minister to put to me? I cannot answer that.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I meant your Select Committee.

Mr SLATER: A Select Committee should be master of its own destiny. We have set a time for the Select Committee to report back to the House, but on occasions Select Committees have deferred their report, and it depends what sort of examination of the subject is to be made, but that is not a question that we should be able to answer now.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: You are putting forward that it should be a wide-ranging inquiry, so that will take a long time.

Mr SLATER: It depends on the interpretation of the phrase. I hope that the Select Committee to which this Bill is to be referred will conduct a wide-ranging inquiry and not a superficial one. To have a superficial inquiry into a casino in this State in two months would be wrong. It may take longer than expected, but the Select Committee should be the master of its own destiny. I will not be a member of any Select Committee that does not effectively and efficiently do its job. We have limited time. The Bill was introduced into this House yesterday, it is being debated today, it is expected to be completed today, and that is quite unfair. The Select Committee would be expected to report back to this House in about two months, and I do not believe that that is sufficient time for the conduct of a wide-ranging inquiry.

Mr Hamilton: You might have to go overseas.

Mr SLATER: I do not know whether that is the case. I hope it is not, because I do not think the overseas experience is comparable with the Australian experience, particularly if we are to effectively control a casino as we should. I do not think the overseas experience is relevant, and I hope it is not intended that we should do that. I hope it is intended to have the widest possible inquiry, with the terms of reference being wide enough for that to be done.

I have made my position clear. I support the second reading, and I want the Bill to go to a Select Committee, because this is the only and probably the last chance this House will have for many years to investigate the desire of the community in relation to a casino. The letters being received from various people are mostly against the casino. I understand from a very good source, my wife—

Members interjecting:

Mr SLATER: I rely on her integrity.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Does she rely on yours, Jack?

Mr SLATER: I think she would. She informed me this morning that most of the calls on a radio talk-back programme last evening were against the casino. That does not indicate a general consensus of opinion; it indicates that those persons opposed to it are the most vocal in the community. I support the concept of a Select Committee so that all those people will be able to make representations to it, either verbally or in writing. The opportunity will be there for them, and I want the public to have a chance to express an opinion, because this is the last opportunity we will have for a long time to thoroughly investigate this issue, and we must not let it slip away.

I appeal again to the Minister to consider this as a non Party political non-partisan committee, even though the Government has introduced the Bill. I think we should balance the committee so that this is seen as a non Party political issue. It is a conscience matter, even for the member for Henley Beach, and I look forward to seeing how he faces the situation, because he is in a pretty dicey situation politically. We will see what he does when the time comes. That will be the case for other members opposite, too. I am disappointed that the Minister, by suggesting that four Government members be on the Select Committee, does not consider this a non Party political non-partisan committee. We should have equal numbers of members from both sides, together with the Independent member for Semaphore.

This is an important social issue, a matter of great public interest and controversy, and I wish it to be considered a non Party political matter, even though the Government has introduced the Bill. I hope that the Minister will reconsider the position and allow us to have seven members on the committee, three from the Opposition, three from the Government, and the Independent member for Semaphore. I hope that the debate to follow will be based on that consideration. Let us look at the issue of what is in the best interests of the South Australian public. I have personal views, as have other members, but I hope that the debate will be based on logic and common sense rather than emotion. I support the second reading so that the Bill can be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I intend to support the Bill to the second reading stage in the hope that it will then be referred to a Select Committee. Personally, I have no great enthusiasm for a casino in South Australia, but I think that members of the community, from both sides of the public argument on this matter, should be given an opportunity to go before the Select Committee and put their point of view. Most of my constituents—

Mr Keneally: Have you always thought that?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Morphett will please resume his seat. There has been every indication to the Chair that this will be a long debate. Despite the feeling of some members that two or three speaking at once might reduce the length of it, that would not be the case, and I ask honourable members to hear one another in virtual silence.

Mr OSWALD: The member for Stuart, of course, has not heard me speak on this subject, so I am surprised that he has expressed that point of view. Later in my speech I shall give him some specific reasons and develop those reasons why I wish to see this Bill go to a Select Committee so that the public can make a real contribution to the debate on the matter.

Most of my constituents would never set foot inside a casino for moral, religious, or financial reasons. I imagine that some would go into a casino out of curiosity, but the majority of my constituents to whom I have spoken have all made the one common point, which I think is worthwhile relating to this place today. They say to me, 'We will never use it, but, on the other hand, we do not believe we should prevent others, if that is their wish.' I believe a Select Committee is an appropriate place as members are probably in the best position during the process of taking evidence to determine whether in fact this feeling is truly abroad in the community.

What many of my constituents are saying is that, in fact, in South Australia we promote and make available to the public every conceivable form of gambling other than that provided by a casino, and that, whilst society continues to condone other forms of gambling, why should society prevent those in the community who wish to use a casino from having access to one? There is, of course, the opposing point of view. It is by allowing this particular Bill to proceed to a Select Committee that those groups in the community either for or against the issue will be able to come before the committee and put forward their points of view.

I have many constituents who are concerned with the future expansion of organised gambling in South Australia. I am sure that other members have heard similar points of view from their constituents. We have all heard reports of wage packets being lost at casinos interstate, and quite frankly, many of my constituents are concerned about that. On the other hand, we have also heard about the same wage packets that are lost every Saturday at Morphettville or at Victoria Park or lost at the trots or, if you like, lost in people's homes when playing cards of an evening.

To a lesser extent, there are children who lose their weekly wages in machines dispensing those scratching things that they have access to, or on those space invader machines, and the like. Only recently the State has added X-Lotto and pools to its range of available gambling facilities. Certainly, nothing is new here in South Australia other than the concept of a casino that we are now moving towards. Thank goodness, poker machines have been specifically excluded from the provisions of the Bill.

My support for the Bill to the Select Committee stage is given because I know that I have constituents with expert knowledge, who wish to make a contribution in four specific areas, and I believe they should be given the opportunity to make their contributions. The four areas cover, first, the effect that a casino will have on business in surrounding areas; secondly, the association of casinos with illegal activities; thirdly, the effect a casino would have on tourism and employment generally; and, fourthly, an assessment of the public demand within South Australia for a casino.

In relation to that last point, I refer to a poll that I conducted in the Glenelg district last Saturday, Monday and this morning. The results show that an appreciable percentage of residents are firmly opposed to the establish-

ment of a casino in this State. It is a large enough percentage to warrant those involved having their voices heard in this place, certainly, before a Select Committee. I shall briefly explain the survey and then read out the figures so that they can be incorporated in *Hansard*. The survey was conducted on Saturday morning on Jetty Road, Glenelg. The shopping centre on Jetty Road is one particular shopping centre which is contained in the one shopping street, where many of the local population go. Those not familiar with Jetty Road will bear in mind that there are no shops of any number in the cross streets; everyone goes into Jetty Road and walks up and down that road.

Mr Mathwin: And it has two good members of Parliament, one on each side of the road.

Mr OSWALD: It has. It is well known that on Jetty Road on a Saturday morning one will find a first-class cross-section of the community, people from Glenelg North, Glenelg East, as far afield as Morphettville, and perhaps Glenelg South, even down to Somerton. We took a sampling of 1 108 people on Saturday morning. The poll was conducted at either end of the street and, as people walked down the street, they were asked this simple question: 'If a casino came to South Australia, would you be for it or against it?' The response was as follows: out of the sample of 1 108, 61.5 per cent said they were for it; 23.5 per cent said that they were against it; 5.5 per cent were undecided; and 9.5 per cent said that they did not care, that they had no opinion. On the following Monday morning we went back and obtained another sample, this time a sample of 289 constituents. Out of that sample, this time 53 per cent came out for the proposal; once again, 24 per cent came out against; 6 per cent were undecided, and 17 per cent had no opinion. The exercise was repeated again this morning, this time on a very quick sample of only 83 people. The figures were, 48 per cent for, 30 per cent against, 5 per cent were undecided, and 15 per cent had no opinion.

It can be said that only a certain type of shopper is found at Jetty Road, Glenelg. Therefore, on Monday I went into areas with which I am familiar that have more of the elderly citizens of Glenelg, and by going around to home units I gathered a cross-section sampling of many streets of Glenelg East. Out of a sample of 145 residents at home (and I stress that they were residents who normally would not have gone up the street on a Saturday morning because of their age, and by such a sample we picked up the feeling amongst the elderly), 66 per cent came out for the proposal, 24 per cent were against, 3 per cent were undecided, and 6 per cent had no opinion.

One common percentage runs through all of the figures: for the Saturday morning poll of 1 108 people, 23.5 per cent were against; on Monday morning, 24 per cent were found to be against, and on Tuesday morning the percentage against was up to 30; amongst the elderly the figure was 24 per cent again. One particular figure came up throughout the surveys, namely, the figure of 24 per cent, which indicates that 24 per cent of my constituents are in fact totally opposed to the casino issue.

It would appear from the Glenelg poll, which, as I pointed out a moment ago, comprised a very good cross-section of the Glenelg electorate (and most members would probably agree with me that the suburbs within my electorate probably constitute one of the more conservative areas in metropolitan Adelaide) and, I think it is revealing to detect that even in the suburb of Glenelg 24 per cent of people are against the proposal. It could be argued, of course, that consequently, 61 per cent are for the proposal, but one must bear in mind the number of people who had no opinion or who did not care, which was roughly 10 per cent. However, I am concentrating on those who are concerned and who want to put their points of view forward at a Select Committee.

However, that does not mean that we should not have absolute due regard for the minority group involved. It is all right to look at the higher percentage, but we must have due regard for those comprising the minority group. It is my intention as part of my philosophical approach to this Bill to ensure that together with my vote it proceeds to the Select Committee stage so that the expertise amongst that group of 24 per cent against the proposal can put forward their points of view to the Select Committee of this House, which can then balance those views with other points of view that will be put forward.

I believe it is imperative that a social issue such as this one should go to a Select Committee; it should be looked at in great detail apropos the four points to which I referred earlier, namely, the effect of casinos on businesses; the association of casinos with illegal activities; the effect of casinos on employment and tourism; and, of course, a determination of what the actual public demand for casinos really is. These are the issues that must be canvassed before the Select Committee.

They are the issues on which they must take expert advice from members of the public, who will come and tell the committee members what in actual fact they want. Then we will be in a position, with a report from the Select Committee, to report back to this place and give an indication of what the public of South Australia wants from this Parliament in our decision-making processes regarding the casino. For this reason I support the second reading and I hope that the Bill will move very quickly to a Select Committee so that these experts within the community who have a lot to put forward can come forward and make their thoughts known.

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): I also will be supporting this Bill to the second reading so that it can go to a Select Committee. Before launching into my remarks, I would like to ask a rhetorical question: when is a categorical statement not a categorical statement?

Mr Peterson interjecting:

Mr TRAINER: As the member for Semaphore has pointed out, it seems to be when a Liberal makes it. If we look up a typical dictionary—the one I happened to grab last night was a Webster—and look at the definition of 'categorical' we will find descriptions such as 'unqualified'; in other words, a statement is made with no ifs or buts and no qualifications. It is 'unequivocal: with no beating around the bush. It is absolute, unconditional. When is a categorical statement not a categorical statement?

Mr Max Brown: When it is made by a Liberal Minister.

Mr TRAINER: It seems that that is the case, when it is made by a Minister in this Government. I will explain that particular remark later.

I have had some interest in this issue of the possibility of a casino for some time, because one of the first places that has been suggested as a site—I am not just talking about last month: I am talking about early last year—was the Morphettville Racecourse, which is in my electorate. Morphettville was one of the first sites floated as a possibility for a casino. In that context, I notice, if members will excuse the pun, that there is another suggestion being floated in today's *News* by which we are all going truly up the river, although it is an interesting possibility. The *News* headline states, '\$2 000 000 Riverboat Casino Plan'. There are many possibilities in that.

However, I would like to return to the subject of the Morphettville Racecourse in relation to the possibility of a casino. In the *Sunday Mail* on 18 January last year, an article headed 'Nightlife plans for new grandstand' stated:

The facilities could be used as a casino should the Government allow a casino to be set up in South Australia.

Some of my constituents were rather interested in that particular article and the suggestion of a casino at Morphettville, particularly since there were also suggestions in that same article of rock concerts, which rather horrified those residents of Plympton Park immediately adjacent to the racecourse. I asked a question about this in the House on 4 March last year of the Minister of Recreation and Sport. I asked for information as to the possible operation of a casino at that site, amongst other matters. The Minister's reply was:

I can assure the honourable member that it will not be used as a casino. Certainly it will not unless there is a great change of heart in this State. I just cannot foresee that happening at all during the term of this Government. I am quite prepared to make that a categorical statement.

Indeed, when is a categorical statement not a categorical statement? We will come back to that subject later.

Only a few days later, around the time that the then Premier of Victoria, Mr Dick Hamer, proposed a casino but was outvoted within his own Party, the *News* on 10 March reported our Premier as saying there had been no lobbying for casinos from either the hotel industry or the travel industry. He said:

The issue has not even been considered and there has been no indication that it is about to be.

It is rather strange that he should say that. How can the Minister of Recreation and Sport, a few days earlier in the House, have made his 'categorical statement' if there had not been some sort of discussion about the possibility of a casino? That is rather strange. The Premier went on to say:

It is open to any private member to put that up, but certainly it is not the Government's intention to do so.

The Premier implied that the Government had no particular position on casinos. Yet the same article quoted the Minister of Tourism, Mrs Adamson, as saying, 'I do not see the State Government altering its position on this issue.' It is difficult for them to not alter their position if they have not got a position, this is another one of those amazing contradictions.

A few weeks later, in May, the casino issue was again prominent. For some reason or other a survey was taken in the first two weeks in April. That was published in the *Advertiser* on 29 May and, as has been mentioned already by the member for Gilles, that survey showed that South Australians approved of a gambling casino by 51 per cent to 43 per cent. Articles of that kind were appearing regularly in the press, such as in Stephen Middleton's column in the *News* on 21 May. An article headed, 'Casino has numbers' predicted a Parliamentary vote in favour of the casino and pointed out that there was something very strange about the sudden burst of interest. Stephen Middleton said:

Others are questioning the motives behind the current burst of interest in casinos and expressed concern over who should control any such operation in South Australia.

So it looks as though all sort of things were bubbling away beneath the surface. On 9 May the South Australian Jockey Club publicly requested a casino. An *Advertiser* item headed, 'Racecourse casino would be welcome' stated:

The Morphettville Racecourse grandstand could be used as a casino, the Secretary of the South Australian Jockey club, Mr F. W. Keen, said last night. Mr Keen said the S.A.J.C. had told the State Government that, if casinos were allowed in South Australia, it would seek a licence for Morphettville. 'We have just completed a \$6 300 000 grandstand complex there,' Mr Keen said. 'There are two floors which can be readily converted to casino operations.' Mr Keen said the casino would be profitable for the S.A.J.C. The conversion could be completed at minimum cost as there already were full catering facilities, the course had ample parking space, and a casino would not interfere with normal racing activities. Mr Keen said he believed casinos would come to South Australia. The S.A.J.C. had first mentioned the idea of a casino at Morphettville to the Government about 12 months ago.

That was May last year. There obviously had been things bubbling beneath the surface for at least 12 months even then. The article continued:

If it appeared likely the State Government would allow them, the S.A.J.C. would make a full submission.

The Premier's response in the *Sunday Mail* of 17 May was based on his remarks while opening the new grandstand at Morphettville Racecourse, which, the article pointed out, 'has already been suggested as an ideal venue for a casino.' The Premier said:

'I am well aware that there is a school of thought within the community that South Australia should have a casino.' He told the huge Marlborough Plate day crowd, 'It has been suggested that Morphettville, with its new facilities, would make an excellent setting for that casino. Well, that's an interesting thought.' Mr Tonkin said that the State Government's policy regarding casinos had not changed.

However, earlier he said that there was not a policy. He went on to say:

We will listen to any properly presented approaches from reputable sources. It has been suggested that we consider holding a referendum on the subject and that could certainly be looked at if that is what the community wants. But I emphasise that at the moment we are still at the listening and assessment stage. There has been no shortage of suggestions pointing out the benefits of a casino to the community. But the would-be casino operators always omit to mention the considerable benefit to themselves.

In a follow-up to the categorical statement by the Minister of Recreation and Sport, I received a letter from him about the intentions of the South Australian Jockey Club regarding Morphettville and the rock concerts I referred to earlier. On 4 June he stated unequivocally—he is referring here to the committee on the South Australian Jockey Club:

The committee will consider the establishment of a casino at Morphettville if the South Australian Government introduces successful legislation in this regard. However, as already stated in Parliament, I cannot foresee this happening during the term of this Government.

That earlier response to my question on 4 March was obviously no accident. There was no slip of the tongue there. That categorical statement was apparently intended as a categorical statement because on 4 June the Minister referred back to it and said, 'As already stated in Parliament, I cannot foresee this happening during the term of this Government.' But categorical statements by Liberals are apparently not categorical statements. In any case, what happened last year? The member for Semaphore introduced a Bill that was harshly dealt with and the member for Gilles introduced a motion for a reference to a Select Committee and it was not even possible to get that voted on. It is still on the Notice Paper.

Yet, somehow since then the Government has gone off on the road to Damascus like St Paul. Once again we have had one of these sudden conversions. In just the last few days we have had introduced a Bill for Sunday trading in hotels and a Bill on pecuniary interests of members—the sorts of things that before were never possible.

But, I suppose we cannot say we did not get some sort of a warning. For example, there was a reference in the *Sunday Mail* of 8 November last year which warned 'Tonkin in surprise Casino switch.' It said:

The State Government may bring in its own legislation to allow a casino in South Australia.

The Premier, Mr Tonkin, indicated a change in Government thinking on the issue at yesterday's State Council meeting of the Liberal Party.

Speaking after a resolution opposing a casino was solidly defeated by council delegates, Mr Tonkin said establishment of a casino in South Australia would now be 'carefully considered' by the Government.

It is interesting that the motion against which he was speaking came from the electorate of the member for Victoria, who was at that time a member of the Cabinet and Chief Secretary, because that article pointed out:

The anti-casino resolution at Liberal State Council was introduced yesterday by Mr Allen Heinrich on behalf of the Victoria State Electoral College of the Liberal Party.

It said: 'That this council opposes the establishment of a casino in South Australia.'

That is interesting, because the member for that district is now no longer in the Cabinet: he has been replaced by the member for Rocky River. It is possible that there is now a difference in Cabinet approach to this particular issue—perhaps we are getting a small-liberal approach to this issue since the member for Rocky River joined it. There may be a coincidence, may be not. But it may be that the road to Damascus runs through Kadina.

A few weeks later, after the member for Gilles had his Bill rejected, on 12 December, Greg Kelton in his article referred to the defeat of the Bill introduced by the member for Semaphore. He referred to some influential people who were not too happy about it. The article stated:

Some influential Liberal M.P.s were angry over the defeat of the Bill, proposed by Mr Peterson.

They claimed they were prepared to support it to the Committee stage in order to amend it.

However, opponents of the Bill brought the vote on early and the move resulted in a 43-2 defeat.

It is interesting to wonder just who were these influential members on the back bench. Certainly, there seems to be some sort of division in the Liberal Party. There seem to be all sorts of splits and tensions in the Government. I notice the member for Henley Beach is now preening himself and sitting up very nice and straight. I am not sure whether he is trying to imply that he is one of the particular influential back-benchers, but there were certainly all sorts of tensions within the Government. I have already referred to the contradictory statements by the Minister of Tourism. The portfolio of tourism will cover a casino. The *News* last evening reminded people:

At the Liberal Party annual meeting last November—the meeting to which I referred earlier—

Mrs Adamson said she objected to a casino. I believe casino gambling is a complete waste of time and money, she said.

She must have got a bit of reaction then. In an article in the *Sunday Mail* of 8 November, under the heading 'Casino conflict causes strain', Onlooker was not too impressed with the Liberal Party. The article stated:

There was a time in those heady early days when Liberal Party M.P.s in true liberal tradition said (while looking to the heavens) that colleague Jenny Adamson had a right to her own opinion and should be able to express it.

And express it she did on everything from cigarettes to air-conditioning and a number of other matters, many of which were politically sensitive.

As we said in those days such statements often were laughed off.

Not now though. The signs are out hard and strong that many Liberal M.P.s have lost patience with their Minister of Health and Tourism.

The article referred to her comments on a casino. It continued:

These thoughts, we can assure you, went through the minds of many a Liberal back-bencher and Cabinet Minister last week after Mrs Adamson gave her personal thumbs down to a casino in South Australia.

As one M.P. said, her timing was atrocious, especially when she said she objected to gambling being an unproductive pastime on Melbourne Cup day when you couldn't get into a TAB office in South Australia for the ordinary people having a flutter.

Apart from the fact that Mrs Adamson is Tourism Minister, the other factor which is disturbing Liberals is what they see as a developing difference of opinion between herself and the Premier who is keeping his casino options open and seeking public opinion on the matter.

I have always wondered who these influential Liberal back-benchers are. I see the member for Rocky River is leaving the Chamber, but I do not know whether there is any coincidence in that. One of them is quoted as saying:

What if the public opinion convinces the Premier that South Australia should have a casino? Would we have a top-level split?

Certainly, the Adelaide City Council was not too impressed. An article on 4 November, headed 'Adamson "out of step over casino"', quoted Alderman Bill Manos as follows:

'I am particularly surprised Mrs Adamson would oppose a major tourist attraction when South Australia is lagging behind other States in tourist development,' he said.

'South Australia should have had a casino years ago. If we had been one of the first States with a casino, we could have enjoyed the benefits of some exclusivity. But now is better than never.'

Mr Randall: Why don't you tell us why you are supporting it?

Mr TRAINER: Members opposite are obviously embarrassed, so I will continue with the line I am following, because some of the members opposite ran for cover when *Nationwide* asked them their opinions on this particular matter. *Nationwide* last Friday stated that only three people would give clear-cut evidence of any sort of support, and to their credit, they were the Premier, the Minister of Recreation and Sport, and the Minister of Agriculture. They asked the Minister of Tourism but she refused to discuss the matter and said that only the Premier could comment. The Attorney-General said that he could only comment when it got to the Legislative Council.

Mr Max Brown: What about the member for Mallee? He commented.

Mr TRAINER: I will come to that in a moment. The Minister of Housing said he would discuss it with community groups and the Minister of Education said he had not studied it yet. However, one particular member was most outspoken, although there were a couple of others, apart from the member from Mallee, who commented. The member for Fisher said that he was violently opposed, or so he was reported on *Nationwide* as saying. The member for Hanson was reported as saying, 'Why prostitute oneself for the sake of tourism?' That is putting it strongly, but the most outspoken statement came from the member for Mallee. Most members have seen his press release that was published in the *Advertiser*, which was headed 'Casino fight on'. The press release stated:

I am shocked and appalled at this most recent proposal to introduce a Bill to legalise a casino in South Australia at this time. It is just not necessary! We debated and voted on this proposal less than six months ago. On that occasion it was overwhelmingly defeated in the House with 43 members opposed to it and only two members (both independent) supporting it.

I cannot imagine what it is that has happened in the last six months that will now enable any other member to vote in favour of it, unless it is political cowardice.

However, public opinion polls might have had something to do with it. The press release continued:

It is frightful to contemplate the lack of moral commitment there must be in some members if they are prepared to change their vote in such a short space of time. The simple fear they have that they must appear to be in tune with the popular mood of the moment is despicable and gutless. They should take a firm, responsible, moral stand and, through factual, informed debate, support what they know to be right, as well as being for the best benefit of all South Australians. Their responsibility is to convince the ill informed members of the community of the undesirability of a casino, and not bend with the breeze. It seems all the more regrettable to me that they are now prepared to support a measure which will alienate millions of dollars and construction worker skills from building the homes which are urgently needed in this community—

He does not say how those homes are going to be paid for. He makes no reference to the fact that the building industry is in a gigantic slump and is working well below capacity. The article continues:

and put those resources into the building of a den of iniquity for the idle rich—

Fancy a Liberal member referring to the idle rich! He must be very popular in some circles at the moment! He continued:

—while we still have other people in circumstances of depression and poverty without work or homes.

He referred to a den of iniquity but he has certainly not heard the rumbles in the community about the economic strife from which people are suffering. He has not heard the results of his policies, because he does not care about ordinary working people. He does not care about those who live in working class areas. So, he has not heard the rumbles of complaints about this Government. He is more interested in the den of iniquity than the din of inequity. It is interesting to note that a section of the press release was left out when it was published in the *Advertiser*. The next paragraph stated:

It is this bankruptcy of principle in the logic and behaviour of some members of Parliament which brings all of us into disrepute in the minds of the caring members of the community, and causes me a great deal of anguish and worry when I wonder whether it is all worth while or not. However, I comfort myself in the knowledge that we at least live in a democracy and we get the Government we deserve.

That is terribly unfair. What on earth have the people of South Australia done to deserve a Government like this one? He said:

It is now up to all responsible members of the community who oppose this calamitous casino proposition to join with me in my fight and work hard to convince a majority of citizens of the folly of this measure. We must win, and win convincingly.

Some people approved of that press release. Stewart Cockburn said in the *Advertiser* of 30 March:

The leadership of the Tonkin Government, remember, was convinced until a year or so ago that casinos were socially harmful. But the Liberal Party is obviously now frightened by the prospect that it might lose power at the next State election. So it is trying to clear the decks of issues likely to cost it those marginal votes which might be needed for its survival.

He obviously agrees with Peter Lewis in one sense that the casino is elitist because Stewart Cockburn says:

But perhaps we should not be surprised to find the Liberal Party sponsoring a casino. After all, casino betting is essentially an elitist form of gambling.

But, the honourable member certainly did not win many friends amongst his Party. On 26 March we read:

However, Liberal sources said Ministers and back-benchers were upset by the comments, especially those relating to political cowardice.

It sounds like the truth hurt. The *Advertiser* article continues:

They said Mr Lewis's statement had taken the gloss off what should have been a vote-catching announcement.

As the member for Morphett has pointed out, there seems to be a fairly strong degree of community support for a casino. References to percentages in favour of and against have already been made in respect of several surveys, so I will not refer to those. Certainly, there was a very scathing letter to the Editor on 31 March from a rural constituent or someone, and I have not had time to look up where Wandearah East is. For all I know, it might be in Mallee.

Mr Lewis: You might be interested to know that no such person has ever been on the electoral roll in South Australia.

Mr TRAINER: Then, Peter, you will not have to worry about his voting against you. This writer to the editor was rather disappointed at the statement released by Mr Lewis. He thought it shocking and despicable. Mr or Mrs T. W. Towle said:

May I remind Mr Lewis that he and all members have been elected to Parliament to legislate for, and enforce, the popular mood of the moment. They are not our keepers.

Perhaps the member for Mallee could do with one. Mr Towle concluded with a rhetorical question:

Australia is a democracy—haven't you heard? It is governed by the popular mood of its people. This is despicable!

There seem to have been some hidden pressures that have been at work on the Government. We have had references

earlier to brewing interests. On 21 May, Stephen Middleton referred to people questioning motives behind the current pressure. On 6 November last year Stewart Cockburn, in reference to an Adelaide city councillor being jumped on for opposing the casino, said:

What I find especially disturbing is the statement by Councillor John Sellick that he may have put his neck on the block for being the lone opponent of casinos at Monday's council meeting. Are the shadowy vested interests behind the proposal so powerful that they could force an elected councillor out of office?

He asked about the proposition:

Who are its real sponsors? Who are the power brokers at Government and local government level who are secretly committed to getting it under way?

He said:

A casino for South Australia would be a confession of economic bankruptcy by the Tonkin Government: a confession that the only new revenue earner left to this benighted State is an eat-drink-and-be-merry-for-tomorrow-we-die joint.

Bottoms up, then, David Tonkin and John Watson. Are you two fundamentally decent men really going to let yourselves slither into a grubby trap normally likely to ensnare only political time servers?

My, do not people fall out! A whole series of propositions has been put forward as to who is going to make the money out of the casino. Suggestions such as Ayers House, the newly completed Hilton Hotel, the Windy Point Restaurant, the South Australian Jockey Club, and so on, have been made. I refer to the article in the *Sunday Mail* on 28 March:

The S.A.J.C. suggestion, in view of its current problems, is the most curious of many suggested sites that sprouted in the corridors of Parliament House on Thursday.

The Government is quite clearly determined to have the casino licence placed by the time of the next election . . .

But the article points out:

Whoever gets the licence will be assured of a lucrative business.

That is my concern, and I hope that the Select Committee when it is formed looks very carefully into who is going to be making the money out of this. I support the remarks made earlier by the member for Gilles, who said some body like the Lotteries Commission should operate it so that the revenue reverts to the community. Certainly, some people do not agree that the South Australian Jockey Club should be thus favoured. An article entitled, 'Write your own ticket!', appeared in the *News* of 30 April. The racing writer, Jack Rowe, said:

The South Australian Jockey Club has no chance of getting a casino licence—and you can write your own ticket about that . . . There is no easy solution to the present S.A.J.C. financial problems, but I can see their point of view that a casino . . . would rid them of their current financial situation . . .

But, he does not think they are going to get it. And I am not too sure that the South Australian Jockey Club establishment group ought to get it. Its 1 600 members apparently paid a \$200 joining fee and \$280 in subscriptions each year. So, I do not think that there are too many working class members of the South Australian Jockey Club. Certainly, some comments have been made regarding their competence. The Government was not keen, apparently, when the South Australian Jockey Club voted for the proposition for a Government hand-out because, a prominent member of the Legislative Council was quoted on 12 March as having said:

The Government cannot keep ploughing money into any sport or sector which cannot generate sufficient revenue to make it viable.

It was also said on 19 March:

Feeling is strong within racing circles that the State Government . . . has no alternative but to bail out the club. The Government does not agree.

That is because of strong demands for hand-outs that would automatically follow for other venues. But the Jockey Club felt that it was fairly competent and stated in the 8 November *Sunday Mail*:

With our existing expertise within the gambling industry, we consider ourselves well credentialed to operate a casino.

However, perhaps its position is better described by someone who was quoted on 25 February in the *Advertiser* as saying:

The S.A.J.C. makes the South Australian National Football League look like financial wizards.

I do not have a closed mind on the issue. I have not made up my mind completely. I would like to wait and hear contributions from other members in this House. At the moment, I am inclined to support the Bill, particularly to take it into the second reading. A Select Committee is, after all, as has been pointed out by the member for Gilles, the best way to approach it by way of an in-depth study. We in this House are not experts on the objective facts concerned with a casino. People may have opinions, but not necessarily opinions based on fact. Let a Select Committee get these objective facts together. However, I do not give unqualified support for the second reading, because that will depend on what emerges later in Committee.

I am interested in how the Select Committee is to be set up. I would like to be sure that it is not stacked with either supporters or opponents of a casino, and I would like to see that it is not stacked with Government members, either. When that Select Committee reports back, we will all be able, as will I, to make a further decision on it. I mentioned that I am not terribly enthusiastic about the South Australian Jockey Club, the brewing company or any other vested interests getting their hands on it. I do not believe, even though it is, as the member for Mallee has pointed out, predominantly the elite who participate in gambling casinos, that it is exclusively their province. But certainly, if some better-off members of the community are willing to throw some of their money away, we should maximise the Government slice of that and get it back into the community, through something along the lines of the Lotteries Commission.

We should not be in the business of issuing licences to private entrepreneurs to print money. I suspect the member for Fisher agrees with me. On 28 March he said:

I am still opposed, but if it passes, I will then support the concept that it must be owned and operated by the Government, even though I am a strong private enterprise supporter.

I do not want it to go to some private operator to make a fortune from the weakness of others.

I concur with those remarks of the member for Fisher, suggesting that we should have a Government commission, as a result of the Select Committee's inquiries, to operate any casino established in South Australia.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): Before speaking to this Bill, I express my appreciation to the member for Brighton, who has permitted me to take this turn in the debate, rather than wait until later. I appreciate the inconvenience that that means to him, and I thank him for his consideration. I wish to make two points which are not immediately relevant, but I am sure that you, Mr Speaker, will allow them to be said.

First, may I take this opportunity to express my condolences to the family of the late Cyril Hutchens, a person whom I knew and respected and who was a worthy member of this Parliament and of the community. Secondly, I take this opportunity, this being the closest time from the last official day of service of the outgoing Governor of this State, to acknowledge the very valuable contribution that I believe Sir Keith Seaman has made to the State of South Australia. I believe that his contribution will be noted in the years ahead. I personally wish to thank him for that.

The casino is a much tortured issue, as the member for Ascot Park pointed out. How tortured it has been in people's experience! In the absence of any apocalyptic revelations

that may come from any Select Committee, I propose to vote against a casino at the third reading stage.

I do not believe that a casino would be in the best interests of this State for a number of reasons, and I hope that the various reasons that I advance will be considered by the Select Committee. I would want to see the results of any investigations by a Select Committee into those areas. It is possible that, as a result of that, apocalyptic revelations may be made, and one must always accept that, but I must admit that I am very doubtful that that would occur. I will outline my main areas of concern, but at this point I indicate that I am concerned about the Select Committee itself. At the end of the second reading stage I may vote in support of a Select Committee.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: After the second reading?

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: After the second reading I may vote in support of the formation of a Select Committee, pending assurances from the Minister when he closes this debate that the Select Committee will be able to entertain the full breadth of discussion on a casino in this State. The extent to which that Select Committee can entertain discussions on such things as the social, economic and legal impact of a casino will determine the extent to which I am prepared to support the formation of such a committee.

