

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 18 August 1982

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

## PETITIONS: CASINO

Petitions signed by 261 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Federal Government to set up a committee to study the social effects of gambling, reject the proposals currently before the House to legalise casino gambling in South Australia, and establish a select committee on casino operations in this State were presented by the Hon. J. D. Wright and Messrs Blacker, Gunn, Lewis, and Mathwin.

Petitions received.

## PETITION: INTEREST RATES

A petition signed by 18 residents of South Australia praying that the House request the State Government to urge the Federal Government to reduce home loan interest rates; ensure that home buyers with existing loans are not bankrupted or evicted as a result of increased interest rates; provide increased welfare housing; and develop a loan programme to allow prospective home builders to obtain adequate finance was presented by Mr Whitten.

Petition received.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SPINAL INJURIES UNIT

The Hon. **JENNIFER ADAMSON** (Minister of Health): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. **JENNIFER ADAMSON**: During the debate on the Supply Bill yesterday the member for Hanson referred to the condition of the spinal injuries unit of the Royal Adelaide Hospital which is accommodated in the Morris wards at the Hampstead Centre at Northfield. In his speech the member for Hanson acknowledged that the service provided in this unit is one of the best of its kind in the Southern Hemisphere. I wish to advise the House that the spinal injuries unit is accommodated in an old T.B. ward which was upgraded some 20 years ago for this purpose.

The ward is being repainted and an eight-bed bay still remains to be completed. Painting of this ward was brought forward by reallocating funds set aside by Public Buildings Department for painting of another section of the hospital. Because Ward IV is larger in area than the ward earlier programmed for painting, the allocation of funds was insufficient. However, arrangements had already been made for the work to be completed within four weeks.

In addition, quotations have been obtained for new curtains in Ward IV (total cost—\$10 000) but because of the financial situation, this could be done progressively with the first area to be decorated being the eight-bed ward I have referred to. It was proposed that this be done in conjunction with the painting.

Proposals are being considered for further redevelopment of Hampstead which will include new accommodation for the spinal injuries unit. Although these proposals are continuing, they are overshadowed to some extent by rumours of dismantling Hampstead and transferring some functions (including spinal injuries unit) to the Julia Farr Centre. At

this stage it would be premature to comment on what the outcome of discussions will be.

With regard to the presence of ants in the spinal injuries unit, these are a continuing problem with large areas of surrounding paddocks. However, when ants are discovered and reported arrangements are made to spray the area concerned immediately.

It is acknowledged by the administration of the hospital that high cleaning in some ward areas has been delayed, and this is unsatisfactory. It is not done on a daily basis and is programmed as staff are available. Recent staffing shortages have slowed the programme down. However, this will be examined further. It should be noted that, in relation to the remainder of Royal Adelaide Hospital, the spinal injuries unit has received a generous allocation of minor works funds during the past two years, including the following:

	\$
Provision of occupational therapy kitchen . . . . .	15 000
Carpeting of spinal injuries unit conference room and surrounding areas . . . . .	2 500
Treatment room and outpatients' area (upgrading) . . . . .	7 000

I am anxious that the confidence that the community rightly has in Royal Adelaide Hospital should not be undermined by reports which place undue emphasis on conditions which are acknowledged as being deficient in some respects, but which are in the process of being upgraded.

## PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr **BECKER** brought up the twenty-sixth report of the Public Accounts Committee, which referred to the use of computer-based patient information systems in hospitals.

## QUESTION TIME

The **SPEAKER**: Before calling on questions, I indicate that any questions for the Deputy Premier will be taken by the Premier.

## UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr **BANNON**: Will the Premier say whether he expects that unemployment in this State during 1982-83 will rise in line with the huge 19 per cent increase in the number of persons receiving unemployment benefits forecast in the Commonwealth Budget, which would mean a jobless total in this State of 57 000? I am waiting for the pretender to brief his Leader. Are you ready to receive questions?

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The honourable Leader will proceed.

Mr **BANNON**: I did not wish the Premier to be distracted by the Minister of Industrial Affairs. I will repeat the question. Will the Premier say whether he expects that unemployment in this State during 1982-83 will rise in line with the huge 19 per cent increase in the number of persons receiving unemployment benefits forecast in the Commonwealth Budget, which would mean a jobless total in this State of 57 000, and, if he does not, will he say what increase in South Australia's unemployment is expected in the coming financial year and why?

Last night, the Fraser Government budgeted for a sharp rise in unemployment. The Budget forecasts that 395 000 persons will receive unemployment benefits this financial year, compared with 332 000 in 1981-82. That 19 per cent rise, if matched in South Australia, would increase this

State's jobless total from an average of 47 900 in 1981-82 to between 53 000 and 60 000, depending on our comparative performance in 1982-83. The Opposition has information that two Commonwealth departments in South Australia have put forward plans for extra staff, office space, and counter services for the unemployed in the expectation of 10.4 per cent unemployment in Adelaide by December of this year.

Information released by the A.B.S. is that as at May a person was out of work for an average 43 weeks in South Australia, whereas throughout Australia the average duration of unemployment was 31.9 weeks, meaning a person in this State—I am waiting for the Premier—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Continue with the explanation or leave will be withdrawn.

**Mr BANNON:** Yes, Mr Speaker. This means a person in this State is out of work on average two or three months longer than elsewhere.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** There is some considerable doubt as to whether or not the figure quoted in the Budget last night of 19 per cent is correct. Indeed, I heard the honourable member (I cannot remember his district), but it was Mr Hawke last night who strongly queried that on a television debate with the Federal Treasurer and Mr Willis. I am constantly amazed by the slightly juvenile activities of the Leader of the Opposition. He seems determined to spread doom and gloom, to rumour monger. He has a very miserable outlook on life.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** It seems to me that this outlook was typified last night when I think everyone in South Australia was looking forward to personal income tax cuts and to some form of tax rebate to assist home buyers in respect of interest payments. I listened carefully for some recognition by the Opposition that the things most people in South Australia wanted have been provided, and I did not hear one mention of it. All that we heard was some carping criticism about sales tax, something that was tried before and was totally unsubstantiated last year. Let me talk to the Leader of the Opposition about unemployment. I made the point yesterday to the honourable member for Napier that instead of worrying too much that poverty exists and talking about poverty we should acknowledge it exists and do something about it.

**An honourable member:** Well, resign.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The honourable gentleman should do far more talking about job creation, and so should his Leader. Looking at the figures which have been brought down I can take some encouragement from the trends shown in the statistics released last week. No wonder the honourable member for Elizabeth is silent. South Australia is the only State which has had a fall in unemployment numbers between last July and this July. Let me make that quite clear. We have dropped from 48 800 to 45 600—the only State in Australia to show a fall in unemployment from July 1981 to July 1982. That was a fall of 6.56 per cent, whilst Australia generally rose 19.8 per cent. In New South Wales (and I have given these figures before but obviously honourable members opposite did not take note) it rose 34.9 per cent; Victoria 19.3 per cent; Queensland 5.5 per cent; Western Australian 40.4 per cent and Tasmania 15.7 per cent. This means that, whilst in South Australia our unemployment level for that 12-month period has fallen, the rest of Australia has increased markedly.

I do not suggest for a moment that unemployment throughout Australia is going to do anything other than increase. It is very likely to increase, but to translate Australia-wide figures and concoct some remarkable figure out of the air as regards South Australia, as the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting (projecting that unemployment will

be at those levels in South Australia next year) in my view is totally defeatist and a miserable outlook. The record shows that South Australia is holding its unemployment problem and doing it very well compared with the rest of Australia. There is no reason why we cannot continue to do that. There are two things necessary and I mentioned them to the honourable member for Napier yesterday. The first is wage restraint, and honourable members opposite would do a great deal more to help the unemployment situation in this State and in Australia if they would urge on their own trade union bosses the need for wage restraint.

That is the only way that we can afford to continue employing people and, indeed, employing more people. The second thing is that honourable members opposite would do well to get behind this Government's job creation schemes, which are proper ones, by creating development, investment and resource development in this State. Instead of standing in the way and doing everything possible to discourage development in this State, members opposite should help the Government in its efforts to encourage development. By encouraging development and investment, we can create more jobs. People do not want hand-outs: they want the opportunity to work. That is exactly what this Government's policies are doing.

The last available unemployment figures for the previous 12 months show quite conclusively that we are achieving our goal against national trends. I totally refute the miserable outlook of the Leader of the Opposition and can only urge him to take sensible and realistic measures to help us to encourage development and expansion in South Australia, thus creating jobs and putting money back into people's pockets.

## PARLIAMENTARY MEETING

**Mr ASHENDEN:** Is the Premier aware of a meeting that is alleged to have taken place in Parliament House early this morning involving members of the Parliamentary Liberal Party to discuss business relevant to this House, namely, that there be an early election following the handing down of the Federal Budget last night? I understand that several news organisations were contacted by a member of the Opposition Leader's staff this morning and advised of the so-called secret meeting.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Late this morning several members of my staff were contacted by members of the media. They were not just asked, but challenged, to give details of an alleged secret meeting of Parliamentary members of the Liberal Party which was supposed to have taken place early today to discuss certain matters. They said that the information was given on the best of authority and that the meeting was called to discuss an early State election.

*Mr Slater interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** We understand that the rumour originated from a member of the Opposition Leader's staff.

**Mr Gunn:** Mr Muirden?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I do not know whether or not it was Mr Muirden. The person involved said that he heard that members of the Party were urged to attend the meeting on time. It just goes to show to what length the Labor Party publicists will go to mislead the media and spread misinformation.

*Mr Bannon interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** It makes the Leader's staff look absolutely ridiculous. It turns out that there was a meeting at Parliament House this morning.

**Mr Max Brown:** You weren't here.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Indeed, I was not able to attend. The meeting in Parliament House—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:**—which so excited certain Opposition officers was held at 8.45 a.m. Some 21 members attended, including several members of the Labor Party. They gathered for their prayer breakfast. It just goes to show exactly to what lengths the Opposition will go to mislead the media and the people. I think that the Opposition's credibility rating has again taken a further nosedive. I do not think it can go much lower.

### POVERTY

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** My question, which also is addressed to the Premier, is not on a light note like the last one. Will the Premier ask the Minister of Community Welfare to initiate immediately a royal commission into poverty in South Australia and, if not, why not?

At least 160 000 South Australians are being forced to survive on incomes below the Henderson poverty line, accepted by social workers, and it is quite clear from information being brought to members of Parliament and being published in the media as well that the plight of the new poor in South Australia is getting worse daily. The Premier will be aware that, according to statistics from the Australian Council of Social Service, single unemployed people over 18 years will still be forced to survive on an income of \$27 a week below the accepted poverty line, despite Mr Howard's miserly increase last night.

Social workers say that the worst hit are single unemployed people under 18 years, who are living away from home. Even after Mr Howard's \$4 increase (the first increase since 1975) these young people will be forced to survive on a level that is \$51 per week below the poverty line.

In some suburbs in Adelaide, nearly 30 per cent of the population are relying on social security benefits, and one in five are unemployed. I have been informed that the number of people seeking assistance from Department for Community Welfare offices has increased markedly. We have also seen in the newspapers and on television that there are elderly South Australians in such desperate straits who are being forced to survive on pet food, and young women being forced into prostitution. However, the Premier apparently is not even listening to the question. Further, I point out that reports show there are more than 6 000 homeless youths in South Australia, and that the level of reported child abuse, always associated with poverty, has risen by nearly 100 per cent a year for the past three years in this State.

I have also been informed that, despite the growing level of poverty in this State, there are several hundred unemployed social workers here, and the tip is that the Tonkin Government is set to cut back jobs in the Department for Community Welfare in the coming Budget.

For some time social workers have said that the level of emergency financial assistance provided to the needy by the Department for Community Welfare varies considerably from area to area, and often acute needs are only partially met, or ignored, because of constraints imposed by local budgets. This, I am told, has resulted in a situation where those needing food in one area are receiving less than those in another area, simply because some offices are under greater pressure for assistance than others.

My Parliamentary colleagues tell me that the pressure on welfare staff is becoming so great that even emergency cases must wait days before they are dealt with. It is quite clear, from the information I have received, that the growing poverty in our community is contributing to rising crime, alcoholism, marital break-ups, bitterness and resentment.

It has been put to me that it would be a very cynical and callous act indeed if the allocation for community welfare was cut back rather than increased in this coming State Budget.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Quite a number of questions are inherent in the honourable member's one question. If I were to answer his first question I would say 'No, there is no intention of establishing a royal commission into poverty.' If the honourable member were to consider the matter a little, he would realise what a fatuous suggestion that is. First, the establishment of a royal commission alone would cost a vast sum of money. Considering the amount of evidence that would need to be taken to ensure that the royal commission did its job properly, many thousands of dollars would be expended. That money can be better expended on doing something directly about poverty.