Mr Keneally: And family impact statements?

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Certainly, family impact statements must be taken into account. If a Select Committee cannot consider those matters under its terms of reference (and it has been suggested that it cannot), I am not prepared to support its formation. My vote at the end of the second reading stage will depend entirely on the quality of the assurances that the Minister will give in that regard.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: But will you support the second reading?

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I will listen very closely to the Minister's reply, which will determine my vote. At this stage I point out the reasons why I am opposed to the establishment of a casino in South Australia, and I am pleased that the Minister is here to listen. First, I believe that a casino will produce social hazards in the community. I know that many people say that there are social hazards in regard to all forms of gambling and that many other forms of gambling exist in this State which create social hazards, so why should one object to one more set of social hazards? I believe that the very fact that one more set of social hazards will be created provides part of the answer. Why should we willingly entertain the creation of more hazards just because other hazards already exist? To adopt that kind of logical progression would be very damaging in many other areas of government and legislation, and so I do not believe that that argument should apply in this instance.

The member for Stuart referred to family impact statements. I certainly hope that, if the proposal does succeed, a family impact statement will be a very high priority and will achieve more results than have some other family impact statements about which we have heard (not officially, because those statements are not released officially) but which merely say in one line that there will be no family impact. The ills of gambling addiction can be so serious that we cannot allow such a matter to be glibly wiped away.

Of course, other social problems may arise from the existence of a casino, in addition to the hazards directly related to gambling. Those members who had the opportunity to see the *Four Corners* programme would be aware of the rather quaint way of referring to a nexus between the two problems of gambling and prostitution. A person on that programme said that anyone who says that a casino can be kept free of proliferating prostitution in the area is in a real dilemma, because that is like saying that one can have

a fish and chip shop without the chips. It must be stressed that a Select Committee, if it is to limit itself to the casino and ignore all the other potential impacts, is not worth a scrap.

The other points I want to raise touch on a variety of areas. It has been stated that a casino in South Australia would bring economic benefits to this State: for example, it would provide a tax revenue for the Government. It has also been said that a casino would provide extra jobs and a boost for the construction industry. I was interested to hear the Minister on television last night when he was being interviewed about this cornucopia of wealth that the casino would bring to the Treasury.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I don't think they were my words.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Perhaps the word 'cornucopia' was not used by the Minister, but recently other people who support a casino have said, 'Look what a casino will do for tax revenues.' The Minister cited a figure of \$1 000 000 in the first year of operation. I point out that \$1 000 000 is only chicken feed. We would be selling out so many aspects of this State for \$1 000 000 a year. I cannot accept that that will solve any of our economic problems at Government level—\$1 000 000 out of the total budgetary allocation!

Mr Blacker: That's 60c a person.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: That is right, and it will really have no significant impact on the Government coffers at all. Secondly, I do not believe that the employment impact will be very beneficial. Members may recall that, in my Address in Reply speech on my return from my self-paid study tour in 1980, I commented on the relationship between the tourist industry and the role of employment. I stated that the figures required closer examination, because I am not absolutely convinced that there is always a direct nexus between an increase in tourist dollars and an increase in employment. I quoted figures relating to various countries in Europe over a period which did not indicate a definite relationship. However, those figures suggested that employment in the tourist industry may be quite susceptible to economic ills.

A casino must rank as one of the most unnecessary tourist attractions and as a luxury in every sense of the word. Therefore, in terms of the person who spends money and whose budget is under pressure, a casino is expendable; he would ignore it. Therefore, employment in a casino would fluctuate according to the economic well-being of the State at large much more than would many other industries. We have had enough problems in this State over the years in respect to elements of our economic base being susceptible to fluctuations in the national economy, and I seriously doubt the virtue of introducing another such element.

The member for Mallee made the point very well that anyone who suggests that a casino would be a boost for the construction industry really has not closely analysed the problems in this State in that regard. South Australia has enough construction needs at present which could well be attended to without it being claimed that the casino is the only option we have. In fact, the construction of the casino would supplant another construction option or a set of construction options in this State. It would not add anything at all. In fact, I would like some answers from the Minister on what sort of funding arrangements may end up applying to the payment for construction.

We know that Commonwealth and State superannuation funds have been used for what I believe are sometimes speculative investment projects. Shopping centres have been developed and various other investments have been undertaken, and sometimes I believe that that has not been the most appropriate use of investment money. Is there a danger that money from Government superannuation funds, for

example, will be used in this instance? If that is the case, I believe that moneys over which the Government has some degree of advisory power will be directed away from other more productive uses into this avenue.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: That's very much speculation, though, isn't it?

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: It is speculation at present, but I know that the Minister will put the matter to rest if my suggestion is without foundation. It has also been suggested that the casino will attract tourists to South Australia.

I do not think anything would suggest that that would be so. It may have been the case, if the casino was to be the first in the nation, that it would attract tourists. I think there is no doubt that Wrest Point, in Tasmania, has attracted tourists. It may have been the point if it had been the second, and I am even prepared to concede that, if it had been the third or the fourth, there might have been some residual flow, but this will not be in that ranking. It will be low down, very late on, in the list of casinos to be built in this country. There will be no more untapped tourist casino market to be drained into this State.

As for the international circuit, my belief is that a few casinos around the world make up the international casino circuit that the jet set (such as they are, and if we desire them to be coming here) frequent: for example, Monaco, Macao, Las Vegas and perhaps Baden Baden and such places. I am prepared to concede that Wrest Point, in Tasmania, or perhaps Alice Springs may be on that circuit or may end up on that circuit, but there will be only one in Australia that will do that, and it will not be the one established in South Australia. We can write off any suggestion that we will be receiving a flood of international tourists in this State as a result of a casino.

I believe that there is no argument to be made that it will stem the flow of tourists out of this State. There are positive things we can do for tourist promotion in South Australia to stop the flow of tourists out of this State other than building a casino, because I do not believe that casino hunting is the prime motive taking South Australian families on their holidays elsewhere. There are other factors involved and, unless we answer those problems, these people will not stay home because we have built a casino.

One of the most serious allegations of all, however, is that regarding the role of the criminal element in South Australia or interstate in any casino that might be built. I found the programme on *Four Corners* some weeks ago a frightening programme when it talked about the extent to which criminal elements can get involved in and control in a wide number of ways a casino development—very frightening indeed. I am amazed that the Government should have introduced such a Bill after that programme went to air. I could possibly have understood it before that.

The aspects that concern me about the criminal element are two-fold: first, there is the aspect of the management; secondly, there is the aspect of the clientele. The Minister has indicated that the proposal would be under the most strict statutory regulations, and I can accept that perhaps there may be a higher degree of honesty achieved in the management of any casino here than may well exist in many overseas casinos. I am prepared to accept the contention that the administration or management of casinos in Tasmania and the Northern Territory may well be free of anything other than the ordinary level of corruption that may exist in the business community. I certainly think we could ensure that it would happen if it were Government controlled and if, at any unfortunate stage, a casino gets through, I would support its being controlled by the Government, but the more worrying aspect is the criminal element with regard to the clientele.

When I was in Tasmania last year, I asked why people should invest or bet large sums of money at a casino. Why should they do it if they have any brains at all? The mathematics of the situation must tell anyone that, if you run a casino, you pay the salaries of a large number of people, you pay the dividends of the company that operates the casino, you pay tax to the Government, and that must be coming from somewhere. It is coming from the gambling dollar, the dollar that is being bet. For all the money put in, that has to be paid for, and there is only a lesser amount available for return to the investors on the casino floors.

Why should those people gamble, knowing full well that, when it all comes out in the wash, they must lose? They might win on one night or they might have a string of wins for a few nights, but finally, if everything is fair and above board and the running of the boards is quite without reproach, statistics must come home to roost and guarantee the investor takes home less than he took along, and it is a good percentage less. Many people invest their money, large sums of money. They have worked hard, or maybe they have not worked hard, but they have used a degree of economic skill or cunning, depending on the individual, to get that money, so they are not without the ability to assess these things.

An honourable member: Sometimes it is borrowed money.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, sometimes it is borrowed money. Why should they do that? The suggestion was put to me very strongly by people I spoke to that of course casinos represent a laundromat for money, a place where dirty money can be cleaned, criminal money, or where undeclared income can be hidden to avoid tax. The idea is that if you can claim that money came from a casino, a large sum of money, there is no record to prove that it was not won on the gambling tables. You could claim that, but it can come from anyone of a number of sources—criminal activities or money you have not declared against your tax.

It has been put to me that the percentage rakeoff that such people have to pay for legitimate money, money that can be declared for taxation, is less than the tax rate, so the investor is still ahead, has still made some money, rather than if he had declared it for tax. As for criminal money, thank goodness we do not have provision for criminal money to be declared legally untaxed without recrimination. So, they clean it up at the casino and lose some money, which they are prepared to do, because now it has become legitimate and they can use it. I cannot see that we would want to encourage in this State such a money laundromat, and I cannot see any other way in which a casino could end up.

It must end up being a point of access for criminal money to be laundered and cleaned. How can we prevent that happening? What statutory regulations can be imposed that could prevent that happening? Any Government, I believe, that would want to raise its own tax revenues on the basis of such activities, knowing full well the sources of the money, would deserve discredit.

That brings us to the point of the Select Committee. I had been prepared to support that, and I had been answering correspondence from various people who were asking me to oppose the casino legislation. The member for Semaphore introduced the previous legislation. I wrote back to those people saying that I was going to oppose the legislation, but they wanted me to oppose the Select Committee proposal of my colleague the member for Gilles. I wrote back saying I was not going to do that, because I was convinced that the member for Gilles envisaged in his motion a wide brief for the Select Committee, and I thought that that was an appropriate forum for those in the community who had views about a casino to make their opinions known. Surely, in the spirit of debate and investigation we could not oppose such an activity. I presumed that the Select Committee

anticipated by the Minister was going to be the same sort of Select Committee, and in that light in the early stages I had been saying, 'Let us support that Select Committee', but I am now worried that that might not be the case. Will the Select Committee be able to investigate the question of the laundering of criminal money? Will it be able to investigate the incidence of that in other casinos? Will it be able to investigate ways to control it, if you can control it? Will it be able to investigate how to stop the subtle corruption of management? *Four Corners* pointed out how that could still happen, albeit that the management desired to be straight; it could still be affected by subtle pressures from the criminal world.

Will the Select Committee investigate all of that? Will it investigate the impact of the industry on this State, the way in which it will enhance and solidify the employment base of this State? Will it investigate, in depth, social aspects, such as impact on the family or any effect on the incidence of gambling addiction? What will the Select Committee investigate? The answers that the Minister gives to those questions will determine my opinion on this entire Bill.

In the few minutes I have left I want to raise an alternative. It is said that the casino will bring benefits to South Australia; that those who would deny a casino are denying this money to the State. I have spoken about the motives of simply obtaining money at any price—one could suggest that the Government Printer go into the business of printing pornography, because it is a source of money, but surely we would not support that, because we have some scruples, I hope. However, what other suggestions do we have, other than to increase taxes at the State level? I have been intrigued to note what certain Governments do in other parts of the world. I refer to two: one is the Austrian Government, which for a very long time has been involved in a lottery system, an international lottery. In more recent times certain of the German State Governments have done the same. I have an advertisement from the North-West German State lottery. The gist is that these lotteries are not lotteries run in the local community, in the local financial market, draining money that is already there, but they are in fact run on the international economic market, trying to attract funds from outside the local economic community and to bring them inside so that they are bringing in a net addition of funds. They have very expensive ticket prices, but they can be purchased in smaller units, and the proceeds are in fact quite considerable. I shall quote from an article about the Austrian lottery system.

Mr Mathwin: I hope you are not going to quote in German.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: This happens to be in English. Their current lottery is their 114th lottery, so members will realise that they have been doing it for a long time. It pays a first prize of \$US650 000 and it pays many other prizes: in fact, there is a total of over 40 000 cash prizes. From the figures I have worked out the total prize money is \$US21 190 000. Total revenue from the tickets sold—and there are 72 000 full tickets sold at \$468 each, but they can be purchased in half ticket or quarter ticket units—is \$33 696 000, which nets a gross proceed of \$12 500 000. It is equal to 12 years proceeds that this State Government would obtain from a casino. Accordingly, it would not need to be held all that often and the advantages are that we would attract to it not only money from outside our own economic community but also foreign currency which would be of considerable benefit.

Another lottery is run by a German State Government, and they receive a revenue of 360 000 000 Deutschmarks, a payout in prizes of 188 000 000 Deutschmarks, with gross proceeds of 171 000 000 Deutschmarks, which is approxi-

mately \$84 000 000. They also have been running these for quite some time. The proceeds of that lottery go to the governing authority, to the Government of that particular area.

If we are genuine in providing employment in this State, it could be said that we should have such an international lottery system in an attempt to draw on funds from overseas as the Austrians and the north-west States of Germany do, and we could use that money specifically for assistance to the manufacturing sector or industry in this State at large, to provide jobs that will last, jobs that will give us a stable economy, not jobs that will be attached to the periphery of the economy at large.

The very fact that there is a growing number of these lotteries being run on the international market indicates that they are finding buyers for the tickets; they are successful. The Austrians, as I have said, have run 114 of these lotteries to the present time. The North-West German State lottery has run 68.

Mr Mathwin: The larger populations must be taken into account.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: The point is that they are conducted on the international market. The North-West German State lottery is advertised in the *Far Eastern Economic Review*, so that lottery is obtaining purchasers from this zone of the world. The Austrian lottery is advertised in the international *Herald Tribune*, which as members would know is distributed all over Europe and all over East Asia as well. I am making this proposition as a real alternative. If we are having to sell out because we are so short of money and must have a casino to bring in this paltry \$1 000 000 for the State coffers, then I pose what I have outlined as an alternative suggestion as a way by which we can bring money into this State, money that would go to the State Government and money that could then flow on to real job creation. I believe that proceeds should be tied to something positive like real job creation; it should not be used in another kind of fund which would allow the Government revenue to be saved elsewhere, which would allow it to put extra money into the Health Fund for example, so that health funds from Consolidated Revenue could be chopped off from the other end.

Rather, a purpose for the money could be chosen which has not yet been considered to a significant degree. That is why I raised the proposition of job creation assistance to industry which would help industry to provide jobs that would last in this State. I know this debate will be a very long one and the Minister will have much to hear and he may not be able to reply to all the comments made, but I repeat the point: the questions that I have raised about the breadth of the Select Committee, its terms of reference and what it will be entitled to investigate will determine my vote; therefore, if the Minister chooses to ignore those questions, so be it; I will accept that. I point out that my view is dependent entirely upon the Minister's answers. However, at the third reading stage I propose to vote against a casino.

Mr GLAZBROOK (Brighton): May I say how much I enjoyed that part of the debate that the member for Salisbury offered, because he raised some very interesting and thought-provoking points. I only wish that his colleague, the speaker who preceded him, had contributed something to the debate in that way, because we would then have had the benefit of his thoughts on a wider range of issues.

In consideration of my contribution to this debate, I have sought to ascertain opinions from within my electorate over the past few months on this very question. I have tried not to veer from a belief that I was elected to represent people and should endeavour to present their views in as wide a

field as possible. Concerning a Bill such as this one, for which there is the facility of a Select Committee at the end of the second reading debate, we can afford the opportunity for South Australians to personally present submissions on their thoughts. It also gives a member's constituents the opportunity to comment after reading the debate and after reading the reports in newspapers. My belief is that there is a majority acceptance within the community on the question of whether South Australia should have a casino or not. My personal belief is based on 20 years experience within the tourist industry. Thus, in speaking to this Bill, I want to put forward arguments for consideration concerning the effect that the establishment on a casino in South Australia would have on the field of tourism.

My colleague the member for Fisher has had attributed to him some statements in the *Sunday Mail* last week (and also I might add the member for Salisbury made a statement a short while ago) with the belief that a casino would have little effect, if any, in attracting additional tourists to South Australia, particularly in view of the fact that Tasmania, Queensland and the Northern Territory already have, or will have shortly, such establishments. Whilst that argument may have some basis of validity in regard to attracting additional tourists from those particular States where there are already casinos established, I believe that both the member for Salisbury and my colleague the member for Fisher have overlooked one of the most important markets world wide in tourism; that is, 57e convention trade.

Most people connected with tourism and the convention trade will tell you that it is a very highly sought after trade. During my 20 years of involvement within the tourist industry, I was connected in part with an organisation that was generally known as I.C.C.A., the International Convention and Conference Association, which is a world-wide association that deals solely in the convention and conference trade. Conventions are generally organised between two and eight years in advance. Some of these cater for as large a number as 3 000. Indeed, the largest of the conventions I can remember is the one held by the International Lions Club each year, which sometimes boasts in excess of 6 000 people.

Economically, conventions can be of huge benefit to a successful country, the State and the venue. As an argument, I would like to put forward to members to consider, I ask them to suppose that South Australia had a complex that included first class accommodation, a hotel of world-class standing, a convention centre as such, and a casino and entertainment complex. Let us further suppose we could accommodate in this State 3 000 such delegates at any one time. These conventions usually cover a period of a week to 10 days, so if each delegate spent on an average of say \$600 each over this period of time on hotel accommodation, meals and entertainment, we would see an expenditure for that period in the order of about \$1 800 000, which money would be spread around the community on hotel accommodation and entertainment.

Thus, if we did have such a facility then perhaps we might be fortunate enough to secure 20 or more of these types of conventions and they could be attracted to South Australia each year. Some members may perceive this as a pipe dream. Of course, it would remain a pipe dream unless we can attract convention tourists, along with the general tourist trade, to South Australia. The question may be posed: will a casino bring this about? The answer is simply 'No, not alone; it will not'. The same argument could be put about a new hotel and again it could be given about a new convention centre, for each would be greeted with the same sort of response; alone they will not work, alone they will not generate large increases of trade. However, if we were to put these facilities together to bring about a

complex of facilities, the answer most definitely must be 'Yes'.

Some uninformed people may argue that South Australia has enough beds to offer the tourists that come and that we hope will come to South Australia, so the argument for another hotel is false, but the simple fact is that South Australia has a shortage of first-class beds. At present we can only boast of approximately 2 000 first-class beds in the metropolitan area of Adelaide. Therefore, to cater for a convention trade of around the 3 000 mark and also for the historic tourist trade, we would need other hotels and facilities.

I am also certain that, once South Australia has an international airport, we will also become embarrassed by the shortage of first-class beds. Others will argue we simply do not need a convention centre, as we already have sufficient space and venues. Again, I believe that that argument is fallacious. The largest venue that we have is capable of accommodating around 2 000 people, and that venue is the Festival Theatre. I will speak later regarding the difficulties that using such an establishment poses for the holding of a convention.

Thus, our offering to the convention world is limited by the availability of space and the facilities that we have to offer them. The largest convention centre within Australia is capable of holding some 2 000 to 3 500 delegates; therefore, Australia does need a facility to compete with the world-wide international convention trade. Competition in the convention trade is very intense for those who are brave enough to attempt it. However, the prize to be won in attempting to win that convention trade is calculated in millions of dollars of expenditure by those delegates. It also provides literally hundreds of jobs within the tourist industry and allied industries, both of which commodities we seek in South Australia.

We have heard from previous speakers about some of the increases in accommodation and arrival figures in Tasmania, and I understand that the Federal Hotels plan to build a \$18 000 000 convention centre in Hobart, which will adjoin the Wrest Point hotel and casino complex. That convention centre will be based on theatre-style accommodation for delegates and it will cover some 2 000 people, so all of a sudden they have expanded their horizons and visions of what they need to provide.

I also understand that the Northern Territory is completing a complex which should be in use early this year and which also includes convention facilities. Western Australia is seriously considering and are having a very close look at this extremely lucrative trade, whilst Queensland has already been chasing this and is very deeply committed to the convention area and the extension of facilities which they feel are needed to attract that type of customer. Each State has realised that a hotel alone and a casino alone simply will not work. Thus, commitments to overall complexes incorporating the three facilities has already become mandatory for success. For South Australia to even compete in the convention States stakes, we must be in a position to offer at least equal if not similar facilities. To believe that we can compete without one of those three ingredients, I believe is to bury one's head in the sand and to also tie the hands of our convention and tourism entrepreneurs behind their backs, making it so difficult for them to compete.

The difficulties of using existing facilities such as the Festival Theatre are fairly obvious when we look at its offerings. Conventions, as I stated earlier, are planned between two and eight years ahead.

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

Mr GLAZBROOK: At the Festival Theatre, which is really designed as a live theatre, no guarantees can be given as to the actual availability so far ahead of time for the

use of the building as a convention centre. The arts take preference, and quite rightly so, for the Festival Theatre was built for that purpose, so until the trustees have established their theatrical year's calendar, other booking requests must wait. Therefore, those who utilise such facilities are only using band-aid measures to attract the convention trade or, rather, what is left.

What South Australia needs, in my belief, is a multi-purpose centre designed first and foremost as a modern convention building with a flexibility covering a wide range of uses; in other words, a multi-use centre. I also believe that it would need to have a minimum capacity of about 500 and a maximum capacity of about 4 000. Accompanying this we need a minimum of 500 first-class beds and finally, of course, the casino. Harking back to the public statement in the *Sunday Mail* of last week attributed to the member for Fisher, it seems also that he is somewhat at odds in his belief with the move that has been made in Tasmania, which opens its second casino, in Launceston, on 12 May next.

The Wrest Point report by Corporate Communications Pty Limited and published in March 1981 shows the tourism impact in Tasmania. This particular document, whilst I have found it to be full of interesting resource material, I must admit, does give one the impression that it is perhaps more one-sided than what one would have hoped. However, in this document on tourism and the effects of the casino in Tasmania, I note a quotation from it attributed to the Minister for Tourism (Mr Michael Barnard), who described Wrest Point's performance in the 1970s as being 'of immeasurable help in launching a new era of tourism'. He went on to say:

Since its inception, the hotel-casino has been the driving force for expansion in the tourist industry. 'It has had a more dramatic impact on the community than any other single thing in Tasmania. It has seen an incredible rise in tourists, and it has opened up doors in the community which may never have otherwise been opened.'

Mr Spencer Logue, Chairman of the Tasmanian Tourist Council, said:

The hotel-casino still rates high as a tourist motivator: visitors don't necessarily want to play the casino—but they do want to see it.

There are many other comments in this document relating to the question of the impact of this type of facility within the tourist area but, as I have been saying, my interest is in the impact it would have on conventions and why I personally believe that having some facility that is capable of being seen as an equal to what other facilities are offered in other States has quite a lot of relevance. There is a note headed, 'Conventions: leading the way', which states:

Tasmania's Minister for Tourism (Mr Barnard) described Federal Hotels plans for its new convention centre as the most exciting single aspect of Wrest Point planning.

He goes on to explain about the investment of an additional \$15 000 000 to \$18 000 000 in building another 100 luxury bedrooms and the convention centre, which will seat 2 000 people. The report further states:

And when it starts operation it will take Tasmania to the forefront in attracting national and international conventions. Says the Executive Director of the Tasmanian Convention and Visitors Bureau, Mr David Weston:

It will probably be without equal in the Pacific Basin region as a hotel-convention centre.

Wrest Point is not moving into a new market but expanding an already established one. It was the first hotel group in Tasmania to pursue the convention market and it presently has facilities to cater for conferences of up to 800 people. Up to December 1980, 736 conventions had been held at the hotel-casino complex, which required the accommodation of 129 490 guests.

The interesting thing was that for the 1981 period the projection was for a further 65 conferences with approximately 10 300 guests. It concludes with a comment that

conventions are big business. The comment they are making in this Wrest Point report goes along with the thoughts that I have had for a long time that conventions can benefit a State that is prepared to go out and attract that sort of business. I also believe that we must bear in mind the multiplier effect of this form of tourism. It is a known fact that for every \$1 that is invested in tourism, we can expect a return of approximately \$2.62. It is also acknowledged by the Department of Trade and Industry that, for every 30 to 35 visitors, one additional job is created. The employment market, I believe, is extremely important in this argument, not necessarily as a means to achieve an end in getting a casino in South Australia but in solving so many of our pressing problems created through unemployment.

A philosophy that I have held for an extremely long time and espoused as long ago as 15 years is that I believe a properly co-ordinated scheme of major standing will certainly have the ability of creating hundreds of jobs in a whole range of situations. I also believe that, if we remain over-zealous in protecting society from a system which, if controlled rigidly and policed to ensure a minimum of repercussions to our constituents and the people of South Australia, we are in danger of turning our back on another solution to reach levels of employment that will benefit or be of benefit to hundreds of South Australians unfortunate enough to be out of work and struggling to survive.

The question of the unemployment matter in relation to the development of tourist projects has been a major problem in my mind, particularly when I look at the social ills of our current society, which I believe are equally as bad as, if not worse than, what may be created by a casino, particularly if that casino operation were policed and regulated to the degree that I believe it should, but it is a fact that forms of gambling in this State are really quite extensive.

It is also believed, of course, that gambling in private is a very common practice, from unlicensed lotteries to games of two-up. Indeed, if we look at the area of gambling that covers racing, lotteries, X-lotto, pools, bingo tickets, quick cash tickets, and money tickets, that you will find in delicatessens and so forth, to me it is not really a question of a further decline in the area of morality but perhaps an extension of the range of facilities, and this to only a few people who perhaps would patronise such an establishment.

I know, in looking at the Tasmanian document again on the impact, that they make an interesting statement that they had been able to identify approximately 500 people who had become compulsive gamblers. The interesting thing in their statement was that the casino operators had joined community welfare in counselling those people recognised as compulsive gamblers. The query in one's mind is whether they were compulsive gamblers before the introduction of the casino or whether they became compulsive gamblers after. The report does not tell us that. I think they are areas that need to be researched.

Mr Peterson: It does say that the majority of them were horse-racing gamblers.

Mr GLAZBROOK: There are references to horse-racing. They identify 500, but they do not say how many to each specifically. There are many organisations, even some churches, which run raffles of chance to raise funds for some purpose or other. There are those who regularly play cards in the privacy of their own home, even for money. All those forms seem to be acceptable in our society, bearing in mind the illegality of the latter. Regulations and laws will need to be designed to protect those who cannot control their compulsive gambling habits and who perhaps need to be controlled.

Regulations will be required to ensure that money used is controlled. We heard the member for Salisbury talk about the laundering of money. We would need to ensure that

crime and criminals are kept out of the system. We would need to ensure that safeguards are taken to prevent people from spending their housekeeping and living expenses at the casino. I am sure that regulations will do just that, because if time permitted, I could quote again from some of the documents, and I am sure other members will, in relation to how they have controlled that sort of thing in the Tasmanian situation, but to bar a casino from the State which will provide for jobs and an upsurge in the flow of the tourist dollar, and revenue for the health care of South Australians, is surely an argument that we must consider, because to me unemployment is known to create hardship.

It increases some crimes. We know it increases poverty. It causes break-ups in families. With unemployment there is a decline in morality. There is a decline in social acceptance. There are break-downs of health and, there is mental strain. It is demoralising to the people. It is sometimes unjust and degrading and there are even cases of suicide by people who cannot cope with the strain of being unemployed. It certainly can mean the loss of the family home and it creates hardship for the children of those families, so it is a social ill, but it is a subject that I believe demands action.

I therefore see the use of additional facilities as being able to encourage more people to this State, and particularly in the convention area and with a controlled casino acceptable to South Australians, perhaps as a catalyst to achieve some employment relief and to increase the wealth of the State in order that it can continue to benefit all South Australians. I do not believe that it is a panacea to solve all of our ills, just as I believe that Roxby Downs is not the total panacea for additional income for the State, but each in its part must play a role in the development of the State and to benefit all of us. I do not believe for one moment that we are a wowsier State, nor do I believe the vast majority of South Australians are compulsive gamblers. Therefore, if adequate protection is afforded to those few in the community who cannot control themselves, the advantages to us must outweigh the dire predictions and projections of those who are against this Bill. I believe in the last few minutes I should perhaps explain my reasons for rejecting the previous Bill, which was introduced by the member for Semaphore. I believe it was deficient in so many areas, offered no protection, and was almost unworkable. Had it reached the Committee stage, I was prepared to move substantial amendments. In fact, I have in my hand a copy of the amendments that were prepared by the Parliamentary Counsel to cover the event of the Bill reaching the Committee stage, but it did not go that far and I kept the amendments.

Mr Millhouse: I do not believe it.

Mr GLAZBROOK: The member for Mitcham, if he does not believe it, may like to read the copy, because I did not forge it. The only thing that would have remained in that original Bill was the title and I did not proceed simply because others also thought the Bill was deficient and that, together with the lack of time afforded to members to debate the question logically, I believe, barred me from making any contribution to the debate at that time that was worth while, but I believe this particular Bill offers a sound base for debate. We have heard the member for Salisbury give some very good and rational reasons why he personally did not favour the casino, and I hope that my contribution tonight might show some reasons why I, as a person who has been involved in the tourist industry for 20 years, believe that it has some benefits to offer.

I think the subject needs to be aired rationally. It needs to have the opportunity afforded to the public of South Australia to make contributions by expressing themselves. If they do not believe in it and if they feel there are some parts of it which need to be purged, they need to be heard.

For those reasons, I believe the Bill is worth consideration of this House in a logical and proper manner, so therefore I support the Bill and hope that people will understand my contribution as being an argument to consider in this debate.

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): I would like to refer first to the statement by the Minister of Recreation and Sport in this House in answer to a question concerning the casino Bill when it was introduced by the honourable member for Semaphore. The question was asked on notice on 4 March 1981 and the reply was: I can assure the honourable member that it (referring to the Morphettville Racecourse) will not be used as a casino—certainly it will not unless there is a great change of heart in this State. I just cannot foresee that happening at all during the term of this Government. I am quite prepared to make that categorical statement.

I wonder what has changed his mind over the past three or four months. The Minister of Tourism, the Hon. Jennifer Adamson, said this concerning the casino issue:

I do not see the State Government altering its position on this issue.

Mr Randall: How about telling us what you think?

Mr PLUNKETT: If the member for Henley Beach will be patient, I will do that, and I intend to tell him what a lot of other people in this House thought. I will then tell him what I said. I said it on radio, so there are no problems about what I said and will say tonight, I now refer back to 7 November 1973, when the then Premier, Don Dunstan, introduced a Bill along similar lines. When he introduced the Bill, some of the arguments were raised that are being raised tonight concerning tourism. This House would sacrifice its soul for tourism. It is marvellous what it would do for that extra quid for tourism.

Mr Millhouse: Speak for yourself.

Mr PLUNKETT: Robin, you will get a mention later on. I will come to that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must refer to members by their districts, not by their Christian name or surname.

Mr PLUNKETT: I apologise. First, I will deal with the member for Fisher. I will be very surprised if that honourable gentleman changes his mind and supports the casino. I will quote what he said in 1973:

'I do not support the establishment of a casino in any part of South Australia ...'

So, it is no use saying, 'Oh, that was a casino. We did not support that because it was 80 km from Adelaide.' I would like that to be a point in relation to any part of South Australia. He goes on to say:

'... whether it be 80 km from Adelaide or otherwise, I am confident that the majority of people in my district hold the same view.'

Of course, that was in 1973. It may be that the constituents in that electorate have changed their minds. However, I would be very surprised if the member for Fisher has changed his mind. I do not think that he has, because it would have been only over the last one or two days. However, one never knows. They put the heavy on the Liberals over the other side, and I have seen a lot of things change. They have got the weak blokes like the member for Henley Beach that they do not have to change. He is a changer, anyway. He is a switcher, and switches accordingly. He goes along with the lot. Later in the piece I may get very insulting, because I think I know why members on the other side have changed their minds over the past four or five months. This is the power of the money. It makes a big difference. However, first I would like to come back to what the member for Fisher said in 1973. I am quoting only portions of it. I apologise to the member, but it is with no disrespect. It may even assist him when he speaks later in the night, because it will show that he is not the hypocrite that a lot

of his comrades are on the other side of the House. He said:

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.

That is one of the reasons why I think that the honourable gentleman will not change his mind. Let us see what another honourable gentleman, the Hon. Dean Brown said. I will not quote the whole speech, but I would like to quote portions. He said:

The main argument advanced in favour of a casino in South Australia has been that it will attract tourism to the State.

There it is again—tourism. Surely, this is not the same Government that, just prior to Christmas, did not have any thought whatsoever. They were still in Government then. They will not be next Christmas. They did not have any thought then for the casino and for tourism. But they have now. Do you know why? Because I think that there will be an election by September. I hate to do this, but I honestly think that the money has a lot of power with the Liberal Government. I think that it is very important. I think that they already have the money for the next election.

An honourable member: Have they been paid in advance?

Mr PLUNKETT: Yes. I think they have been paid in advance. I hate to say that, because there are people on the other side for whom I have respect. There are some people, I do not have to mention their names, but there are a couple of them over there for whom I have no respect at all.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PLUNKETT: They are twisters and I have never had any time for twisters. I will quote another gentleman from the other side—one of the people for whom I have much respect. I would like to apologise to him, although he is out of the Chair at present. It is the Speaker to whom I refer. He was then the Leader of the Opposition. I will quote what he said in 1973:

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 ... 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 would like to add to that I am not trying to reflect on the present Speaker of the House, because I honestly think that that gentleman, if it comes to a vote and if he has to register a vote, will still be like the member for Fisher. However, there are others on that other side who have no worries in the world. They have already changed their minds, and I think that there are reasons for those people to do so. The promise has already been made. It may be that the Sangsters and the Murdochs already know who has the contract for the casino. We will not have to look around for the boats on the river! I guarantee that there are plenty of people on the other side who know how much money can be put in for the next election.