The other reason is that there is a great deal of evidence already available, including that to which the member for Napier referred yesterday in his speech in this House. I realise that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was not in the Chamber at the time, but the explanation that the Deputy Leader read out was almost, word for word, the speech of the member for Napier. I have already replied to the remarks made by the member for Napier, but I will again refer to those points in a moment. I refer now to one of the last points that was made: the honourable gentleman will have to wait for the Budget before he has details of it. The rumour mongering, yet again (which is exactly what the honourable member is doing), about the D.C.W. and its activities and funds available, cannot be forgiven. It is totally without any—

*The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** It has been done without any informed knowledge, and I can say only that the Deputy Leader will have to wait and see, as will the people of South Australia, what sort of action will be taken.

Let us consider poverty itself. As I pointed out to the member for Napier, who made a most sympathetic and humane speech in this place yesterday, poverty exists: we accept that and that it exists largely because of unemployment, to some extent because of high interest rates and, indeed, because of the many factors that are depressing the world's economy, the Australian economy and, therefore, the South Australian economy. We must accept that poverty exists. The honourable gentleman stands on his feet and all he can suggest is a royal commission to do something about poverty. Perhaps the honourable member is well intentioned, and I believe that he is, but it is far more important that we look at the basic causes of poverty in our society and attack its root causes. Those people who are suffering—

**An honourable member:** It is growing, you know.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Yes, indeed it is growing, but it is not being helped by the attitude of members opposite and members of their Party. People do not want hand-outs: that is not the answer to poverty, and the honourable gentleman ought to know better. People who are able to work want to work. People want the dignity of employment and the opportunity to work. They want significant, permanent jobs that will guarantee them some security. Those people who can work want to work, and work must be provided for them. Those people who are infirm, aged, past working or unable to work must be supported, but the community cannot support them at an appropriate level unless the economy is sound and buoyant and unless money is being generated. To generate money, it is necessary to have employment and productivity, and we must present and sell our products overseas in order to ensure that the economy is stronger and that more money is provided.

There is one other aspect. We must ensure that those jobs are provided. Again I urge honourable members opposite

to get behind our efforts to attract investment and development to this State, because, if they were to do that, they would do far more to relieve poverty than any of the other suggestions that they have made. This country, as was very aptly summed up by the Federal Treasurer in his documents last night, is suffering from greed and excessive wage demands which are making it impossible for some employers to survive and for a great many more employers to employ as many people as they would like to employ.

It is a fundamental principle that a wage increase will ultimately tend to cost someone else a job, and that is the fundamental fact that governs the unemployment and poverty situation in Australia today. Honourable members opposite would do a great deal more to help poverty (and I accept that they are concerned about it—I know the member for Napier is concerned) if they could convince the trade union leaders of this country to moderate their wage claims—indeed, to make certain that they argue against excessive claims and accept what is a reasonable proposition only, even if it is allied to a cost of living increase.

If we could find more jobs for more people because employers could afford to employ them, if we could increase our productivity, and if we could sell those goods overseas, we could employ more people, and the whole cycle would go on so that the questions of unemployment and poverty could be overcome. That is the fundamental answer to the problem, which I freely accept is very serious indeed.

I have one last word. I would like to urge those members of the unions that have recently made wage claims on the Government to accept the offer that has been made, including the acceptance of a period of up to six months in which no further wage claims will be made.

That is the sort of approach which I believe people in the community are now expecting to see from both sides of politics and from both employee and employer sides of the community. We need to see a united commonsense and realistic approach to the problems which touch everyone in this community. I certainly hope that the members of those unions whose leaders are presently deliberating on whether or not to accept a period in which no further wage claims should be made will make their views known to the trade union leaders who represent them.

Yes, poverty is an appalling thing; it is something which concerns us all, but I would suggest that members opposite would do a great deal more by doing something positive to stimulate the economy than just standing up and weeping and wailing about the situation yet doing nothing about it.

## ROAD FUNDS

**Mr GUNN:** Can the Minister of Transport say where the extra funds for road construction announced in the Federal Budget delivered by Mr Howard last evening will be spent in South Australia? On page 20 of the Budget speech, the Treasurer said:

The proceeds of this surcharge will be paid into a special trust fund so that none of those proceeds can be used for purposes other than the Australian Bicentennial Road Development Programme. About \$2 500 000 is expected to be provided under this programme over the period to 1988-89.

I suggest that projects such as the Stuart Highway and one or two other roads in my district could well do with a large slice of these funds being spent on them.

**Mr Trainer:** Are you going to thank him for that question?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** I thank the honourable member for his question and place on record the great interest that the member for Eyre shows in funding for roads in his district, in particular the Stuart Highway. I will come to that in a minute.

**Mr Trainer:** It's the only road in his electorate.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** I am always happy to accede to the requests of the member for Ascot Park and he did ask—

**Mr Trainer:** Always?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** Well, often. The member for Eyre referred to the announcement made by the Treasurer last evening. The Treasurer said that a 1 cent per litre surcharge on fuel would be put into a special bicentenary fund which will be expected to attract about \$2 500 000 000 between now and 1988. As I understand it, the surcharge will rise to 2 cents per litre in the next financial year. Members will be aware that road funding was an item on the Premiers' Conference agenda. This proposal was floated, and I understand that it originally came from Queensland.

The Premier and I made two strong points to the Prime Minister at the Premiers' Conference: first, that if there was to be a bicentennial fund the money for it should come from the present Commonwealth excise and that an additional tax should not be levied on the motorist. It seems to me that whenever these things are done it is always the motorist who pays.

The second point that the South Australian delegation made, and on this we were strongly supported by Mr Wran, was that any such dedicated fund should not be apportioned merely for national highways. There is no doubt that the most serious aspect of the Australian road system is the deterioration of the arterial road system, both rural and metropolitan.

**Mr Keneally:** You lost the first point and won the second one.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** Indeed, it seems that the Prime Minister has accepted our advice on the second point, if not the first.

**Mr Keneally:** That's what I mean.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Stuart will not win anything, other than an expulsion.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** As I say, it seems that the Prime Minister did accept our advice on that matter. I can see why Mr Wran did not support us on the first point, because the day after the Premiers' Conference, if I remember correctly, Mr Wran instituted a State fuel franchise levy of enormous proportions in New South Wales and is still reaping the repercussions of that decision.

To get back to the question, it was up to South Australia to make representations to the Commonwealth on what road construction projects should be bicentenary projects and named as such. The final details of that scheme are not yet available and the Commissioner of Highways will be attending a meeting in Canberra on Friday to ascertain the final details. I assure the honourable member that the Stuart Highway will be one of the projects enumerated, because, as I understand the position, the fund, which is to be a trust fund, will be divided into national highways, arterial roads, and local roads. I give the honourable member an assurance that the Stuart Highway will be one of the projects enumerated or nominated under the national highways category.

Regarding the question as to what other roads, especially arterial roads, will be enumerated, I cannot say that at this stage and, because I had warning of this matter from the Premiers' Conference, I have instructed the Commissioner to prepare for me a suggested list of which roads would be suitable as bicentenary projects.

**Mr Gunn:** I can make some very good suggestions.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** I am sure that the honourable member can make very good suggestions, and I will be happy to look at them when I have considered the matter further.

### PORT PARHAM LAND

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** Will the Minister of Lands say what submissions he has made to the Commonwealth Minister for Defence or any other Minister in relation to the dispute that has emerged between the residents of Port Parham and surrounding areas and the Army? Is the Minister aware that, whenever area R259B is gazetted, the residents of that area will be breaching Commonwealth law by residing in their own homes? If the Minister has not made any representations, what decisions, if any, has this Government made to alleviate this embarrassing situation?

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** The first thing that the honourable member should recognise in this embarrassing situation is that the embarrassing situation was created by the previous Government, inasmuch as no land has been let out by this Government in that particular area. In fact, the allotments and the area concerning the people there at present were sold by the honourable member's own Government, and that is where the problem lies. I think that the honourable member is well aware that since 1978 no further allotments have been let out or sold in the area in question.

In fact, I had a discussion with two residents of that area only on Monday morning. I told them that I was more than happy to support any proposals they wished to put to the Federal Minister (Mr Sinclair) on this matter. They are in the process of preparing a submission to me as to their attitudes and the attitudes of the people concerned, which submission I said I would be more than happy to put forward.

I believe that the residents concerned have the support of the Mallala District Council in the same way. I informed this delegation that I would welcome the support of the Mallala District Council in the representations I made to the Federal Government on behalf of the people in that area. I reiterate (and I am quite sure that the honourable member is well aware) that the problem was virtually created by the fact that the allotments were let out or sold by the previous Government to the people currently living there.

### FEDERAL BUDGET

**Mr BECKER:** Is the Minister of Agriculture satisfied that the rural community received a fair deal in the Federal Budget announced last night?

**The SPEAKER:** Will the honourable member please repeat his question?

**Mr BECKER:** Is the Minister satisfied that the rural community received a fair deal in the Federal Budget announced last night?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I rule the question inadmissible.

**Mr BECKER:** Mr Speaker—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I rule the question inadmissible. If the honourable member wishes to dispute the matter he can approach the Chair in the time that remains.

### SPORTS LOTTERY

**Mr SLATER:** Has the Minister of Recreation and Sport considered a proposal for a special sports lottery conducted by the South Australian Lotteries Commission for the funding of recreation and sport in South Australia? It is obvious that soccer pool funds have not come up to expectations and that some other form of funding is necessary for recreation and sport. The Minister gave information to this House last week regarding a proposal to alter the game and

method of soccer pools which, in effect, is somewhat similar to the Lotto Bloc competition.

Although I point out that there are some essential differences, the six-in-36 competition still relies on match results. The prize dividends also is a departure, because the Lotteries Commission pays 61 per cent of the pool back into the prizes as dividends, and soccer pools return about 37 per cent to the prize dividend pool. I would be interested to know whether a proposal for a special sports lottery or lotteries is being considered and, if so, whether the Minister can provide any relevant information.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** I have considered this matter to the extent that I have investigated the system operating in the Northern Territory, where they have a special lottery from which the proceeds go into sport. However, as yet I have given no consideration to the matter as it would apply in South Australia.

### FEDERAL BUDGET

**Mr BECKER:** Is the Minister of Agriculture satisfied that the rural community in South Australia received a fair deal in the Federal Government's Budget announced last night?

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** Did Ted make a mess of the first one?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr BECKER:** Mr Speaker—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Deputy Leader will remain silent. The honourable member for Hanson.

**Mr BECKER:** I understand that any difficulties experienced in the rural community in South Australia affect housewives in relation to the cost of living in the metropolitan area.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I recognise, with respect, that it was the Speaker who ruled the question out of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister has been asked a question, and I ask him to direct his answer to that question.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I am not satisfied that the Federal Government gave the South Australian primary producers a fair go in the Budget announced last night. Before I refer in particular to the areas concerning me and, I am sure, the primary producers, consistent with my attitude on many other occasions I believe it is fair that I acknowledge some of those areas that were recognised by our Federal colleagues.

It is true that the Federal Government has honoured its undertaking with respect to no wine tax and maintenance of the current excise on spirits. It is true that the lifting of the taxation threshold will flow on to those people in the rural community. It is also true that the family taxation relief measures that have been announced will flow to the whole community. I recognise further that the household interest taxation rebate, to some limited extent, will apply to people living in at least the rural village areas of the State. The superphosphate subsidy has been reintroduced to apply retrospectively from 1 July, which is indeed important. On reading that announcement I was somewhat comforted. I recognise further that the enormous increases for research at C.S.I.R.O. and other State authority levels have been sought by rural organisations all over Australia. I add to my list of welcome benefits that announcement as well.

The fact that the Federal Government has failed to appropriately lift loan funding to primary producers in this country is a recipe for disaster in that industry. The Federal Government had last year identified a figure of \$18 000 000 to be available to the States for in turn lending to their rural producers. That money is available through the Rural

Industry Assistance Divisions in the respective States. The Federal Government knows, through Agricultural Council meetings and through its own colleague, the Minister for Primary Industry (Peter Nixon), the need for additional rural funding throughout this country. It knows it only too well. To lift the Budget amount by a miserable \$2 000 000 reflects a position by our Federal colleagues which can only attract flak from the rural community.

I cannot believe, on the basis of the statement, that it is serious about the intention to go to the polls before the end of this year. I believe that the Budget in that respect fell far short, not of what people want but of what people need. Our own Premier today stated in this House on two occasions the importance of people having a job and the importance of people being able to remain in the industry in which they are expert. The people in the rural community are not seeking hand-outs. They are not seeking to be propped up by artificial subsidies. They are seeking access to moneys on loan to which they do not have reasonable access at this time. The sort of carry-on finance that is required is a part of management in the rural sector and is no longer available to them through commercial sources at interest rates within their reach.

In fact, stock firms which traditionally have been the organisations to fund primary producers between crop returns and wool and stock returns on an annual basis now have interest rates of nearly 18 per cent, which is indeed unobtainable by our primary producers. No longer is there a margin in that industry to allow people access to funds attracting that sort of interest rate level. We desperately need in this State a rural banking source to which our rural community can gain both short and long-term funding at interest rates within the reach of their pockets. They are faced with that situation. We are on a disaster course. We cannot compete within our own country or on the export market for produce of a primary industry nature while that sort of formula or level of interest rate prevails.