Mr Ashenden: Sustentation fees?

Mr PLUNKETT: The Liberals are not worried about sustentation fees. I will tell the member, while I am standing here, that this is one way in which he will get his finance for the next election. You have already put one Bill through here. I refer to the perpetual leases legislation. You get—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will link up his remarks.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Napier. The honourable member must address himself to the matter before the Chair, and cannot refer to previous debates.

Mr PLUNKETT: Thank you, Sir. I should have realised. I should not have said that while you were in the Chair.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I take it that the honourable member is not reflecting upon the Chair.

Mr PLUNKETT: Most certainly not, Sir. I would like to refer back now to the Hon. Dean Brown, the member for Davenport. I would like to quote from further down. He has already said that he does not back a casino. He also says:

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 minimise 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.

This is the Hon. Dean Brown saying this. He continued:

The South Australian Young Liberal Council voted clearly against the establishment of a casino.

So, you are not going to get any of your money from the Young Liberals for your next election unless they have changed their mind since 1973. I think that they have had a fair stomach of you. He further says:

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.

That is the honourable gentleman from Davenport. There is another member to whom I would like to refer, namely, the Hon. Steele Hall, who is not in the House now.

Mr Ashenden: He is not here.

Mr PLUNKETT: I know, but he is still with the Liberals. I would like to quote one passage, because he supported the Bill. He was with the small Liberals then.

Mr Hemmings: Is that when they kicked him out?

Mr PLUNKETT: I think they did. He was one of the Hon. Robin Millhouse's cohorts in those days. He is a former Liberal Premier of the State, and was in and out a fair bit. It is hard to keep up with him, but he is back with the Liberals in the Federal Parliament now. I quote from near the end of his speech where he defended casinos. He must have wanted a bit of finance that year. He said:

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 believe 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 none.

That was the time when the Liberals spoke strongly against introducing a lottery in South Australia. It has changed now, of course. In those days, the Liberals used to give themselves pet names. They used to call the Hon. Mr Millhouse and the Hon. Mr Steele Hall Heckle and Jekyll. They have changed slightly in their sarcasm, because sarcasm was always recognised as the lowest form of wit. When one cannot come up with something witty or interesting to say, one comes up with something like the Liberals are doing at present. I do not accuse all the Liberals of this, but there is a handful who have got nothing going for them whatsoever, and that is what they are left with.

Mr Randall: You're joking.

Mr PLUNKETT: The person who just spoke, the member for Henley Beach, would be the greatest offender. He will not be worrying much about the casino because he has probably got only about another three months. This is what the Hon. Mr Millhouse said:

I have grave reservations on moral grounds, both direct and indirect, about the establishment of a casino.

Let us see later in the night when the honourable gentleman speaks how his morals are now, and see whether they have changed like some of those on the other side, like the member who spoke a few minutes ago, the member for Brighton. Dear oh dear! Before I proceed with that, I refer to the member for Kavel, Mr Goldsworthy. He did not mess around. He was rather honest right from the start in 1973, when he stood up and said:

I oppose the Bill. I will not canvass the arguments that have been put forward.

He is rather an abrupt, straightforward type of person when he does not want something. I am pleased that the Minister has come in. He missed what he said. He would not know about it, because he answered a question recently and said that he did not support it. I now move to the gentleman from Alexandra, the Hon. Mr Chapman, who was sure to have said something about this matter in 1973. He did, having said the following:

This afternoon we have learned that if one puts steel in the fire and gets it hot enough it will bend.

Of course this was when he first entered Parliament and was rather rough and raw. He still is, but that is how he started. He opposed the Bill. I might add that he has visited a few casinos since then. He continued:

The beginning and end of the Government's case for a casino—this is the same man—

is that it will afford some lift to our State Budget.

That is probably why the Liberals are introducing this Bill. He continued:

Before I comment on the Bill, I should like to quote from an article by Max Harris—

he was a good mate to the Liberals—

on 2 September, 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.

Further, he said:

I went to a casino.

He then told about winning on that night, which he probably did. The game was probably crook, because they were trying to win him, to get him to support a casino. The Hon. Mr Russack did not mess around, either. Those people now support the Bill. He said:

During the earlier debate on the motion concerning a casino, I spoke at some length.

He opposed it, too.

Mr Oswald: How do you know?

Mr PLUNKETT: I wanted to make it clear that there are some honest gentlemen on the other side. I am not saying that there are not. I am not criticising the member for Fisher, the Speaker or the Hon. Mr Russack, but I would like the other members who spoke to tell us why they have changed their minds in their three months.

Mr Ashenden: How did you vote last time?

Mr PLUNKETT: I will come to that. I have still 10 minutes in which to tell you that. Members opposite have not got off the hook yet. What would the member for Glenelg say? I would have liked to read all of his speech, but honourable members know what his speeches are like. I will quote from the last part:

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.

I wonder whether the honourable gentleman has those same figures, 698 to one, and now he is voting for it. My God! I have not much time left, so I cannot answer stupid interjections. I would now like to turn to the gentleman who has just spoken, the person who had the gallery*full

of Festival of Light people when the prostitution Bill was being debated. One would not consider it to be the same person standing here tonight supporting casinos. Nearly all the speakers have indicated that, besides tourism, casinos generate several other things. In all the articles I have read on casinos, it has been clearly indicated that prostitution goes hand in hand with them. Where was our honourable gentleman from Brighton, the great defender of the Festival of Light, when the prostitution Bill was being debated here? Why is he not here tonight? He has spoken in the debate. He gave tourism as the reason. My God, it must be important tourism.

Mr Hemmings: He is not supporting it?

Mr PLUNKETT: Yes. He gave reasons. I do not know whether he and the Festival of Light have fallen out; possibly they have. I suggest that many of his mates on the other side have had a similar falling out. Perhaps the member for Henley Beach is looking for something along the coast to help finance his election campaign. Perhaps they could promise a casino halfway between Glenelg and Brighton and Henley Beach, and they could get four for one, because the member for Hanson is very worried about the money for the election. The Liberal who stood against me in 1979 said that all the money was going to the member for Hanson. The Government has performed very badly, and the member for Hanson recognises that. That is why it bought him off with a car. He expected to be a Minister, so that Government gave him a car, but he has stopped talking about that recently.

Mr Becker: You write fairy stories.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr PLUNKETT: I am pleased that you are in the Chair, Mr Deputy Speaker, because you are always fair and you always protect the member who is on his feet. I was asked earlier what I support. I shall be serious.

Members interjecting:

Mr PLUNKETT: I have been serious throughout, but I will be serious now about what I support, because the member for Henley Beach and others have asked for my views. I want to give some examples of the two-faced hypocritical attitude of members opposite and how they can be bought. I hate a person who can be bought.

I was telephoned by a radio talk-back show when the member for Semaphore first brought in his Bill, and I was asked my opinion. I gave it. I like to gamble. I am an Australian, and I have always liked to gamble. I back a racehorse and I have played two-up, and I have been to the casinos in Tasmania and Darwin, as well as to a few unofficial ones when I was younger. I have played two-up in Broken Hill, and I played it when I was in the army. I like a bit of a plunge, but that is my business. My honest answer was that I would consider supporting legislation for a casino, but under certain conditions, not Liberal conditions. Being bought off is not for me.

If it will benefit the State, then let it benefit the State. Do not let the Government do what it has done with Murdoch and Sangster and sell the place out. That is the attitude of this Government. It must be fair dinkum. If it is to build a casino, it must be run by the Government and that can be successfully done, as has been shown in Tasmania. Anyone who has visited Tasmania and who has not come away with that impression has not had his eyes open. Even the church people, who had their doubts earlier, say that it is well run and they consider that it is of benefit to the State.

It must benefit the State by doing something to help the hospitals, for instance. It must not only benefit tourism, putting money in the pockets of a few people. I believe in tourism, but the benefits of a casino must go to the hospitals,

the unemployed, and the people in South Australia who are suffering; it must not go to the big-wigs who do not need the money. If it is done in that way, I will support it, but it must be run by the Government, and not by a shoddy private organisation.

We have heard what has been said recently in America and England about the casinos there, and the talk of thugs and washed money. Of course there will be washed money in gambling. There has been black money being washed as long as we have been on earth. Let us not be stupid about that. With Government control, one knows what money is being washed and from where it is coming. If a private organisation is running the casino there is no check on that.

I do not think this Government will be in office for much longer to make decisions, but if it is fair dinkum, and if this is not just an election gimmick for a quid in the pocket, it should say so. Hospitals in South Australia in the time of the Liberal Government have been shockingly run down. I have been trying to get the Government to do something about the disgraceful state of the Thebarton High School, because it is falling to pieces.

Under the conditions I have suggested, I would support a casino. I would like to see members opposite say why they have changed their minds. I would like to know. I appreciate what the member for Mallee said. I have a lot of time for what he did, because he spoke as he should have spoken. I do not think members opposite will let him speak tonight. If members opposite gag him, that is disgraceful, because he made a statement that he believed in. The present Premier, as member for Bragg, also opposed the Bill in 1973, so all the people on the other side gave their view on whether or not they opposed it. I suggest that some of them—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I oppose the Bill, as I have in the past and as I will continue to do in future.

Mr Millhouse: Even at this stage? Not even a Select Committee?

Mr EVANS: I suggest that the member for Mitcham is usually paid a lot to speak in other places, and I would prefer his voice to be heard where he can make a proper use of it financially to help himself. I oppose the concept but, if a casino is to be established, I support the comments of the previous speaker that it must be Government owned. I particularly support the concept that, if we are to have this form of gambling, it should be on the basis upon which the English law is established. I shall read that to the House for about the fourth time. It was included in my report of a study tour I made overseas, paid for by the State, to study casinos, but I am doubtful whether more than two members of the Parliament have bothered to check whether it is accurate, or checked it in the various countries that I visited through letters to our embassies, and so on. They have ignored it, but now those same members are prepared to set up a Select Committee, to look at the matter as a total Parliament, because that is the trend. I do not support that. The English concept is this:

The bases for the legislation were:

(1) For many it is basic human nature to gamble, and to prohibit gambling forces it underground with all the other undesirable elements, such as protection rackets.

I do not necessarily disagree with that statement. The concept continues:

(2) It should not have any connection with raising money as a form of taxation or to encourage tourism.

I stress that, and I agree with it. I am sorry that the member for Brighton, who came from that country, disa-

grees, but I shall come to his comments later. The concept continues:

It should cater only for the unstimulated demands of society. Enough places should be available to cater for this, but all advertising of gambling should be prohibited.

That is English law, and that is the way it is practised in relation to casinos as that country knows them. Those people who wish to seek them out can find and use them. It is one of the few places in the world where those three points established at law operate.

There are writers in newspapers who maintain that casinos are a great thing, that they have done no harm to the people of Monaco, for example, in respect to Monte Carlo, and that we should take note of that, and also the fact that the casino has been operating in Monaco for some time. Such people did not even bother to check to find out that no residents of Monaco are allowed to enter their casino and gamble. In that country people have identity cards, but we do not. It would be difficult for us to put such a system into practice. In France the responsibility for issuing licences was given to the equivalent of our local government, and in every case the local government authority that issues the licences prohibits its own residents from entering the casino. In Italy and Greece no public servant, no lawyer who operates trust accounts or who operates for people or organisations as treasurer, members of the armed forces or the Police Force are allowed to enter a casino. There is a severe penalty for any breach of this law. If that was done in this country there would be very few customers.

In Austria, if a person believes that a business associate is gambling too much or a partner in a matrimonial or domestic situation believes that the other partner is gambling too much, the aggrieved person has the right to go to any of the casinos in Austria, speak to the management and point out his concern, or such a person can direct a letter pointing out his concern and naming the individual. All the establishments are connected by a computer; everyone has an identity card; and the management is bound by law to carry out a credit check of the individual in question. Their credit-worthiness is checked and, if a person is believed to be gambling too heavily, due to observations made of the person, the management can invite that person in and say 'We believe that you are gambling too much and you are causing concern to others; we have done a credit check on you and this is your credit rating. Do you object or do you disagree with that?'

If the person disagrees, he or she is asked to give a statutory declaration stating his or her income or credit rating, but it is a statutory declaration that is kept only within the casino. It is similar to the situation concerning our income tax laws relating to a person's private dealings. The casino operators do not care whether a person is getting money by blackmail, gambling, prostitution, or wherever else; it can be from burglary (it does not matter), as long as a person can prove the extent of his income. A judgment is then made by the casino operation concerning how often the casino will let a person into the casino and the degree to which they will be allowed to gamble.

These operations state quite categorically that 70 per cent of the money that is played through the Austrian casinos comes from money that is never declared for taxation. In other words, it is either cash money from business deals or it is from some other operation that is illegal: 70 per cent of money goes through that casino by that method. That is one of my greatest objections to this form of gambling being established in this State, even though casinos exist in other places within the country.

I know that it can be argued that a person can hop on a plane and fly to another casino in Australia, whether it be the Northern Territory, Tasmania, or Queensland, which is about to establish a casino. In such cases the few dollars

spent on an air fare is nothing if such people want to clean up \$50 000. All they need to do is have a few people cash the cheques, collect the chips to go gambling, gamble for a while, stop and then begin again, not spend overly much, not caring whether they lose 10 per cent or 20 per cent of their stake if they are going to clean up \$50 000 or \$100 000. Once a person has the chips, he can go back at any time and cash them, take the money and then say that he has obtained a cheque from the operators for so much and show it to the Taxation Department, and, because the money came from gambling, no-one can do anything about it and the money has been cleaned up for all time.

It would be an interesting exercise if any Government in Australia ever has the guts to clean up the taxation evasion and the immoral practices that go with such practices in this country.

Mr Millhouse interjecting:

Mr EVANS: Nor has the honourable member said anything about it until he got into the position where he had no real effect on the Federal scene, and that is the real reason why he is opening his mouth now.

Mr Millhouse interjecting:

Mr EVANS: No, the individual has it. When that occurs, it will be interesting to see what the income of casinos will be, because throughout the world the only thing that allows a casino to survive is the fact that it is a place where people can clean up money—either money from tax avoidance or money that has been gained illegally. If that money could be taken away not one casino could survive.

In Switzerland, where they tightened up the law and made it very difficult for some of these people to operate (and it was very difficult for them to do so for a short period), the end result was that the casino at Lugano collapsed and went insolvent. It just could not survive with the competition. Let us be frank; we all know that that is one of the biggest problems. A Government or a Parliament can try, by legislation, to provide that it will not allow anyone with any business interests outside a State or Commonwealth or a particular country to have any interests in the operations of a casino. That is the English law, and we could do it here if we wished. However, the difficulty we have today concerns making sure that people who have contacts, whether it be with the Mafia or any other group, do not filter through the system.

We cannot clean up that type of racket in this city, where we do not even have a casino but where we have night club operations. We know that such things exist, and we know that the police cannot wipe it out and they have difficulty tracking it down, even though they spend a lot of time and effort trying to do so. Each and every one of us is aware of that. We know, in the main, perhaps who some of the key people are behind it, but we cannot even solve that problem, yet we maintain that we can control a casino.

The member for Brighton spoke about the benefits to employment arising from such an operation and its associated activities. This is a conscience issue, the same as the liquor question was, when we were arguing the age of majority back in 1969-70. I suppose, if one wants to draw a comparison, one could argue that changes in the provisions in the liquor industry create employment, because people must grow the grapes, the barley, the hops, and so on; that if a person is killed through an accident someone must make the coffin and do the undertaking, people must produce the flowers, the wreaths, and so on, and someone must dig the grave. If someone is injured, a person must make up the artificial limbs or a person must be involved in the rehabilitation in order to help a person pull himself back together again, or that nurses and so on are involved. There is a multitude of jobs pertaining to this area.

Most of us participate to some extent in the liquor industry with regard to consumption of liquor, and it could be argued that it is one of the greatest creators of employment within our community. We also know that when a conscience vote was taken concerning the liquor laws, back in those times when some people argued that the age of majority should be no lower than 20, the trend in Parliaments at that time was to get a quick vote, because the young were supposed to be so important, in proving that a Party was progressive and on the ball. Perhaps that is why the various sides of politics at the moment are chasing this carrot, because there are no more carrots left to create a stir in the community to show that a certain Party is a bit different from Parties in the past decade.

What happened with that vote that we took? We are now all scratching our heads, saying 'What are we going to do about the teenage drinking problem?' I draw that comparison because we all said that it would be all right and that there would be no problem. But now, the vast majority of us are saying, 'How do we tackle the problem?' We are unable to do anything unless we are able to change the law or bring out some form of identification, but we are frightened to do that because we would be accused of attempting to interfere with the rights of an individual. Similarly, with regard to a casino (and the member for Brighton and, in particular, the member for Morphett made this point), it could be said that we should not interfere with what an individual wishes to do.

In the main that is my philosophy also, but that will not operate unless you are prepared to say to the individual, 'Yes, we will give you the right to exercise that freedom and that right, but with it you also accept the responsibility that, if you end up being insolvent or you end up in difficulties, you do not go running to a Government department saying, 'The rest of the taxpayers should help me.' What we have tended to breed in recent years is irresponsibility in many areas.

One of my other arguments in recent times is that I believe we have developed a society that does not know how to plan for the future. We spend money on gambling and other things, and then later, when we may wish to settle down or purchase suitable accommodation, we cannot do so, because we have followed the path that has no financial return. I know that we have now reached the stage that more and more people are dependent upon Government support in such areas as housing and welfare, regardless of the current interest rates, which only make the situation worse. We are now getting to the point where, within a few years with the sort of measure that some members are supporting here tonight, more and more people will be saying, 'We want the Government to provide our housing because we ourselves have not been able to manage our own resources and finances.'

I do not accept the argument that with a casino there will be no more people gambling than those who already gamble at the races or trots or on lotteries and the pools. It has never proved to be the case, and I would be happy if at some time a Government in Australia carried out an investigation and inquired into the social consequences of some of these operations. I say that not on a moral basis, because I have at least sometimes participated, and still participate, in all those areas of gambling in a very moderate way. In other words, I may have been to the races, trots or dog-racing 20 of 30 times in my life. If I am in a city where there is a casino, and somebody says, 'Come along,' I will go along and make a donation, as it were, of \$20 or \$30, and then wish them farewell. So, I say this not on a moral basis at all but because I believe this activity has no real benefit to our society. In areas such as dog-racing and horse-racing we already have everyone in those codes telling

us, 'There is not enough money for us for what we want you to do; we want you to help us.' One such organisation would be happy if we gave them a casino licence. They believe that it would put them on the right financial track. The other two areas in question would not be too happy, nor would the other groups that would like to have a licence. But we have those groups asking the Government to help them.

If members argue that it is the same people, in the main, who go to the casinos who also bet on horse-racing and follow that form of gambling, how much greater is their problem going to be? When people talk to me about Tasmania, how much horse-racing takes place in that State?

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Every Saturday.

Mr EVANS: I ask the Minister who has interjected to what degree does it involve the major States? Those who go along to the races in Tasmania do so to lodge their bets on the races conducted in the mainland States. When Tasmania first set up a casino, there were relatively few motels and restaurants there, but of course, if they were going to have the only casino to be established legally in Australia they expected to have a massive boom in this area, and of course they did have. The member for Brighton is right when he says that they have committed themselves to extensions in Tasmania there hoping, first of all, to bring people in from New Zealand and other places, but they were not aware at the time that Queensland definitely had a licence coming up, and if a licence is granted in Victoria we will see what the consequences are for Tasmania, although do not forget that the operators there and in the Northern Territory are the same and that they can organise some cross-over benefits.

I am in favour of a convention centre. The number of convention centres in the world catering for 4 000 people (the figure mentioned by the member for Brighton) is minimal. The vast majority cater for about 1 000 or less, and for a city of this size I believe that it would be foolish to provide a convention centre of that size if we want to have a viable proposition. In the main, convention centres throughout the world, unless you go to a centre such as the one in Belgium, are non-profit organisations, supported by the provincial Government or whatever it may be.

Mr Lewis: With a multiple use.

Mr EVANS: The main centres successful in multiple use are those that have had a sufficiently large outside area for trade markets and that sort of thing. In the case of the Berlin centre, where they are attempting to cater for 10 000 people, great difficulties have been experienced. People have drawn a comparison with Nevada. Las Vegas came about because that State was in financial trouble. The idea was to establish the first gambling facility in a desert area and to pick up money from other States. I have not had time to check the figures but at a recent reception visitors to this Parliament told us that 70 per cent of the people in gaols in Nevada were from outside the State and had been apprehended within the area of the gambling facilities of Las Vegas. That may not be unusual in that State, but the statement was made that they have a tiger by the tail and they do not know how to get rid of it. Having started to become dependent on this activity, they did not know how to tackle the problem. Most people interviewed on this subject, when asked 'How many States of America prohibit gambling of any kind?' reply 'None,' when, in fact, roughly 50 per cent of them prohibit gambling altogether, and those States get by. Nevada is no better off. France had casinos reasonably early, in about 1907, but the vast majority of casinos started in the depression years, from 1928 onwards. Mussolini started the first one at about that time, and so they began to grow in big numbers in the depression years, because Governments were short of money; it did not matter

that people were short of money. What do we find now? When there is a scarcity of money throughout the world, and when people are feeling the pinch, the authorities are turning their minds to areas where they do not have to apply a tax but where they hope that people will contribute. Nearly all the casinos of Europe in the countries that have established them commenced in the 1930s. Germany had one in 1944, but then—

Mr Millhouse: What—during the war they started?

Mr EVANS: Germany had one in 1944; it was established previously but was operating from 1944.

Mr Millhouse: Where was that?

Mr EVANS: I think it was at Baden Baden.

Mr Millhouse: Surely there had been some there for a century.

Mr EVANS: That is not the case. In recent times the Austrian principle used has been regarded as being the best in Europe. The Austrian Casino Commission, which I will call it and which is operated under Government control with some private nominations on the board, is establishing casinos in Holland to run them for three years or longer until they are properly operating on a commission basis, and then they will be passed over to the Dutch Government.

The reason other countries are putting them in Europe is, first, to try to pick up the neighbouring clientele and, secondly, because there is a shortage of money and it is a method of raising money. I disagree with that concept totally. I say to this House, and to my colleague the member for Brighton, who I know has some knowledge of the tourist industry which I respect, that if you really want to attract tourists and you believe the casino is the means of attracting them—I disagree with that, but if you really believe that as a Parliament or as individuals—let us say that we are not going to make money out of the casino; we are going to set the odds so that all we want is operating costs and some money to pay for the capital invested in the buildings, and to gamble in the casino we set the best odds anywhere in the world. We then advertise outside the State as widely as we wish, say, 'Come to Adelaide; you will get the best odds available in the world. Come and clean your money up here. We do not care how rough or where you got it from; just bring it here and clean it up.' We are saying that it will be a tourist benefit: if that is the case, let it be just that.

I suppose that some people would ask where it should be. I have never supported the concept of a casino, but I have always said, and I believe I was the first to make the statement, that the West End site would be the best place for a convention centre, hotel, or that sort of complex. I always attacked the Victoria Square site. We know that the City Council and others let the operator in question get away with the smallest number of car parks that anybody could conceive would be accepted, and it was against any of the precedents applying to the number of car parks that should be provided, so that site was never really suitable for the proposed purpose.

As to the site that the member for Brighton suggested, over the top of the station yards at the Adelaide Railway Station, I suppose that over the years 10 or 15 people—and I have been one of them—have advocated that as an ideal spot for some form of development, such as a small convention centre, hotel, motel, car park or whatever it may be. That is not new. In fact, I believe that the former Minister of Transport, Mr Virgo, put up a proposition at one time as to how the Adelaide Railway Station could be redeveloped. Now we find ourselves locked into a decision on whether we support a casino or not. If this Parliament votes in favour of a casino, and that is the final vote of the Parliament, I will fight to make sure that it is Government owned.

I would argue strongly that cheques can never be cashed in the casino and returned to the owner. In other words, if the cheque is cashed to obtain chips, it would be an obligation on the casino operator to retain that cheque and to present it to the bank within two clear banking days. I believe that that is one way of making sure that if people do over-gamble their bank manager has knowledge of what is happening and they cannot go and buy the cheque back next day by borrowing from a friend and hoping to get away with it, and that is the English law.

I also believe strongly that we should guarantee that no outside interest has any chance—in other words, any person who has any business interests outside, I would say, the State, although some might argue Australia, but I know it is difficult to control that aspect, because the Companies Act—

Mr Millhouse: Don't you think we have any criminals in Australia?

Mr EVANS: The honourable member would know, because he represents them and makes a living from them. I believe that we should provide this control if we can, and also I would hope that we could control the advertising of such a venture, if ever it occurred, so that its advertising was restricted within this State. I would also like to ensure that it could not offer cheap food or drink, as it is offered in most casinos, to encourage people to come and participate in the operations.

In conclusion, I do not accept that a casino will provide any long-term benefit to the State in the way of tourism, employment or any other area except that, if it is considered in the same category as alcohol, it will create much employment, and if we want to create employment along those lines, let us have it. I oppose the Bill, and I will oppose any move to refer it to a Select Committee.

Mr MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): When the Government announced that there was to be a Bill, or when the Minister gave notice of the Bill, I was as surprised as anybody else, and I was almost immediately asked whether I would support it or not. I said, without much hesitation and no more thought, that I would. I based that on the fact that I was the only member in this House to support my good friend from Semaphore on his Bill. I did that because I had seconded the Bill, and as I thought the whole matter ought to be debated. I still believe it should be debated and I think that, in the light of what the Government has done now, the way in which Government members acted on the vote on that Bill was absolutely despicable.

As I have said on radio, they are a bunch of hypocrites to have done what they did, and the Labor Party is no better: They all voted against it because they did not want the Independent Labor man from Semaphore to get any kudos for it. I have no regrets whatever about supporting the Bill of the member for Semaphore, but it did lead me, without thinking, into saying that I would support this Bill. There are a number of other reasons that I can think of as to why this Bill should be supported, and I have made some of them public. First of all, I did think last week that it was almost inevitable that some time or another we would get a casino. The one thing that I do not want to happen is for us to go back to the Playfordian days when it was all 'thou shalt not'. We did not even have a lottery, a T.A.B. or anything. It was all going to be stopped, and South Australia was going to be pure and simple and that was that.

Then, of course, there was a change of Government, a change of heart, which I was part of, and it all happened anyway in South Australia, and the Liberal and Country League people were regarded as wowsers. I just do not know how long you can hold the floodgates back, if in fact

it is inevitable, but I must say that now I am not nearly so sure, a week afterwards, where I stand on this matter, and I am not sure what I will do. I will certainly support the second reading, but I do not think I will be here for the vote. I am not going to stay until breakfast time tomorrow to go through the agony of listening to every member have his say.

I would certainly support the Bill to allow it to go to a Select Committee, but what I will do after that depends very much on what the Select Committee says and on how I feel at the time. I certainly do not want either one side or the other to feel that it has my vote in the bag, because I genuinely do not know now what I will do. I have lots of doubts about it and, although I do not agree with the way in which the member for Fisher speaks on these matters, some of the points he made have a good deal of value.

I believe, in any case, that South Australia has missed the bus. It is far too late to expect to get a lot of money out of a casino. They will be two a penny in Australia soon. We have two in Tasmania, one in Darwin and one in Alice Springs. There is going to be one in Queensland, and I guess the other States will come in, too. There is absolutely nothing in a casino *per se* which will bring people to South Australia. If we had wanted to do this to get some money from tourism, etc., it ought to have been done years ago when Don Dunstan tried it. My colleagues in this area have reminded me of something I completely forgot. I could not remember which way I voted in 1973. The member for Semaphore has very dilligently looked all these things up and reminded me that I voted against it then; not that it affects what I am going to do in this debate.

If we wanted to make some money out of the casino, that was the time to do it, before anybody else, but Tasmania was in the market. I think now it will be a non-event if we have a casino here. It will be a novelty for a while, but unless there is something special about our casino, as the member for Fisher suggests, it will fade. I have one suggestion to put to the House. This morning a gentleman came to see me who tells me that he is an expert in gambling. He does not gamble himself, but he has made a study of it, and I accept that. I have told him that the best thing he can do is to go to the Select Committee, if we get as far as that. He put to me that the only hope there would be of anything like this succeeding in South Australia is if it had some unique feature about it, and his suggestion in a nutshell is that it should specialise in the great Australian game of two-up, not what he calls the bastardised version which is played down at Wrest Point but the pure game of two-up.

He left with me a document which has been prepared by a man called Nappy Ollington, who is the king of swy, he tells me, in Melbourne. For years he has been running illegal two-up or swy schools in Melbourne and I saw a letter he wrote to Dick Hamer, the former Premier of Victoria, in which he said he had to move it 80 times in five years, or something like that, to keep ahead of the police, but he is convinced that the Victorians could make a lot of money for their football game over there if they had a casino which went in for two-up only, or swy.

This gentleman who came to see me today has made the same point here—and I think he is right—that, unless there is some unique feature about a casino in South Australia, as I have said, it will be a non-event. I know, Mr Speaker, you told me to stand up, speak up and shut up before I started, but let me read one page of the document that I was given this morning:

The original game of two-up is without doubt the most spectacular gambling game in the world and above all the fairest. This particular game operates at 10 per cent on three consecutive winning bets:

this commission is also applicable on the 5th, 7th, 9th consecutive winning bets, and so on.

I have not the faintest idea what that means, but I have read it. Continuing quoting from that report:

Should this game become legal, the policing for the correct commission would be very difficult; for example, clients are very reluctant to pay the correct commission if they are losing at that particular period. The commission that I recommend is that clients pay \$10 per hour for a seat in the stadium.

This is anti-inflationary compared to 10 per cent consecutive winning wagering, and would also eliminate the harassing of clients for continued commission, thus enabling the game to flow with entire freedom. This form of tax would be totally acceptable to anyone who wishes to play this historic game of ours. In recent discussions with numerous clients who attend my game this suggested tax met with instant approval. Should this method be adopted, I would recommend two schools of 60 clients, so as to guarantee the smooth operation and control of the game, also that a minimum of \$10 be set for these two schools. Furthermore, I would like to emphasise that what makes this game so spectacular is that it be played in cash rather than tokens.

The gentleman had a set of pennies which he showed me this morning which he said were the things to use. Continuing from the document:

Remove the cash betting out of the game and the core and atmosphere would be lost.

That is his suggestion, and I put it to him that he should go to the Select Committee, if we get that far, because unless South Australia has something unique in the casino it will be like every other one which has no attraction whatever, after the first visit of locals and interstate people, for people to go back. I felt under an obligation to make that point. It may be that, if the Select Committee can recommend something that satisfies me, I will vote for the Bill on the third reading, but I am by no means convinced at the moment that I should.

Mr Ashenden: Will you be here tonight to vote for the second reading?

Mr MILLHOUSE: No jolly fear, I am not going to stay here all night. If the honourable member had been in his place, he would have heard me say that 10 minutes ago. There are only two other matters I want to raise. The first is that the Government, I think, has put all sorts of base motives about why we have this Bill. I do not know whether it has been bought or not, but I assume it has not. I assume it is merely an attempt to be trendy and to be with it among a group of variously socially conservative men and women led by the Minister of Health. If that is the reason, I believe it has reacted against the Government rather than for it.

There are so many people who know what the attitude of the Premier and the Minister of Recreation and Sport has been in the past and they are quite disgusted with the way in which they have changed. I know the member for Ascot Park reminded the Minister of what he himself has said and written about this in the past 12 months. In March 1981 he said in relation to Morphettville:

I can assure the honourable member that it will not be used as a casino—certainly it will not unless there is a great change of heart in this State. I just cannot foresee that happening at all during the term of this Government: I am quite prepared to make that a categorical statement.

Where is one of the favourite spots which is suggested—Morphettville—because the S.A.J.C., I suppose, is in financial trouble? On 4 June he wrote in a letter concerning the S.A.J.C. at Morphettville:

The committee will consider the establishment of a casino at Morphettville if the South Australian Government introduces successful legislation in this regard. However, as already stated in Parliament, I cannot foresee this happening during the term of this Government.

He is the very person who with a blush introduces the Bill. I do not know when you can trust a Liberal, I am dashed if I do. A number of people are quite disgusted at the

change of heart. I propose to quote a letter I have received from a minister of religion who lives in the member for Glenelg's district. I will not read all the letter, because a lot of it is complimentary of me and my Party, but let me read the relevant part from a letter dated 29 March 1982:

I'm deeply disturbed, as must be many Christian people in this State, over the events of recent days. The about-face of David Tonkin regarding the casino makes for terrible reading, and worse thinking. What pressure group hit him so hard? No moral change could surely be possible, for moral values do not change so easily. And then the arrangement to open the hotel bars on Sundays is a retrograde step. Where do we move next, and in what direction?

Robin, I have never voted Labor in my life, nor do I intend to do so now: however, may I place before you the dilemma which confronts people in South Australia, who have a concern for society, youth and morality. Take myself as an example of what is going to happen in South Australia. When the next elections come to pass, I am not going to vote Labor, and with the present climate being set up, how can the Liberals expect my vote? (Frankly, I voted Democrat last time!)

Mr Mathwin: He obviously didn't know how you voted on the Prostitution Bill.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Yes, he did. He was in touch very closely with me on that. He did not agree with me either, but he still voted Democrat, because, as he says further in the letter, at least I follow my conscience on these things. But the rest of his letter is a plea to make sure that the Democrats have a candidate in every seat, and I will write back and tell him that we are going to have a candidate in every seat and—

Mr Langley: You were in very close touch with the girls on that Prostitution Bill.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Metaphorically speaking, I was. While I am talking about Labor and Liberal, I would like to put in for the edification of members how delighted I am with the result of the Hillhead by-election in England.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Whitten: For goodness sake.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Yes, for goodness sake! I bet it does not please the member for wherever he comes from.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham will do the House a great service if he comes back to the clause.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Yes. I could not resist that. I had been looking for an opportunity yesterday and today to bring it in. There is only one other point I make. So far as I can remember, this is the first Bill on which there is to be a conscience vote for reference to a Select Committee. I cannot remember any other one.

Mr Evans: Abortion, the one you introduced in 1969.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Yes, that is right. However, it is the first one since then. I must say—and the member for Fisher was a member of the Select Committee—that that Select Committee was chosen bearing in mind the general views of members, irrespective of Party. There were five members on that Select Committee. There were three Government members, two of whom were in favour of abortion before we started. I think three of us were, were we not? I do not remember. The Labor Party split; there was one in favour and one against, I think, in that case.

However, it is a very difficult thing to get a Select Committee which reflects the views of the House, when there is a conscience vote. It is not hard when it is a Party matter, such as Roxby Downs, or something, when the Government is in favour and the Labor Party or the Opposition is against. You can make your three to two or four to three without any trouble. However, on a Bill like this that is not, in my view, the way to proceed. It is not a fair thing, and we should try—heaven knows, I will not be here at the end of the second reading to take part in that process, not so far, unless it goes on until 9 o'clock and I come back after breakfast.

An honourable member: Anne is expecting you then?

Mr MILLHOUSE: No, I told her 10 o'clock. I will be about right.

Mr Whitten: What if it is lost by one vote?

Mr MILLHOUSE: That is bad luck, isn't it? I do not feel as strongly about it as that, anyway. I can tell the honourable member that this is not going to make or break me, or the State, in my view, one way or the other. However, it would be very unfair if the Government stacked the Select Committee one way or the other. I hope that that will not happen. I understand that there was some discontent about it. Was there not some headline about it in the dear old *Advertiser* this morning?

An honourable member: We read it before you did.

Mr MILLHOUSE: You probably wrote it. I was in bed asleep. That is all I have to say. I am quite equivocal after the second reading stage on this matter now. I have very grave doubts about it. Certainly, I support the second reading of the Bill, and we will see what the Select Committee comes up with. I doubt, whether it goes ahead or not, unless some such suggestion as I made about two-up being a speciality comes about, whether it will succeed in any case.

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN (Chief Secretary): I will be making a brief contribution to the debate at this stage. I do want to place on record my attitude in relation to this measure that is currently before the House. It is my intention to support the legislation so that it can proceed to a Select Committee in order that adequate investigation can be undertaken to advise members of the House of various aspects of the establishment of a casino. I will be reading the report of the Select Committee, if that is the wish of the House, with keen interest. I will be relying on the report in determining how I will vote on the third reading of this Bill, assuming that the matter proceeds to that stage.

I indicate to the House that I have not made up my mind how I will vote on the third reading of this measure. I will rely on the report of the Select Committee to advise me of details on which to make that assessment. As one who is not basically a gambler, I have no direct interest in gambling and those sorts of activities. Having no direct interest in them, I have what can commonly be described as a lack of understanding of the intricacies of running a casino. For that reason, for me to make a proper assessment or judgment as to whether we ought or ought not to have a casino established in South Australia, I need more tangible evidence.

I want to comment on my attitude to the previous measure and the fact that I did not at that stage support it. The reason for that was that I did not have the opportunity to explain to the House my reasons for what I believed to be the necessity for that Bill to be heavily amended. Not having that opportunity of being able to explain my reasons as to why I thought it should be heavily amended, I felt inclined to take the only course available to me, and that was to oppose the measure in that instance.

Earlier in this session I supported the retention of the betting shops in Port Pirie. I think I explained at that time that I had no interest in gambling and did not participate in that sport. However, in that instance, in that town I made the assessment to support the retention of the betting shops because of the number of people who were employed in that industry in the town, a town with high unemployment levels. I believe that the social consequences of the closing of those shops, the resultant effect on people who would have been unemployed because of that, was more serious than the retention of shops in a part of my electorate.

The material that I have been able to review or research in the short time that has obviously been available since the measure was introduced last week seems to indicate that where illegal casinos operate there is a basis for saying

that there is evidence of criminal involvement and associated criminal activity. I think it is also fair comment, from my observations, that where there is a Government-controlled instrumentality, such as that operating in Tasmania, there is not any significant evidence of criminal involvement associated with that instrumentality. I understand that in relation to the Wrest Point operation the number of criminal activities associated with that establishment has been quite insignificant. Yet, obviously in terms of job opportunities and the like in that community, it has been a most significant asset to Tasmania.

I believe that at a time of high unemployment those social factors have to be weighed up equally with other factors that people claim are social disadvantages in establishing a casino within a community. If one were established in South Australia, other than a cursory glance to look at what is inside the establishment, I doubt that it would have an attraction to draw me to participate in the games on a repeated basis. Be that as it may, I think that in representing my electorate and having a responsibility to look at the interests of this State, I ought not let my personal prejudice interfere with my having an objective look at the measure. I view the support of this measure to go to a Select Committee as another step towards taking an objective look, making an objective assessment, of a casino operation in South Australia because of my basic lack of knowledge of casinos.

I repeat that I reserve my right to vote, if the matter proceeds to the third reading stage, on the basis of evidence tabled before this House, my assessment of that evidence, and how I perceive the wishes of people within my electorate, whose attitude I will take into very serious account in any determination I make.

Mr LANGLEY (Unley): I listened intently to the Minister's comments on this Bill. I have visited the Wrest Point casino, and if anyone ever had a shilling each way on anything in this House, the Minister has just done that. I am sure that he is under a commitment to Cabinet concerning this matter. All members know that on occasions certain Bills have been rushed through this House. There is no doubt that this is happening with this Bill because the Government does not know where it is going. If honourable members opposite spoke with their constituents more often, they would have more knowledge of how badly they are going. I wonder how many Ministers or members opposite have door knocked. I do not suppose that the Premier would have knocked on one door in his district in his term in office. I have been rude at times, but I do not want to be rude now.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not admonish the member for Unley for being rude, but I will ask him to come back to the clauses of the Bill, which is quite important in any debate.

Mr LANGLEY: Last time this matter came before Parliament, as *Hansard* shows, I voted for a casino. Five Government members voted that way. Three were paired. Finally, the motion was defeated. The Bill was introduced by the Hon. Don Dunstan, Premier at the time. A similar thing will happen this time, but I believe that the Premier should have introduced the Bill and should not have left it to the Minister of Recreation and Sport. It may be that it concerns both the Minister of Recreation and Sport and the Minister of Tourism. I am led to believe that by Government members to whom I have spoken. I heard the Premier the other night say that after three months he had changed his mind. That is not unusual. He has changed his mind on many occasions and this is just another case. He did not vote for a casino in 1973. In looking at that division list I see how many members of the then Opposition voted for it.

Mr Whitten: One.

Mr LANGLEY: I think Steele Hall voted for it then. I have changed my mind on the matter now. I am willing to do the right thing in this case simply because I have received several letters. I will play the game exactly the same way as the members opposite played it.

Mr Russack: They must be right.

Mr LANGLEY: I may be wrong. The member for Goyder will probably be consistent. I am waiting to hear what he says. I will not put words in his mouth. I believe that this Bill will be lost. There are no votes in this. Only one person crossed the floor on a previous occasion. Members opposite may cross the floor. However, there will be much discussion before that time. Much has been written about this in the newspapers and said on the media. I only hope that Government members abide by what they have said. Many members opposite will have to decide what to do. I assure them that there is no need to worry in the Unley District, but members in seats that are in jeopardy will have to carefully consider their attitude.

I do not understand why this Bill is so important that it has come before the House now. I have listened to members opposite and know that several do not intend to vote at the second reading stage for reference to a Select Committee. This will be a conscience vote and as an Opposition we are concerned that we will be denied the opportunity of having three members to three members.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is now straying to a matter that is not yet the subject of debate by this House.

Mr LANGLEY: I will not digress in any way. I thought I heard the shadow Minister speak on that matter, but if I am wrong I am willing to bow to your wishes, Sir. A casino may create more employment, and there may also be more crime committed. The Government is trying to make an issue of the employment angle. The Government needs money, and this may be a fillip to it. I am surprised that it needs to get money from such an angle. If we do get a casino, it should be controlled and run by the Government. I will not say I would vote that way, but the Government is crying out for funds. Several sites have been suggested; for instance, the Murray River, the brewery building and the Morphettville Racecourse. No-one knows what will happen.

Do we need a casino in this State? I learned my lesson when I voted for it previously, and I was soundly defeated. Of the members who were in the House at the time of the 1973 vote (the new members will have to make their own decisions), the member for Whyalla, the member for Stuart, the member for Mitchell, the member for Adelaide, and I voted with the Ayes. The member for Hartley was granted a pair for the Ayes, and the member for Fisher and the member for Victoria were pairs for the Noes. Looking at that, we can see how members opposite can be controlled by Cabinet. Members know how I voted on that occasion, but I do not intend to vote for a casino this time. The Noes were the member for Chaffey, the member for Hanson, the member for Flinders, the member for Davenport, the member for Alexandra, the member for Kavel, the member for Eyre, the member for Glenelg, the member for Mitcham, the member for Goyder, the member for Light, and the member for Bragg, who changed his mind just three months ago.

Mr Keneally: Three weeks ago.

Mr LANGLEY: I will give him the benefit of the doubt. It is marvellous how one can change his mind in three months. However, I have changed my mind, and I am not a hypocrite. If ever a Party was hypocritical in bringing in such legislation at the end of a session, it is this Government. It has done this to put me on the spot. Only one member crossed the floor on the occasion to which I have referred.

Even then Opposition members voted *en bloc*, because they were under strict instructions. Government members crossed the floor at that time. In my opinion, several Government members will cross the floor on this occasion, but now they have one thing in their favour: the plebiscite is over and they have the opportunity to say and do what they like. If it had happened earlier, there may have been some trouble. Those members on this side who voted against a casino were the member for Elizabeth, the member for Baudin, the member for Playford, and the member for Gilles.

Mr Randall: Did they vote for it?

Mr LANGLEY: They voted against it. Perhaps other members have done as I have done, perhaps they have changed their minds. In a conscience vote it is unusual for the Opposition to vote *en bloc*, as happened in 1973, and it happened more than once. When we consider legislation of this kind, we should come to it with an open mind. On many occasions since I have been in this House, people have not voted as they would like to vote. That is wrong in the case of a measure that will benefit the State. It is a numbers game. In a game of cricket, if a team needs four runs to win, the batsman might try to hit the ball through the covers, but if it goes to deep fine leg the team can still win.

I will not be in this place much longer, but in my years here I have never known so many people on the Labor side to have voted so conscientiously on many matters. In the time I have been here it has become on the other side a Party vote more than anything else. If members opposite want to refute what I have said, they have an opportunity to do so. Many seats are in jeopardy, and members have to win this time. People in my area have spoken to me about casinos and about the Government. I am close to the people, unlike some members opposite with their letterboxing. I have listened to the people, and I have heard their view of the Government's performance. The Government is doing badly, and it is looking for an issue. This Bill could have been brought in long ago, but it is being rushed through to try to do something to improve the Government's position in some way. However, there are no votes in this, and there are not many votes that the Government can win from hereon.

An honourable member: I think it's got egg on its face.

Mr LANGLEY: That may be so, but the people will make their decision. If the Government continues in this vein, it will be going further into the mire. I do not know whether the Premier has run away from this Bill. The Government wants money, and it must have money to run the State. But, if it does it this way, it will lose more votes than it gains.

I have changed my mind for one reason. In my district, the people in certain areas will be pleased that I have done so. People in the other areas say that it would not matter to them because they will not be able to afford to go to a casino. They will not be helped by the Government, because there have been many cutbacks. The Government runs this State and the Government is to blame. I do not know what Bill will be the next to come up before we go into recess, but this is one of the greatest efforts of all time to con people into something that does not mean very much at all. The only thing it will do is lose votes.

However, I can tell members opposite that I do not have to worry about losing votes because, as members know, I am retiring. Members opposite must think about this matter. Members on this side of the House have cemented their position as members of Parliament but Government members must cement their position also. I say in no uncertain manner that I am confident that this Bill will not be passed. I will go a little further and say that in the final event

people will look back and realise that it may not have been any benefit to the State.

Other matters concerning this matter are in the papers every day. Those people have their points of view, and I do not care what they are but I am entitled to mine and I am entitled to express those of my electorate. The papers have a point of view which is biased, as I have found throughout my political career, if they want a certain thing. The Minister of Transport would well know that in relation to a matter that was passed in this House. The newspapers were biased and were against him.

Mr Randall: You do not really mean that.

Mr LANGLEY: I do really mean it. That is why I do not play cricket against the press. I would like to play cricket against them. I have nothing against the average person who works for the press, but I do not believe in their dictates and the way that they try to dictate their policy to the people. The fact is that again the press is starting to promote a casino in this State. The papers are full of it. I do not believe it will happen. The newspapers may be able to carry on as they are doing, but I can assure members opposite that the newspapers are part and parcel of life. They are produced, sold and read but they do not have to be believed. If three-quarters of the content were taken, one would be left with somewhere near what is actual fact.

I do not want to be placed in the Premier's category in this case, as I am a socialist and he is a Liberal. I am entitled to change my mind. I can assure members opposite that I have thought a lot about the matter and that will be the case.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): Members opposite seem to have had great delight in pointing out that the Government is supposed to have changed its attitude to this Bill, but I feel that it is only fair to remind all members of this House that when the vote was taken in the House on the so-called Peterson Bill, I seem to remember that the Labor Party was unanimous in its vote to reject that Bill at that time, too.

I now want to indicate my stance as far as the present Bill is concerned. I will be voting for this measure to go to a Select Committee. However, that does not necessarily reflect the way in which I will be voting at the time of the third reading.

Mr Keneally: How will you be voting?

Mr ASHENDEN: I can answer that easily. I do not know at this stage. If the honourable member can be patient, I will tell him the reasons why. I believe that this measure must be considered fully and therefore, any vote that would prevent this Bill from going to a Select Committee would be stifling what I believe could be very important debate. That is the reason why I will be supporting the Bill at this stage. I stress that that does not necessarily reflect the way that I will be voting at the time of the third reading.

As a member of Parliament, I believe that I have a responsibility to represent the wishes of my electorate. It is my opinion that, as a member of Parliament, I was not elected to push my own personal points of view concerning a matter such as the Casino Bill. When elected to Parliament, I stated that I would represent the wishes of my electorate as well as I could. Therefore, over the next few weeks I will be making as much contact as possible with residents in my electorate and with as many organisations as I can

to determine as well as I can the way in which people living in the electorate of Todd would like their member to vote on this issue.

One of the beauties of the democratic system is that it enables the majority point of view to be put. At this stage I simply do not know what is the majority point of view as far as the District of Todd is concerned. I do know, however, that whichever way I vote at the third reading, I will cause concern to a number of people resident in the District of Todd. I guess that is the unfortunate part of democracy. The minority often has to go along with the wishes of the majority. However, I know of no better system and because I believe wholeheartedly in the democratic process, I will be voting at the time of the third reading in accordance with the way in which I believe the majority of my constituents would want me to vote.

Mr Keneally: Read Edmund Burke.

Mr ASHENDEN: I already have, but thank you for that tip. In regard to the casino issue itself there are two major and very divergent points of view. There is the group strongly in favour of the development of a casino because of what it sees as being advantages flowing to the State in relation to tourism and the resultant flow-on to other business houses that would come from the attraction of tourists and also flow on of income to the South Australian Government. However, there is also the other point of view, namely, that the development of a casino will lead to serious social disadvantages.

There is no way that those two divergent points of view can be catered for in one vote. I respect those two dichotomous points of view, and as I have said, as the member for Todd I will be making a decision based on the feedback that comes to me from my constituents. I will be listening very carefully over the next few weeks to all the comments in relation to the issue in my electorate. If I do decide (and I stress the word 'if') to support this issue at the third reading, I would be looking for some very very strong controls in relation to the development of a casino in South Australia. I am sure members opposite would be the first to admit my speeches in this House have made very clear that I am a very strong supporter of private enterprise.

However, I think a casino is an exception to the rule. I would be looking for very tight Government control of any casino developed in this State. There are a number of reasons why I believe that Government control should be exercised over a casino. It would remove all possibility of organised crime having an opportunity to gain control of that casino.

At my own expense I travelled to Alice Springs to look at the operation of the casino there at the time that the member for Semaphore put his Bill before the House. I must say that I was extremely disappointed with the operation of that project in Alice Springs.

I was disappointed not just for one reason but for many reasons, and I left after having spent three days actually staying at the casino and attending the casino on one night with the feeling that, because it was a monopoly and because Federal Pacific Hotels was the only organisation that had casinos in Australia, one took it or one left it: one liked it or one lumped it. They were not particularly interested in making sure that they treated their guests as guests or were worried about their welfare.

I could list here a number of the things that occurred while I was staying at the Alice Springs casino. The hotel was very new, but not so new that they could not have had the bugs ironed out; the accommodation left a lot to be desired. For example, the room that we were given had a main door that could not be locked. We determined this very quickly after our arrival when we tried to lock the door, and as soon as it could not be locked I contacted the

management and they would neither offer us another room nor send someone up to repair the door that would not lock. So, for the next three days we stayed in that hotel room that could not be locked.

Mr Keneally: Did you tell them you were Scott Ashenden?

Mr ASHENDEN: Certainly not. The last thing I wanted them to realise was that I held a position that might determine some future developments in South Australia. That was the very first matter that occurred. The second thing was that the plumbing left an awful lot to be desired. The problem was that if anyone in our wing wanted to have a shower or to utilise the toilet everyone in the wing knew that that had occurred. I have never heard such noisy plumbing before. I know this was not isolated because a friend of ours came up with us and had another room in the same wing, and he indicated to us that that was exactly the same case as far as his room was concerned.

Another point is that Saturday night was the only night on which my wife and I went into the gaming room to observe the operations. We stayed there until the operation closed at 2 a.m. and we were therefore not at all impressed when at 7.35 on Sunday morning the room next door was vacuumed in an extremely noisy manner. I think that is fairly indicative that the welfare of guests was not really of very much importance to the management at that time. Also, on the first night of our arrival the air-conditioning broke down. This was during the hot part of the year and, once again, that was not rectified on the three nights that we were there. I must say it was quite uncomfortable staying in a room which was designed to be cooled by air-conditioning but which could not be cooled in that manner.

I left feeling, as far as the accommodation was concerned, that there was a lot to be desired. I also considered that the standard of food was extremely poor and the prices were very high. I do not mind paying high prices, as long as I get value. However, I certainly could not put that down to my stay at the casino. Incidentally, during my previous employment I used to say in Alice Springs quite frequently at another motel, and I certainly know that the standard of accommodation and the food supplied at the alternative motel that I usually used was very much higher. So, it is not the fault of its being Alice Springs. I can only put it down to the fact that management tend to feel, 'We are the only ones with this facility, so you will take what you get.'

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: How was the band?

Mr ASHENDEN: There was not a band there. I think they were waiting for the honourable member to come up. We were extremely disappointed on many counts in relation to the way in which the guests were looked after. The evening meal was very expensive, and we had to pay a \$30 cover charge to go into that room that evening. We arrived at 8 o'clock, and finally received our main course at a quarter to 10, just when the floor show was about to start. So, we were trying to find the food and watch the floor show at the same time. My friend agreed with us that the whole situation left an awful lot to be desired. I guess the thing that really brought home to me the attitude of the management was that I did write a letter—quite a polite letter—just pointing out to the management of the Federal Pacific Hotels what had occurred during our stay. However, they did not even bother to acknowledge the letter or the points that I made to them. Once again, I felt that this could come back to one reason, namely, that they as a group felt, 'So what if we have one dissatisfied customer; there are many more yet to come along.' I was bitterly disappointed with the treatment that we received, because it had been my firm belief prior to my travelling to Alice Springs that, if a casino was ever to be opened in South Australia, it would be best to have a company that obviously

was well versed in the operations, but I certainly have come away with a totally different impression. I return to the point that, if a casino is to be operated in South Australia, I will certainly, for the reasons that I have already outlined, support any move for it to be completely controlled by the Government.

Finally, I wish to repeat that at this stage I have not determined how I will vote on this Bill when it comes to the third reading. I will be supporting it to go to a Select Committee. I believe that that is extremely important, in order that the Parliament can be apprised of that committee's findings. It will also enable me to talk with my electorate to determine how they feel. Therefore, my final decision will be based somewhat on the report of the Select Committee but predominantly by the wishes of my electorate, as I determine them over the coming weeks.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): Listening to various speeches in this debate thus far, I think that, like Gaul, we can probably divide the members of this House into three parts. There are those people who will vote against this Bill at the second reading, for whatever reason, and there are two categories of people who will be voting for the Bill at the second reading. First, to be perfectly frank, I believe that there are those people who are using the Select Committee as something behind which to hide. They do not really want to show their cards at this stage. The Select Committee is a convenient device whereby things can be left around the place until June, by which time something may have turned up.

Then there are those people who have a commitment to a Select Committee, irrespective of their viewpoint on casinos, and for that reason will vote in such a way as to facilitate the passage of the Bill to a Select Committee, although they may have qualms and may even now have virtually made up their minds that they will vote to reject the Bill at the third reading. I fall into that third category. Of course, it is necessary for me to say that I cannot altogether rule out the possibility that the Select Committee might just possibly come up with information that could change my mind. I guess all things are possible, but it is also necessary for me to say that I think that is very unlikely indeed.

I have been consistent in my opposition to a casino ever since this matter was first raised in this Parliament. As a very junior Minister (possibly the most junior Minister—I cannot remember now) in the Dunstan Cabinet, I voted against a Bill that was introduced by my Premier at that time. I must say that I look back on that episode with a great deal of regard for the Premier that he attempted in no way to put any pressure on me as a member of his Cabinet or indeed as a person who would have been, I should imagine, open to persuasion from the Premier, because he was the person whom I had admired and perhaps even revered since my teenage years. Don put no pressure on me whatever. He respected my right, as an individual member of this House, to make up my own mind and to vote according to conscience. I voted against the Bill, and the only qualm that I had was that I was voting against the person that I so much admired and the initiatives that he had introduced in the House.

I believed that I was right in casting my vote in the way that I did. I believed that I was right in casting my vote against the Bill introduced by the member for Semaphore—or at least, should I say, in canvassing the attitudes that I did, because we are all aware of the fact that that Bill did not go through the whole of the procedures laid down in Standing Orders.

I have heard or read nothing in the meantime that would induce me to change my stand. Honourable members will recall that at the same time my colleague, the member for

Gilles, had on the Notice Paper a motion for the setting up of a Select Committee to investigate this matter. Various people approached me about my attitude towards the Select Committee, and I said that, although I was opposing the measure brought in by the member for Semaphore, I could see no harm in a Select Committee collecting information for honourable members to consider.

I do not believe that we should ever run away from any collection of facts or information that would help us in drawing the proper conclusions and applying them to our votes in this Chamber. So, consistent with that, I will be supporting the reference of this Bill to a Select Committee. However, it is necessary that I put on record here and now that I think it is extremely unlikely that that Select Committee will come up with any information that would in any way induce me to change my attitude.

Government members have been a little bemused at the attitude adopted by certain of my colleagues in the debate thus far, but I do not think they should be all that surprised. If they are surprised, if they were somewhat puzzled at our reaction when the Minister of Recreation and Sport gave notice of this Bill, I can only say that they either have very short memories or else they are rather poor judges of human nature; perhaps they are just incredibly naive, because there is little doubt that during the period of the Dunstan Government there was very little that one could call a conscience vote exercised by members of the then Opposition.

Perhaps there was a good deal of unanimity on the so-called conscience issues on the part of the Liberal Caucus of that particular day, but, as a good deal of those members are still with us in the present Liberal Caucus, and, in view of their actions in the past week or so, I think we are entitled to draw the inference that, whatever else was operating on the minds of members of the Liberal Party in those days, the Party politics of the situation was not very very far away.

In fact, I was rather interested in an *Advertiser* editorial of 26 March which heralded the announcement by the Minister of Recreation and Sport. Under the heading, 'A casino at last?', it said:

For the second time in a week the State Government has announced a deviation of attitude to controversial social issues. Firstly, it gave the green light to restricted hotel trading on Sundays. Yesterday, it was revealed that M.P.s are to be allowed a 'conscience vote' on whether or not South Australians should have a casino.

In passing, I am glad that they put the words 'conscience vote' in quotes. I do not like the term. I believe that it is an act of conscience that a person adheres to a particular political Party. I would prefer to see it in this light: that the political Parties largely grew up against a dialectical process which is largely centred around economic issues, and therefore their following was attracted to them as a result of people's attitudes to these economic issues.

So, both political Parties find themselves with a wide spectrum of opinions in relation to matters that have nothing to do with economics or are only very peripherally related to it. So, on a purely pragmatic level they find that the so-called conscience vote is something that is necessary to preserve Party unity in relation to other matters, or perhaps it would be better to say that it is a valuable part of our modern democratic process that political Parties should not adopt a position on every issue that comes up for public debate. Why should they?

My Party was formed with certain specific aims and goals. They have been modified over the years, but they are largely in the same ball park. Having been created to do that, and having adopted the best tactic to employ in the Parliamentary sphere, namely, the concept of Caucus solidarity, why does that have to be extended to other issues such as the fluoridation of water supplies or issues to do

with gambling or anything like that? I do not think there is any inconsistency in a political Party saying, 'On these other matters we will not take up a political position.' That in itself can well be a matter of conscience. I apologise. That is somewhat of a circumlocution. Let me turn to the final paragraph of this editorial, which is what attracted my attention. It states:

It is interesting to note how public thinking has changed in South Australia.

There is an assumption in itself that the editorial does not bolster with any further facts. It further states:

Only a few years ago a libertarian Labor Government was too wary to proceed with plans for a casino. Now a more conservative Government is obviously responding to its assessment that majority public opinion would favor it.

Then they go on. I would like to take issue with that. I believe that what has changed is not public opinion but the stance of the Liberal Party or the tactics that it seeks to adopt in this Chamber. As a matter of fact, if one goes over the history of so-called social legislation in the past 10 or 12 years, it is very difficult indeed to sustain the labels of a libertarian Labor Government and a more conservative Liberal Government.

Let us remind ourselves of the sort of things that people bring to mind when social legislation is canvassed. First of all, I refer to abortion law reform, which, for the purpose of this House, is represented by one measure, namely, that which was introduced by the member for Mitcham when Attorney-General in a Liberal Government, to make the definition of a legal abortion a matter not of case law but of Statute. That is in effect what happened at that time. It was argued at the time that this was a considerable liberalisation (small 'l') of the law, but I remind honourable members that it was introduced by an Attorney-General in a Liberal Government.

If people turn their minds to the decriminalisation of homosexual acts between consenting adults, we recall that it was, of course, an Attorney-General in a Labor Government who finally steered that legislation through both Houses. But, who took the first legislative initiative in relation to that matter? It was indeed the present Minister of Housing in this Government. Again, if one was to ask one's friendly Martian to walk into one of the book shops around town that has a wider range of books than, say, Standard Book supplies, and he had already had that dubious pleasure five years ago, I think he would be hard put to find that there has been very much change in the so-called censorship laws, in the way in which they operate—the laws in relation to what a person may read.

I suppose the Labor Party attracted this label to itself largely because of the legislation of the mid-1960s in relation to the setting up of the State lottery, the liberalisation of drinking laws and the introduction of the T.A.B. However, I would remind honourable members that if one really looks at the legislation that is being introduced and the way in which it has been administered by either Government, it is very difficult to maintain this simplistic view of Labor in Government as being 'libertarian' and of the Liberals being significantly more conservative in Government. So much for that.

I am aware that I have not attempted in this speech to set down what one might call the philosophical basis of my opposition to casinos. I refer honourable members either to the speech that I made in the early 1970s in opposition to the Dunstan Bill, or alternatively to the speech that my colleague the honourable member for Salisbury made earlier this afternoon. I can do little more in respect to that speech other than to say 'ditto'.

Mr RUSSACK (Goyder): I rise to speak briefly to the Bill. At the outset, I would say that I oppose the second reading of this Bill. Over the past almost nine years I have had the opportunity of speaking four times in this House concerning such a consideration. In September 1973, the member for Fisher moved in this House a motion couched in these terms:

That in the opinion of this House a casino should not be built in South Australia.

At that time a Bill was to be introduced by the Government of the day. That Bill was introduced in, I think, about October 1973. One honourable member tonight said that he has had no experience or knowledge of casinos. That is the position in which I found myself in 1973. I thought the best thing to do was to visit a casino, so I went specifically to Tasmania. I do not wish to go over the same ground in reporting on that visit, because I have done it two or three times already in this House.

On that occasion and one occasion following, when I happened to be in Hobart with a group of Parliamentarians, I paid a second visit to the casino at Wrest Point, and on both occasions I was not impressed with what I saw. In 1981, the member for Semaphore introduced his private member's Bill, the outcome of which we are all aware. On every occasion I have opposed the measure, and, as I feel that my mind has not changed, I am following that same course. For interest sake I read through some of the reports in *Hansard*. I find that in 1973 I presented a petition with something like 1 700 names from the electorate which I represented at that time.

I now represent a much larger area, which has almost incorporated that previous electorate. I feel quite confident that there has been no change in the attitude of my constituents. In fact, when the announcement was made (I think it was last Thursday), I received on my return home telephone calls from some very concerned people in relation to this measure. They were concerned that the subject had once again been introduced. It was so different to the situation last year.

I said in my speech on 28 October in this House that I retained the right to express my view and the views of others who had approached me. I must be fair and say that in 1973 there was more vigorous opposition to the measure than has been the case with this Bill. I can recall in 1973 many petitions, with thousands of signatures, but on this occasion, I went on to say, there had not been the reaction from the churches.

An honourable member: It is coming. They haven't had time.

Mr RUSSACK: No, I am speaking about 1981—last year. I said that I had not received the vigorous reaction in 1981 that I received in 1973. However, I have experienced a vigorous opposition on this occasion. I received telephone calls on Friday, Saturday and early Sunday morning. I have received letters from private people and from organisations. I have also been approached personally, and I am sure that there will be a very vigorous campaign in opposition to this Bill. The member for Gilles quoted figures today that I think were the result of a poll. He said the poll indicated that there was a majority in favour.

Mr Slater: The Gallup poll in October last year showed 50 per cent in favour, 36 per cent against, and 14 per cent undecided.

Mr RUSSACK: Be that as it may, I feel, in representation and in a democracy, that, although notice must be taken of the majority, consideration must also be given to the minority. If, in my view, I am representing a minority, I feel justified and that I have a right to speak for that minority, and I do so, if it is the case, in this instance. I have said before that I am doubtful whether there is a

minority who have doubts and fears about the introduction of a measure such as this. I will mention some of the organisations and church bodies that have already contacted me.

I suppose every member has received a communication from the Women's Electoral Lobby. It asks a series of questions, and it would appear to me that it is suggesting that there should have been greater research and a greater consideration before the measure was introduced. I have received personal letters expressing concern and opposition. As I suppose most members of this House have, I have also received a letter from the National Council of Women. The letter, addressed to me, reads:

The National Council of Women wrote to you on 24 November 1981 informing you of a resolution which was passed unanimously at the council meeting on 12 November 1981 'opposing the establishment of a casino in South Australia'. We thank those members who took the trouble to reply.

This council is still strongly opposed to the establishment of a casino.

1. We feel there are enough opportunities for gambling in South Australia.

2. We consider a casino will not be a major tourist attraction as has been suggested by some.

3. Our council is sceptical as to the ability of the proposed 'Casino Control Board' being able to control many of the undesirable aspects associated with casino operations.

Members of the National Council of Women of South Australia commend the stand taken by members who oppose the introduction of poker machines and hope they will continue with this stand. We look to you, our respected elected members, to exercise your conscience vote, with the utmost care and consideration for the quality of life of all South Australians.

I would like again to comment on the third point of that letter, which talks about the National Council of Women being sceptical about the ability of the proposed Casino Control Board to control many undesirable aspects associated with casino operations. I refer members to an article that appeared in the *Sunday Mail* last Sunday, 28 March 1982. I will just read a couple of paragraphs from that article, as follows:

Safeguards—A casino control board member is likely to be on duty whenever gambling takes place. Another condition of operation will be safeguards against the gambling causing severe social problems. There will be no poker machines and measures will be taken to prevent people betting the 'housekeeping money'.

How on earth can anybody prevent a person from spending the housekeeping money? In that segment of the article I have read, there is an admission that there are dangers and that there is the possibility of many undesirable aspects associated with a casino. In that self-admission, I say: let us vote against the Bill so that those dangers will not be a possibility. The next letter is a personal letter, but I do know that this person is Secretary of the Social Justice Committee of the Churches of Christ and has expressed disappointment that this measure has been reintroduced.