I repeat: primary producers are not looking for hand-outs, but are looking for access to the required amount of money in order to survive with interest rates at a realistic level. In 1980-81 in South Australia we enjoyed, on loan at 8 per cent interest, some \$2 200 000. That figure was raised by \$50 000 for the period 1981-82, and it is proposed to be raised by some \$500 000 for the current financial year. That amount falls far short of not what is wanted, but of what is desperately needed for carry-on loan financial purposes in the rural area.

Applications directed, in particular, to the Rural Industry Assistance Division within the Department of Agriculture during the past 12 months have reflected more than a 100 per cent increase in applications, for carry-on loan funding assistance in particular, for the purposes of rearranging the debt structure of farmers.

If ever the Federal Government needed a signal, it was implicit in that record. The same pattern of applications is flowing into my department at this time, which demonstrates clearly that primary producers are in need of not only access to adequate funding but also funding at realistic interest rates that they can meet.

I am disappointed also about the fact that the proposed funding for the bicentennial road construction plan is to be extended to inflict a further tax of 1 per cent per litre on all fuels, in particular those that are used on primary producing properties. If there was a need to use this type of formula for road vehicles I could understand it, but indeed, to extend that taxation measure to the farmer, concerning non-registered vehicles that are used exclusively for farming purposes, is yet adding injury to the worker.

Those remarks I believe sum up my feelings about the Federal Budget as it applies to the rural sector, and I am

satisfied from the reports received from the field (even at this early stage) that those sentiments I have expressed are the feelings of the primary producers throughout South Australia, if not throughout the nation.

It is amazing that two people, the Deputy Prime Minister of Australia and the Minister for Primary Industry in Australia, being two Country Party members of the coalition, should have lost touch with the rural community to the extent to which they appear to have done or that they should be such lightweight in the outfit at that level that they have not been able to convince the Prime Minister and his Treasurer (Mr Howard) to give the rural community a fairer deal.

#### NOARLUNGA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

**Mr SCHMIDT:** Will the Minister of Education advise members of this House, and particularly, residents of the outer southern suburbs, of the progress of the Noarlunga Community College with respect to the appointment of a college council and the formulation of a range of courses to be provided giving due recognition to courses for women, and, to assist those courses, the provision of a creche?

For some time local community groups have requested that a college council be set up for the Noarlunga Community College and that that council comprise a good cross section of community representatives. Furthermore, the college will service an area containing a large number of youths, and therefore requires courses pertaining to their apprenticeship range. Also, it will service an area with high unemployment and an area containing many single and married women. Many of those women seek to undertake an enrichment course or some other form of course within the college, and therefore, it is important also that we maintain the policy that was announced sometime earlier, namely, that qualified voluntary workers be used in the creche and that that creche would have a suitable location within the college.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The honourable member has put to me two questions. The first concerns the nomination of a college council. The question of whether or not a college has a council is in fact an optional one. I believe that one of the older, long-standing colleges, Croydon, does not have a council, but it will be having a nominated council sometime in the fairly near future. Meanwhile, the Noarlunga college is still in the process of firing up and it will be put on-stream in 1983.

The college Principal, Mr Colin Read, is currently studying and reviewing this matter and I believe that he will make some personal representations to the Director-General of Further Education regarding the establishment of a college council in the near future. However, I believe that there has been some suggestion that the Principal of the college might have been a little obstructionist in his reluctance to appoint a council early and I would assure members of the House that this is not so. Mr Read is well aware of the importance of a properly constituted council to the running of this college and, in fact, he has been personally contacting a large number of organisations in the community and has made patently clear to the Director-General of Further Education that he will be making some recommendations about the establishment of a council.

I believe that his approach is appropriate. It is better to have a council that is fully representative of the community rather than to appoint an *ad hoc*, interim council, which may have to be reviewed rather quickly after the college comes on stream. I can assure the honourable member, who has taken a long standing interest in this matter, that the college Principal will be making recommendations to the Director-General and to me in the not too distant future.

Regarding the establishment of a creche, this is one of those unusual situations in colleges of further education. The Federal Government, in its wisdom, decided many, many years ago that in funding colleges of further education it would not finance the construction of creche facilities. Therefore, a number of colleges, such as the Gilles Plains College, have built in creche facilities, but the provision of a creche at Noarlunga was not part of the original plan that was put to the Public Works Standing Committee some time before this Government came to power, the construction of which was approved very soon after this Government came to office. As a result, there was no formal provision for a creche within the college plans.

Upon being approached by the people in the Noarlunga district on this matter, I suggested that the college Principal examine the situation to see whether he could make some provision for accommodation for a creche, but that was provisional upon the creche being run on a voluntary basis. I would advise the honourable member that the matter still rests with the college Principal to make recommendations regarding appropriate accommodation, and I would still anticipate that, as in the majority of cases in which we already have approved creches, the operation of that creche should be on a voluntary basis.

To anyone who would ask why, I would point out that the Education Department is not in the business of providing and, in fact, is not financed to provide creche facilities anywhere in South Australia and that that provision might more properly be addressed to the Department for Community Welfare. In fact, that department received additional benefits from the Federal Budget which was announced only yesterday. I do not believe it is appropriate that the Education Department and not the Department for Community Welfare should finance creche facilities.

Another important point which is frequently missed by those people who insist upon creche facilities being provided at colleges is that South Australia generally has an adequate provision of pre-school facilities and that it is more the rationalisation rather than the provision of extra facilities that should be considered. The Childhood Services Council, when this matter was brought to its attention a year ago, stated that it believed that the existing early childhood facilities in the district should be considered by those people who wish to send their youngsters to colleges as a first option rather than coming along and insisting that additional facilities be provided at the college.

Therefore, I hope that the honourable member realises that the matter has not been lightly considered but that he in turn will go back to his electorate and suggest that the various facilities that are available should be given first choice by those people who wish to attend the college. He should also advise them that the Principal of the college is further considering alternatives.

### STONY POINT PROJECT

**Mr MAX BROWN:** Does the Premier still stand by his statement that at the peak of development the Stony Point project will have a maximum labour force on site of 1 500 men and, if he does, will he explain how he arrives at that figure when Santos has said that only 750 to 800 men will be employed at peak? I refer to the statement made by the Premier on page 18 of *Hansard* when he said:

Not only that, over the next few months there will be a peak of 1 500 men employed at the site of Stony Point.

Santos itself has denied this figure, so either the Premier is in receipt of more favourable employment requirements at Stony Point than is Santos or the figure supplied by the Premier is cruelly incorrect.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is now tending to both comment and debate.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** I do not want to debate it or to comment on it.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is to explain it.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** I simply point out to the Premier that the information that he has given to the House of 1 500 men being employed at peak has been quite noted by the unemployed work force in Whyalla. I am interested in hearing how the Premier reached that figure.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The figures have been given by Santos and by those companies working on the pipeline which is rapidly reaching Stony Point. There is much work to be done there still in the preparation of the deep water harbour, the moorings, the pipeline and storage facilities and on the on-site treatment itself. I will get a report for the honourable member, certainly, but as far as I understand it, with all of those facilities and the pipeline which is now approaching Port Augusta, I have no reason to doubt the accuracy of the figures.

### ABORIGINAL COMMUNITY YOUTH SERVICES

**Mrs SOUTHCOTT:** Can the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs say what will happen to the Aboriginal Community Youth Services programme now that Federal funding has ceased? Money was originally allocated in 1979 to the Department of Social Security for a three-year programme to be administered through the Department of Community Welfare for pilot projects.

The programme has been particularly useful in country areas where there are high numbers of young unemployed Aboriginal people. If the programme does not continue there would be a likelihood of an increased risk of involvement in crime and vandalism.

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** I think I should refer the honourable member to my Ministerial statement of last week which covers exactly that point.

### HEALTH COMMISSION

**Mr RANDALL:** Is the Minister of Health aware of attitudes within the health services of South Australia towards the concept of regionalisation of health services in this State and can she advise whether the restructuring of the South Australian Health Commission to establish an administrative structure based on regions would be welcomed by hospitals and health units?

The Australian Labor Party's policy on health released in June this year commits a Labor Government to restructuring the Health Commission and to establishing administrative regions. In the light of the Public Accounts Committee report tabled recently in this House that worthwhile results are being achieved by the commission, I would be interested to learn whether changed administrative arrangements would be in the best interests of the health system.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Yes, I am in a position to be aware of the feelings of hospitals and health units on the question of the administration of the South Australian Health Commission. Quite apart from the normal communication that I have with those units, I have today addressed a seminar which I arranged for all hospital and health unit honorary boards in South Australia. A similar seminar was arranged last year so the Government could communicate directly with hospital boards and also receive the benefit of their views.

Today and in previous weeks I have received a stream of protests from people who are appalled by the Labor Party's health policy and at the prospect of the Labor Party achieving Government and inflicting yet another change on the South Australian Health Commission. Far be it from me to give credence to some of the gratuitous statements made in that policy, but one or two of them need to be really set to rest. Page 21 of the policy states:

Under the Liberals the Health Commission has become centralised, bureaucratic and top heavy.

That statement can only have been put on paper by someone who has his head completely in the sand and has failed to communicate effectively with any health unit in South Australia. Under this Government the Health Commission for the first time has become decentralised and, far from being top heavy, the central office of the commission has had its staff reduced by 10 per cent. No-one could suggest that it is top heavy. The whole concept of regionalisation is one that is entirely inappropriate to South Australia.

One has only to look at this State's geographical and demographical features to realise that regionalisation is entirely inappropriate. It would be extremely costly to establish regional offices in the metropolitan and country areas of this State and it would be virtually ineffective in terms of improving communication between health units and the commission and certainly thoroughly inequitable in terms of distributing resources. One has only to look at the situation in New South Wales where there is at least a case for regionalisation to see that it has failed miserably (and the Labor Government there has recognised that it has failed) and to see the absolute futility of suggesting such a situation for South Australia.

Another point that I think is most important is that the Health Commission is now working effectively for the first time and to disrupt that effective work by the possibility of another change just when the health units are enjoying a period of stability is, I think, entirely insensitive and inappropriate. The attitudes of hospitals generally can best be summed up by a letter that was sent by the administration of the Naracoorte hospital to the Leader of the Opposition, a copy of which was sent to me. The letter states:

It has taken in excess of six years to get the Health Commission working satisfactorily, and only by a great deal of effort has that been achieved . . . there would be almost unanimous agreement that the present system, established since the arrival of the present Chairman of the Health Commission (Mr McKay), is working satisfactorily . . . Further, the present sector arrangement is working extremely well, and there is no reason to alter it.

In analysing the remainder of the Labor Party's policy the Naracoorte hospital makes the observation that whilst many of the ideas are worth while, most are already either established fact or are in the pipeline.

Going through that policy and analysing it (and a mish mash policy it is) I noted that virtually every worthwhile suggestion in that policy has already either been implemented by this Government or planned to be announced for implementation for many of those worthwhile ideas. I inform not only the House but the Labor Party that there is abundant evidence that the Opposition spokesman on health is thoroughly mistrusted by the health system and its proposals can do nothing but damage to his Party. That is likely to have a happy outcome in so far as the Labor Party's policy will, I firmly believe, be thoroughly rejected by the people of South Australia.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: CASINO BILL

**Mr LEWIS (Mallee):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr LEWIS:** I want to put the record straight in connection with an article that appears on page three of today's *News* attributed to the political reporter Mr Frank Jackson. The headline is 'Odds against Casino Bill passing, tips Labor M.P.'. In that article Mr Jackson allegedly says:

The Government's Bill introduced by the Premier, Mr Tonkin, had a bad start in March when Liberal M.P. Mr Peter Lewis accused his Party of political cowardice.

That is not true. At no time did I accuse members of my political Party or of any political Party, as a Party, of cowardice. This matter, as a matter of fact known to all members, is a conscience vote.

*Mr Bannon interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** The Leader, by interjection, draws the attention of the House—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will come to a personal explanation and take no heed of interjections.

**Mr LEWIS:** The press release that I issued in no instance mentions any political Party. My press release, issued on 24 March this year, states:

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

I cannot imagine, as I said, what it was. In that release, I went on:

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—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Mallee is now going far beyond a personal explanation in quoting so fully from a statement he made earlier this year. I have accepted the situation that the honourable member may, as any other honourable member may, make a personal explanation relative to his or her own particular position but it may not then develop into a debate on a matter that is currently before the House in any circumstances, or a debate on a matter that is not before the House. The Standing Order allows for a brief personal explanation.

**Mr LEWIS:** Quite simply, I challenge any reporter on the *News* staff or any member of this House to show where I ever accused members of the Liberal Party or of any other Party of such behaviour.

*At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Call on the business of the day.

#### ALSATIAN DOGS ACT (REPEAL) BILL

**Mr HEMMINGS (Napier)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to repeal the Alsatian Dogs Act, 1934-1980. Read a first time.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

The reason for the introduction of this Bill is to take off the Statute Book a discriminatory piece of legislation against one breed of dog, the German shepherd. The title of the Act itself is discriminatory: it is the Alsatian Dogs Act. In practically every other country and, indeed, in Australia, this breed of dog is given its correct name, and that is the



German shepherd dog. I do not intend to detail to this House the overwhelming evidence that can be put forward that the German shepherd dog is not more likely to savage human beings or stock than is any other breed. In fact, evidence shows that the sheep dog, which all the primary producers have to control their stock, is more likely, when running loose, to do more damage to sheep or cattle than is any other breed of dog.

**Mr Randall:** What evidence?

**Mr Lewis:** What evidence is there of that?

**Mr HEMMINGS:** All the primary producers over there are asking what evidence there is. I only have something like between 20 and 30 minutes to explain this Bill and I do not intend to bring forward to the House the evidence that shows that what people have been saying in the past, namely, that the German shepherd dog is the one that should be blamed, is not the case. The evidence shows that the German shepherd dog is not the guilty one.

**Mr Lewis:** No, but you—

**Mr HEMMINGS:** We all know that the member for Mallee feels more for sheep than for people and more for sheep than for dogs. I place on record the fact that in this House on many occasions I have talked about the underprivileged, those people who have been discriminated against, the ones who have the bureaucracy stacked against them, and I am proud of that record. I am also very proud to be able to put a case for the German shepherd dog in this State.

The Dog Control Act quite adequately covers the powers of local government to control the behaviour of all breeds of dogs and the responsibilities of their owners. Since the passing of the Dog Control Act in 1979, it has been obvious that special legislation against one particular breed is not only unnecessary but also undemocratic, irrelevant and completely discriminatory. The original Alsatian Dogs Act of 1934 was a direct result of the feeling in the community that anything associated with Germany was to be feared.

**Mr Lewis:** Nonsense!

**Mr HEMMINGS:** The member for Mallee says that that is nonsense. One only has to consider the feeling in this State when we changed the German names of townships and gave them anglicised names. That proves my point. The member for Mallee is unaware of that. I would not say he is foolish, but he is—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Let us have the debate without recriminations about individual members.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** I take your point, Sir, but the interjections coming from the other side do—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair will look after the interjections.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** As I have said, the original Act was a direct result of fear of anything associated with the German race. In fact, as far back as 1928, the importation ban was placed on the German shepherd breed and this ban produced inbreeding and there was no way in which any person who was attempting to maintain the growth of the breed could produce anything that was being maintained elsewhere. Since the lifting of the ban in 1972, Australian breeders have invested millions of dollars to import top breeding stock.

As a result, since 1972 Australia has been able to produce a German shepherd breed comparable with those breeds elsewhere in the world. The main opponents of the German shepherd have always maintained this breed will mate with the dingo, and that is a very emotional argument. The dingo in this State has always been shot, trapped and, in effect, seen as one breed that is not compatible with sheep and cattle in this country. Opponents have said that if a German shepherd mates with a dingo the end result will be a dog that will continually prey on stock. Today I would like to lay that claim at rest. In doing so, I quote part of a letter

that Senator Don Chipp wrote to a member in this House. He said in part:

When I was Minister for Customs and Excise—

that was when he was part of the Liberal Government— one of the Acts of which I am most proud was rescinding the stupid ban on the importation of fertile male dogs. The Country Party, in their continued stupidity, had opposed the lifting of this ban for 20 years, thus cleverly ensuring that the breed became more inbred and more ferocious. Since I lifted the ban, in 1972, common sense has prevailed. Before I did this, I arranged for experiments to be carried out, under scientific supervision, to see if the German shepherd did, in fact, mate with the dingo. The information given to me was that it did not and would not.

**Mr Lewis:** Prove it.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** I will not answer that interjection. I said earlier that the Dog Control Act is quite sufficient to enable local government adequately to police the behaviour of dogs. I would like to quote from the original Bill which was passed in 1972 but which was opposed by the then Opposition, which said that we were inflicting on the people of South Australia too stringent controls. In the end, common sense prevailed, and the Dog Control Act was passed. Clause 50, which deals with the problem of dogs that savage stock, provides:

(1) Where a dog is shown to be unduly mischievous or dangerous, a court may order that the dog be destroyed.

(2) An order for the destruction of a dog may be made by a local court, upon application, or by any court (including a local court) hearing any proceedings (whether civil or criminal) in relation to the dog.

(3) Where a court is empowered to make an order for the destruction of a dog, the court may in addition thereto, or in lieu thereof, do one or more of the following things:

- (a) provide that the order shall be remitted in specified circumstances;
- (b) order the seizure and detention of the dog, whether or not an order is made for the destruction of the dog;
- (c) make an order requiring that the dog be controlled, or be controlled in a specified manner;
- (d) make an order requiring that the dog be disposed of, or be disposed of in a specified manner;
- (e) authorise a member of the Police Force or a person appointed by the council to give effect to the order;

That clause, in effect, gives power to local government to say that any dog that is causing mischief, a nuisance or the destruction of stock may be destroyed. That was passed in our period of Government. There were amendments in 1981, and I refer to clause 28 of that amending Bill, which gave the courts even greater powers, as follows:

The following section is inserted in Part IV after section 50 of the principal Act:

50a. (1) Where a justice is satisfied, upon the application of an authorised person, that there are reasonable grounds for believing that a dog is dangerous, the justice may, by order, authorise the authorised person to seize and detain the dog under this section.

(2) An application for an order under this section shall not be made to a justice who is a member, officer or employee of a council.

(3) An authorised person, acting in pursuance of an order under this section may exercise such force as is necessary to seize and detain a dog to which the order relates.

(4) As soon as practicable after a dog has been seized under this section an application for an order for destruction of the dog shall be made.

(5) Where the application for an order for destruction of the dog is refused, the dog shall be returned to its owner.

That clause clearly illustrates why the Dog Control Act exists and is necessary, and why it gives local government full power to police the behaviour of the dog. There is no doubt that local government (whether or not it enjoys the ban of German shepherd breeds or whether it has the power to act where necessary) has power to use the Act to ensure that no breed of dog can run loose.

I have consistently attempted in this House to point out the stupidity of the present Alsatian Dog Act. I turn now to the situation not only on Kangaroo Island but elsewhere.

Since the proclamation of the Dog Control Act, every area that has had the ban on German shepherds lifted had German shepherds introduced into its area illegally. Andamooka and Coober Pedy would be prime examples of this. When amendments to the Alsatian Dog Act were introduced into this House in regard to Coober Pedy, the Minister said (and I will not quote his direct words) that German shepherd dogs were being introduced into Coober Pedy purely and simply as guard dogs. The Minister recognised that and moved the necessary amendments. I do not often praise the Government, because most times it does not deserve it.

The Government has reacted reasonably to the illegal importation of the German shepherd breed into those areas where the ban was in force. It accepted that people in those areas wanted to keep German shepherd dogs for a specific reason, and they acted in a reasonable manner. But, what is the situation on Kangaroo Island? That is the whole crux of why I am introducing this Bill.

On Kangaroo Island, the reasonableness with which our dearly beloved Minister of Local Government acted in Andamooka and Coober Pedy is not being felt. I would be the last one to condone any law breaking in any area. I do understand the attitude of the owners of the German shepherd that is now on Kangaroo Island. That dog is a pedigreed dog and is not ferocious in any way whatsoever. To those people, the dog was a part of their family. Some people in the House may believe that dogs should not be a part of the family. However, in many instances that is exactly what they are. Tara was part of the Doig family. When they imported that dog they did so knowing that they were breaking the law. I had reservations when they proceeded along those lines, but they had their reasons for doing so. When I went over to Kangaroo Island to assess the situation, I was completely astounded because on Kangaroo Island dogs are roaming in packs. They roam around American River, Penneshaw and Kingscote, and no-one cares a damn.

**Mr Slater:** Not even the member for the district.

**Mr HEMMING:** No, not even the member for the district. Dogs do roam. When I was in Kingscote, at every shop front a dog was lying along the front path.

**Mr Randall:** What, every shop?

**Mr HEMMING:** Yes, every shop. The member for Henley Beach has decided to come into this. I hope that he will get into the debate. In front of every shop a dog was lying. That does not exist in my own district, and I am sure that it does not exist in the district of the member for Henley Beach. Yet, local government in Kangaroo Island is cheerfully taking fees for dogs but is not controlling dogs. However, it has a fixation that German shepherds should not be allowed on Kangaroo Island.

When I went to American River and spoke to Mr and Mrs Doig, I had my family with me, and I had no fear whatsoever that my children were in any danger from Tara. Yet, while I was having coffee with them I could see packs of five dogs or more roaming around, and no-one taking any notice of them whatsoever. Do members know the reason why? It was because they have a queer principle over on Kangaroo Island, that, as long as they know to whom the dog belongs, they should not worry about it. If that is not a negative attitude to dog control, I have not seen a better example of it.

Why are the local government bodies in Kangaroo Island opposed to lifting the ban on the breed to which we are referring—the German shepherd? I maintain that it is because pressure has been brought on them by their local member, the Minister for Agriculture, who is a primary producer and who represents the very wealthy farmers on Kangaroo Island. Kangaroo Island is only one part of his electorate, and it seems rather strange that in the other parts of his electorate there are more German shepherd breeders than there are

anywhere else in the State. The local member cannot do anything about that, but he likes to think that he is the king of Kangaroo Island. So, that small portion of the State will always remain free of the German shepherd dog.

It may be relevant to quote some of the comments that the Minister of Agriculture made to the German shepherd club regarding the problem of a German shepherd dog being on the island. This involves a very smart remark. We all know that the Minister of Agriculture is a very smug person. He states:

As a resident primary producer of that district and local member representing the area, I comfortably reflect the views of the community with respect to the law as it applies to the district. The law in relation to Alsatian dogs is clear, and Kangaroo Island is one of the small parts of the State where the entry and keeping of German shepherd dogs is prohibited. I am not impressed with what I understand to have been a blatant disregard of that law by a family who I believe have recently settled on the island.

That is the attitude of the Minister of Agriculture, the local member. I received feedback last year when I introduced a private member's Bill that the Minister of Local Government was sympathetic to the problems relating to Kangaroo Island. He was also sympathetic to the problems relating to that breed of dog in other areas of the State. I have it on good authority that he used his power in Cabinet to roll a recommendation from the Minister of Local Government. Many times in this House we have had instances where the Minister has rolled other members of the Cabinet.

It seems that the Government is not prepared either to repeal the Act or to grant exemptions to Kangaroo Island solely because of the Minister of Agriculture. In a democratic society surely that is wrong, because, in effect, the Minister of Agriculture is denying those people in that region the right to own a German shepherd dog, and they must also go through the problems of obtaining a permit if travelling through the State.

There are members opposite who may be aware of the real problems facing those owners of German shepherd dogs. I am referring to those members who represent metropolitan districts, and those who represent districts where primary producers are in the majority. I would be only too pleased to pass over this Bill to the Government, because if the matter must be subject to all the trauma and delay of being dealt with during private members time, it will be something like three, four or six weeks before the matter is resolved. I am prepared to pass over the Bill to the Government so that we may speedily resolve this situation of being seen as the only State in the Commonwealth and the only area in the world where in certain places that particular breed of dog is restricted. I urge Government members to support the Bill. Important implications are contained in its provisions, and, as the Premier is so fond of telling us, the matter could be seen as a de-regulation whereby one Act which would no longer be applicable would be taken off the Statute Book.

The Bill contains two short clauses. I thank the Parliamentary Counsel for pulling out all stops in getting the Bill to me today, because until yesterday I understood that time for debating this issue was not to be made available to us. I thank the Parliamentary Counsel for helping me out with this matter. Clause 1 deals with the short title, and clause 2 provides that the Alsatian Dogs Act, 1934-1980 be repealed. I ask all members to support this Bill.

**Mr EVANS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### STUDENT COUNSELLING SERVICES

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury):** I move:

That this House calls on the Minister of Education to ensure that student counselling services are available as an element of

staffing additional to direct teaching appointments at all colleges of technical and further education which provide adult Matriculation courses.

It is not my intention to speak on this matter this afternoon at great length, and I will be seeking leave to continue my remarks later following some brief introductory comments, because I am well aware that there is another matter on the agenda on which members are eager to commence debate. This motion, in the light of certain recent events, will withstand delay by a couple of weeks before substantive debate. By that I mean that I understand that the Government (I am not entirely certain that it is the Minister) has agreed to the proposition put forward for some considerable time that, indeed, the provision for a half-time counsellor at the Port Adelaide Community College adult Matriculation unit should be considered as matter of staffing right rather than as a part of a *quid pro quo*, namely, at the expense of a reduction in the teaching staff of that unit.

I said that it was my understanding that the Government has made this decision, because I have had forwarded to me a copy of a letter from the Minister of Health addressed to one of the students of the Port Adelaide College. I find it quite unusual that a matter of such import should have been handled by the Minister of Health. Nevertheless, although that is something that is unusual and to be marvelled at, it certainly indicates that at long last the Government has seen the wisdom of the arguments that were put forward by the students and many others at the Port Adelaide Community College.

The motion that I have put before the House goes wider than that. Indeed, it is referring to all colleges of technical and further education, because surely that is the principle that we are debating, namely, the right for such appointments to be made at all colleges so that all those students that return to the education arena in order to do Matriculation studies can have counselling to which, it is generally agreed, it is quite necessary for them to have access.