Last year when I spoke I did to a degree criticise the churches for not being active, and said that I was disappointed that they were not, but tonight I want to say that I commend the churches. We know that there have been statements made by Archbishop Rayner, and there have been statements, perhaps conveying not such a severe attitude, by the Catholic Church. This telegram received today states:

We urge you to vote against casino. Our arguments stated in letter to you 8 December 1981. Uniting Church in Australia S.A. Synod Darcy Wood Moderator.

I previously mentioned that the Uniting Church had circularised a letter to each member some months before the vote was taken on the Bill, stating that that letter would be followed up. However, it was not followed up until after the vote was taken, I believe, and that letter was received on 8 December. So, I want to say and emphasise again that there has been an immediate, spontaneous and, as far as I

am concerned, desirable response from the churches on this occasion.

I do not think that there is any need for me to say anything further. One could talk at length about the moral and sociological aspects of the matter, but I am sure that most of those have been canvassed. I know that they have been canvassed by me on previous occasions. However, I do want to say that I oppose the measure, and I would ask all members to think carefully and to search their consciences. I ask that on the vote on the second reading members cast their vote against the measure.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I want at this stage to indicate my support for the Bill. I do so because it is going to a Select Committee, and I want to say a few things about that at some later stage. If all members in this Parliament were as honest and sincere as the last speaker about this matter, I do not believe that this legislation would now be even before the House. There have been so many inconsistencies and so many changes of mind and rethinking about this matter that I feel somewhat sorry for the Minister who has had to introduce the Bill. I know that the Minister himself within the previous fortnight made claims in the State that there would be no possibility of casino legislation coming from the Government benches, anyway, and nor would they support it. Whatever changed the mind of the Government, one has only to ponder. One can say (it has been said, and it is being said in the community now) that there is a very large sum of money about for anyone who would introduce a Bill in the Parliament—not necessarily to have that particular Bill passed.

Mr Peterson: They didn't offer it to me.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Perhaps they did not think that the honourable member was sufficiently important. Maybe they did not think that he could get the Bill through. I am not making the allegation, but I am merely saying what is being said in the community. Whether the community is absorbing that and believing it is another question, but it is certainly being said. The question that we need to look at quite clearly and consciously is why this Government changed its mind. There is no reason given at all by this Government as to the change of mind. In this regard, I support what the member for Mallee has been saying. Quite clearly, I think he was entitled to come out and make the criticisms and allegations that he made a week ago when there was a complete about-face by the Government in this regard.

I do not want to say that because of that this Bill should not pass the second reading. I believe that it ought to, but I think one has to try to understand, if that is possible, why there has been a complete change of mind on the Government benches. To my mind, there has been no explanation of that matter. So, the Government has egg on its face, for whatever reasons. I believe that the Minister certainly has egg on his face. It will be interesting to see whether or not any of the other Ministers take part in this debate, and whether this is or is not a Government Bill.

In my view, the Government is depending upon the Labor Party's support for the progress of this legislation. I do not believe that the Government has the numbers to carry this legislation if the Labor Party even split down the middle. If the Labor Party had been split down the middle, I do not think that this Bill could pass the second reading. I think that the Government quite clearly knew that when the legislation was brought in.

I thought, Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, listening to the debate tonight, that you were easily the most comfortable speaker in the House. You leant back against the wall over there and spoke in a lazy, relaxed sort of manner. At least you had the courage to say that you supported the legislation.

That is your view, to which you are entitled. But very important people in this Parliament will not express a view, not so much at an election, but about the dictates of this Government. I refer to the Ministers who will not take part in this debate.

It will be interesting, not only tonight but in the final analysis when this Bill comes back. I have given no indication nor assurances to the Parliament on how I will vote then. The member for Goyder is receiving many protests, as I am. He is sincere and consistent in his approach to this matter. I am also being consistent, because in 1973, when similar legislation was introduced by the then Premier of South Australia, the Liberal Party voted *en bloc* against it. Now we are talking about a conscience vote. How many inconsistencies does one have to bring up about this Government?

Mr Mathwin: When things are different they are not the same.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I'm pleased the member for Glenelg has admitted it. He voted against it. Every Liberal member now in this House voted against Don Dunstan's private member's Bill in 1973. On that occasion there was absolutely no expression of conscience. There may have been by some people, but certainly there was a doctrinaire attitude taken on that occasion by the Liberal Party. It wanted to embarrass the Premier at that time, so its members decided to vote *en bloc* against the Bill, which they were saying was a conscience measure. I believe it to be a conscience Bill, and there will be no whip taken on this side on this occasion. Opposition members will vote as their conscience dictates so that the matter can go to a Select Committee and evidence can be taken.

I say to the Government that, unless there is a conscientious and proper view, an allowable expression of opinion and all the wider matters are examined by that committee, such as sociological and criminal problems which affect the State, I will vote against the legislation when it comes back. Merely because it goes to a Select Committee does not encourage me to say at this stage that all will be well. I will still have the right which I reserve in a conscience situation to vote how I think when the legislation comes back. If I am not satisfied with that committee's findings, I will judge that at the time.

Mr Mathwin: You're not happy about numbers on the Select Committee.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: No, I am not very happy about numbers on the Select Committee.

Mr Keneally: Or the terms of reference.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The terms of reference are not good, in my view. The standover tactics adopted by the Government on this occasion are not acceptable, nor is telling us that we will have two members on the committee, the Government will have four, and there will be one Independent. So far as I am concerned, those conditions are not acceptable to me, either. We are not starting off very well. The Government has rushed the Bill into the House at the very last moment. I am told that not even all members of the Liberal Party were informed at the Party meeting and that it was not a unanimous attendance, let alone a unanimous decision. Obviously, some people were not told about this meeting before the Bill was introduced. It is rushed legislation. The Government has had a twisted mind on this matter for some time. It has changed its mind and has brought in legislation with which I am not satisfied, nor am I satisfied with the Select Committee's terms of reference. I am not satisfied with the conditions under which that Select Committee will be established, so I query this whole Government gesture. I repeat that the Government benches are dependent upon us as to whether this legislation even passes the second reading.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The member for Glenelg interferes and interrupts. We will see what happens in the vote. There are rumblings within the Liberal Party about this legislation. Already, speakers have indicated they will not support it. It would not be much effort for the Labor Party to prevent the Bill from passing the second reading stage. Personally, I support the right of people if they desire a casino, but this can only come from the Select Committee. I want to state why people should have that right if they wish. First, we tolerate, if that is the right word, the racing industry, greyhound-racing and trots meetings, we allow people to go along to the TAB and bet, we allow them to participate in X-lotto and to try for Instant Money in South Australia. The Government introduced the pools legislation which, so far as this Party is concerned, was wrong. In fact, when I read about it I found it was not going well. Pools have not been popular.

If we as a community and society accept the right of those people who choose to spend their money that way, it is not for us to debate. That is an accepted part of society. Society provides those facilities for people to lose their money. My experience of people in the racing game, in which I have had some experience, is that only about 5 per cent of people actually win. Somebody has to pay; it is usually the punter who pays for the expenses in those industries. But, I believe that those people have a perfect right to spend their money in any way they desire. Having said that, it must obviously follow, so far as I am concerned, that people can choose to spend their money in casinos. If people desire that rather than going to the races, to the football or investing their money in the pools, the odds are not very much in their favour at all.

I have had some experience in these matters. I have looked at casinos in Tasmania, London, Malaysia, Bangkok and Macao. I have seen many sorry faces on people leaving those establishments after a night out. Do not let us fool ourselves that we are providing an avenue for people to win. If this Bill becomes law we will provide some entertainment for people, but it will be costly. One cannot go to the pictures or the races for nothing. Wherever one goes, one has to pay. Let us bear that in mind. Anyone who walks into a casino is at a disadvantage from the minute he or she goes through the door, because a percentage is required for the gate, and the gate will win. Do not let us think that we are setting up a paradise, but we are at least being libertarian in our attitudes towards people who choose to follow that pastime. People will not win. Do not let us kid ourselves about where the finance for any casino will come from. It will not come from tourists. Not enough tourists go to Sydney, Melbourne, Hobart or Adelaide to keep any casino buoyant.

It is not possible in those circumstances. The local people will pay. In a place such as Macao, with 5 000 000 people in Hong Kong, most of whom are gamblers because it is part of the Chinese society, most of the income comes from the people 40 miles away. A similar situation occurs in Malaysia, as well as in London, probably one of the most popular tourist cities in the world. Let it be on record very strongly and advisedly that, if a casino is to survive in South Australia, along with the other competition that will exist, what I have said will be the case. I suggest that, irrespective of when this legislation goes through, it will be three or four years before the casino goes up. I do not know what the Government intends regarding its location.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Minister waves his hand and says, 'No'. I would hope that there is no intention at this moment of placing the casino in any area presently established.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am sure it has. I would hope that, if the casino licence is granted, it will be conditional upon the casino being a new project in South Australia, not involving an establishment already in existence. In my view, it would otherwise simply be a handout to existing establishments.

I think the Select Committee should seriously consider whether or not this project should go to private enterprise. I see no reason why a commission could not be set up. I know that the shadow Minister of Tourism, the member for Gilles, spoke about this tonight. Although I did not hear his speech, I am told that the member for Fisher is opposed to the legislation, and he is talking about a commission with the casino being run by the State Government.

Mr Keneally: So did the member for Todd, so there must be something wrong with it.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: If the member for Todd said it, I am worried. However, it seems to me that there is some sense in it. If the enterprise is to go ahead, why should not the Government be in on it? The Government should have the responsibility of owning and controlling the casino, and in those circumstances, if the report by the leading *Advertiser* journalist yesterday has any merit in it about Atlantic City, where the crime rate has increased since the establishment of casinos, the Government would have absolute control of all the people running the casino. It would have control of the Police Force, and it seems to me that that is interwoven in that scene, and it could control the crime rate if it were to increase. I would be extremely worried if the crime rate were to increase, because we do not want that happening in South Australia.

We have a long way to go. The Select Committee has a very important task to perform, and that is why we should choose wisely the people who are to be on it, evening up the numbers between the Parties in this place, so that, if the Select Committee comes back with an acceptable report, we know that it has done its part well and we can accept the report in all earnestness and honesty. Failing that, I think this legislation will have some difficulty in passing, but at this stage I am prepared to support the second reading.

Dr BILLARD (Newland): I oppose this measure and, in so doing, I note that I intend to vote the same way this time as I voted on the measure introduced by the member for Semaphore. I do not wish to debate the issue at great length, because I think that pretty well all the arguments that can be put on this issue have been put today, as they were put in the debates in this House last year on the Bill introduced by the member for Semaphore and on the motion by the member for Gilles, both of which were extensively debated. All the arguments that can be put have been put.

I simply wish to indicate those reasons which have influenced me in my thinking in forming my view, without debating them at great length. My first reason is that I believe that there is insufficient evidence that organised crime will not be attracted to a casino, and in this respect I refer particularly to the arguments outlined today by the member for Salisbury and others. Secondly, I believe that there is insufficient evidence that the presence of a casino is either necessary or sufficient to attract tourist activity to South Australia, and in this respect I note that the major tourist State of Australia, Queensland, has developed that tourist industry without the assistance of a casino, while the State that has relied on a casino to promote tourism, namely, Tasmania, currently is in dire financial and economic straits, and has the largest unemployment in Australia. I believe that the arguments based on the creation of jobs and the development of tourism are not sound.

Thirdly, I believe that, with respect to the facilities available to the public in South Australia for gambling, there has been a great deal of liberalisation and extension in those opportunities in recent years, and I refer particularly to the extension to Lotto Bloc, to the football pools, and to the after-race payouts which have extended and liberalised opportunities for gambling. Finally, may I say that the only point that I could debate at all is the assertion made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and also made fairly generally in the past few days that, if people want a casino, they should be allowed to have one. I believe that that itself is a misleading argument, although it is tempting at a superficial level.

We live in a society where people have freedoms, but where they also have responsibilities. When we exercise those freedoms, our freedoms cease to become legitimate freedoms when they become another man's burden. Some of the arguments put, particularly those relating to organised crime, are arguments that we have to consider very seriously as having an impact on other individuals in the community; therefore, as a Government and as a Parliament we have to not simply consider people's freedoms that they would like to exercise but the consequences of those people exercising those freedoms.

Another argument that has played a part in the formation of my views is the argument that the operation of casinos is somewhat different from that of other forms of gambling because it does have a detrimental impact on people in the community in that one can gamble in a form that has immediate impact and, as other members have alleged, potentially people can get rid of their pay packets very quickly. In my mind, I am not certain one way or the other on that argument.

I noted the comments of the member for Fisher regarding the practice in casinos overseas where locals are prohibited from gambling in those casinos. However, that is not the overriding argument as far as I am concerned. The overriding arguments were the three arguments that I presented and they formed the basis of my decision. As far as a Select Committee is concerned, I have already said that I believe that most of the arguments raised in the debate have occurred during the past 12 months: I do not believe that a Select Committee will come up with any more significant material. However, if the measure does pass the second reading, I would support the operation of a Select Committee if only in the hope that some of the members who have supported the second reading might be persuaded otherwise through the hearings that would result from the Select Committee.

Therefore, I would view the operations of the Select Committee as not generating any new information because I believe that most of the information that can be obtained has already been aired, but I view the operation of a Select Committee as simply being an opportunity for members of the public to make their feelings felt very forcefully. I oppose the measure.

Mr KENEALLY (Stuart): The member for Newland has demonstrated a rather strange logic in his contributions to recent debates in this House, but it is a logic that we find consistently amongst conservatives, not only in Australia but elsewhere throughout the world, and that is that money and property are more important than life. The member for Newland has been a strong supporter of Roxby Downs and the mining of uranium in South Australia. He is prepared to gamble with people's lives, but with regard to this measure now before the House, which is dealing with people gambling with their money, he is opposed to it. It is all right to gamble with people's lives but it is bad to gamble with

people's money: that seems to be the logic of the member for Newland and his colleagues.

The actions of the Government in recent weeks have brought scorn on politicians, and it is no wonder that the community is cynical about the people who represent them. We have seen the Government somersault on a number of measures. Its attitude today for some reason, of which we are all aware, is different from what it was a few weeks ago. We have seen the Government change its mind concerning pay-roll tax; pecuniary interest legislation that is before the House (and we all know how Government members have opposed that); Sunday trading; and uranium, interestingly enough, as members opposite will soon find out. Government members now have changed their minds on that. The Minister of Education knows full well what I am talking about because he was a contributor to the relevant debate. Now, the Government has done it concerning the issue of a casino.

I want to briefly explain what has happened concerning the issue of a casino, during the 12 years that I have been a member of this House. In 1973, when a measure was brought before the House by the Hon. Don Dunstan, not one Liberal member of Parliament supported that measure—not one. There was a Liberal Movement member who supported that measure but not one member of the Liberal Party did. The member of the Liberal Movement was Steele Hall, and he was very critical of his erstwhile colleagues. The paternalism that he has criticised was very much evident then. I am not so sure that it is simply a matter of paternalism: I think that many members of the Liberal Party in their voting on this particular issue have been no more than plain political pragmatists. Their vote has nothing to do with their consciences—it has all to do with who introduced the measure.

In 1973 when this measure was brought before the House the members of the Liberal Party who are now Government Ministers (and I refer to *Hansard*) and who voted against the measure were Messrs Tonkin, Arnold, Brown, Chapman and Goldsworthy, and those who are now back-benchers in today's Government are Messrs Becker, Gunn, Eastick, Mathwin and Russack. The member for Flinders, of course, voted against it but he is not a member of the Liberal Party. Some of those gentlemen indicate a consistency in their views; certainly the member for Goyder does, and he has the respect of all members of Parliament. He has been consistent on this issue, but there are many others whose opinions we are waiting to hear. The member for Alexandra (the Minister of Agriculture) said in 1973 that he could not support a casino and never could support a casino in South Australia. It will be interesting to hear what that honourable gentleman has to say.

I do not need to repeat what the Minister of Industrial Affairs, the Premier, the Deputy Premier, and the Minister of Water Resources said in 1973, but they should be participating in this debate, and I will be waiting to hear what they have to say. To date, and I understand that I am the eighteenth speaker on this matter, we have heard from the Minister of Recreation and Sport and from the newly appointed Chief Secretary, but we have not heard from one other Minister of the Government. As this is a Government measure, the people of South Australia are entitled to know what the feelings of the members of the South Australian Government are. It is not as important to the community to hear what back-benchers on the Government side have to say or even what Opposition members have to say. It is important for people to understand the views of members of the Government.

I believe that at least half of them will not have the courage to stand up and be counted. They might take the opportunity to refer this Bill to a Select Committee, but

they will not have the courage to stand up in this House and explain to the South Australian community why they will vote in a certain manner. Such action might not be so bad a thing if it applied to members on the back-bench, but it is a shameful thing for members of the Government to do, because this is not a private member's Bill—it is a Government Bill, and that is why the people of South Australia are taking it seriously.

I heard the comment made earlier that there was not so much concern when the member for Semaphore introduced his Bill. The reason for that was that the community in South Australia believed that the Government, which has the numbers in this House and which has always voted against a casino, would do so again. It has been only within the past few days that the community has been rudely awakened to what this Government is prepared to do. The Government will do anything to score a few votes politically; it has absolutely no principles at all, and if anyone ever doubted that, the Government's actions in the past two or three days would prove otherwise.

They have somersaulted on many issues that they said they believed in strongly. It was a matter of principle for them. They have somersaulted and those questions ought to be asked. No wonder people in the community can only ascribe one reason for this change in attitude of the Government, and that is that it must have been bought off. There was absolutely no indication at all throughout the community that the Liberal Government in South Australia would introduce such a measure because it has always opposed it and then out of the blue we have this legislation before the House.

It was not only in 1973, I might add, that Liberal members of Parliament opposed this particular legislation. Before he retired in 1979, the Hon. Glen Broomhill wanted to move a private member's motion in this House to see whether the attitudes towards a casino had changed. He canvassed all of his colleagues and he had 20 members in support of a Select Committee. He then took his proposition to a member of the then Opposition, a person who we knew frequented casinos. The Hon. Glen Broomhill thought that member might be able to indicate what support there was amongst the Liberal Party. That particular gentleman, after two or three days of canvassing his colleagues to see what their attitudes were, came back to the Hon. Glen Broomhill and said, 'There is not one vote for a casino in the Liberal Party. You are wasting your time if you bring the private member's legislation before the House.' That was in 1979, not 1973. It was in 1979, when most of the members currently in the House were here. Not one member of the Liberal Party would give an assurance that he was prepared to support a Select Committee to look into the establishment of a casino in South Australia.

In 1981 the member for Semaphore and the member for Gilles on the same day each introduced legislation that was designed to test whether the community in South Australia wished to have a casino. The members of the Labor Party did not support the Bill introduced by the member for Semaphore, because we had a motion of our own on the Notice Paper, which we, in the majority, I believe, would support. That was to establish a Select Committee to look at all aspects of a casino, whether it would benefit South Australia and what problems there were. That particular motion is still on the Notice Paper; it has not been disposed of and not one member of the Government has spoken in support of the motion moved by the member for Gilles and not one member of the Government spoke in support of the Bill introduced by the member for Semaphore. Is it any wonder that the people of South Australia and the members of the Opposition are cynical as to the motives of the Government on this occasion?

There is no road to Damascus performance here. There is some other reason that has influenced the Government to introduce this measure. If Government members are consistent in their voting pattern (as most of the members of the Opposition are), they will have a great deal of difficulty in having this measure supported to the second reading. Therefore, it is quite clear that the Government has taken count of the numbers and is depending upon the support of the Opposition. Of course, if the second reading is supported, Government members will rush around madly in South Australia taking credit for this. It is their measure. That is a cynical move. I suppose politically it is a cunning move; it may get some votes, but I rather doubt that. I rather think that in the long run it may lose a vote.

There are only five members of Parliament left in this Chamber who supported the 1973 motion. I will read those from *Hansard*, as follows: Mr Max Brown, member for Whyalla; Mr Keneally, member for Stuart; Mr Langley, member for Unley; Mr Payne, member for Mitchell; and Mr Wright, member for Adelaide. We are the only five people left in this Chamber who supported the motion on that occasion. Personally, I am very relaxed about a casino. If we had a casino in South Australia, I do not believe I would be particularly worried; if we did not have a casino in South Australia, I certainly would not miss it. One of my colleagues said he is an Australian; he likes to bet. I am an Australian and I would be the worst and most reluctant gambler in the House. Despite that I have been to casinos in Tasmania, the Northern Territory and America and I suppose in total they would have taken from me about \$3 or \$4.

I am not opposed to gambling, I just personally have a total reaction against it. I think it has a lot to do with my background and, without bleeding hearts, I never was in the position to be able to take a chance with a dollar punt on racehorses or anything. I am just not a gambler. I certainly do not have any objection to anyone else who may wish to gamble. There are plenty of avenues for gambling in South Australia. I have no moral objection at all to gambling. I personally would not gamble, but I would certainly not make any decision that would inhibit other people's opportunity to gamble.

On this particular measure, which I will support to a Select Committee, I want to make two very important points. First, I agree with those members who have asked the Minister, when he replies to this debate, to give a very clear indication as to what the terms of reference for the Select Committee will be. The terms of reference must be the widest possible. Everyone in South Australia, or elsewhere, who has a point of view, whether it be a sociological point of view, a gambling point of view, a point of view that relates to crime, whether the citizenry of South Australia would believe that crime would expand, or whether there would be no discernable impact upon crime, ought to be able to put those points of view to the Select Committee. That Select Committee ought not to be inhibited in its ability to have the widest input that is possible for it to have.

There is one particular hangup that I have about a casino in South Australia. I feel my support for a casino at this stage largely depends upon whether the Select Committee brings down this sort of recommendation. I am totally opposed to privately-run casinos in South Australia. If there is any opportunity for crime in a casino, that opportunity exists much more readily in a privately-run casino than in a Government-run casino. I totally agree with the member for Todd. He has expressed much better than I could the failings of private enterprise in areas of gambling. He has expressed much better than I could the corruption that takes place in private enterprise that would not take place

in a Government-run casino. I agreed with the member for Todd and other members that, if we are to have a casino in South Australia, it must be Government controlled, it must be Government funded, and the community of South Australia, not a small group of entrepreneurs or some private enterprise group who do not have their roots in South Australia, should get the direct benefits. I make the strongest appeal to those members, if this should go to a Select Committee, to support that point of view.

I understand that there is, in my own electorate, a small paragraph in the local newspaper that goes something like this: 'Gav is going to vote on the casino legislation. I do not think Gav has asked the local community what they think about the casino. How can he possibly make a decision on our behalf if he has not sought our view?' I do not intend to read out for the benefit of members the comments of Edmund Burke, which I think are the most pertinent comments I have read on the duties of a member of Parliament to his electorate, his own conscience, and his own integrity. Members have responsibilities to all those things. I would advise anybody who wishes to do so to read Edmund Burke on that. The quotes are very readily available from the library. I think perhaps they ought to be compulsory reading for members of Parliament.

I should point out to the people of my electorate, and I shall do so at the appropriate time (and I would assume that the Minister will give adequate reasons for supporting this motion to the Committee stage that my support will be for such an action and I would encourage all those people in Port Pirie and Port Augusta, including the Editor of the *Transcontinental*, to take the trouble to make their views known to the Select Committee, and through the Select Committee they will be made known by me, and I most certainly will take account of them. In conclusion, personally I say once again that I am very relaxed about a casino in South Australia. If there is one, it will only be very infrequently that I will go through its doors. If there is not one, I will certainly not miss it. I have absolutely no objection to it on a moral conscience ground but I am very strong in my view that any casino that may be established in South Australia must be run by a casino commission or a body of that type, a Government body, because I cannot countenance a facility like this in the hands of private enterprise. I feel quite confident that, after hearing the Minister, I will be supporting this Bill to the Select Committee.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I oppose the second reading. I do not think members will be surprised to hear me say that because that has been my attitude ever since entering this House. I do not believe that a casino is in the best interests of South Australia. I guess that, if one were to argue on the economic benefits that a casino may bring to the State, there would be some merit in that argument if, in fact, the casino were the first in Australia and the premises would attract interstate visitors to South Australia. Fortunately for Tasmania, I guess, that State was the first, and there is no doubt that that State did benefit tremendously from interstate visitors and overseas visitors that it attracted to the casino premises. I guess that, basically, it was a novelty that many people wanted to try.

I do not know that very many Australians would frequent the Wrest Point casino on a regular basis but certainly a large percentage of Australians would have been to the casino on at least one occasion. I think, in measuring the economic benefits of a casino to a State, one would have to take into account whether the visitors were curiosity visitors or whether they were genuine gamblers wishing to take a punt and become involved. I have visited Wrest Point casino in Tasmania. I was particularly impressed by

the manner in which it was run. I think every genuine effort was being made by the proprietors to see that the casino was run in an orderly and efficient manner. I do not know that I saw one incident that could cause one to question the manner in which it was run.

I guess it is more a matter of whether one believes that another form of gambling is a necessary part of the life of South Australians. As has been read in this House, a considerable number of forms of gambling already exist, and what is this one but just yet another. One tends to wonder how far it will go. I guess there is the carrot there that people would like to be able to gamble at a casino. We have all of the other forms of gambling and yet the forbidden apple, or that attraction, seems to be there for yet another form of gambling. If we had a casino, what is next? There is another step along the line and there may be a push for poker machines or something else. I think there will always be the element of the forbidden apple just out of the reach of the individual, just something else to look to and something else that may be a change. I do not know that society will ever reach the point where it will be satisfied in the pursuits it may wish to follow along that line.

When the Bill was before Parliament in 1973 I spoke against it, as did many other members. The Opposition has made considerable play about the way in which some members have apparently changed their views. Just so that they cannot include me in that, I reinforce the views I expressed on that occasion and express my opposition. We were then dealing with a Bill that proposed a casino at least 80 kilometres from the metropolitan area of Adelaide. Under this present Bill, that requirement does not apply, although there is no strict provision to say that it cannot be 80 kilometres from Adelaide.

One thing that concerns me a little in any gambling venture or any opportunity for people to gamble is where the real effects of that institution lie. Quite frankly, I have no real concern for the individual who has money to spend, who wishes to take a punt by going along and spending that money, and is prepared to lose it. If a person is prepared to make that calculated judgment in his own mind, good luck to him or her, but how often does it rest at that point? I believe that along the line there are many families who suffer as a result of that lost money. Whilst there may be a winner occasionally, more often than not there is a loser, because if there was not a loser, there would be nothing to go into the Government coffers, so there would be nothing really for the Government to push for.

Along the line it is the wife, husband or children who are left at home, and they are the ones for whom I feel sorry, because they are not in a position to stand up for what they believe and demand and receive their fair share of the family household income. The implications go far wider than the surface. One of the constant cries we hear within the community is that there is not enough money. People are always screaming for increased wages because they cannot meet the breadline. There are always cries that one section of the community is entitled to more money because another section is receiving higher wages, yet it is always the cry that everyone is out of money. On this particular occasion we are providing an institution to take off that surplus money. Where do we stand? One minute we are short of money: next minute we have a surplus and are looking for ways of spending it. I think there is a philosophical argument to be put there as to where one really goes in saying, yes, we have surplus money; our average weekly earnings may be more than adequate to provide for that surplus for casino expenditure and they may not, but there is an inconsistency in the argument.

One of the other problems that does concern me is the manner in which money can be laundered. I think it has been mentioned on many occasions, but we would all know that it is a very simple matter, in the purchase of chips and the cashing in of those chips, to have an exchange of money. Any money that was ill begotten or ill received could easily be lost in the channels of the exchange of money.

We have an avenue, which by its very nature is going to attract a certain element in the community which I do not think anyone would like to have around. Nevertheless, that is a fact of life. In the nine years I have been in Parliament I do not know how many petitions I have presented to this House and I do not know that I could even guess as to how many petitions other members have presented to this House, all opposing the introduction of a casino. Over the weekend, following the Government's announcement last Thursday, I had a new petition containing 153 signatures posted to me yesterday, which would indicate the immediate response of people within my electorate. No doubt, petitions are circulating in every member's electorate at this time in response to the Government's announcement last week.

The indications that my electorate has given to me have been very much against a casino and I must share that view in the same manner in which it has been expressed to me. That is to oppose it at every possible stand. I oppose the second reading of this Bill. Should it get to the Select Committee stage, I would hope to be able to make representation and that people within my electorate will make representations to that Select Committee to put forward their views. I oppose the second reading.

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): This is an extraordinary situation on this measure. Although it is a conscience issue for both sides of the House, it is nonetheless being introduced as a Government Bill, and we have now reached, I think, something like the twentieth speaker in this debate and not one Minister, other than the Minister who introduced the Bill and the Chief Secretary, has had a word to say about it. It is quite an extraordinary gutless performance of the Cabinet, and an indication of the fact that we are confronting in this place one of the worst Governments that this State has ever had since the great depression.

I am saying that, because my words today were misrepresented by the Deputy Premier when he attempted to say I said we were in exactly the same economic situation as we were in the depression. In comparative terms we are, but we have not got 30 per cent unemployment: we have only 8 per cent. What I said was that we have the worst Government since the depression. We have faced 30 wasted months in this State while it has stagnated and what can this Government produce in its last minute flailing around to try to find an issue to win the election—a complete somersault of this issue of a casino and a dressing up to try to salve their conscience over it as some sort of measure on which there is total freedom of voting. In the face of what must have been a Cabinet decision to introduce this measure, we have heard nothing from the key members of the Ministry. I can understand their embarrassment and the appalling situation the Minister of Transport is placed in when he is firmly on record as saying that he is opposed to such a measure and there is no way it will be introduced in the life of this Government, and here he is introducing it.

I think that has been canvassed adequately in the early parts of the debate. The hypocrisy of the Government on this issue has been totally exposed. It is quite extraordinary that it has sunk to this degree of desperation and, as is so often the case, when a Government is going bad, everything

it touches tends to go even worse and these measures that it is trying to dream up in a last-minute attempt to placate those groups they have alienated, or to try to garner some support in the last desperate attempt are going to explode in its face. I think this Bill is a typical example.

We have seen trade-offs going on. Using the word 'trade' reminds one of the issue of Sunday trading, another social issue related to this whole question of a casino. There is enormous criticism of the Government and enormous pressure surrounding the issue of random breath testing and the problems under which the hospitality industry is labouring in this State, and out of the blue the Government produces such a Sunday trading measure and out of the blue another social issue, another cynical attempt to try to rescue itself in some way with the electorate through this Casino Bill. It just will not wash. I reject utterly the statements made by such journals as the *Adelaide News* in its editorials, that what we are saying in the course of this debate is simply the petty bickering of politicians and cheap political point scoring.

If there is any cheap political point scoring going on, it is going on on the Government's side in that gutless Cabinet that has made this decision and flung the Bill out and will not stand up for it in this House of Parliament. It is a Cabinet that allows its back-benchers, and more importantly, the Labor Party to do its work for it, in getting this Bill through the Parliament. It is extraordinary that the *News* should be so deluded to talk about that as political point scoring. The facts are that in 1973 and 1974 proposals have been debated and argued in this Parliament and there has not been, despite the so-called conscience nature of the issue, one Liberal, with the exception of Steele Hall, who was prepared to stand up and support the measure. In 1979, in the canvassing for a proposition which was referred to by my colleague the member for Stuart and of which many of us are aware, again not one single member of the Government side, the then Opposition, was prepared to stand up and be counted, and it is supposedly a free vote and a conscience issue. That is absolutely extraordinary.

We come to 1981, and on the same day proposals were put before this House to raise the issue of a casino as a matter of private members business, not sponsored by the Government, but from private members, from the member for Semaphore, who proposed a Bill for a casino and from my colleague, again on this side of the House, the member for Gilles, who proposed a Select Committee to inquire into the general question of the casino. Those matters were proposed and debated only a few short months ago and, if it was the intention of either the Government Parties or, more particularly, the Cabinet, this rabble that is attempting to lurch its way through the crisis it has created in the State, that something should be done about a casino, there were two alternatives that it could take up.

It could either say that it liked the specific proposal of the member for Semaphore and it would support that and get it to a Committee stage and do something about it, or it could say it preferred (and in fact all members on this side of the House preferred this course and stood up for it) the motion moved by the member for Gilles, which would establish a Select Committee to look into this on a wide-ranging basis without a particular measure. It did neither. It opposed *en bloc* the member for Semaphore, not because it had an alternative, as the Opposition had, something else it preferred, but it opposed, too, the motion moved by the member for Gilles. There was no opportunity provided or no indication given that that would be voted on and supported by the Government.

It simply languished on the Notice Paper and the idea was rejected. In March, out of the blue, suddenly the Government sponsors a Bill that the Ministry is not prepared

to stand behind, but nonetheless a Government sponsored Bill and the hapless Minister of Recreation and Sport has introduced it, not because, I suggest, of its recreational elements but because the Minister who is really meant to be in charge of the matter, the Minister for whom one would have thought the relevance of a casino was most pertinent, happens to be totally opposed to the proposition. I will say in the context of that Minister that I am appalled that she has not yet spoken in this debate, after 20 speakers have been on their feet—not a word from her.