In making that point, it is worth remembering the type of clientele that the adult Matriculation courses at the various community colleges attract. They are predominantly those who have had a break from established education of at least one year or two years: they are those who for one reason or another were not able to complete their secondary education when they were adolescents because they had to go into the work force, perhaps for economic reasons or perhaps even because of disinclination to continue their studies, but who, after some years in the work force or perhaps even amongst the unemployed, find for various reasons that they would like to continue their studies once again.

It may be because of the desire to improve their employability, if they are unemployed, or it may be because of a desire to improve their chances of obtaining better jobs in the work force. For whatever reason (the actual reasons why such people chose to go back are not entirely relevant to us at the moment, but it is something that is a person's right; it is their right to have varying motives), such people have come back, having left their classroom atmosphere that they had previously been in as adolescents, having broken away from the type of subculture, one might almost call it, that naturally exists within schools. It does have its own type of hierarchy, its own type of power structures, its own types of relationships between teacher and student, between student and student and between student and home. Such people then return into the education situation and sometimes have considerable difficulty making that transition.

I will focus my remarks today on counselling facilities. We hear much about the difficulties of the transition from school to work, and justly so, because it is an important transition; however, there are also transition problems in this area—the transition from the community, work place

or from being unemployed back into the school environment. I know from conversations with a number of staff and students of such colleges that many students face difficulties in this regard. Counselling does not only relate to this problem: it also relates to helping the student choose the best range of subjects for his or her advancement.

A wide number of subjects are available at matriculation, but less subjects are available from force of circumstances at adult matriculation colleges. Very often first appearances about the curriculum vitae of those subjects can be quite deceiving and not really give an adequate indication to the potential student as to the best or optimum range of subjects that that student should be choosing.

Counselling is one way of resolving that problem. We recognise that at secondary schools before students have left the education arena, when they progress from the junior secondary level to the senior secondary level, a significant amount of advice is proffered in most schools not only by teachers but also by the school councillor to assist the student to choose the best range of subjects to ensure that he does not bite off more than he can chew or plans the spread of those subjects over a time scale for which the regulations provide and with which the potential student can cope.

If that back-up and support is not provided to potential students, there is a very real danger of a high drop-out rate, because those students enter the course with enthusiasm to improve their educational circumstances, but because they have not had adequate advice they may make a variety of wrong decisions. When the wellknown mid-year crunch comes, many of those students will become so dispirited that they may be inclined to give up entirely rather than to battle on. They may not see what alternative options are available even at that late point.

Those points were argued by students certainly at the Port Adelaide college, and I am quite sure that they would have been echoed by students at other colleges had the same situation faced their colleges. Those thoughts are also echoed by the TAFE council of the Tertiary Education Commission in its report in preparation for the triennial period that we are in. Indeed, in that report the TAFE council notes the fact that there is a lack of many facilities in this area in South Australia. South Australia is particularly identified from its fellow States. I have a Question on Notice about that matter. In its report for the 1981-82 triennium, the council states:

It will be necessary to provide improved student service facilities including counselling areas, an adequate library, and modest recreational facilities.

The general thrust of my contribution, when I continue my remarks later, will be to argue the case that counselling facilities should be an integral part of the staffing of adult Matriculation colleges and not a superficial or supplementary part only to be provided if per chance teaching staff can be accordingly reduced or if spare funds are available.

I will be arguing that both the viability of the colleges and the chance of success for potential students within those colleges are fundamentally dependent upon the availability of counselling services. As I am conscious of the fact that other matters are to be debated and that the House wishes to proceed with another debate that will take some considerable time, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

## COUNTRY FIRES ACT

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I move:

That the various regulations under the Country Fires Act, 1976-1980, made on 15 July 1982, and laid on the table of this House on 20 July 1982, be disallowed.

These regulations have caused a great deal of concern to a number of local government bodies, particularly those in my electorate. I have been contacted by a number of my constituents who have expressed concern at the effect of these regulations if they remain as they are currently drafted. I am concerned that these regulations appear to have been made without full and frank consultation with the people affected by them.

For a long time district councils have had the authority to appoint fire controllers and supervisors for their areas. They have endeavoured to appoint people, particularly fire control officers who are experienced in burning-off operations, who have knowledge of fire fighting and who also have local knowledge of the area. I have received a copy of a letter from the District Council of Streaky Bay, dated 4 August and addressed to the Secretary General, J. M. Hullick, Local Government Association, 2 Hutt Street, Adelaide. It states:

I am directed by council to request you, as a matter of extreme urgency, to bring to the attention of your association the amendments to the regulations under the Country Fires Act, 1976-1980, and this council's comments, in relation thereto, listed hereunder.

(1) Council deplores another breach of the bounden promise so often given that amending legislation affecting local government will not be introduced prior to councils' having been provided with a draft, given adequate time to consider same, consult and comment. This council alleges that pages 178-180 of the *Government Gazette*, of 15 July 1982, was the first time it had any inkling of this legislation. Inquiries to other Eyre Peninsula councils suggest that Streaky Bay was not in isolation in this instance. Council asks the question: Why has your association failed to provide the prior information promised?

(2) Council believes the C.F.S. organisation has for some time been advocating that all fire control officers should be either the captains or lieutenants of C.F.S. Brigades. If this belief is factual, council records it opposes the proposal completely and utterly, on two main grounds:

- (a) Local Government is contributing very substantially to the cost of fire control and, therefore, should retain a significant input into how the organisation operates, particularly in the field. It will not willingly accept a 'you will pay but have no say' situation.
- (b) If council has interpreted these amendments correctly, and it believes it has, the Director of the C.F.S. will have absolute authority to delegate to any fire control officer/s the powers to assume command of fire-fighting operations at the scene of any fire (see the Act—section 52).
- (c) C.F.S. Brigades are all, so far as is known, incorporated bodies in their own right. The captain and lieutenant/s of each brigade are, *ex officio*, fire control officers (see reg. 16).
- (d) Accordingly, council believes that, resulting from this amending legislation, the Director will be vested with the necessary power, should he desire to use same, to destroy the longstanding right of a council to decide who will control fires within its council district.

This council will not accept, and this consensus is based on practical experience in connection with other Acts, that such powers are only included as a 'saving clause to be used only in extreme situations'. Indeed, council records its opinion that such powers will, in fact, be used, at some time. Accordingly, I am further directed to plead with your association to do all things possible to have the proposed regulations in relation to the vesting of these power in the Director of the C.F.S. disallowed.

A copy of this letter was sent to me, to the Director, to the District Clerks of the District Councils of Lincoln, Tumby Bay, Franklin Harbour, Cleve, Kimba, Elliston, Le Hunte and Murat Bay. I think that that letter clearly outlines the concern that has been expressed. I believe it is most unfortunate that this matter has had to be raised in the House, but I believe I would not be acting in the best interests of my constituents if I did not raise it here. I do not intend to complete my remarks this afternoon, because I hope that common sense will prevail and that these regulations will be withdrawn and more suitable regulations drawn up. It is a matter of which I have some knowledge, and unfortunately such regulations are doing nothing to enhance the standing

of the administration of the Country Fire Service organisation in country areas. We are all aware of the recent controversy, which in my view was most unfortunate. However, I have been surprised at the extent of the comments that these regulations have generated over the past few weeks.

I therefore request the C.F.S. board to give this matter its urgent consideration. I have written to the Chairman and advised him that I will not put this particular matter to a vote but that I do give the board the opportunity to consider the matter. If common sense does not prevail, I will have no alternative but to do everything possible to have these regulations disallowed. My colleague the Hon. Martin Cameron, in another place, will also be taking appropriate action in that Chamber to ensure that these regulations are removed, as there is no justification for them to be implemented in the way they have been. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

## DEVELOPMENT PLAN

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

That, pursuant to section 40 of the Planning Act, 1982, the development plan laid before Parliament on 17 August 1982 is approved; and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting its concurrence thereto.

Section 40 of the Planning Act, 1982, provides for the preparation of the development plan, which is to be the primary reference for the exercise of development control under this Act. Section 40(2) sets out the basis for the compilation of the development plan, which is to be 'based upon' specified provisions of all development plans and planning regulations authorised under the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1981, and also requires the plan to be in a form 'approved by resolution of both Houses of Parliament'.

The Planning Act, 1982, and regulations thereunder, can take full effect only when the development plan has been so approved. During the last six months, officers of the Department of Environment and Planning have been engaged in the compilation of the draft development plan, copies of which I tabled yesterday. In the process of preparing this admittedly massive document, consultation has occurred with every council in the State, such consultation taking the form of referral of the relevant draft sections of the plan to each council for comment. Additionally, copies of all sections of the plan have progressively been made available for public inspection at various metropolitan and country centres.

Close consultation has also taken place with the Local Government Association and its planning consultants, and the detailed comments of the association and individual councils have been taken into account in the compilation of the final draft document.

The development plan consists of 13 parts, the first part relating to policies having State-wide application, the others containing policies having application to the 12 planning areas into which the State has been divided. Within each of these planning area parts, subsections contain all policies applicable to individual council areas.

In case members are deterred by the size of the document, let me emphasise straight away that very few individuals or organisations would have cause to use the plan as an entity. More typically, those sections of the plan which relate to an individual local government area, together with the relevant State and planning area policies, would constitute the document likely to be used on a day-to-day basis in various parts of the State, and it will be possible for interested

organisations or individuals to purchase only those parts of the plan relevant to their interest.

In the course of discussions with the Local Government Association and other interested bodies regarding the draft plan, concern has been expressed that potential exists for legal challenges to the validity of the plan to be mounted. This concern stems from the vagueness of the term 'based upon' in section 40 of the Act. To ensure that any doubt concerning the status of the development plan as the principal source of policy under the new Act is removed, I intend, following approval of the development plan by Parliament, to introduce a Bill to amend the Planning Act, 1982, by repealing subsection (2) of section 40 of the Act and replacing it with the following words:

The development plan is, subject to amendment under this part, the document declared by resolution of both Houses of Parliament to be the development plan.

The same Bill will also contain proposed amendments to section 42 of the Act, to rectify anomalies created by the disallowance of the River Murray Valley and Tea Tree Gully zoning regulations subsequent to the compilation of the development plan. If this section is not amended, the plan, at the time the full Act is proclaimed, will have to contain policy which has already been disallowed by the Parliament.

In seeking the approval of this House to the form of the development plan, I wish to make clear that the policies contained therein have variously been authorised by the Governor-in-Council over the last 15 years and are not new policies. Furthermore, I should emphasise that mechanisms exist in the new Act for me to rectify errors in the plan by gazettal of amendments, and that changes to policy can be effected by councils (for individual local government areas) or by myself (for greater areas) by the preparation of supplementary development plans in accordance with the provisions of section 41 of the Act. In this regard, I wish to reiterate a commitment which I have included in a recent letter to all councils in the State that I will be willing to consider any representations they may wish to make concerning necessary or desirable amendments to the development plan as it affects their areas.

Accordingly, this House is not being asked to endorse the policies in the development plan, but merely to endorse its general form, arrangement, and structure as a basis for the on-going process of review and amendment which necessarily (and desirably) accompanies the making of planning policy.

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

### CASINO BILL

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. M. M. Wilson:

That the report of the select committee be noted.  
(Continued from 12 August. Page 465.)

**Mr SLATER (Gilles):** This is a very important debate. The Parliament will decide today whether we can have a multi-million dollar development complex in South Australia, and heaven knows, we need such a complex, particularly in relation to the tourist industry. We are all aware that the casino issue in this State has been, for many years, an issue of great contention. It is an emotive issue. It has been and still is, both politically and in the community, particularly sensitive.

The matter has been before this House on two previous occasions, once by way of a Bill introduced by the Government in 1973 and again in a private member's Bill introduced in 1981. Members may also recall that, in August 1981, I proposed, in a private member's motion, the appointment of a Parliamentary select committee to examine the issue, take evidence, and report to the House on the benefits or

otherwise of a casino in this State. The matter was partly debated and, as is the wont with private members' motions, finally discharged from the Notice Paper.

In the interim, the Government quite unexpectedly introduced a Bill for the establishment of a casino and this Bill provided that the matter should be submitted to a select committee. I say 'unexpectedly' because the Premier had, on a number of occasions, stated quite categorically that the Government would not introduce any measure for a casino in this State. What, then, prompted the Government to introduce the Bill that is before us? We may never know. I am prepared to accept that the duty of the select committee was not to examine the Government's motives but to consider the issue at hand.

I believe that all members of the select committee did this to the best of their ability. However, unfortunately, the matter had been handled rather badly by the Government. There will be a conscience vote on the question, but I regret to say that, on occasions, this issue has been treated by some members on the Government side as a political issue. Members will recall that, in the debate to allow the Bill to go to a select committee, I stated that there should be on the committee three Government members, three Opposition members, and the Independent member for Semaphore. I took that matter to a vote in this House, and it was defeated on Party lines. I understand that a number of members on the Government side will not be supporting the adoption of this report or the passing of this Bill, so the Government wants members on this side to carry the can, if I may use that expression, on its behalf.