I challenge her to come forward, to get herself on that list and to come and speak in this debate and let it be known what she thinks. If what she says is consistent with what she has said as Minister of Tourism, she ought to resign her portfolio, because the Cabinet of which she is a member has sponsored a measure to implement a casino, in large part on the grounds of the tourist impact and effect it will have. She, as Minister of Tourism, is totally opposed to that course of action. She has no right to hold that portfolio in that Government. We have not seen or heard from her yet. We had better see or hear from her in this debate, or she will stand totally condemned.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BANNON: Yes, I will tell you precisely where I stand, but I am just pointing up the total inadequacy and hypocrisy of this measure. Let me say that this is not, as the editorialist of the *Adelaide News* would suggest, predictable politics in relation to this measure. It is an extremely fundamental principle. We on this side have sponsored, through either a Government or private member's motion, and have supported on a conscience basis, a number of attempts to introduce or have this measure discussed. That has been done by members of the Labor Party—not all of them. Not all of us have agreed at all times that that measure is appropriate. Nonetheless, there are members who have stood up and been counted and sponsored moves.

On every occasion, there has been total opposition from members on the other side. Now they are hoping that they can gain some kudos on the basis of Labor Party support for some sort of social reform along those lines. That will really stick in the craw of members on this side of the House who are prepared to vote this Bill to the Select Committee. Nonetheless, a number of members on this side of the House will do so, because we believe that the issue must be considered before a Select Committee, that it is time to do so, and that it was time to do so many years ago. We will, therefore, vote to ensure that that is done. We will see what happens on the Government side and what the Cabinet of State, which has thrown Cabinet solidarity to the winds on this issue, is going to do in respect of it.

Let me say further that the reasons given for this change of heart by the Government have been totally unconvincing. The time is ripe, it is suggested, in the Minister's second reading explanation, to have such a measure. It apparently has not been ripe at any other time, but it is ripe today in the context of this debate. Why is that? What evidence has been adduced? A public opinion poll, we are told. It is going to be government by public opinion poll, it seems. At least, if Government members are going to make their decisions on the basis of public opinion polls, we are going to get some decisions out of them instead of the immobility to which this State has been subjected for these 30 wasted months. They are actually going to do something, even though what they are going to do is based on the findings of their pollster.

The other aspect of it, we are told in terms of its timing, is that while only six months ago it was obviously inappropriate to support either the member for Semaphore's proposition or that of the member for Gilles, now it appears it

is, because, after all, the Minister says that at one time the establishment of a casino in South Australia would have been seen as a radical move. Now that casinos are well established in Tasmania, the Northern Territory and with Queensland entering the area, the novelty is greatly diminished. I would suggest, too, that if we are talking about tourist initiative, if we are talking of the impact of a casino in terms of tourism and its revenue-raising potential, one could well argue that the time has long since passed. The very fact that all these other States have been establishing casinos in a sense makes what we are doing about casinos fairly irrelevant.

One wonders why, in the face of all their opposition over the period when to establish a casino in South Australia would have had a major impact, if the researchers are to be believed, on both tourism and revenue, now at a time when it is really not going to have that sort of impact the Government has introduced this Bill. It is an extraordinarily convoluted method of arguing. When one looks at the predictions that the Minister has made about the estimated revenue from the casino—he is talking of \$1 000 000 in the first year—one realises what an extraordinary proposition this is. If that is all that we can expect from the casino, if that is all the benefit that the Hospitals Fund will get, why are we embarking down this track? There is genuine community disquiet about it, genuine concern about the nature of casinos and the problems of criminal interests and other anti-social elements established around it. The Government has said, 'We have changed our minds. We have now decided to set them aside in sponsoring this move. In part, we will look at the revenue benefits. We are talking about what is comparatively an insignificant sum.' It sits very oddly against a Government that wants to go through this exercise to establish a casino to get itself \$1 000 000 a year.

When we look at what it has done to the Lotteries Commission in the time that it has been in office, when we look at the way in which it tried to throttle back that particular sector of well-established and well-controlled gambling in South Australia, when the Lotteries Commission wanted to promote particular types of lotteries, when it wanted to expand its advertising budget on clear indications that it would get a far greater return for any of the outlays spent, the Premier himself countermanded those requests by the Lotteries Commission. The Premier himself said, 'You shall not do it. Keep it down at the level at which you are.' The Lotteries Commission could have raised many millions of dollars more than it has been allowed to do under this Government. It would have been done in terms of an acceptable State-run commission, which the public supported by means of referendum many years ago and which has been running with the full acceptance of the public ever since.

That is where more revenue could have been raised. On the contrary, the Government has tried to suppress the Lotteries Commission and its activities and forgone revenue. Now the Government comes before us and says, 'We need more revenue. A casino is one way of getting it.' The sum is trifling; it is insignificant. One reason it is insignificant is that this Bill proposes a casino that apparently will be owned and run by private interests. The return cannot be as great as the return from a properly organised, well-regulated, well-managed State-run and owned casino.

Like a number of my colleagues, I say that if a casino is to be established in South Australia it must be a casino that is owned and run by the community. Certainly, let us get the best management to ensure that the job is done efficiently, and the basis on which they operate—whether by commission, and so on—can be worked out. But, fundamentally, it must be in the hands of the State. It is only that way that we will ensure that not only a proper return

on revenue but also any profits, any specific or special advantages that the casino will give in terms of revenue, will return to the community. That is the principle on which we are working.

This \$1 000 000 within the framework of the Bill that we have seen presented to us by the Minister may be a realistic sum, but it is a trifling sum to put the community to the dislocation that is suggested in the course of this exercise. It is a trifling sum compared with alternative revenue-raising measures, and it indicates the way in which getting it run by these private interests will ensure that the State will not get the sort of benefit that it should from the casino.

We know, of course, that this question of control becomes very crucial, too, in that area of very great concern which many of us share about organised crime and the incentive for it to be involved in this State. One of the things which has protected us from major and widespread corruption and temptation of organised crime has not been some special probability or social conscience of South Australians, although I suggest that, comparatively, there are objective measures to suggest that we do have those to a large extent. Another most important reason is that there just has not been the big, fast money in South Australia that breeds that sort of corruption and that sort of criminal intervention. It is present in some other States. It has not been present here. We have to be very careful, if we are going to pump large sums of money into a particular gambling enterprise in this way, that it be very strictly protected. That, in terms of the way in which this Bill should come from any Select Committee, is a crucial point to be made.

So, we are in quite an extraordinary position in relation to this so-called conscience or social measure. The facts are that if the Government perceived a casino to be of benefit to South Australia, either through the vehicle of the member for Semaphore's Bill or through the member for Gilles' proposal last year, we could have been through this exercise and ready here and now to have some concrete discussion on a specific proposal to be implemented in this House. Instead, nothing happened at all.

Now, we are debating this in this very odd context indeed. What are the Government's motives? Public opinion seems to be one, because it is relying on public opinion polls to determine its policy in the area. Political expediency is clearly another. The fact that the Government is finding that its record is so deplorable that it must show something is another. Finally, I suggest most strongly that we have not really heard the full truth about what financial or other incentives have been suggested to the Government in return for introducing this measure. Those remarks and my question the other day have not been made lightly. It is well known that the site of this casino and who shall have the licence are of great interest in the community and, of course, great financial benefit to whomever is fortunate enough to do it.

An honourable member: The site will be determined by the tribunal.

Mr BANNON: The site will be determined by the tribunal, on reference to the Minister. In this Bill the Minister can withhold that decision from the tribunal and make it himself. If the tribunal decides, the Minister can still make the final decision. So, Government members should not try to come at that and say that they will shelter behind the tribunal. The Government has allowed for Ministerial control of the tribunal, and Government members know it. Is it to be the West End site, the Hilton Hotel, the Railway Station, Victor Harbor, Mr Veenstra's River Murray floating casino, or is it Wallaroo? Where will it go? I suspect that the Government may have some idea about that aspect. Secondly, who is to get the licence? In the way in which the Bill is drawn it

will be put up for grabs in the private sector. It is well known that at least one company interested in these areas of casinos is prepared to provide financial or electoral campaign expenses to Parties that are willing to sponsor some measure of this.

Mr Becker: Name the company.

Mr BANNON: I am not saying that this is conditional on the passage of the Bill. However, I am saying that this is a wellknown fact, and I challenge the Government to deny it with clear conscience.

Members interjecting:

Mr BANNON: Yes, just as the Deputy Premier denied this afternoon in the House that Mr Story was on the selection committee for the Police Commissioner. He is on that committee but the Deputy Premier denied it. It was the same blanket denial that he made yesterday about campaign funds. So, Government members should not come up with this denial thing. They know the facts and the background to this. I suggest that this measure and strange turn-around of Government concern and policy requires a full disclosure from the Liberal Party and the Government as to who is funding its campaign and what sort of donations are being made. I suggest that that would be very appropriate in the light of this rather suspicious move on the Government's part.

Having made those points and canvassed the Bill to the extent that it can be canvassed, bearing in mind that it is to be the subject of a Select Committee, let me finally say that I believe that the proposition put by my colleague, the member for Gilles, as to the committee's composition is one that the Government should heed.

We are told by the Minister that it was not done in the case of the Prostitution Bill, and indeed it was not. On that Bill, the Minister was the only one on the Government side on what was meant to be a free conscience issue, like this one is who stuck to his guns and acted according to his conscience. Putting that to one side, the fact is that on the occasion of the Prostitution Bill I am not aware (and perhaps the Minister is) that requests were made to have the sort of composition of the committee that we have suggested. I do not think that the matter was raised. It was assumed that there would be four Government members, and it simply went on that basis. The matter was not addressed.

Members interjecting:

Mr BANNON: That is right. It was expanded to seven in order to put the member for Mitcham on, and an extra Government member was added in consequence. That was taken as fair and reasonable.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BANNON: He may have told you, but you did not object. Be that as it may, that is surely not relevant to this measure. We have made this request and, in all the circumstances of the Government having been so totally opposed and now doing this back flip, let us at least have those who have been interested and concerned to explore the casino proposition consistently on this side of the House properly and adequately represented.

The member for Semaphore, by all means, should be on the committee because of his interest in the matter, as should the member for Gilles. We have another two members that we believe can provide a major contribution to that committee. Equally, on the Government side, as we on this side will propose members who we believe represent a balance of views, let us hope that the Government will propose some members who will represent a balance of views. Let us see someone who is really openly opposed to this placed on that committee so that representations on that point of view can be heard.

Members interjecting:

Mr BANNON: We intend that they should be represented, because we are going to vote for one. I conclude by saying that I will vote to send this Bill to a Select Committee. I do that very reluctantly. Not only do I have grave reservations about a casino as such for various reasons but also I certainly have very grave reservations about it in the framework of this Bill. But, I think the matter must be explored and, in doing that, I will not be seen in any way to be aiding and abetting this cynical political exercise on the other side. I will vote for it to be considered by a Select Committee, because I believe that it is in the interests of the community for it to be so considered and for everyone to have a fair chance of putting his views through that procedure.

I do that, in no way pre-empting my final attitude on the Bill as it comes from the committee, or my final attitude to the concept of a casino. I stress very strongly indeed that it hurts a lot to be supporting this Government sponsored measure, because of the gross hypocrisy and the way in which it has been introduced.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): Big John has come out punching. He is about as strong as orange flower water, as he was described by his colleague, the member for Salisbury.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I rise on a point of order. The reference made by the Deputy Premier was totally incorrect and was never said, nor would it be said, by me.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I apologise to the member for Salisbury. Of course it was the member for Elizabeth, the Hon. Peter Duncan, who described his Leader as being about as strong as orange flower water. Indeed, he just has been again. Not only is he pathetic but he is also about the ultimate when one thinks of the way in which a two-timer would behave. He says, on the one hand, that this matter must be explored. He spent a considerable part of his speech berating the Liberal Party for not knowing where it is going. The Labor Party is going precisely the same way, because the Labor Party voted to a man against the Peterson Bill when it was in the House. A number of the Labor Party is prepared to support the referral of this Bill to a Select Committee so that it can be considered.

I think that someone on the other side is sick. He is making strange animal noises. I think someone out there is about to calve. It is all right for members opposite to open the dirty tricks bag and tumble the filth out, but when Government members seek to put the record straight they do not like it very much. I repeat what I said to this House, namely, that no approach at all was made to the Government in relation to financing any campaign that the Government might care to mount in any direction. I denied it categorically yesterday, and I deny it again now. While we are in the dirty tricks department let me put this on record: it was put to us (and I would not have mentioned it in this place if the Leader of the Opposition did not persist with this filth) that it was put to this Party about a fortnight ago that someone was in the Philippines trying to drum up campaign funds for the A.L.P. for the next State election. I would not have mentioned this, but—

Mr Slater: Are they going to see General Marcos?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Members of the Opposition do not like it. It was a statement of fact that it was put to us that a prominent member of the Labor Party was in the Philippines trying to drum up campaign funds for the next election on the promise of a casino. If the Leader of the Opposition had not persisted with this calumny in relation to the Liberal Party, I would not have mentioned it, but I categorically deny that any approach has been made to any member of the Liberal Party Cabinet in

relation to campaign funds for the Liberal Party. I state as a fact that it was put to us a fortnight ago that that was happening to the Labor Party.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I would like to know who put it to the Leader of the Opposition so that he can state it with certainty, on two consecutive days, in effect calling me a liar, suggesting that what I am saying to the House is not true. The Leader has raised this matter, and he has compounded the calumny by repeating it tonight. The Leader, running true to form again, completely misrepresented the answer I gave when he asked today whether Mr Story was on the selection panel for the appointment of the new Commissioner of Police. I said perfectly truthfully that, to the best of my knowledge, the answer was 'No', and that is a complete statement of fact. If Mr Story is on the selection panel it was not known to me. That does not detract from the fact that the Leader of the Opposition has completely misrepresented me again tonight. He knows it, but he is so used to dealing in less than the facts that I do not think he could lie straight in bed, and he would not know how to deal with the facts.

The Labor Party does not know where to jump. On the one hand, it has blasted the Liberal Party, saying that members on this side all opposed the previous Bill and now they are running off at sixes and sevens, but what are Opposition members doing? Some are supporting the Select Committee, some are supporting the Bill. Everything that any Labor member has seen fit to say tonight about the Liberal Party applies with equal force to them and the way in which they are behaving. My main purpose in rising briefly to make this contribution was to let it be known—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Opposition members always behave like apes when they have no real contribution to make to the deliberations of this House, and they are running true to form. I shall support the referral of the Bill to a Select Committee because the Government has said that there should be discussion of this matter—precisely what the Leader of the Opposition said a moment ago. He said he would support it to a Select Committee because he believes that there should be public debate.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is precisely the position of the Government. He is supporting the Government. The Government has made clear that there will be no pressure on anyone in this Party to vote in any way, and, unless there is more evidence than I have seen and heard, I will be voting against the Bill at the third reading. I am willing to let people give their evidence to the Select Committee and to hear what they have to say. I have been to casinos in Macao and to one casino in Darwin that is in operation, as well as to one being built there, and I have had discussions with the people who run them. I have seen the casino at Alice Springs in operation, and I have had discussions—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am always flattered by the interest of the Opposition in my speeches. I have never made a speech in this House that has not interested members opposite, judging by the strange noises that emanate from that side of the House. I am flattered by the degree of interest shown by Opposition members when I am speaking.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have been to the casino at Alice Springs and that at Wrest Point. I have talked to the people who run them and to others who are

interested. It will take much weighty evidence before I change my mind to the extent of supporting a casino in South Australia. I have consulted the community leaders in my electorate. I recall the referendum into the State lottery. The electorate of Angas, as it was then, was encompassed in my electorate. The country districts have been progressively enlarged by the Labor Party over the years to reduce the number of seats and keep it in office when it looked like losing. Angas was the only seat in the State to vote against the State lottery.

I have consulted community leaders throughout my electorate, and the overwhelming weight of opinion would be against a casino. I believe in participatory democracy, and one of my functions in this place is to reflect the views of the people who put me here. Before I support this measure, it will be necessary for the community leaders in my electorate to be convinced that I shall do so. When the Select Committee reports in due course, if I am convinced, and if the leaders of the community and the community in Kavel are convinced, that will be the only circumstance in which I will support the third reading. I think that is a highly unlikely event.

I do not believe in casting a vote without making my position clear publicly, and that I have done. I have spoken for five minutes more than I intended because I had the misfortune to come in and hear what the Leader of the Opposition had to say. I could not let that go unchallenged, because it was a completely contradictory and mixed-up effusion in relation to his attitude to the Bill. On this measure, as on most of the other things that come before the House, he and his Party do not know where to jump, and on this issue they are jumping in all directions. The Government brought this measure in because it did not believe that the discussion on the Bill introduced by the member for Semaphore was satisfactory. The Labor Party opposed it to a man because the member for Semaphore is an outcast, a leper, to them. He committed the unforgivable sin of standing against a card-carrying endorsed member of the Party.

An honourable member: Mr Apap?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. The Labor Party did not cast him off, but the public had the good sense to do so. The Bill introduced by the member for Semaphore went out with the Labor Party because he is out with the lepers. A number of Opposition members are going to support the referral of this Bill to a Select Committee, and they say they are being consistent. What credibility do they have?

Mr Hemmings: It's a conscience vote, you fool.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I would suggest to the honourable member for Napier that he should not continue in that manner, and I suggest that he withdraw his comments.

Mr Trainer: He cannot withdraw a fact.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I do not need the assistance of the honourable member for Ascot Park. I invite the honourable member for Napier to withdraw the comments, as I do not believe they assist the deliberations of the House.

Mr HEMMINGS: Are you ruling that my remarks were unparliamentary?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I invited the honourable member—

Mr HEMMINGS: I decline that invitation.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I had almost finished, but the obvious interest of members of the Opposition has compelled me to make a few more remarks. The honourable member said by way of interjection that this is a conscience vote, but the consciences of members opposite must all have been asleep when the member for Semaphore's Bill

was before the House, because to a man they voted against it. We know perfectly well that it is a conscience vote.

Mr Trainer: We had our own Bill on the Notice Paper.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, I think that there is a motion on the Notice Paper from the member for Gilles, but that is not stopping a number of Labor Party members from supporting this measure. So, they have been entirely inconsistent in this matter. I have made my position abundantly clear; I support the Bill to the Select Committee stage so that the public can come and have its say on this matter. It is the Government's view that previous debate was not satisfactory, that the matter should be cleared up, and that members of the public should have an opportunity to express their views and the committee have an opportunity to gather evidence. As I have said, it will need to be pretty weighty evidence to convince me and the people in my electorate that the Bill should be finally supported.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): I should say at the outset that I speak with some feeling of cynical amusement, I suppose one could say, as I am probably the only member who has been consistent about this matter for some months. When I introduced my Bill it was my intention that what might occur on this occasion should happen, namely, that a committee should be set up which would allow for public input and for concerned persons and organisations to contribute their ideas and their protests if desired. So, I have been the only consistent one here.

Members interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: No retorts—I must have been right.

Mr Keneally: You had a seconder, though.

Mr PETERSON: That is true, although he is a bit wavery; he is now probably home watching T.V. or in bed. So, I am not quite sure what will happen with regard to the seconder now but, as far as I am concerned, I was there!

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: Talking about going to bed, why don't you go?

Mr PETERSON: Is the Minister a bit worried about getting a job? I see that he has his croupier's suit on. The Minister must be confident that this Bill will go through, as he is obviously looking for a position on the staff and looks the part; he would be pretty twinkly fingered too, I would think. However, with regard to the business at hand, which is a serious matter, I wonder why the issue has been raised again. Many suggestions have been put forward. I think there has been more than a bit of anxiety on the part of members opposite and I think that is reflected by their attitude. The only members who have signs on their cars telling people who they are (one can see this in the car park) are those in the Liberal Party. I saw a new one today belonging to the member for Glenelg, I think.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: Today is the first time I saw it, and it stood out. That indicates to me that there is quite a bit of anxiety among members opposite. I think that is part of the reason for the introduction of this legislation. I must admit that I feel sorry for the Minister who has introduced it. I think he has been caught in a cleft stick. However, I respect the Minister, and, as I say, I feel sorry for him.

An interesting side effect of the Government's actions occurred only this morning when a very upright, nice looking middle aged but very irate lady came into my office. She swept in and ripped into the Liberal Party. She said that she had been a Liberal supporter but that, following these latests twists and chopping and changing, she would not support them again. Members of the Government should realise that they are starting to lose their support because of all these things the Government is doing.

Mr Trainer: Starting?

Mr PETERSON: That is the first person who has swept into my office in that fashion, and so, that is a start. When the debate about a casino occurred previously I wrote to a fairly broad spectrum of the community, people who I thought would be interested in a casino, and most of them wrote back. I will quote part of one of the letters which is an interesting one. It is a letter from an organisation that has now come forward saying that it is very interested in getting into the casino game. Although I have not read that, I believe it to be so. I wrote to the Victoria Square International Hotel Pty Limited asking that company of its intent, in an endeavour to get a feeling from the community of what was going on. I have the reply, dated 15 June which is here for anyone to see, signed G. A. Fricker. The letter states, in part:

The plans for the development of the Adelaide Hilton International Hotel do not make provision for the introduction of a gambling casino. Moreover, the structure of the building is such that this could not be readily accommodated in the future, even if this course of action became possible.

That is a significant group in the race for a casino, I would think, which in June last year could not accommodate one. However, now, in March 1982 it is obviously interested in it, so there has been some change in attitude. So far in the debate there have been comments on the ownership of the casino. I said previously in this House that I believe that the State should own and operate it. So, there is nothing new in my saying that in this instance. In the debate that has occurred I have had a feeling of being there before.

Mr Trainer: *Deja vu.*

Mr PETERSON: Yes. As a matter of fact, when I looked back at my speech I found that I had said things that have now been repeated. Therefore, I must have been a fairly wise fellow at that time. One of the criticisms at that time was the fact that members had not been given sufficient chance to speak to the Bill and to put their points of view forward. One of the things that worries me is that, since the introduction of the previous Bill and its defeat, some three months had elapsed, and then following that three months there had been comments from the Government side, in particular, that it has not had a chance to have a say. Therefore, I would have anticipated that because of the intervening time there would be much new information coming forward and that a new set of arguments would be advanced by interested speakers. However, there was not one new argument put forward today, not one new point, not one new piece of evidence to support or oppose the Bill. The arguments were the same old, dragged out arguments that were put forward before.

There is nothing new in the arguments that have been put forward, so what is different in the attitude of some people? Contained in the previous two measures, the one that I proposed and the one that the member for Gilles proposed, were provisions for a Select Committee or a committee of some type to allow for public input. Indeed, at the time I told the member for Gilles that if my Bill lapsed I would certainly support his Bill for a Select Committee because I believed that it would be a reasonable thing to do to bring out the facts of the matter.

[Midnight]

As a matter of fact in tonight's speeches there have been allegations and innuendoes about moneys being offered. I would like to put it clearly on the record that when I introduced my Bill I had not been approached by any person with any interest in establishing a casino.

Mr Hemmings: No-one suggested that.

Mr PETERSON: I realise that, but I am putting it on the record. I was never approached at any stage by anybody with a financial interest in the casino when I put that Bill

forward. After the Bill was introduced, I was contacted by one or two persons with an interest, but nobody at all ever offered me money—I would not have taken it, anyhow.

Mr Hemmings interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: Nobody with any vested interest, put it that way. 'My bad luck', as the honourable member says. I would like that on the record because it has been mentioned in this Chamber tonight. It certainly was not so in my case and I would like it also on record that I would not have accepted money even if it was offered. Members have spoken about the casinos that they have visited. I have been lucky to do some travelling and have visited a few casinos. I have been to Wrest Point. I have been lucky to have travelled around a little in my life. I am not a gambler, but I was in Las Vegas at one stage; I lost \$10 and that was that. I have no vested or personal interest in gambling as such, and I have no interest in a casino. I would visit it if it was there, but my whole approach during the debate has been to get a decision on this matter. I was disappointed we could not do that before.

I will be supporting this Bill at the second reading. I suppose that, by supporting the Bill at the second reading, because my name has been thrown around fairly widely as a member of the Select Committee, people may suggest that I am doing it to get on the Committee. If that is so, and if anybody thinks that I am quite prepared—

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: You're entitled to do that.

Mr PETERSON: Yes, I am not doing anything to get on the committee. I believe that the Select Committee is a reasonable thing; I have backed that up by saying that I have supported it from the start. It is just a point that may be picked up at some later stage, and it is not so. What are we looking at on the Select Committee? I think we had better look at what we want from it. Last year I investigated casinos fairly broadly, and I would be extremely interested to see the additional information that comes out of the Select Committee.

I am very disappointed that not one piece of additional information has come out of the debate tonight, even though people said earlier that they had reservations about the legislation because they did not have the opportunity to speak. Both of the previous Bills had provisions for a committee to take public submissions, and the thing that worries me is that to date, in all of this debate and in all the work done on this matter basically by three members in this House, there really has not been any opportunity for the public to have any input into this matter.

I think it also has to be considered that there are South Australians who do want to gamble in a casino (what that percentage is nobody is sure of) and there are South Australians who want to gamble in one. I sincerely believe that if this House does not allow a Select Committee to gather all the possible information it will do the State an injustice. People have the right to know as much as possible about the effects of any casino established here. The act of carrying the second reading does not automatically mean that there will be a casino here. As a matter of fact, many speakers tonight have said that they are waiting on the outcome of that Select Committee. I think that is a wise stance now. I believe that all members, if they have the interests of the people of this State at heart and want to get as much information as possible for or against a casino, should support the second reading. I think that anybody who denies the public of this State the right of access to all possible information on this matter will not really be living up to his responsibilities as a member of this Parliament. I would ask all members of this House to seriously consider what I say. I know I am a fairly new member here and that my words do not have much weight in the House, but it is important that the people of this State and the members

of this Chamber have as much information as possible to make a judgement upon the matter, and I ask the House to support this Bill on the second reading and see what comes out of a Select Committee.

Mr SCHMIDT (Mawson): I rise to support the second reading so that the Bill can progress to a Select Committee.

Mr Hemmings: You hypocrite.

Mr SCHMIDT: Come on now. Before you jump to any conclusions my dear friend just listen for a while. The debate this evening has been somewhat interesting, because the Labor Party has gone to great pains to do as it normally does, that is, take a handful of mud and throw it into the stream of argument and stir up the waters, hoping to blaze it can muddy it up enough so that its own supineness can be covered up.

Members opposite were beaten to the punch by the member for Semaphore when he introduced his Bill last year. So, in order not to be shown up, we quickly saw them also propose a Bill for a Select Committee. This was a prime example of one person acting as the legitimate Opposition and, rather than embracing him back into the Party, members opposite were prepared to leave him out on the outer and now they have tried to outdo him. However, he outmanoeuvred them right from the word 'go'.

The member for Peake raved and ranted and was quite entertaining, and he tried to stir up this whole issue of offering money to the Party, and so forth. Then he came out with an interesting statement that there was no way in the world that he would support the introduction of this measure by a Liberal Government, but if it was introduced by the Labor Party by all means he would support it. That raises the question of the conscience vote, because if we hark back when we had the debate on the prostitution Bill the member for Florey said, 'I am espousing my Party's policy.' When that uproar occurred, he turned around and said, this is a conscience vote. Yes, I am expressing my conscience here, and I shall follow my conscience. So, there has been a definite indication on this matter from Opposition members, and unfortunately the member for Florey committed a Freudian slip when he let it come out that he was going to follow the Party line rather than exercise his conscience.

As has been pointed out quite categorically tonight, when the member for Semaphore introduced his Bill we saw Opposition members cross the floor, because there was no way in the world that they could countenance the kind of thing being mooted by somebody else sitting on that side of the House, and they came out against it. Where is their conscience vote? Of course, it was not a conscience vote; they were playing pure politics and did not want to be outmanoeuvred by somebody else. So now they are stirring up the waters again and saying, 'We shall exercise our conscience vote.'

Let us get back to some of the things that have been mentioned in the debate tonight. One of the interesting statements was that made by the member for Salisbury, who indicated that he personally was against gambling and he was opposed to the casino but brought in as an alternative, and a very interesting one, the Austrian and West German foreign lottery system. He said that they were up to their 114th lottery and it had gained \$12 500 000 revenue for the country.

Does the member for Salisbury deem that sort of money as foreign risk capital or does he regard it as gambling? To me, there is no difference: if he does not countenance gambling, he could not countenance that form of lottery, either.

I think unfortunately that many people look upon a casino as being the panacea to many of our economic and employ-

ment ills and that they are trying to look upon it as being some form of compensation for those areas. I am sure other members received at the end of last year a document handed out by Rev. Keith Smith, of the Uniting Church, the former Moderator for Australia, in which he outlined several of these factors. As part of the background debate he referred to a book called *Gamblers' Money*, which won the Pulitzer prize.

Going through his argument, there are some flaws in it. However, he addressed himself to the economic aspect of the whole debate and said that we have the case in Tasmania where initially, because this was a brand new casino, of course everybody flocked to that casino, but what we have now found happening is that there is a redistribution of the wealth of the tourist dollar and also a redistribution of the wealth of the gambling dollar. That is one of the things that will have to be looked at by the Select Committee in determining the benefits of such a casino. If we allow people to gamble in casinos, how many of these people are going to withdraw their money or their support from other forms of gambling, such as the T.A.B. or dog-racing, on which we have already heard argument tonight?

A casino, on the other hand, is going to be more attractive to a certain clientele. I do not think we will find too many low-income earners being able to go into a casino to spend money. They will probably stick to Instant Money, X-lotto and those forms of gambling. There are those sorts of revenue or economic aspects that would have to be examined by the Select Committee.

I think more important is the element of crime, which has also been raised tonight. When we debated the Prostitution Bill, I said that I was not convinced from all the arguments put forward in the debate at that time that there would not be elements of criminalisation coming into South Australia. Obviously, this is a concern expressed not only by the former Moderator of the Uniting Church but by many people in the community—that this sort of thing will attract syndicates. Again, examples are given of the laundering of money, the use of prostitutes in the U.S.A. and the closure of casinos in London, namely, the Playboy, Ladbroke and Coral casinos, and so again I go back to the point that this will have to be looked at very closely.

Other elements of this debate concern me personally. I recall that in 1975 when I visited Wrest Point in Hobart—I could not afford to spend money gambling—it was certainly educational walking around with a drink in my hand watching people, the way they acted and the sort of money they could turn over, and the sort of money some people turned over at that stage I could have lived on for half a year when I was a student. What disturbed me most of all was the fact that, on one of the levels of the casino, one could sit in the bar and watch closed circuit television, and much to my surprise there was nothing there to forewarn you that it was a blue movie being shown.

If we are going to say, as has been said, that minors will not be allowed into a casino, we are back to the situation we have now in our hotels involving the drinking problem, which is how you identify an 18-year-old. We know that this is not easily done. Therefore, I would again advocate, and I think the member for Fisher raised this point, that at some time society as a whole must examine this question of identification. On the one hand we are saying we should be prepared to spend millions of dollars rehabilitating young people because of their involvement with alcohol. We try to rehabilitate them because of their involvement with drugs and with a number of other matters, but on the other hand we do nothing to try to minimise that involvement, and I refer particularly to alcohol.

It is too difficult for anyone to clearly identify the age of a person in that general age bracket. I again go back to

the point that at some time we will have to look seriously as a society at this idea of identification, because it not only helps us in that regard, but it also has other widespread advantages, namely, for pensioners cashing cheques, giving them a ready form of identification, and it also gives ready identification for shopping and other purposes. Perhaps that is a side issue that the Select Committee might decide should be examined at some future time.

I support the second reading so that the Bill may go to a Select Committee. I do this from the point of view of knowing people within my own constituency who have expressed their concern over the casino, so that they may have an opportunity to go before the Select Committee and present their evidence to it, so at least in that way their voices have been heard. All that evidence can be condensed into a report, and we will be in a far better position to look at that report, examine the evidence that has been put to us, and hopefully come to a more objective analysis of the whole casino issue.

I might add that I opposed the Bill when it was presented by the member for Semaphore and similarly, on personal grounds, I would also oppose the Bill at the third reading on moral and social grounds. I am prepared to accept the second reading of this Bill so that it may go to a Select Committee, so that those persons whose minds are not yet made up on the issue may give the matter the due regard that it deserves.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health): I oppose this Bill, just as I opposed the previous Bill. I oppose it for the fundamental reasons of my objection to gambling and my very deep disquiet about the effect that a casino could have on South Australia. The basic concept of gambling to me is abhorrent. I think that it is anti-family and that it expresses an approach to life and to recreation that is unproductive and unfulfilling. For that reason I believe that it would be inappropriate for Parliament to pass this Bill.

I am concerned about the opportunities for criminal elements to gain a foothold in this State as a result of the presence of a casino, which would provide possible protection for them in terms of covering up their activities and their financial gains. Other speakers have dealt at some length with that aspect, and I will not pursue it. However, I will deal with the subject of the alleged benefits to tourism which are supposedly inherent in the establishment of a casino. I should say that I have too much regard for South Australia to believe that its attractiveness needs to be enhanced as a tourist destination by the establishment of a casino and I am inclined to agree with a letter which I received today and which expressed the view that Adelaide is fast losing what made it distinctive, that is, not doing every fool thing that is done in other places.

That may perhaps be a somewhat harsh judgment, because I believe that Adelaide is distinctive and will continue to be, given care, judgment and foresight by the people who are responsible for its social and economic planning, as well as its environmental planning.

I had not intended to speak at length, but I do want to respond to the most extraordinary charges made by the Leader of the Opposition in the *News*, which was published yesterday, and also in his speech tonight. The headline in the *News* yesterday read, 'Adamson must quit portfolio'. The report of his remarks, if he was reported correctly (and his remarks tonight appear to indicate that he was reported correctly), was as follows:

The State Opposition today called on the Tourism Minister, Mrs Adamson, to resign her portfolio because of her stand on casinos.

The Opposition Leader, Mr Bannon, said Mrs Adamson would be in conflict over the need to promote tourism and her opposition to casinos.

Tonight, he said words to the effect of, 'She has no right to hold the portfolio'. I feel that it is absolutely extraordinary that a member of the Labor Party should say, in effect, that I and I alone am the only member in this House who is not allowed to exercise a conscience vote on an issue because it (the Labor Party) alleges that my stand is in conflict with my responsibility as a Minister of the Crown.

Such an assertion is absolutely preposterous. It completely denies the basic rights of Parliamentarians, including Ministers of the Crown, and it is based on such a false premise that I should think that the allegation would bring the Leader of the Opposition into disrepute, even amongst his supporters. To suggest that I should not be able to exercise a conscience vote because of some alleged conflict with my Ministerial duties is quite ridiculous and simply cannot be substantiated. In addition, to suggest that there is conflict on this matter and that I cannot continue to hold my portfolio ignores the fact that for 2½ years this Government has done more for tourism than has any previous Government in the history of South Australia.

Before I go into some detail on the promises and the performance, let me respond to the allegation that my colleagues rejected my stand on this. I want publicly to commend the Government for introducing legislation that has enabled members of this House to express a view and to record a vote that is based on a Bill that is soundly structured in terms of its legislative nature.

Earlier this evening, the Leader of the Opposition referred to Ministers as 'gutless' because they had not spoken in this debate. I think that the Leader of the Opposition will find that a number of Ministers will speak. They will express differing views, because we are dealing with a matter of conscience.

Mr Bannon: You are accepting the challenge—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Health has the call.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It certainly does not become the Leader of the Opposition to suggest that I am accepting the challenge late in the day. I have made my views public right from the start. I have never shirked from expressing a view on this Bill, and I do not shirk from it right now. Nor do I shirk from voting in accordance with the views that I have expressed. To suggest that Ministers are gutless simply because for various reasons, including work responsibilities, they have not entered the debate earlier in the evening, to my mind is absolutely unworthy.

Let me just deal with some of the achievements of the Liberal Government in tourism, and go back to the early days of our election and look at the organisation of the Tourism Department that we inherited from the previous Government. As a result of the recognition that that department was not sufficiently staffed and was not given sufficient resources, I initiated a review of tourism in South Australia, which was conducted by Rob Tong and Associates. As a result of that review, the department was reorganised and upgraded. We established a Tourism Development Board to provide advice to the department and the Minister of Tourism. Again, without prejudice, and in accordance with an undertaking which I gave to the board, I express to the House the view of the board on a casino. Whilst not all board members support casinos, the general view held by the State Tourism Development Board is that a casino should be established in South Australia. In saying that, I am expressing my undertaking to the board to convey its view to the House. In addition, five regional managers have been appointed to supervise the development of tourism in the 12 tourism regions in South Australia.

That initiative has been most warmly welcomed by tourism associations and will go a long way towards improving the professionalism of approach in the areas that are important

to tourism development in this State. The department's office, which was formerly known as the Tourist Bureau, has now been renamed the Government Travel Centre, in accordance with what I believe is an accepted practice and a name far more appropriate to the function of the centre.

Now we come to a very important part, particularly in the light of the economic restraints which are facing this Government, all State Governments and the Federal Government. Since 1978-79 the department's funds for advertising and promotion have been increased by 62.1 per cent. Grants to regional tourist associations were introduced in the 1979-80 Budget, the first Liberal Budget. Since then, they have been increased by 30.8 per cent. When we came to office there was not one dollar given by the previous Government to regional tourist associations. Overall funds to the Department of Tourism have been increased by 35.4 per cent since 1978-79. I would like to speak now about marketing campaigns that have been undertaken by the department.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will link her remarks with the clauses of the Bill?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes, Sir, I do so to outline that the assertion that the development of tourism depends to a large degree on a casino is a false assertion, and to demonstrate that tourism can and has taken place in this State without the development of a casino thus far. Various marketing campaigns have been conducted. The 1979-80 intrastate campaign entitled 'The Long-Lost Weekend' resulted in an extra 60 000 holiday trips in this State generating an increase of \$3 500 000 in tourist expenditure. Reference has been made this evening to the fact that the revenue to the Government from the casino in a year would be in the order of \$1 000 000. I contrast that with the \$3 500 000 generated, not, admittedly, directly to the Government but within the State economy, as a result of that single campaign.

The 1980-81 Hit the Trail campaign, which cost \$886 000, was launched. It was the first time ever that television had been used to promote South Australia to South Australians. Indications are that this is a highly successful campaign, although the final results are not yet available. In 1979-80 the interstate VISA campaign resulted in a 6.3 per cent increase in interstate visitors to South Australia, leading to the generation of an additional \$12 000 000 in tourist expenditure. In 1980-81 the Discover the Many Worlds of South Australia campaign was launched. In 1980, 1981 and 1982 the department sent its Director to the International Tourism Fair in Berlin. As a result of that, South Australian tourist destinations are now being included in the package tours of major European tour operators.

At the moment, the department is involved with the Australian Tourist Commission in a major promotion in South-East Asia, and it is also participating in the Premier's tour. Later this year we will undertake another promotion in New Zealand. All of these things have a bearing on this Bill in that they demonstrate that tourist development does not necessarily hinge on the establishment of a casino.

As far as economic development is concerned, the Government has been active in trying to provide incentives to encourage tourist operators to establish facilities in South Australia. The tourism development loan scheme has been established. We have to look to the construction of the Adelaide Hilton Hotel, which will open later this year and which will employ 400 people when it is operational. I am not sure, because I have not heard all the contributions to the debate, whether the proposed introduction of international flights to the Adelaide Airport has been mentioned but, if it has been, there would have been reference to the fact that those flights will bring tourists into South Australia who will undoubtedly undertake package tours and spend

considerable sums, tens of millions of dollars in a year, which will generate economic prosperity for South Australia. All of this is taking place, and will take place without the establishment of a casino.

As far as forward planning is concerned, I know that every member of the House is aware that a conference is to be held this month (as we are now past midnight and it is 1 April) to enable industries all over South Australia to participate in the development of a five-year South Australian tourism development plan. So, in summary, the overview of the Government's achievements—and I mean achievements, not just promises—is that we have increased substantially the number of trips to and within South Australia since assuming Government. The figure was 5.1 per cent over the 1979-80 figures. Interstate trips increased by 6.3 per cent, and intrastate trips by 4.7 per cent in 1979-80. The increase in interstate visitors followed a decline of 4.7 per cent recorded in the previous year, the last year of the Labor Government in office.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: These are A.B.S. figures. The increase in intrastate trips followed a growth of only 1.8 per cent in the previous year, the Labor Government's final year in office. Since 1978-79, the number of rooms sold in hotels and motels in South Australia has increased by 6.7 per cent, and the majority of this increase occurred in the 1980-81 year, the year in which a 5.1 per cent increase took place.

All of this has been achieved by a Government and a Minister who, it is claimed by the Opposition, has no right to hold the portfolio. I believe that the achievements speak for themselves and they also indicate quite clearly that this rate of development can and will continue and will not hinge on the establishment of a casino.

I am very doubtful of the benefits of a casino. I am not so doubtful of the disadvantages, because I believe that it has been proved the world over that, once the initial novelty has worn off, the disadvantages associated with the casino become apparent, particularly the social effects, and most particularly the possible encouragement that can be given to criminal elements as a result of the establishment of a form of disguise for the acquisition of money by improper means, and this worries me very greatly.

Again, I commend the Government for doing what I believe has been the right and proper thing, for trying to ensure that a vote is taken that is not a distorted vote, as was the previous vote that was distorted, I believe, by the Labor Party's jealousy of the Independent member for Semaphore, but a vote that truly reflects the view of members of this House. I think the Government is to be commended on its initiative in this regard. Having said that, I repeat that I oppose the Bill and I hope very much that it does not pass.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I support the Bill, and I commend the Minister of Recreation and Sport for bringing before this House a proposal that is clear and straightforward on the subject of a casino in South Australia. Since I have been in this Parliament there have been a number of attempts to canvass the issue of whether or not South Australia should have a casino, and on each and every occasion they have been very clumsy attempts indeed. In 1973, the then Premier of South Australia introduced a Bill which was encumbered by a number of provisions. For example, he said at the time that if this, and if that, a referendum would be held and, if successful, for example, the Bill would come back to the House for debate and the conditions would be further identified, etcetera, etcetera, and at the end of the line, under no circum-

stances, however, if and when agreement was reached could a casino be established outside of an 80 kilometre radius of the city of Adelaide.

It was no wonder that the House was thrown into confusion at that time, as was the public, and we were invaded by heaps of petitions, bearing thousands upon thousands of signatures, from people who had become alarmed at the alarmist type publicity that the subject attracted. The member for Semaphore has sought this evening to explain his position yet again and his reasons for introducing a Bill as he did. Clearly, on that occasion last year the member for Semaphore proposed to take the business of the Government out of the hands of the Government. The conditions associated with his Bill clearly proposed to do that.

An honourable member: Nonsense.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: He did. Subsequently the Opposition spokesman on tourism sought the establishment of a Select Committee, and indeed a naked one at that. He failed to identify the conditions on which the committee would operate and the conditions on which a facility, if granted a licence, would be able to perform, and he got what he deserved in this place. This time, the Minister of Recreation and Sport has presented to the House not only a clear and straightforward opportunity for public participation on a subject on which the public deserves to have an opportunity to be involved, but he has accompanied that principal ingredient in the Bill with the conditions on which a licence would be granted, identifying quite clearly in the definitions clause the terms on which an application or group of applications would be considered, licence fees, registration requirements, the contributions that a successful licensee would be required to make to Government, and indeed in great detail setting out the circumstances under which it would be granted. I come back to the principal element of the Bill: the opportunity for the public not only to participate but to know the ground rules when setting out to give evidence to the Select Committee.

If a Select Committee is formed in this House, which I hope will be the case, it will go into this arena and take evidence on subjects that witnesses wish to put before it. I have no doubt that they will be invaded by emotion and all the rest of the concerns that occupy the minds of South Australians, which has been the case in the past, which is the case to some extent now and which will be the case in the future whenever this subject comes forward. I do not propose to enter into the debate about the details of those personal emotions that have been expressed over and over again before, and again during this debate. I simply express my delight about the measure that has been taken giving individuals an opportunity which they deserve. I know where the lay members of my own Party stand and I know where the senior representative members stand on this issue. An opportunity has been given for a conscience vote on this matter and members have demonstrated their intention to exercise that right.

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): I want to inform those people who are interested that I oppose this Bill. I do not believe there is any need for any more of this type of gambling entertainment. It will not affect the working man, the family man, I suppose, because it mainly caters for a different class of person, although there are a small number of working men who frequent this type of establishment. There are a number of agencies already available in various areas where a person who wishes to gamble, whether it is on the horses, the trots, or whatever, can do so. I think there is ample provision available for this type of entertainment. There are the horses, the trotting, dogs, Instant Money, and many other areas.

If one looks at the situation generally, there is only a certain amount of money available for this type of interest, but unfortunately there are some people who, after having spent an amount of money that they have put aside for this type of entertainment, find that they have become addicted and then have to find money from other sources. Indeed, it can cause a lot of hardship to many families and there are people who go short in relation to food and clothing for their children, and so on.

The Bill presented by the Minister does not include poker machines; if there is to be a gambling Bill introduced and if everyone is madly interested in providing facilities of this nature, why lay off poker machines? If people are entitled to go into casinos, why should there not be poker machines, as most of the casinos I have been in have had poker machines? If it is the intention to make it easier for people to gamble, why not make it open slather? It is not that I support poker machines—indeed, I do not—but if that is the intention of the legislation, let us make it an open slather for everything.

There has been much talk by many people in relation to the effects of casinos. Also, there has been much talk about the tourist attraction that a casino would be to this city and this State. I believe it can be properly argued that, if there was only one casino in Australia, there might be something to argue about along those lines, but does anyone in this Chamber tonight really believe that people go to Tasmania, Alice Springs or Darwin just because there is a gambling house there? Do members believe that people who have frequented places like Monte Carlo over many years merely go there to have a run on the tables? I do not believe that that is a fact at all. I have been to Tasmania on a couple of occasions and I certainly did not go there just for the purpose of going to the casino. In fact, I have not been to the casino in Tasmania, but I have been to casinos in other parts of the world.

The member for Brighton emphasised the fact that he believed there would be a great interest and a great attraction to tourists created by the provision of a casino. However, it has come to my notice only recently, in fact, while watching a programme this evening, that in America casinos in Las Vegas, and particularly in Atlanta, have contributed to an increase in the crime rate of 3 per cent. I ask in all seriousness whether that is what we want here in South Australia. We have a fair amount of crime now, but are certainly better than many other parts of the world, and we certainly do not want to have an increase.

Many years ago I went to Monte Carlo and attended the casino there, and I saw the dowager, old ladies there with their systems that never work, who spend all their days at the casino in the grand place that it is. However, I can see no advantage in that in relation to the city of Adelaide. When I was in the United Kingdom recently I attended a casino there with some friends. They do fairly well there; they give free meals, but, of course, they also have poker machines for people who wish to play them. As I said, if this State is to provide these dens of iniquity, let us do it properly and lay the matter open and give everything a free go.

There is no doubt that, if we are considering gambling, one must also consider prostitution, because we cannot split them. If one talks about prostitution one must talk about drugs because the two are allied, and any person who is running a prostitution racket, generally speaking, is involved in drugs. If they can involve the prostitutes with drugs, they have then got them under their thumb for the rest of the time for which they are able to perform the duties of a prostitute. Those two things go hand in hand. I would hope that members of this Chamber would not be encour-

aging in this State prostitution that is closely allied to the drug scene.

I would like to refer to the Bill, because there is one area which was touched on by the member for Mawson earlier and which certainly concerns me a great deal. That is the area of the young people and the juveniles. We should all be concerned about the young people that get into trouble and are able to do so in areas such as this. We see that clause 22, the 'Provisions as to age,' states:

No person under the age of eighteen years shall be admitted to a licensed casino. Subclauses (3) and (4) provide:

(3) It shall be a defence to a charge of an offence under subsection (2) for the defendant to prove that he believed on reasonable grounds that the person to whom the charge relates was over the age of eighteen years.

(4) A person under the age of eighteen years who enters a licensed casino shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding five hundred dollars.

How on earth is this to be policed? We have a situation now in our licensed hotels of under age drinking where kids are in there drinking at 15 and 16 years. They cannot be controlled now. The police cannot control the situation. The hoteliers cannot control the situation. Who, in all reason, can point the finger at a young person—

Mr McRae: What about your law and order campaign to make the streets safe for kids to walk in?

Mr MATHWIN: I wish the honourable member for Playford would go back to sleep.

Mr McRae: I haven't been asleep.

Mr MATHWIN: You ought to be asleep.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is only to be expected that members on both sides of the House will have divergent views on the matter before the House. The Chair will not allow them to express those views concurrently.

Mr MATHWIN: I say that clauses 22 and 23 cannot be policed. The only way to police the situation with young people under the age of 18, going into a casino and drinking, and the like, is to have identity cards with a photograph on them. That is as plain as can be. If we are going to legislate to keep the juveniles out and protect them, the only way to police it is by identity cards and by photographs on those identity cards, because over the years, while the young people are going into hotels to drink or to see R films and the like, no-one has a chance of saying just how old they are or guessing it. It is impossible to do that. The only way you can do it is by using identity cards. I would like to refer in part to the explanation given by the Minister in introducing this Bill. The Minister said:

The Government has also taken into account the advantages that will flow to the State if a casino were to be established.

He went on to say that:

It will provide potential for future development of this State as a tourist attraction.

Of course, that is open to argument; I do not believe it will. I do not believe for one minute that people would decide to come to South Australia because we have a casino here. I think that is complete rubbish. The explanation of the Bill goes on:

It has been stated that the establishment of a casino in South Australia will have a minimal family impact only.

That is a situation I would disagree with also. I believe that that statement is quite wrong. I believe it will have an impact on the family, especially in the cases where people are unable to control themselves and who become latched by the gambling bug and attend the casino regularly, forcing hardship on their families in relation to the lack of food or clothes.

Mr McRae: Well, get rid of him as well as the other Minister.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Playford.

Mr MATHWIN: In the Minister's explanation, he goes on to say:

Provision has also been made to prohibit a person under the age of 18 years being admitted to a licensed casino.

I do not think provision has been made. Words are about all that has been made. I know that it would be impossible to police the situation, unless of course we are going to go into the provision of identity cards with a photograph. Whether it is done with identity cards or a driver's licence, I do not care, but if we are going to police it, that is the only way you are going to stop juveniles going into these casinos.

My other objections to the Bill are that it will cause great social problems within the State. It is another form of gaming gambling that is not needed. It will affect some families, and with it we are going to extend gambling. We are going to encourage more prostitution than we already have and we are going to allow and encourage drugs. We are going to bring in a greater criminal element than we have at the moment. There is no doubt in my mind that we will have this element in it, whether we like it or not. I believe it has been proved in many other countries that that is what happens.

Last time a similar Bill was before the House, my stand was the same as it is now. I oppose the Bill for the reasons that I have given. I believe that the majority of people within my electorate have also indicated to me their feelings previously on this matter. They do not want a casino in this State and, certainly, my advisers who are close to me in my electorate, my committees, and the people I rely on to keep me in touch with the people within the electorate also know and have advised me that we in South Australia do not need a casino. I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs): I was interested to hear various members opposite earlier this evening ask why the Ministers are not speaking. I had already put my name down to speak. I was also interested to hear what a number of members had to say about what I said in 1973 when debating a casino Bill, as though there had been a sudden change of attitude. I can assure honourable members that I think I opposed the Bill in 1973 on two fairly specific grounds. The first ground was the rather illogical way in which the then Government had brought forward the Bill. My argument was that the proposed referendum was not particularly logical because the referendum was—

Mr McRae: Too democratic.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: No, not too democratic. The referendum, if the member for Playford would remember, was whether or not the casino should be established in a particular town, not whether or not a casino should be established. I pointed out I thought that it was more important, in a referendum, to establish the principle, rather than the details, as to where, for economic reasons, the casino should be established.

The other argument I put forward was that I did not particularly support a casino. I have, on a number of occasions during Ministers' conferences, stayed at Wrest Point casino in Hobart. Frankly, I am not a person who has any great desire to gamble, at least in a casino. Some people appear to enjoy gambling. I acknowledge there are a reasonable number of people and a large number of tourists at Wrest Point who participate in gambling. I find it a fascinating evening wandering through the casino and watching the expressions on the faces of people as they congregate around a table. I found the two-up table at Wrest Point interesting: it was an area in which there was more life than in other areas. Perhaps there were more amateurs there too. There was a certain atmosphere, and

people who were probably there for the first night seemed to be enjoying it. I remember that one particular character had had something like seven or eight straight wins and was doing extremely well. I have not changed my attitude to casinos since 1973. I do not believe that it will be of enormous benefit, and I am not yet convinced that there is an enormous demand for a casino within the community of South Australia.

The tourist aspect has been raised. I do not know whether the tourist aspect is so positive but, if it is important, it is hard to determine exactly how important it is. There is a casino in Tasmania, two casinos to be built in Queensland and two existing casinos in the Northern Territory. To a certain extent any State that does not have a casino may lose out on some tourism because of the lack of that facility.

It is important to highlight the fact that a casino is no longer a great tourist attraction in Australia. The great benefit that would come from a casino is the ancillary hotel and other potential facilities that go with it. If there is to be a Select Committee, that committee should look seriously at the possibility of convention facilities that might go with a casino and at how viable those convention facilities would be.

Of all the possible benefits I can see coming out of a place like Wrest Point, I should have thought the convention facilities would be of the greatest benefit to Tasmania and, as a consequence, tended to attract certain conferences. The convention facilities at Wrest Point 12 months ago when I was there were fairly minimal and inadequate, although I believe that new convention facilities are being built. I saw plans of those new facilities but I could not judge from those plans because they were only sketches showing an exterior silhouette of the building.

If this Bill goes to a Select Committee, I urge that Select Committee to look at the convention facilities and the advantages that may accrue from such facilities and examine whether it would be feasible to provide a convention facility adjacent to or running in conjunction with a casino and, if so, the potential business that may arise from it.

I maintain the view I held in 1973, and it has not changed as several members opposite have suggested. The question is important that the Bill go to a Select Committee so that these matters can be looked at. These matters were not looked at in 1973, but they can be examined in detail now. I refer particularly to the fact that in 1973 Wrest Point had been operating for only nine months. In the second reading debate then I indicated that I thought it was not practicable to make any assessment of the sociological effects, welfare problems and criminal elements of Wrest Point because nine months was not a sufficient time to make any judgment. As Wrest Point has now been operating for a number of years, it may be possible to assess the social consequences of having a casino.

These are the various reasons why I support the Bill's reference to a Select Committee. It would be my intention to vote against the Bill at the third reading stage unless the Select Committee can come forward with evidence I have not yet seen which adequately covers the various doubts I have. If there is to be a Select Committee, I ask that it be fairly thorough in a number of areas, and I will quickly touch on some of those areas. The first is the social effect of a casino in a large city. Having spent a number of years at Armidale in New South Wales at the University of New England, I saw, in a community of 15 000 to 16 000 people, the social effect of poker machines. This social effect most people would not realise and would not see if they went to Sydney, because that city is so diverse that the effects are largely hidden. However, in Armidale, a large number of people, including some of my friends, would go down in a pay week after paying their bills and

would lose the entire balance of their salary on poker machines, live on credit for the next week until they were again paid, pay their bills immediately, and again lose the remainder of their money on the poker machines.

I saw families reduced to below the poverty line because one or both of the parents had a habit that they could not control in the extent to which they used poker machines. I know that there was a black list of people circulating around the stores in Armidale, and it was a fairly substantial black list containing the names of people who could not be given credit because they were people who, because of their own weaknesses, could not control their use of poker machines and the amount of money they lost on them.

I saw, even amongst the university community, but also the residential community of Armidale, the fairly severe social effect from the use of poker machines. I have a strongest objection to the use of poker machines, at least on a broad basis. This area should be looked at by the Select Committee, if there is to be one.

Mr Crafter interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am opposed to poker machines.

Mr Crafter: You just asked it to look at poker machines.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I said I thought that the Select Committee should look at the social effects. I appreciate that the Bill excludes poker machines, but I think that a Select Committee should still look at their effect. We should, as a Parliament, make sure that we do not allow the introduction of poker machines.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I realise this is banned in the Bill, but it should still be looked at.

Mr Crafter: There's no authority to look at that.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It is in the Bill and the Select Committee has the right to look at any aspect of the Bill. The next point I ask the Select Committee to look at is the possibility of any criminal element becoming associated with the introduction of a casino. I have talked to a number of the Federal Hotels people, and I have met some of those responsible for administering Federal Hotels casinos. Federal Hotels seem to have a particularly good reputation in the running of casinos, from what I have seen, but that does not mean that there may not be criminal elements involved.

If there is to be a Select Committee it should look at that in some detail. At this stage I am opposed to the establishment of a casino, perhaps because I have no strong personal desire and because I do not see in my district any strong demand for a casino. Certainly, I am willing and ready to look at the evidence that a Select Committee might bring forward.

It is important that a Select Committee undertake a thorough examination and report to this House on a number of various aspects that I have raised. I will support the Bill to a Select Committee, but I give no guarantee. At this stage I indicate my likelihood to vote against the third reading.

Mr CRAFTER (Norwood): I wish to speak only briefly. I am willing to support the second reading only in the hope that a Select Committee will try to sort out the conflicting evidence that has been given by the Government in support of this measure. We see this as a Government measure, yet it is opposed by the Minister of Tourism, and the arguments advanced by the Government in support of this measure have been that substantially it would benefit tourism, particularly international tourism in this State. That is a conflict which the Government must resolve to my mind and that of the general community. I listened with interest to the Minister of Tourism trying to justify how this measure would have little effect on the tourist industry in this State,

that is, if a casino were established in this State. I bring to the attention of the House a report in the property section of the *National Times* for the week 14-20 March this year. In his report, Michael Dickinson states:

Statistics show that people are spending more of their disposable income on leisure and holidays. This is the major reason why the country is embarking on a tourist resort boom. Figures compiled by Cordells indicate that here are plans for entertainment, recreational and waterside facilities throughout Australia totalling \$3 112 600 000. State by State the figures are:

Queensland, 65 projects worth \$1.2 billion.

Victoria, 17 projects worth \$750 million.

NSW, 40 projects worth \$500 million.

WA, 22 projects worth \$500 million.

Northern Territory, five projects worth \$100 million.

ACT, one project worth \$8 million.

Tasmania, 10 projects worth \$4.6 million.

Significantly, no reference is made at all to South Australia. One can either conclude that there is no activity of this nature in South Australia or that there are no statistics of this activity in South Australia, but both these facts are a substantial indictment on this Government in the area of tourism. It merely begs the question about the nature of the promotion of tourism in the State and the Government's policies on it.

If the Minister of Industrial Affairs is arguing that the Select Committee ought to look at poker machines as well as a casino, I suggest that its terms of reference might be widened to enable the committee to look at the real facts on the tourist potential of a casino. I am concerned about the discussions that have obviously been held over a long period between Government Ministers and the South Australian Brewing Company. I refer to the reference to these negotiations by Sir Norman Young at the 1981 address to shareholders at the annual general meeting of the South Australian Brewing Company. At that meeting it was indicated that there was no doubt that there was some hope that the company would enter into negotiations with the South Australian Government to erect a casino at the Hindley Street site of that company.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: That's what they said; we didn't say that.

Mr CRAFTER: I am saying that the Select Committee ought to look at it. It will have the powers of a Royal Commission and should call the Minister before it and send for persons and papers and seek other information so that we can look at all the facts.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: That would be dealt with by the tribunal.

Mr CRAFTER: It ought to be dealt with by the Select Committee, because that is the information that we want. We do not want it after the event.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: A Select Committee is not supposed to provide—

Mr CRAFTER: If the Select Committee is going to be a whitewash, we want to know about it now. It is relevant to look at what pressure was behind the Government's decision to bring this measure forward as a Government measure at this time, and what commitments it has made, discussed or entered into with investors. I refer to the *Advertiser* report on 11 November 1981 of the Auxilliary Bishop of the Catholic Church in this State, Rev. P. J. Kennedy, who stated:

'It would be better for South Australia to encourage the development of more broadly based family attraction than a casino. Two basic questions must be asked relating to the form of gambling a casino will provide.' Bishop Kennedy said: 'Will the community get any worthwhile benefits, or will its establishment be just for the enrichment of a small group of owners and affluent investors?'

That is a pertinent question to raise, and I hope it is one that the Select Committee will take up in all seriousness because of the statements that have been made publicly over a long period about the discussions that have been

going on between the Government and the South Australian Brewing Company. There is little more that I wish to add to my concern about this matter, other than to refer to an article by Stewart Cockburn that other speakers have referred to. On 6 November 1981 in the *Advertiser* Mr Cockburn stated:

A casino for South Australia would be a confession of economic bankruptcy by the Tonkin Government: a confession that the only new revenue earner left to this benighted State is an eat-drink-and-be-merry-for-tomorrow-we-die joint.

Here, probably one of the most conservative and pro-Liberal journalists in this State is giving the Government a little advice on this matter, yet in a somewhat uncharacteristic manner for this very conservative Government under which we live in this State.

There have been forces which have brought forward, in such a burst of enthusiasm, this measure, and it is important that we find out what are those forces that have brought the Bill before the House in these circumstances. The Select Committee does have an important role to play and, for that reason, I am willing to support it if it is a broadly based committee. I will reserve my judgment on whether the measure should receive further support on the evidence given to and the nature of the work done by the committee.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I wish to make a brief contribution, as the hour is late and as most of the points have been made in this debate. I will support the second reading. The Government has adopted the correct procedure in proposing to refer this Bill to a Select Committee so that all interested parties can make known their views and comments to that committee. Members of the public should be given the opportunity to clearly indicate where they stand on this issue.

I do not believe that any harm will come from adopting such a course of action. I am not a gambler, I have never been in a casino, and if a casino were established in this State I probably would never grace its doors, but I know that there are people in the community who want to frequent such establishments, and they should have an opportunity to make up their minds on this issue.

It has been interesting to listen to some of the comments, but I was perturbed and disappointed that the Leader of the Opposition adopted such a stance, making wild allegations, without foundation, in an attempt to discredit the Government. He did not in any way give any supporting evidence to back up his claims, and he brought into the debate a note that it could well have done without. It is a pity that, in recent times, he and his colleagues have adopted this line. They appear to have a hatred of the Government and its members, and they still cannot accept that they were defeated by the people of this State. Their attitude seems to be that they will do anything they can and tell any fairy tale that comes to mind, peddling it as fact.

That was an unfortunate course of action. I believe that the Leader has adopted that stance because the Labor Party was considering this matter as part of its election announcements which are to be made shortly. I understand that policy documents will be released in some detail, and I think a casino proposal was to have been contained in one of those statements.

Mr Slater: Wrong again!

Mr GUNN: I think that was one of the matters under consideration. My final decision on this matter will be guided by the recommendations and the report of the Select Committee. Although I have never been in favour of gambling, I do not object to people engaging in such an activity if they wish. For many years we were told that great ills would befall the State if we had a lottery and other forms of organised gambling. No doubt the forms of legalised

gambling that are available would have some social effect on the community, but I do not believe that the lottery and the T.A.B. have caused the social ills that some people expected.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr GUNN: The member for Hanson can say that, but I do not think he can confuse the S.A.J.C. and its problems with the operation of the T.A.B., the Lotteries Commission, Cross-Lotto. I have never participated in them, but many people will. We must bear in mind that people will gamble and, if they cannot do it legally, they will do it illegally. I do not believe that we should run away from that fact.

If a casino is to be established in South Australia, I think the Government should be involved in its ownership. Generally, I do not advocate State involvement, but there is a good case to make for the Government's having a holding of about 30 per cent in a casino. If a company is established, at least two of its directors should be appointed by the Government, people experienced in management and accounting, and probably in the law, or at least one of them should have such qualifications.

Mr Becker: That's impossible.

Mr GUNN: The honourable member is entitled to his views. When legislation was introduced by Premier Dunstan in 1973, I understood that a number of stringent conditions would be attached to the operation of a casino, and I believe the Select Committee to be appointed on this Bill should give serious consideration to those matters. I look forward to the deliberations of the Select Committee. I will need a great deal of convincing before I will vote for the third reading of the Bill, but the matter should be canvassed publicly, and I hope the public will take the trouble to make its views known. The Select Committee should do everything possible to allow the community to comment on the proposal and to carry out the necessary investigations, so that the matter can be cleared up once and for all.

I hope that the members of the Select Committee will be able to give their attention to the matters canvassed, and I will await the report with interest. I will make my final decision on that report but, in view of my past opinions, whether or not I would vote for the third reading is in the balance.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I think it is most appropriate that a vote on a casino in South Australia should be taken on April Fool's Day, because man's greed will always be his downfall. No matter what decision is taken, there will be those who will regret it in the future. I was particularly interested in the scathing attack made by the Deputy leader of the Opposition when he reiterated allegations that my Party had been offered a large sum of money to promote the Casino Bill, saying that the word was that money was available to a political Party to do that. A similar rumour was floated in 1973, and it is interesting to note those tactics, which were rightly rejected and dispelled by the Deputy Premier. We have come to expect such tactics from the Opposition from time to time, accusing the Government of something, quite untruthfully. The fact that it had to be denied and that it would be denied, because our Party does not operate that way, was the fact that caught the headlines, and that was extremely unfair. Let us throw it back at the Opposition.

Of course, this rumour is not an old one, and I would think that it was created by the think tank of the Labor Party. Furthermore, I am concerned about how the Opposition has become quite uptight about the promotion of this legislation in the House and the reason for its introduction. Of course, there were allegations at one stage that no Ministers had spoken on the Bill. Let me go back in history, certainly to a time when many members of the House did

not have the opportunity to consider the first Bill concerning a casino, which Bill was introduced on 23 October 1973 by Don Dunstan. In part of the explanation (page 1368 of *Hansard*) he stated:

In the Government's view, the development of a casino complex of appropriate standard would provide a number of wide-ranging benefits to the people of this State, and it is also of the view that with some foresight and careful planning the attendant disadvantages associated with such a project (and there will be some) can be minimized. Obviously, the establishment of a casino will be of direct benefit to the tourist industry in this State and indirectly to the tourist support industries. It will clearly be another factor in making South Australia attractive to the tourist.

We have heard much about the casino being of benefit to tourism, and of course, I have referred to Don Dunstan's comments. But Dunstan did state, 'in the Government's view', which is the point that I want to emphasise. There were 26 speakers who spoke on that Bill, and I will list them shortly. Dunstan finally said at page 1668 of *Hansard* on 7 November 1973:

Moreover, I do not believe we should lightly pass up the additional revenue to the State—

that would be an understatement, considering the way that that Government finally finished up—

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.