Members may also recall how, early in the committee's deliberations, I stated in this House my concern at certain matters associated with the committee's deliberations, and my colleague the member for Playford also did that. I did that quite genuinely. I did have concern about a number of matters. I will not go into the details of them again but I regret that that led to a situation where those expressions of concern finally resulted in a motion moved by the Premier and seconded by the Deputy Premier, arising from allegations made by the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader.

As a consequence of those incidents the atmosphere that evolved and prevailed during the debate on the Bill and during the early deliberations of the committee unfortunately placed the committee in a difficult situation in a very difficult atmosphere. Despite that, I believe that those actions were not necessary and that perhaps the Government sought to achieve some political advantage from the matter at that time.

As I have already said, it was not the duty of the committee to investigate the motives of the Government, or indeed, any allegations that might have been made at that time. However, some matters still concern me. I am not yet fully convinced on certain matters regarding allegations that were made at that time. I think we can best say that no verdict was given by the select committee. I think we can use the old Scottish verdict of 'not proven' to describe the situation. Despite all these things, I support the Bill.

I support the adoption of the report because I genuinely believe that it is in the best interests of South Australians, and that is the important factor in all my considerations of this matter. I also believe that the select committee's report is a balanced one. The committee deliberated for over five months. If I recall correctly, we had over 30 meetings, travelled interstate to view all of the casinos presently operating in Australia and took evidence from a multiplicity of witnesses. We also received numerous written submissions. The report is based on those submissions and has taken into account, as far as humanly possible, every aspect associated with a casino, a casino operation and the adequate controls that can be exercised in the running of a casino in South Australia.

I repeat the words of the select committee's report at page 2 of the introduction, as follows:

It must be stressed that this committee's purpose was not to report to the Parliament on whether or not a casino should be established in South Australia. The committee also believed its mandate was to examine all facets of the casino industry and to report on the advantages and disadvantages that can come with the establishment of a casino.

Therefore, members of the committee have from time to time adopted the devil's advocate's role with witnesses in an attempt to explore the issues. For these reasons, the report is framed so that the Parliament and the public will become aware of the subject of casinos, and it is hoped by the committee that this report will provide an informative and factual basis for further debate.

I think that that statement sums matters up fairly well, that the committee's duty was not to report on whether or not a casino should be established in South Australia. Although we have made quite a number of findings and recommendations, they are all based on the fact that this is a balanced and open report to this House to enable its members to decide whether or not we have a casino in South Australia. Of all the matters I have been involved with in my 13 years in this Parliament this has probably been the most difficult.

I had to be absolutely sure—as sure as one can possibly be—that the establishment of a casino in South Australia is in the best interests of the people of this State. It involves a conscience vote, and I have thought about it very carefully (indeed, agonised mentally) examining the issue and turning over in my mind every conceivable possibility. As a member of the select committee, I have endeavoured to ascertain, by questioning witnesses, the advantages and disadvantages of a casino operation. It has not been an easy task: indeed, it has been a rather difficult one.

As the Chairman of the committee stated when introducing this report, we were assisted by the Secretary of the committee (Mr Geoff Wilson) and the Research Officer (Mr Chris Sargent) in every possible way. I join with the Chairman in paying tribute to them both for their diligent and excellent work. I also pay tribute to other members of the committee, who performed their task admirably in a very sensitive and emotional issue. We started off rather badly, bearing in mind certain aspects which I hope will be resolved with a lack of acrimony during this debate. I understand that 22 members are listed to speak, and I would ask all who speak, on either side, to consider our report very carefully.

Over the past week members have had an opportunity to read the report and examine the findings, recommendations and all other aspects of the report. In the time permitted this afternoon, it will be difficult to cover every aspect of the report, but I wish to deal with a number of matters which I believe are the most important. I am sure that my select committee colleagues will deal with other matters that they believe are also important. I believe that the report speaks for itself, anyway. As I said previously, the committee's purpose was not to report to Parliament whether or not a casino should be established in South Australia but to examine every aspect of the casino industry. We did that, and now the decision is in the hands of this House. I hasten to say that I believe this will be the last opportunity for a number of years that the House will have of determining this issue. I trust that members will consider the matter seriously (as seriously as did select committee members) and assess what is best for South Australia. That is the issue.

At this stage I would ask whether, in this modern world, we can afford to be left behind the other States. The report is far-reaching and is as comprehensive as possible. It outlines the history of casinos, it refers to the nature of casinos in other parts of the world, it deals at length with other investigations conducted not only in Australia but also in the United Kingdom and the United States. The report also deals with the development of casinos in Australia from the

late 1960s, when the first casino was established at Wrest Point in Tasmania, it examines the social and welfare consequences, the economic consequences, the administration and control of casinos, the corporate structure (which to me was a very important aspect of the committee's investigations), and it deals with the Casino Bill itself. Finally, we summarised our findings and recommendations. As I said, time will not permit me to canvass all these matters in this debate.

However, I will now deal with a couple of matters that I consider to be some of the most important issues. A large amount of evidence was given to the committee in opposition to a casino based on comparisons between Australia and the overseas experience. On page 212 of the select committee's report on the Casino Bill, paragraph 11.3, headed 'International experience' (this sums up quite effectively the comparison that was made) states:

The committee places little reliance on the British experience in respect of the control of casinos for the reasons advanced. In addition, it must be pointed out that although there are over 140 casinos operating in Great Britain there are only 30 inspectors present to supervise and control the operations of those casinos. In other words the casino management are free to run their own operations without any surveillance which other inquiries and this inquiry have revealed are essential.

Therefore the committee finds that it is not prudent to rely on the British system as a system that would recommend itself for adoption in South Australia.

The committee concludes that South Australia faces a vastly different situation to places like Nevada, New Jersey, and for that matter Great Britain, as the problems which faced Nevada and Great Britain when casinos were legalised and controls introduced were different. South Australia has nothing remotely like the background or history which is apparent in those places. That is not to say that the committee was complacent. It carefully considered the Australian experience in great detail and compared and contrasted the experience of other States with that of South Australia.

This clearly shows that the committee considered the considerable amount of evidence given comparing the overseas casino experience to that in Australia which, in fact, was not particularly relevant. In South Australia we have the advantage of ensuring that the unsavoury experiences associated with casinos overseas (as well as in the Australian experience, which I believe we have improved) will improve with the proposed amendments in the Bill.

The Bill as amended proposes to establish a casino investigation committee, and the applicant or applicants must provide to this committee information on the structure of their corporation or company. The casino investigation committee will have powers and functions to ensure that all applicants, either individuals or organisations, applying for a casino licence are above reproach in any way. That is all important. This will thereby ensure that organised crime, or crime in any form, cannot be associated with a casino in this State. That is the all-important aspect: to ensure that the corporation, company or corporate structure is such that organised crime cannot infiltrate into a casino operation. I believe, because of controls proposed by the committee in this Bill, that that will not occur. There is no doubt that the development of casinos in Tasmania and the Northern Territory has substantially boosted the tourist industry there, both directly and indirectly.

One matter to which I pay particular attention is the effect of the introduction of a casino on other forms of gambling. We had evidence from organisations in South Australia that were apprehensive about what might occur, if a casino was introduced in South Australia, in other forms of gambling. Evidence that we were able to obtain showed that initially some minor effect occurred in certain aspects of gambling. However, after a period of time they found their level and, indeed, on occasions improved their performance. So, for an initial period an effect may occur in relation to other forms of legalised gambling and, as a consequence, there may be some difficulties in the initial

period only before it finds its level. It depends on current economic circumstances.

Two very important aspects that we considered were the social and welfare consequences. I am sure that a number of other members will deal with this at length. We were interested in whether individuals or their families would suffer any deprivation from excessive gambling. The committee found that a minority group may be vulnerable or potential gamblers. In any society, in every form of human endeavour since time immemorial, there have been people who are vulnerable to any excesses. How far the legislators go to protect people from themselves is an age-old question.

**Mr Keneally:** You cannot legislate for morality.

**Mr SLATER:** It is true that we cannot legislate for morality, but we must endeavour to protect people as much as possible. It is difficult to go all the way to endeavour to stop people from forms of gambling, alcohol consumption, smoking or any other enjoyment which they may have and which prohibits them from doing so. If we go that far, they will do it illegally, anyway. So, we must consider that aspect, even though it may affect a minority group. It has been proven in other parts of the world, and was shown in reports that the committee had of other investigations, that a small group may be affected. However, it is less than 1 per cent, and those who may be vulnerable were less than 3 per cent. That was I think, stated in the Morin Commission report. In every society there are excesses with individuals. It may be incumbent on legislators such as ourselves to minimise these problems as much as possible. We have in this report proposed a range of measures so that these excesses can be controlled in a casino operation. The committee therefore recommends a range of measures by which those controls may be exercised.

As I stated at the outset, I have given the matter intense thought. I am appreciative of all the witnesses, both those who gave oral submissions and those who gave written submissions. They were comprehensive, and there were a number of them. I accept the views expressed opposing the concept of a casino based on moral and philosophical grounds.

I hope that they will accept the views that I have expressed in regard to my philosophical attitude towards gambling. I, together with other members of the select committee, certainly appreciate their views, and we took all submissions into consideration. Not only did we investigate every conceivable aspect of gambling, not just casino gambling, but also we heard from those who have an interest in poker machines. We heard from witnesses from Government and from the Police Departments of three States of Australia, including South Australia. On many occasions, particularly when dealing with the area of crime, there was a degree of reluctance to give us certain information, and on a few occasions witnesses decided to give evidence off the record for the sake of confidentiality. Indeed, on one or two occasions this was done for fear of retribution. That also made our situation somewhat difficult, and of course, that evidence is not contained in the report, as it did not form part of the transcript of evidence.

I point out that the report of the select committee into a casino in South Australia is a sane, sensible and reasonable one. I trust that the debate on this matter that will follow will be sane, sensible and without emotion, as the committee, in its report, has endeavoured to be. As I have said previously, at times the issue has been very acrimonious, but, despite all that, it has been my privilege and pleasure to be associated with the compilation of the report and to provide, personally, some significant contribution to the deliberations of the committee in its findings and recommendations. It has been quite an experience for all of us.

The Minister said that it was claimed that committee members had a predetermined attitude on the issue, but I certainly was not in that category. I was a supporter of the

casino issue, as people know. I made it obvious. I fluctuated quite considerably during the course of the committee's deliberations, and then I had to assess very carefully my position: how I would contribute to the report and how I would vote when the matter came before the House. However, during the last two or three weeks of the committee's deliberations my view was firmed very strongly, namely, that it was in the best interests of South Australia to have a casino.

The committee endeavoured to cover every aspect of the operation of a casino, and the final report is as thorough and comprehensive as that which any select committee can produce to this Parliament. I hope that every person who intends to exercise his vote today has read in detail the select committee's report. I say that because, although members of the committee have had the advantage of knowing exactly the whole situation, unfortunately some members did not have that opportunity: we could not all be on the select committee. However, in view of the deliberations and the investigations that were undertaken, let me assure all honourable members that I believe quite strongly that there will be no harm in introducing a casino into South Australia. If I believed that something harmful was involved, I would not vote for a casino.

I refer to one important matter that I have overlooked. The Bill proposes to allow the Government to have equity in a casino in South Australia. I do not see anything wrong with that. As a matter of fact, I would prefer to go a bit further, but for the sake of compromise the Government can have equity in a casino operation. That is a move in the right direction. It could be a joint venture with private enterprise, and we could have control in an effective way as well as through the Casino Investigation Tribunal. The Government could participate in the operations. I support the adoption of the report and I hope that the Bill passes this House.

**Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg):** First, as a member of the select committee, I believe that the committee worked very hard. The Minister was a good and fair Chairman, and a gentleman. If one could complain about the Chairman it was that he was a very hard taskmaster indeed. We had long, full day meetings, and many of them. We interviewed many witnesses, and of those witnesses at least 90 per cent were against a casino. I ask this House to support the report for what it is worth (and it is a good report for reference), but to vote against the Bill when it is put to the House in the Committee stage.

In all conscience, as members of this House, we cannot refuse to take notice of 151 written submissions to the committee (that was the number at the time the report was compiled) against a casino, and a petition that, at the time that report was prepared, contained 8 711 signatures: today, there are 12 673 signatures against the establishment of a casino in the State of South Australia in a total of 89 petitions. If that is not enough proof, I wonder what we are about. I suppose it is all very well for people to say, and no doubt some will say, that the only people who sign petitions are those who are against something, and that those who are happy with a situation do not say anything.

That may be so, but I believe that some note must be taken of and some credence must be given to the people who have taken the trouble to object. The report contains the opinion of every church in the State, but it stated that the Catholic Church is not against gambling that much. Yet the other day Archbishop Gleeson, the head man of the Catholic Church in South Australia, spoke against the establishment of a casino in this State.

**Mr Slater:** That was a personal viewpoint only.

**Mr MATHWIN:** When I am here I speak for the majority of my people, and I expect them to contact me and give me some advice as to what they feel about matters that are brought up in this House. I believe that the churches are in

the same position. People from many small churches throughout this State and from different churches put in written submissions or gave evidence. If members of this House and the committee wipe that off as a nonentity, I will be greatly disappointed.

The other people who appeared before the committee and who represent good people in this State included womens groups, such as the National Council of Women, womens church groups and the Womens Electoral Lobby; they gave evidence against the establishment of a casino in this State. No doubt other members of the committee will say that those people were under a misapprehension, because they were merely talking about what happened in America in relation to the type of crime that is mixed with casinos in that country.

I will not go into that. I ask the House to consider the greatest report ever compiled on gambling in the world. The Morin Report was drawn up by a commission of 15 members and took three years to compile. The commission had a staff of six officials, 19 staff members, 19 students and 10 consultants, including the Director, Cornell Institute on Organised Crime in America, plus 17 other consultants. I will not deal with the question of crime, in case other members of the select committee are upset about that.

I entirely agree that, as far as crime is concerned, Australia cannot compare with what has occurred in the United Kingdom. God forbid we ever reach that stage, and heaven forbid we ever reach the level that prevails in America. I ask members to look at and seriously consider the greatest report ever compiled in relation to gambling. I will refer to those parts of the report that do not deal with organised crime but offer some advice to other States of America and the world. The Morin Commission visited England and refers among others to the Rothschild Report, a large report compiled in the United Kingdom. Page 43 of the Morin Report, referring to compulsive gambling, states:

Approximately 0.77 per cent of the adult population—1 100 000 people—can be classified as probable compulsive gamblers, and an additional 2.33 per cent—3 300 000—can be considered 'potential' compulsive gamblers. In Nevada, the incidence of compulsive gambling appears to be significantly higher.

I remind the House that Nevada has legalised casinos. The report continues:

On the basis of interviews with 296 Nevada residents, it was projected that 2.62 per cent of the Nevada population could be classified as probable compulsive gamblers and an additional 2.35 per cent as potential compulsive gamblers. In Nevada, as in the national sample, the incidence of compulsive gambling among men was much higher than among women. The findings suggest that the widespread legalisation of gambling increases.

Other members of the committee might argue that we already have illegal gambling so we may as well legalise it. If we do that with gambling we can do it with anything else. According to the Morin Report, the greatest report on gambling in the world, that did not occur in Nevada in relation to legalised gambling, because that State has a bigger problem than is experienced in other parts of the world. Page 49 of the Morin Report refers to conclusions and recommendations, and states:

The commission does not believe that the States should expect legalised casino gambling to ease their financial difficulties significantly. Although casinos may generate enough revenue to help meet the needs of a State of Nevada's population, they are not capable of providing the resources necessary to support the costs of public services in heavily urbanised States . . . Casinos are looked upon also as a means of stimulating tourism . . .

There is a fair bashing about that in the report, because our report also emphasises tourism. Some witnesses before the committee had distinct axes to grind and mentioned great figures in relation to increased tourism in Tasmania over the past 15 years. No one can tell me that tourism has not increased in any country of the world, including China and

Iceland, over the past 15 years, simply because people are travelling more. That does not mean entirely that because people are visiting Tasmania now they are going there because it has a casino. The report continues:

However, the possible benefits that could accrue to local economies—assuming that the huge capital outlays necessary to construct casinos and attendant facilities that are competitive with Nevada's could be secured and that competition among resort areas would not fragment the available market—might well be offset by social costs to the surrounding communities.

I ask the House to seriously consider that aspect, not in relation to the adoption of the report but in relation to the Bill itself, and I refer to the social implications and the social cost to the people of this State.

A casino will provide and create another problem; therefore, society will pay. If that is the case, perhaps it would be better for an amendment to be moved to do something about that. Page 51 of the Morin Report states:

The revenues generated by casinos will not be sufficient to ease significantly the financial burdens of densely populated States. Gambling among the local population can be expected to increase.

I ask members to seriously consider that. The report, I repeat, states:

Gambling among the local population can be expected to increase and lower income individuals will participate to a greater extent than at present.

That would prove that the casinos in Darwin and Alice Springs are being maintained and supported by the local population. The casinos in those two areas are being maintained by the local communities. We must consider that point in relation to a casino for this State. We must consider the other areas that may be affected, which are already in existence.

**Mr Keneally:** You're against them, too, are you?

**Mr MATHWIN:** It is too late to do anything about that. At least it is not too late in relation to this matter; we have an opportunity to do something about it. The Morin Report also states:

There is the possibility—although that is yet to be determined—that other existing forms of legalised gambling, such as racetracks and lotteries, will find their revenues decreased as a result of competition from the new source.

Members would be well aware of what has occurred in this State in relation to lotteries, such as instant money; we know what has occurred in relation to football pools and instant money-type lotteries; we also know what has happened in relation to the introduction of other forms of gambling.

A casino will attract people because of its atmosphere and what happens inside. A casino will drag gamblers away from other forms of gambling. The Government, of either political persuasion, will then be approached to do something about it. If a casino causes a decline in racing it will affect a big industry, which includes other areas, such as breeding, and so on. We cannot let that industry go down the drain. It is important that members realise what has been said in the very excellent Morin Report.

**Mr McRae:** I hope you will explain the difference between the experience in the United States and that in Australia.

**Mr MATHWIN:** I have explained that I am laying off the organised crime aspect, for the benefit of the member for Playford, and I am dealing with aspects that the Morin Commission believes will affect the local people, the State of Nevada, and any other State. The honourable member should note—

**Mr Bannon:** Is there a reference to this in the report?

**Mr MATHWIN:** Not to this; that is why I am reading it out. I am quite happy to supply the Leader with the Morin Report if he desires. Page 97 of the Morin Report states:

The Impact of Legalised Gambling in Nevada.



Survey results indicate that the widespread availability of legal gambling—particularly casinos—generates measurably higher rates of participation by Nevada residents.

That is proof. That is what has been found in Nevada where casinos and gambling are legalised. We are dealing with casinos in particular and in Nevada more local people are taking part. The report continues:

Seventy-eight per cent of those questioned in Nevada bet on something in 1974, compared to 61 per cent of the national population. The incidence of betting is approximately 10 to 20 per cent higher in Nevada among almost all demographic groups. The survey results tend to support the arguments of those who claim that establishing Nevada-type gambling in densely populated areas will foster participation by those who can least afford it.

**Mr Bannon:** That's not what your committee said.

**Mr MATHWIN:** This is the Morin Report, and I am asking the House to consider this aspect. The report continues:

Although participation rates among all income categories increase as income increases, there are proportionately many more bettors among Nevada residents earning less than \$5 000 a year than among the general population of bettors in the same income category.

My final reference to the report is under 'Conclusions and Recommendations', and is as follows:

Proponents of legalised casino gambling in States other than Nevada generally put forth two major arguments in favour of their position. The first is that casino gambling will provide needed revenues to States; the other is that resort areas will become more popular tourist attractions with the added glamour of casino gambling. The commission questions the validity of these two arguments. The commission does not believe that States should expect revenues from legalised casino gambling to ease their financial difficulties significantly. Casino gambling has not, to date, proved to be a financial panacea.

Certainly, that is so in regard to Nevada. At page 102 the report states:

In regard to potential increase in tourism—

and tourism is an argument put up—

the commission warns against the promotion of casino gambling as a tourist stimulant where there is no pre-existing demand for this type of gambling. The legalisation of casinos in Great Britain came about because many illegal casinos were already in operation throughout the country and were being heavily patronised by British subjects—to their financial detriment. The commission does not believe that so extensive a demand for casino gambling exists . . .

That refers to the Rothschild Report, but there are matters dealt with in the Morin Report which I would like the House to note. The report suggests that about 0.07 per cent of the population is involved in gambling. Some honourable members may argue that that is not many people but, if that percentage is to be increased by providing a greater opportunity and more enticement to take part in the types of gambling that we will provide, we will create a further problem to confront the people of this State.

That is something about which I am concerned, especially in regard to families and juveniles. I will refer later to the effect on juveniles. I have dealt with the report and the comment in regard to the two major religious faiths which had fundamental differences of opinion. However, that has been straightened out because of the announcement by the head of the Catholic Church in regard to what he believes. Page 67 of the report states:

In general, there are cases where compulsive gambling may have caused divorces, separations, disagreements and other problems that may affect families and the children of gamblers.

I do not think it is a matter of 'may', because there is proof that it has had effects on families and has caused upset and hardship. One need only read the evidence given by Gamblers Anonymous in Tasmania about the situation members of that organisation were in, with so many loans taken out to try to cover themselves. They will be in debt for the rest of their natural lives, and their wives will have to work for

the rest of their lives to keep their families. What a shocking situation!

If we are going to look upon this merely as a matter of raising finance (and there has been talk of raising \$3 000 000), it would only be fair, as a recommendation from the community welfare people, that one-third of that amount should go towards the problem already created and the problem that will be created with the introduction of a casino in South Australia. If we are going to make \$3 000 000, let us put \$1 000 000 aside for the welfare of the community and families who will suffer by this new introduction and this new encouragement of the problem in this State. The report also states:

However, the committee could not establish conclusively whether a casino places the community at a greater risk than do other forms of gambling.

I think I have straightened that argument out by reference to the Morin Committee, which sat for three years and discussed the whole matter very thoroughly. Regarding the person in Tasmania who gave evidence in relation to loans, I refer to page 69 of the report, as follows:

Our oldest member had 127 finance company loans. He had five at the one time and Peter was paying Paul. He is the chap Derek spoke of who is an invalid pensioner and is mentally affected. We have had members receive write-ups in the local paper, one of which appeared in the *Tasmanian Mail* of 31 March 1981. Those chaps were members of Gamblers Anonymous . . . All we are looking at is the people who, through some other avenue, become compulsive gamblers. The social gambler is like the social drinker . . .

He does not want to think he has a problem. On page 97 of the report, there is reference to poker machines. We had our problems with that matter as a committee and as a House. There were also some innuendos. That issue worried me considerably. I had full confidence in the honesty, integrity and sincerity of every member of the committee. I take this opportunity of saying that, if I were to single one person out, with due respect to the other members and myself, the member for Playford did colossa! work, with his legal experience and knowledge and his concern about corporate crime. I appreciate that work and the methods that the member used to try to get information in relation to finding a solution.

Unfortunately, I was unable to attend the committee in the last two weeks in which it sat, because I was ill, but I would like a guarantee that those alterations that were made then make it impossible for foreign crime and foreign corporations to get in under the conditions.

I asked whether it was possible or impossible. According to the early inquiries it seemed impossible to stop criminal factions getting into the casinos. As I said earlier, people in Tasmania boast about the increase in tourism since the advent of the casino. The witness Mr Oldfield from the Department of Tourism in Tasmania said that in 1973 the night life in Hobart was limited. He went on to say the night life had changed considerably and that there had been a rapid increase in the number of restaurants in and around the city and in the accommodation area. Four-season Motor Inns, the leasing by an insurance company of property for another motor inn, and the motor inn at Battery Point were significant complementary developments.

Do the people in Tasmania think that that increase in the past 10 or 15 years in the building of motels and hotels is unique? I would say that in that time there has been an increase in the number of hotels and motels in this State from one end to the other. Have the Tasmanians the audacity to say that they believe the great increase in the development of these new motor inns and restaurants was brought about solely because of the introduction of a casino? What city has more restaurants than has Adelaide, and we do not have a blasted casino? What will happen if we get a casino? Is

the number of restaurants going to double? That is a ridiculous argument.

Witnesses have said that they have a lot more restaurants in Tasmania and a lot more Chinese restaurants in Darwin since the introduction of casinos. I suppose it is a bit of a coincidence that we have had a few Chinese on boats who have come to Australia who might open up restaurants. Nevertheless, I would say the number of hotels and motels would have increased in every State in Australia over past years. Indeed, I would say that in every country of the world tourist accommodation has increased as tourism has developed. Even Iceland would have increased its tourist accommodation. If I had had the time, I would have got those figures for honourable members.

One area that worried me considerably was that of trying to keep control of juveniles. It is suggested that the Bill will require them to produce some sort of form if they wish to get into a casino, but I would defy anybody to look at a form and decide whether it is somebody's driving licence without their being some way to recognise the holder. Nobody would know how old a girl or boy was, whether they were 15 or 20.

I ask members to adopt the report but to vote against the Bill. If one searches the evidence available (and I ask members on the other side to do this), it gives little indication of what went on before the committee. We have the evidence of Mr A. W. McCoy, Senior Lecturer in History from New South Wales, whose evidence takes up only 14 pages of foolscap evidence, yet he was before the committee for over four hours, because a lot of his evidence had to be given *in camera* and could not be included in the report. The same thing occurred with Mr Lionel Thomas Hanrahan, a detective sergeant, whose three hours of evidence takes up only four foolscap pages.

Another witness was Bob Bottom, a journalist specialising in crime. His evidence covers only 13 foolscap pages and he was also interviewed by the committee for about four hours. I ask the House to consider those points when thinking about the evidence, because certain matters dealt with could not be included for obvious reasons—the evidence was given *in camera*.

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

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** I support the motion, and will oppose the Bill. I listened with great interest to the member for Glenelg and thought that for a quarter of an hour he did rather well until he spoke about the Chinese in Darwin and how a few fell off the boat. He did an injustice to the Chinese in Darwin.