So, the Labor Party's great white leader, the Hon. Don Dunstan, predicted that there would be a change in attitude and that the issue would be raised within some time during the following decade. Why is it that members of the Labor Party now have not bothered to read or study that particular passage of Dunstan's speech? It is because Labor Party members have taken great note and great pride in what Dunstan did for South Australia. They may say that he did many good things for South Australia—perhaps with regard to some things he did, but with regard to other things I disagree. However, the point is that he predicted that there would be a change in attitude on the part of some who refused to support the measure at that stage. What is wrong with that?

Mr Hemmings: But not you, though, Heini!

The SPEAKER: Order! The House can do without transgressions involving the use of the christian names of members of the House.

Mr BECKER: I refer now to those who spoke on that 1973 casino Bill. Nine A.L.P. members spoke; two members from the Liberal Movement spoke; one member from the Country Party spoke; and 14 members from the Liberal and Country League, as it was known then also contributed. The lead speaker was the member for Light, then the Leader of the Opposition, Dr Eastick. Then followed the member for Davenport, the member for Goyder, and the member for Mitcham (it is fair to say that the Liberal movement was split 50/50). The member for Gilles was the first Labor Government speaker. He was followed by the members for Kavel, Alexandra, Gouger, Playford, Rocky River, Spence, Glenelg, Peake, Frome, Tea Tree Gully, Flinders, Mitchell, Murray, Mallee, Heysen, Mount Gambier, Eyre, Bragg, and Chaffey. Then, as twenty-fifth speaker, was the Minister for Development and Mines, who was the first Minister to speak. During tonight's debate the Leader of the Opposition and other members criticised the Ministry on this side of the House for not having spoken in the debate.

Mr Trainer: That wasn't a Government Bill, was it?

Mr BECKER: It was a Government Bill; it was Premier Dunstan's Bill. I read out earlier the stipulation, 'in the Government's view'. Therefore, it was certainly a Government Bill. The final speaker in the 1973 debate was the Hon. Don Dunstan when he summed up the debate.

The Leader of the Opposition reminded us tonight that he was the twentieth speaker in the present debate and he made great play of that. However, I do not think he did his homework very well concerning the voting and the history of the 1973 legislation. The member for Stuart briefly touched on the matter, but he could have done a little more homework and could have provided a little more statistical information. I thought I had trained him better on the Public Accounts Committee than his performance tonight indicated.

In 1973, 16 members voted for the Bill. They were: the Hon. Glen Broomhill, member for Henley Beach, who is now retired; the present member for Whyalla; Mr Burdon, the member for Mount Gambier, who is now retired; Mr Crimes, the member for Spence, who is now retired; the Hon. Don Dunstan, the member for Norwood, retired; Mr Groth, the member for Salisbury, retired; the Hon. Steele Hall, the member for Goyder, retired; Mr Harrison, the member for Albert Park, retired; Mr Keneally, the present member for Stuart; the Hon. Len King, the Attorney-General, retired; Mr Langley, the present member for Unley but soon to be retired; Mr Olson, member for Semaphore, retired; the Hon. R. G. Payne, the present member for Mitchel; the Hon. G. T. Virgo, member for Ascot Park, retired; Mr Wells, member for Florey, retired; and the Hon. J. D. Wright, member for Adelaide, who is still a member of this House. Of the 16 members who voted for the legislation, four were Ministers. Of those 16 members, 11 are now retired, so only five members who voted for that legislation at that time are now left in this House.

Mr Slater: What does all this prove?

Mr BECKER: Labor Party members were talking about Cabinet solidarity concerning Government legislation; great play was made of that. What this is all leading up to concerns the fact that the 1973 Bill was a Government Bill. Let me now refer to what has happened so far. By the way, the Hon. Hugh Hudson was absent when the vote was taken.

Mr Mathwin: He was looking after his electorate, which he lost later.

Mr BECKER: I am not too sure what he was doing. He may have had a legitimate excuse for not being present. There were eight Ministers in the House of Assembly in those days and we find that four are recorded as voting for the Bill. Of the 23 Noes, Mr Allen, the member for Frome, has retired; Mr Arnold, the member for Chaffey, is now present; Mr Becker, member for Hanson, is still present; Mr Blacker, member for Flinders, is present; Mr Dean Brown, the member for Davenport, is present; Mrs Byrne, the former member for Todd, has retired; Mr Chapman, the member for Alexandra, is present; John Coumbe, then member for Torrens, has retired; Mr Duncan, member for Elizabeth, is present; Dr Eastick, member for Light, is present; Mr Goldsworthy, member for Kavel, is present; Mr Gunn, member for Eyre, is present; Mr Hopgood, who voted against the legislation, is still a member; Mr Mathwin, member for Glenelg, is present; Mr McAnaney, member for Heysen, has retired; Mr McRae, member for Playford, is present; Mr Millhouse, member for Mitcham, is present; Mr Russack, member for Gouger, is present; Mr Simmons, then member for Peake, has retired; Mr Slater, member for Gilles is present; Mr Tonkin, member for Bragg, is present; Mr Venning, then member for Rocky River, has retired; and Mr Wardle, then member for Murray, has retired.

There were pair arrangements for three members, Mr Corcoran, Mr Dave McKee and Mr Jennings, being recorded as Ayes; the pairs for Noes were Messrs Evans, Nankivell and Rodda. Mr Evans, the member for Fisher, is still a current member. Mr Nankivell has retired, and Mr Rodda, is still present. Hugh Hudson was absent. He may have had some excuse for not being here and I will not be unfair to him. It is interesting to note the number of members who are retired, for statistical reasons. Of the 23 who voted 'No', 16 are current members of the House and seven have retired. Let us clear up that side of the issue as far as the voting pattern is concerned. Let us see what really happened regarding the consistency in the voting that took place in 1973. It was in Government time and the House adjourned about 11.56 that evening. I think it started sitting just after 2 p.m., so it was given a reasonable amount of time.

I think that most of the points have been well covered in this debate by members on both sides and I have been quite impressed that there has been a reasonable standard of debate. There was one aspect of the proposal before the House that bothered me. I believe that the Select Committee will be nothing but an expensive perk. I say that cynically; I admit that, without reflecting on all members, I may be accused of being extremely cynical, but I am not satisfied of the sincerity of some members who want to be on the Select Committee and their reasons for that. If members volunteered to go on to the Select Committee without any additional remuneration, perhaps I might change my attitude. I believe that, if the House is sincere in setting up a Select Committee, they should not accept any payment at all.

In the last financial year approximately \$60 000 was spent on Select Committees. That is just under \$1 000 per member. Not very many members of the House have not been on Select committees in previous 12 months so somebody must be doing quite well out of it, but I believe that Select Committees have got to a stage in this Parliament where they are being overdone and they are starting to prove that they do not represent value for money. The taxpayers of this State have every reason to want to query why we have to have another Select Committee and more so why we have to pay members of Parliament, who receive a reasonable salary these days, to sit on the committees. I think the time has come for us to change the system and for us to strike from the Standing Orders the provision that members be paid in the vicinity of \$12.50 a day, although generally it is \$12.50 for only a couple of hours.

If this Select Committee is formed as has been suggested and if certain suggestions are incorporated that have been floated within the halls of this establishment, I can see that the Select Committee will not meet the deadline in June, that it will continue for probably 12 months, and that the members of the Select Committee would want to visit casinos and all other sorts of gambling establishments around Australia. It is going to be a glorified perk for a selected few members of Parliament.

Let us look at how these members are going to be selected. The point is that, if this was a non-Party political debate and if it is a conscience vote, who has the responsibility of selecting the members for the Select Committee? Does the Parliament itself call for nominations and then decide who goes on that Select Committee? Of course it does not. It has not done that in the 12 years I have been here, because they are selected on a Party line. They are nominated by the Parties. That does not bring it down to an open democratic system for a Select committee. Let us be really dinkum about the whole issue. It is about time we reviewed the whole system as far as I am concerned. It will not come up as a final conscience issue.

The other point is that I am also critical of some members. I cannot understand how members can say they are going to support the second reading and vote against the third reading. Why make the statement that they want to support the second reading but in no way will support the third reading? I cannot follow the logic behind the members in that respect. Are they going to support the appointment of a Select Committee and spend \$20 000 of taxpayers' money, or more? If I can anticipate what is going to happen, it is going to cost a lot more than \$20 000 and these members who have authorised the expenditure are then going to vote against it. It is the craziest economic situation I have heard of in all my life. It could lead to a suggestion in the Public Accounts Committee that we might have to have a look at the accounts and I am cynical enough to do that. That is the type of attitude that I have adopted, because I am not satisfied at all in that respect.

Much has been said about the tourist aspect of the benefit of casinos in South Australia. Tourists, wherever they travel in the world, are always looking for value for money. I do not believe that the majority of tourists circle this globe chasing casinos. That is for the idle rich, the elite few, and I cannot understand how the Opposition could ever support this type of thing, because that is not to the benefit of the majority of people. Most of the people who support these casinos have fat expense accounts and it happens to be a rip-off as far as taxation dodges are concerned. I want to take a few more minutes of the House to read a letter that I believe typifies the point of view in my electorate. I received this letter a few days ago, and it states:

When the Liberal Party came to office it was the hope of many people that at last the quality of life in this State would improve. They felt there were now representatives in Government who had the family unit at heart. Recent announcements regarding the possibility of now having a casino in South Australia, despite all previous assurances by the Premier, do not give confidence in the determination of the Government to work for a society in which good would flourish. The reasons given for the establishment of further avenues for gambling, in particular a casino, are extremely tenuous. Such a move will have a serious effect on many families who can ill afford to be involved. Additionally, a casino would not be responsible for marked increase in tourism. As my representative in the House of Assembly, I expect you to speak and vote against this measure.

I am not prepared to let our beautiful city of Adelaide be prostituted by having a casino in the name and for the sake of attracting tourists to South Australia. I oppose the second reading and will oppose the Bill at all stages.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment and Planning): I rise to speak briefly on this matter. It is not my intention to introduce relevant material at this hour of the morning. I intend to support the second reading to provide an opportunity for appropriate evidence to be brought before a Select Committee of this House. A need has been demonstrated for there to be appropriate debate, both in this Parliament and, particularly, within the broader community, on the issue of a casino in South Australia.

It is essential that a vehicle be provided to enable individuals and groups of people within the community to place before a formal committee of this Parliament appropriate evidence for and against the establishment of a casino in South Australia and, of course, for the Parliament to take account of that evidence. There has been considerable debate on this subject today. Many pertinent issues have been raised; others are quite irrelevant.

I am of the opinion that, if a casino is to be established in South Australia, it is essential that it be under strict Government control. I believe that the community is strongly of that view. That certainly has come through in discussions I have had with members of the community generally. I am personally strongly opposed to allowing poker machines

to be brought into South Australia. I am of the opinion that the community is of the opinion that poker machines should not be introduced into this State.

There are many people who have asked for the opportunity to provide evidence before an appropriate committee of this House. I believe that that opportunity should be provided to them: it will be in the way of a Select Committee. On the Bill itself, it is necessary that the opportunity be provided for wider debate and for evidence to be brought before this House. For those reasons, I support the second reading of the Bill. I know that a Select Committee would take into account the evidence and bring before the House the evidence put before that committee in regard to this issue.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): Why, in the name of civilisation, do we need to consider this measure at this time in this Parliament? I came here to make improvements, to make decisions through consultation, to promote understanding and insight, and to represent people. I did not come here to make friends or enemies, to be involved in confrontations, to antagonise people in debate, or to promote acrimony. I did not come here to represent institutions or organisations.

It is interesting that of all the comments we have heard in recent months about the need for a casino, not one of those comments has been made by an individual citizen as an individual citizen. All the comments have been made by organisations interested in the licence. They want the money, not the responsibility. They are not interested in people, only their money.

If we consider the reasons, we have to ask ourselves why we have put the cart before the horse. If it is believed that a majority of people want a casino in South Australia, why do they want that casino? Do they have in their possession the facts as to the consequences of it? It seems to me that the answer to that question is that they do not.

I have read as much literature produced by Select Committees, Governments and journalists as I can find. In none of that literature can I find any attempt at an honest analysis of the social consequences on human beings and the consequences for their families and the communities in which they live. I did not even find this in the report produced by the Royal Commission in the United Kingdom.

It would be fair to say that the only journalists I have found over the years who have treated that aspect of the question seriously have been the *Hobart Examiner* journalists in 1978 and Stewart Cockburn in recent times. Neither of those articles was able to quote factual information based on sound research into the consequences for the individual, the family and the community. No such research, as far as I can discover, has ever been undertaken or published.

It would come as no surprise to members to hear that over the past few days I have had an enormous amount of mail and telephone messages to me and to my secretary in my office. That would have been expected, although I wonder whether members will be interested to learn that not one of those messages has been derogatory, uncomplimentary, or other than supportive. If concern of that kind can be expressed by people putting sincere views and if members were to have read those letters, they would understand that it might easily match the whimsy of those people who seek the opportunity to gamble in a casino as a trendy thing to do for entertainment without balancing against their desire the consequences that they may inflict upon members or other human beings by demanding it.

The gambler says, 'It is my money.' But, when the gambler becomes compulsive in his habit, does he accept that it is his responsibility? He certainly does not, and the rest of us have to pay taxes to support the welfare problems that result and to clean up the mess. Of course, one might liken that to the problems that arise when people consume

alcohol. The vast majority do so with sober habits and as part of their need to consume fluid and food. However, some cannot control that habit and they become addicted to it. Some become addicted to it because of the psychological support that they need in the company they obtain in hotel bars, and others become addicted to it for other reasons, that is, their physiology becomes hooked. At the present time, we find ourselves suffering the consequences of random breath testing. I wonder whether we would ever find outside casinos a booth set up for random solvency testing to determine the fitness of a person to gamble. It would also be fair of us to consider the implications of someone who has become hooked on the habit and the way in which it then results in their needing to feed the habit by resorting to criminal activities of some kind.

Having mentioned crime, I believe that crime is to be found not only within a casino but also outside it as a direct result of a casino having been introduced. I flag the kind of things that I consider ought to be given the attention of any Select Committee that is ever set up by this Parliament (whether as a consequence of this Bill or at some later time) to investigate the kind of crime that can result and quantify the consequences of taking the deliberate step of establishing a casino in the way in which it fosters an increase in the various kinds of crime that might be associated with it.

No attempt has ever been made to do that completely. I could canvass the arguments that relate to the validity of the view that South Australia needs a casino to promote its tourism industry and encourage tourism development, but that would be wasting members' time. They have already heard an eloquent exposition of that from the Minister of Tourism. Tourism development in South Australia is not dependent, as the figures indicate, upon having a casino in this State. The Tasmanian experience in that respect is not valid, because of the expensive additional promotional funds which were spent by other organisations at about the same time as Federal Hotels began its expenditure promoting its casino.

I will not attempt tonight to produce statistical evidence that validates the view that I have just expressed, but I will certainly be presenting that information to the Select Committee if no-one else does. This is, if there ever is a Select Committee as a consequence of this or any other Bill. As I said earlier, I sincerely believe that there ought to be valid information upon which members can exercise their intellect and conscience. That information should be placed before this House by a Select Committee before members to debate a Bill to establish a casino. Otherwise, as in this case, it is a statement of opinion based on experience and not based on objective analysis and fact, and therefore a waste of time.

The other speeches that I would recommend to people who want to get a perspective on the kinds of problems and other reasons that there may be for opposing the establishment of a casino in South Australia made by other members of the House today and earlier yesterday are speeches by the members for Fisher, Salisbury, Newland, Goyder, Baudin, Glenelg, Coles, and Hanson. In order to refresh the minds of honourable members, I refer to the comments that I made on the last occasion when we debated a measure such as this. That was on 23 September 1981 and my comments can be found in *Hansard* on pages 1127-9, and later on 30 September on page 1300. I explained then that I was categorically opposed to the establishment of a casino in South Australia. I could not find any evidence which would support any view to the contrary. I made the point that there will soon be such a number of casinos in Australia that the experience of Wrest Point will not be repeated in all instances, as the market for gambling will

be shared by all of them and, therefore, as we cannot expect any such increase in revenue to either the State or the company establishing it, as has occurred with Wrest Point, Australia's first casino.

Some people argue that the total number of dollars spent on gambling will not substantially increase. We must accept that there is a total market limit and that it will not be increased substantially by increasing the number of casinos, unless we expect more local people to become involved in gambling in casinos, in the casino nearest them.

If that is the case, then we are advocating that other codes of gambling, such as have been mentioned by other members—dogs, horses, *News Bingo*, or whatever—will have to suffer a loss of revenue, and therefore the Government will suffer a loss in revenue obtained from those sources and pick it up through the casino, so the Government's net benefit will be the same; or else we are saying that we will be spending more than the already high 18 per cent of our household incomes nationally on gambling. That is the highest in the world, and of all the items listed in the article written in the journal called *Facts*, published in November 1978, that is the highest. We spend 17 per cent on food, 15 per cent on travel and communication, 15 per cent on rent, 9 per cent on alcohol and cigarettes, 9 per cent on household goods, 8 per cent on clothing, and 18 per cent on gambling, the highest of the lot.

Are the members who are advocating the establishment of a casino in South Australia advocating that Australia should spend more of the household income on gambling? If they are, are they really being honest with the people they represent and with their conscience? Clearly, to advocate that is to advocate an inflationary pressure, as well as a social pressure on the family unit. There will be an upward demand for more pay to finance the habit, and there will be in the meantime less left to meet the essentials of life. It is my sincere belief that there are already sufficient opportunities for people who wish to gamble to do so.

Who will pay? I put it to honourable members that that is the question they need to ask in establishing the morality of the arguments they advance if they support the establishment of a casino in the light of those facts. Once the money to be spent on a casino has been called up from within the economy as raw capital to spend in that way, it is not available for expenditure on other things. It represents the value of more than 300 homes. Already, we have an acute shortage of housing in South Australia, and members express concern about that, but ignore the implication of that shortage and the funds to supply it provided from within the macroeconomic total of capital available if a casino competes for these funds. I further make the point that casinos offer an opportunity for people to launder dirty money and therefore offer organised crime a method of legitimising its ill-gotten gains.

I want now to examine what I consider would be the ideal terms of reference that, at the very least, have to be considered by any Select Committee appointed by a Parliament to examine the effects of a casino. I believe they should be, as I have said, the social, economic and welfare effects of gambling in a casino on individuals, on the family, and on the community at large. Furthermore, I believe that there needs to be established a relationship (if there is any, and clearly in all the evidence that I have read there is) between the operations of a casino and organised crime. Wherever any such remarks have been made in any report that I have read, they are subjective and not objective remarks, and no attempt was made in those reports to determine what kind of organised crime might be using the casino.

The SPEAKER: Order! The level of audible comment is getting beyond a joke.

Mr LEWIS: I believe sincerely that in the third case, in the terms of reference, and so on, the effects of the operation of a casino on other forms of gambling would have to be considered before any Parliament could make an objective decision about the wisdom of establishing a casino. If this amount by which the revenue derived from gambling in other forms is to be so reduced as the casino's operations take effect on the cash available for gambling in the community, to the extent that revenue derived from all sources then is not increased, then it is an utter waste in every sense. I have found that, in most of the reports and newspaper articles that I have read, a vested interest seems to be more important in the way in which the matter has to be examined than is the accuracy of the material contained in the report. To ask some people, it seems, to make comments about casinos and their relevance and value, where they already have an involvement with or a commitment to a casino, is like asking the Milk Board whether there is a need for goats milk. The Milk Board, of course, will completely ignore those few people and children who have an allergy and need goats milk, simply saying that 99.8 per cent of people are well serviced by the cows milk they can get from the board, and leave it at that.

The SPEAKER: Order! I should draw to the attention of the honourable member for Mallee that the House is in possession of Bills which relate to goats milk, and it would be wrong for him to pre-empt the debate on that issue.

Mr LEWIS: I believe the socio-economic categories of people affected by gambling need to be determined, and the extent to which of the socio-economic categories of people are (in a regression analysis) linked to welfare problems and financial difficulties that would cause disruption to the family and therefore the welfare of members of those families. I believe that it would be desirable, sensible, and necessary to determine the number of local people who use casinos as compared with the percentage of tourists, to determine whether or not the facility is really justified for the development of tourism, as so many people and so many members in this House have argued in this debate. If, as Stewart Cockburn reports, 70 to 80 per cent of the people are locals—and no-one has bothered to determine that—quite clearly it is not servicing in the main the needs of tourists, but rather adding to the burden on the household income of money expended by local people in gambling.

With regard to members making an honest assessment of this very important matter, at present they do not have before them the necessary information for them to be objective. If this measure gets to the Select Committee stage such a committee must consider the factors to which I have referred; if it does not, it will fail this Parliament and the people of South Australia who are depending on this Parliament to make responsible decisions. It will be only by this means that the people who express a whimsey to gamble can be given information that will enable them to understand that their whimsey may be unwarranted, unjustified and unwise.

The member for Gilles said that in the first instance there appeared to be an immediate growth for the simple reason of the factors of novelty and uniqueness of the casino at Wrest Point, but in due course that novelty wore off and, in fact, there was a negative growth within six years. If that is the case, with the additional number of casinos now established and to be established in this nation, we can expect the consequences in South Australia to be less than enchanting in terms of so-called economic benefits. It is regrettable that, if this Bill goes to a Select Committee, the committee will find great difficulty in examining under its terms of reference those things to which I have referred.

In the event that the Bill goes to a Select Committee I have given an undertaking, which I reiterate, that I will

provide as much information as I can to that committee so that it may in the compilation of its report best serve this Parliament and the people of South Australia. Having given that undertaking, I nonetheless urge all members to seriously consider, before they vote on this matter, the implications of the limitation of time available to a Select Committee before bringing down its report and the cost that it will incur which may at some future time have to be duplicated to provide an absolutely and completely adequate report. I thank the House for its attention and I trust that members can exercise their conscience in the best interests of the South Australian public and taxpayers.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Recreation and Sport): We have had some 26 or 27 speakers in this debate, so non-one can say that the matter has not been well canvassed, and it has been canvassed from all sides of the question. Let me make quite plain from the outset that I do not intend to reply to every speaker, nor do I intend to canvass all the issues that were raised in the debate: in fact most of those issues will comprise part of the work of the Select Committee and the comments that members have made will be taken into account by that committee. A little later I will deal with the work of that committee and its terms of reference, which, in particular, the member for Salisbury and the member for Mallee mentioned, as well as some other speakers. I think that that matter is important and I will deal with it in a moment.

At this stage I will repeat the reasons why the Government has introduced this Bill. It seems that it is impossible for members opposite to grasp those reasons, so I will restate them for the record. The Government has introduced this measure because the casino question has hung over this State since before 1973. The question needs to be resolved once and for all. Some members said tonight that they will oppose the second reading, and that is their right; some members said that they will oppose the third reading, and that is their right; and some members said that they will support the matter being referred to a Select Committee and, once again, that is their right.

Whatever happens, this matter must be resolved. If the Bill is defeated at the third reading, some time in June, the matter will be resolved and no doubt it will not be reintroduced for a long time to come. However, if the Bill passes, the people of this State will know where they are, and the Government will proceed to implement the legislation. The Government has presented this House with a clean, competent Bill based on the experience of other States. It is about time that members opposite recognised that fact. The Government has also stated that the Bill will be referred to a Select Committee, so the Select Committee will have an instrument to further its deliberations. The Government has introduced this measure to achieve clarity in this situation.

Much has been said about the individual consciences of members. I believe the Leader of the Opposition made a disgraceful attack on the Minister of Health, especially when one recalls, as the member for Hanson pointed out, that in a like situation in 1973 the member for Baudin, then a Minister, opposed that measure. I believe the member for Hanson's figures also indicate that another Minister abstained from voting at that time. What hypocrisy for the Leader of the Opposition to make this disgraceful attack on the Minister of Health when, in fact, the same thing happened in relation to his own Party in 1973. If the Leader of the Opposition had half the guts of the Minister of Health he might have some future in this State.

I will also make it quite plain just what the Premier said on 25 March about the rights of this Bill and the individual consciences of members. I will put it on the record straight

away, because it applies to what the Leader of the Opposition said about the Minister of Health. The Premier said:

It is entirely a conscience issue, and the fact the Government is introducing the Bill is not to be taken either as Government sponsorship, individual sponsorship or endorsement of the Bill. The vote will be entirely one of conscience and the decisions will be made by individual members of the Parliament as far as the Liberal Party is concerned.

The latter part of that statement is continued in the Premier's second reading explanation. Before I turn to the terms of reference of the Select Committee I will deal with the accusations made by members opposite who had suggested that some forces of darkness are influencing the Government in relation to the introduction of this measure. The Deputy Premier has already very competently rejected the disgraceful allegations made by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday that there is some pay-off to the Liberal Party campaign funds for the introduction of a casino Bill—not the passage of the Bill but just the mere introduction of a casino Bill. Apparently some philanthropist or industrialist is going to pay the Liberal Party tens of thousands of dollars just because we have introduced a casino Bill. I make it quite clear again that I reject that allegation. I believe that members opposite are so chagrined at the fact that this Government has introduced the Bill and at the fact that we are trying to deal with the situation that the Opposition is asking itself what it can say to upset the Government. It is saying, 'What can we say to make public mischief? What can we say to make mischief in the community?'

An honourable member: To cloud the issue.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: —and to cloud the issue?' it is nothing more than an extreme instance of political chicanery. There is no doubt about that at all.

I have dealt with the Government's purpose in introducing the Bill. I want to take this opportunity of congratulating various members for their contributions to the debate. I congratulate the member for Salisbury, who, I think made an outstanding contribution from that side of the House. Also, the honourable member for Goyder also made an outstanding contribution. I thought that the speeches of the members for Brighton and Morphett contributed a lot to the debate, as did various other members. I also refer to the contribution made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the second part of his speech. I emphasise 'the second part of his speech'. He could not have parrotted his Leader. Perhaps his Leader parrotted him; I do not know. It was the same type of content in the first part of his speech. However, I agreed entirely with the second half of his speech.

I would like to take this opportunity, seeing that every other member has taken this opportunity to give his own personal views on this, of saying that I agree entirely with the Deputy Leader. His reasons are the same as mine. I believe, as Liberal, that people who wish to indulge in this activity should be able to have access to it. However, I do agree that there are many questions that need to be answered, but I uphold that basic belief, which is a very strong belief with me.

I move on from that statement to those questions that need to be answered. We now come to the Select Committee itself. First, much play has been made of the composition of the Select Committee, whether there should be three members of the Opposition and three members of the Government, or four members of the Government and two members of the Opposition and the honourable member for Semaphore. The precedent is there. The Government is following the precedent and forms of this House that started, as far as I can find out, with the abortion Bill debate and the abortion Select Committee. The member for Fisher was

a member of that Select Committee, on which there was a majority of members of the Government of that day. The member for Mitcham said that various views represented on that Select Committee, and so they will be with the one that we intend to propose.

With the prostitution committee, (which has already been mentioned by several speakers), the Honourable D. A. Dunstan made quite plain that, if there was to be a Select Committee into prostitution, there was no doubt that there would be a majority of members from the then Government. We have the same position with that committee as we have with this proposed one now, because, it was deemed that the member for Mitcham should be on that Select Committee. Therefore, the Honourable D. A. Dunstan suggested that there should be a Select Committee of seven members, with four members from the then Government, two from the then Opposition and the member for Mitcham.

The Government today is following the same precedent and the same forms. We are putting to this House that there should be a Select Committee of seven members, with four Government members of the government, two Opposition members, and the member for Semaphore. I hope that no-one would deny that the member for Semaphore should be on that committee. The Select Committee will have a lot of work to do; it has to work expeditiously. It should report as soon as possible, so that this matter can be finally debated and cleaned up once and for all. It will have the opportunity of having a clean competent Bill to deal with. Certainly, if may recommend amendments and certainly it must take into account other factors. I now want to come to that, because that is the most important thing.

I believe that the Select Committee would be remiss in its duty if it did not take into account many of the issues referred to by the member for Mallee and the member for Salisbury. Let me give the undertaking that, if the House appoints me to that Select Committee and if I am elected its Chairman, the committee will report on the social, economic and welfare effects of gambling in a casino on the individual, the family and the community. It will also report on the relationship, if any, between the operations of a casino and organised crime, as well as the effects of the operation of the casino on other forms of gambling.

I give that undertaking, but I will also say that there may be other matters (and the Minister of Industrial Affairs mentioned several matters) that the Select Committee may wish to address. I would not want the House to think that, just because I have given this undertaking, which is now a matter of public record, the Select Committee will not address other matters if it deems necessary. I have given an explanation of how the Select Committee should work and what its terms of reference would be. I have restated the Government's position. I believe that the debate has been generally good, and I commend the second reading to the House.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (28)—Messrs Abbott, Allison, L. M. F. Arnold, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Bannon, D. C. Brown, M. J. Brown, Chapman, Crafter, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Hamilton, Hoggood, Keneally, McRae, Olsen, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Randall, Rodda, Schmidt, Slater, Trainer, Wilson (teller), Wotton, and Wright.

Noes (11)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Becker, Billard, Blacker, Evans, Hemmings, Langley, Lewis, Mathwin, Russack (teller), and Whitten.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Gunn and Oswald. Noes—Messrs Corcoran and Duncan.

Majority of 17 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I move:

That this Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr RUSSACK (Goyder): I realise that it is not acceptable and is out of order to reflect on a decision of the House. Although I am disappointed that the Bill has passed the second reading and that that decision has been made by the House, I will support this motion for a Select Committee for the following reasons. I feel that, if the debate on this Bill was to proceed forthwith, having passed the second reading, it would be possible for the Bill to go through the third reading hurriedly. Therefore, it is desirable that an opportunity be given to all interests in the community to express an opinion.

In my second reading speech I mentioned that there was a spontaneous reaction from a number of people who opposed the move to establish a casino in South Australia. I am confident that the opportunity will be taken by those people, the churches, individuals and other organisations; that opportunity will be given if a Select Committee is established. I support the motion.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): It is not my intention to support the motion. I am convinced that on most social issues there is little money involved. I have a strong belief that within this area the end result will be that whoever has the licence (or believes that they have the potential to obtain the licence) will, in many cases, have great wealth behind them—be they companies or organisations—and have the ability and the opportunity to employ people who are professional lobbyists or to use people or reports, for example, the report produced for the casino back-up in Tasmania in 1981.

It is difficult to argue whether it is fact or not that they have pulled together. The opportunity to win people is a lot easier for these organisations than it is for the average individual or church organisation that wants to go along and try to put their viewpoint. I am not convinced that it is satisfactory to refer it to a Select Committee for a couple of months to get the material required to investigate the matter thoroughly. I am not prepared to support its going to a Select committee and I will oppose the motion.

Mr LANGLEY (Unley): I have shown tonight where I stand on this issue. I must stand by my vote. I have changed my mind, as have many people, concerning this issue. I agree with the member for Goyder in this matter. I am in no way told what I have to do; this is a conscience vote. I noticed tonight that it was not so much a conscience vote as far as the Government was concerned.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Huh!

Mr LANGLEY: The member for Davenport, as usual, goes 'Huh!' He went 'Huh' the other day when the candidate for Unley killed him. He went 'Huh' tonight. He has a bit of 'Huh' as far as I am concerned. I voted according to my conscience and I will vote again according to my conscience. I said during the debate that I would vote accordingly, which I did. I do not intend to refrain from that during the course of this debate. I opposed the Bill right through and I will oppose it again.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): For the same reasons as mentioned by the member for Fisher, I too will be opposing the referral of this matter to a Select Committee. I alluded to the reasons why I thought this Select Committee would be incapable of doing in time the kind of inquiry which I believe this measure warrants. I am not saying that it is going to be entirely so and, if the majority of members in all conscience in exercising their vote determine that it

should go to a Select Committee, I will do what I can to ensure that the information which that Select Committee has before it is of the kind that I believe it ought to consider. However, that will be in the hands of the committee. Accordingly, I indicate that I will be requiring the House to divide when it comes to a vote.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (36)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, L. M. F. Arnold, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Bannon, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, M. J. Brown, Chapman, Crafter, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Mathwin, McRae, Olsen, Payne, Peterson, Punkett, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, Wilson (teller), Wotton, and Wright.

Noes (4)—Messrs Becker, Evans (teller), Langley, and Lewis.

Pair—Aye—Mr Oswald. No—Mr Duncan.

Majority of 32 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I move:

That a committee be appointed consisting of seven members, of whom four shall form a quorum thereof.

Motion carried.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I move:

That Messrs Glazbrook, Mathwin, McRae, Peterson, Rodda, Slater, and Wilson be members of the committee.

Mr SLATER (Gilles): In accordance with Standing Order 373, I demand that a ballot, for the election of a Select Committee of seven members, be conducted.

A ballot having been held, Messrs Glazbrook, Mathwin, McRae, Peterson, Rodda, Slater, and Wilson were declared elected.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are no provisions in the Standing Orders for the voting figures to be indicated.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I move:

That the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, to adjourn from place to place and to report on Tuesday 1 June.

Motion carried.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I move:

That the committee have power to invite any specially qualified persons whom they may desire to attend any of the meetings in an advisory capacity.

Motion carried.

PREVENTION OF POLLUTION OF WATERS BY OIL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.21 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 1 April at 2 p.m.