**Mr Mathwin:** It wasn't intended. I just said they had a restaurant.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I know he was talking about the Darwin cafes, but I think it was a slight on the Chinese in Darwin because, as the member for Stuart has pointed out, these people are Australian, having lived in this country for well over 100 years. He was probably referring to the Vietnamese, not the Chinese, when he made that perhaps facetious remark. I compliment the select committee on the detailed information placed before members in this House. It has taken a considerable time to collate this report, and I am very impressed by the detail put into it. What mainly concerns me is the social and welfare consequence of gambling. I am not a hypocrite; I have gambled, probably as much as any other member in this House.

**Mr Slater:** Life is a gamble.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Indeed, but when you are dealing with people's social welfare I think that is another issue. On page 45, the report states:

Experts in the area are few and far between, as the study of gambling in Australia is limited. This is particularly so in relation to any statistical information.

I concur with part six of the report and what is said in other material I have read that there is insufficient statistical information available on gambling in this country. While we can refer to studies conducted in other countries, I believe a study should be carried out not only in South Australia but in Australia as a whole. The report points out Australians are amongst the world's heaviest gamblers.

**Mr Slater:** South Australia is the lowest State.

**Mr HAMILTON:** South Australia may well be the lowest State, but if this casino is introduced (and I know it is a hypothetical argument) who is to say that it will not become the heaviest gambling State? That is what concerns me. Because of the many social problems in the community today, about which I have very strong convictions, I am not prepared as a member of this Parliament to support a measure that I believe could contribute to increasing social and welfare problems in this State. At page 49, the report states:

From what little evidence and research work that is available, compulsive gambling appears to be characterised as preoccupation and the urge to gamble with frequent gambling activity.

There is no doubt that is correct, and I have noted from experience with soccer pools and other forms of gambling, even bingo with which I have been involved, whether bingo tickets in hotels or attending bingo games, the number of people who come along regularly, putting a considerable amount of money into those forms of gambling.

**Mr Slater:** You've run some, haven't you?

**Mr HAMILTON:** Yes, that is correct; for the record, I have run some. I am not prepared to support a casino in South Australia, because I believe it will make the problem even worse.

**Mr Slater:** What problem?

**Mr HAMILTON:** The problem of gambling itself.

**Mr Peterson:** Then ban all gambling?

**Mr HAMILTON:** No, I do not believe in banning all gambling because I do not think that that is a practical solution to this problem. It is like saying that we could ban all alcohol; of course, that is just not on. As I have said, I am not prepared to support a casino. On page 50, the select committee report states:

The 1974 Western Australian Royal Commission into Gambling at paragraphs 42 and 43 of its report stated that its attention was drawn to the problem of compulsive gambling by the submission received from the Department of Correction, which recognised that a number of prison inmates had committed their offences mainly as a result of their inability to control their gambling. Although it was stated that there was no statistical data showing the extent of the problem, it had caused some concern to the department.

The Western Australian Royal Commission had attended a meeting of Gamblers Anonymous and heard evidence from compulsive gamblers revealing their personal problems and confessing to the ruin that they had brought into their lives and those of their families by their obsession with gambling.

**Mr Slater:** They haven't got a casino in Western Australia.

**Mr HAMILTON:** No, they are talking about the report into gambling conducted by the Western Australian Royal Commission in 1974. Once again, I come back to the point that I believe it would compound the problem if a casino were constructed in South Australia. I also believe, as I have said previously, that there is a need for statistical information to be provided on a State and national basis before we can really decide about the problems of gambling. On the same page of the report, Professor Skolnick states:

My three-year study of the legal controls on casinos in Nevada, Atlantic City, and England, however, has convinced me that rational discussion of casino gambling should not proceed without a straightforward acknowledgment that genuine control often looks better on paper than in enforcement practice. The larger the

economic interest of the State in casino gambling, the greater the outside pressure to erode the mechanisms of control.

The report continues:

Professor Skolnick observed a widespread view, even among gamblers, that the regular players around gaming tables are irrational, compulsive gamblers who are destroying their own lives and those of others around them. The social costs are identified as 'criminality, family disruptions, work effectiveness, impoverishment, incarceration, hospitalisation, and suicide'.

If that is the case—and I have no reason to disbelieve what Professor Skolnick is saying—it once again comes back to the need for research in this country. That will be the theme of my statements throughout the debate—the need for research. On page 52, the report states:

Compared with other forms of gambling, casinos are more likely to produce addicted compulsive gamblers.

Whether or not that is the case, I do not know, but it comes back to the need for research into this area. The report continues:

The thrills of even higher stakes and instant winnings are powerful psychological ingredients for potential addicts. 'The very atmosphere of casinos,' says Skolnick, 'is likely to produce more "tapped out" players—those who lose their bottom dollar—than lotteries or off-track betting . . .'

It concerns me that those places have no clocks and no cash money, and people often bet and rebet and ultimately spend more than they can really afford to spend. I believe, from my observations, that that would be more than possible. I have seen in smaller forms of gambling people who I consider to be normal people in every other respect. Yet, once they get into the gambling arena, particularly with poker, they cannot contain themselves and just keep betting until they win. It also applies to two-up. Many years ago in my youth I attended places where two-up was played. I experienced the same thing. People used to go along with their weekly or fortnightly pay packet and gamble. I have seen many walk out broke or owing a large amount of money to people who had won at the game. On page 52 under the heading 'Extent of problem' the report states:

Research suggests that about 0.77 per cent of the population gambles at a level where it creates a problem. This figure was derived from the results of a University of Michigan study which was commissioned by the United States National Gambling Commission in 1975.

It would be interesting to see the results in 1982 if a similar report was commissioned in that country. Also, if similar reports had been commissioned in various States of Australia it would be interesting to see whether or not this problem had compounded. The member for Glenelg referred to the Morin Commission report and I was quite taken by the information he provided to the House. On page 53 the report states in part:

The Morin Commission stated that these estimates should be treated as suggestive rather than conclusive. It stressed that research on compulsive gambling is so meagre that it is impossible to be sure that one has identified the personality disorder correctly.

It became increasingly apparent to your committee that the need for a national survey into gambling and the effects of gambling was long overdue because of the limited and unreliable information which is available on this subject.

Quite clearly this statement supports the view I have that there is insufficient information available in Australia. The report further states:

That committee's final recommendations, which were contained in its report published as long ago as 25 May 1978, were as follows:

1. That the Australian Bureau of Statistics be requested to conduct a survey on gambling participation, expenditure on gambling, its taxation and the extent of compulsive gambling within the community;

2. That the Government consider approaching other State Governments and the Australian Government with a view to having the survey made on a national basis in order that the appropriate information could be put at the disposal of each Government. If this proposal is adopted it could be suggested that a commission

on the review of the national policy towards gambling could be established similar to the Morin Commission in America; and

3. That the Government establish a committee to measure the social and economic aspects of gambling in this State. To be effective, the committee will require the information obtained by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. The committee should have appropriate expertise and access to social and economic research facilities.

This committee finds that these recommendations should be supported, as it is only with such an inquiry into the area of gambling that suitable provision can be made.

I fully support those views. I am aware of the types of social problems that can arise out of gambling and I have seen the effects on families; men and women have known their commitments but have lost their head once they have become involved in the gambling field. Those people have continued to gamble until they have lost a lot of money, or perhaps even their pay packet, or until (as the report points out) they are over-committed, and I refer particularly to big business men who are prepared to obtain loans from other people to keep their habit.

A habit of any description, whether it be associated with alcoholism, gambling or any other addiction, for that matter, is a cost that the community eventually must pay in one way or another. We have heard some argument that \$3 000 000 could be paid into the coffers in South Australia if a casino is built. I wonder what the overall cost to the community in the long term would be as a result of gambling and as a result of families being affected because of people becoming addicted to this form of gambling, compounded by the problems with casinos.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** That is no reason—

**Mr HAMILTON:** People are saying that it will boost the coffers of this State.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** But not the Government.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I am not saying that it is the sole reason. I point out that there will be costs to the community due to certain people gambling and neglecting their families, in a sense, by not bringing home part of the pay packet or, in some cases, the entire pay packet. I believe that the trauma that can be created in that situation may well be compounded by the installation of a casino in South Australia.

I think I have made sufficient comment on this matter. I support the views of the member for Glenelg. This is a bit unusual, but he raised the point that about 12 500 petitioners had signed petitions which have been presented to this Parliament by, I would imagine, almost every member in this Chamber. I do not think we should ignore the views of those 12 500 people in this State.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer):** I think it would be wise to very briefly go over the reasons for the introduction of this legislation. It was introduced, as honourable members would know, for the purpose of allowing a full and informed Parliamentary debate on whether or not a casino licence should be issued in South Australia. It has been established that this should be a matter of individual conscience. I must emphasise once again the fact that the Government introduced the Bill and that is not to be taken either as Government sponsorship, individual sponsorship or endorsement of the Bill. I do not think there is any misunderstanding now with regard to that matter as far as members of this House and members of the community are concerned.

What has happened is that the Government has been prepared to accept the responsibility for giving an opportunity (provided that this matter comes to a vote in a reasonable and rational way, which I have no reason to doubt at all) for a final decision on a matter which has been publicised and speculated upon in the community for far too long.

At least everyone will know where they stand. I hope that the decision will be taken in a quiet and informed atmosphere, and I am sure that it will. The community certainly deserves that, whatever the outcome of the vote might be.

I would like to pay a tribute to the work of the select committee, particularly the Chairman, the Minister of Recreation and Sport. I believe that he and the members of that select committee have had a most arduous task, judging from the volume of the evidence that has been tabled and from all the work that has obviously gone into the report. They have done their job well and very meticulously. Again, I congratulate them, and I thank them for the contribution that they have made to the affairs of this House and to the community of South Australia. I must say that I found their report very helpful indeed, and I sincerely hope that others have found the same. Obviously, the report has been read with great attention.

In particular, I have noted several findings in the report, some of which confirm the most attractive aspects of the casino legislation as it has been proposed for South Australia and as it has transpired in other States and other centres. Under the heading 'Tourism', it states:

Thus, it is estimated that the opening of a casino in South Australia could sustain visitor growth of between 8 per cent and 12 per cent, in addition to expected growth, over a two-year period using the year 1980-81 as a base. In one full year of operation, therefore, it is estimated that a casino could attract between 50 000 and 75 000 visitors to South Australia, in addition to visitors who would have visited the State regardless of the existence of a casino . . . it is estimated that the extra visitors attracted to South Australia because of the existence of a casino could generate income of between \$13 200 000 and \$19 800 000 in a full year, sustaining the equivalent of between 630 and 950 full-time jobs in the State.

Obviously, that matter is of intense interest, particularly in today's economic climate, and the committee's recommendations certainly give very strong support to the view that a casino would benefit the tourism industry and the employment situation in this State. It is further stated (page 176):

Any development should be developed as a multi-million dollar complex with associated hotel, restaurant, and convention centre facilities as opposed to a one-purpose gaming club type casino.

The committee noted, when commenting on the concept that open style casinos were the only type now operating in or projected for Australia (page 12):

It is based on the philosophy that it is another form of business which will add to the capital development and infrastructure of the State. It usually results in a large, attractive, opulent, public, admission-free casino and is usually attached to a large multi-purpose entertainment accommodation convention complex. It offers features such as restaurants, 24-hour snack bars, liquor, cabarets, floorshows, shops, swimming pools, squash, tennis, and golf. These facilities are integrated into the gambling complex and are designed to serve a patron, whether he desires to gamble or simply relax. Casinos of this type are designed primarily to cater for the tourist trade.

These factors which have emerged from the inquiry on the one side of the question make that inquiry worth while, but obviously those factors by themselves are not a basis for making a decision to support a casino, and it is important to note some of the other conclusions on the other side of the question. These matters very properly have concerned some sections of the community, and those members of the community, as is their right, have made their concerns known to members of this House.

I certainly support the proposition that there should be an Australia-wide inquiry into gambling: that is long overdue. Gambling has been with us probably before man used money as a means of exchange. Gambling is part of human nature. How it is controlled, of course, is part of a measure of man's civilisation and maturity. But I believe that the inquiry which has been suggested by the select committee would be well worth following up. One thing that comes out of the report of the select committee is quite clear, and that is that

compulsive gambling is with us but that, while it is a bad thing and while compulsive gamblers deserve every assistance, the establishment of a casino in South Australia will not increase the incidence of compulsive gambling.

That is a clear conclusion of the select committee: compulsive gambling will not be increased by the establishment of a casino in South Australia. Compulsive gamblers and compulsive alcoholics, will gamble and drink, wherever they are and whatever the facilities. The committee further concludes:

Legal casinos exist in most parts of the world.

That also is a fact of life. The committee examined in detail inquiries into casino gambling in Tasmania, New South Wales, the A.C.T., the United States, and Britain. None of these inquiries, which were meticulous and intense, recommended against the introduction of casino gambling.

In regard to social impact, the committee concludes that, drawing on the experience of Tasmania and the Northern Territory, casino gambling is relatively harmless for the majority of participants, and I have already made the point that compulsive gambling will not be increased by the provision of another gambling facility. The committee also concludes (pages 70-71 of the report), as follows:

The potential adverse affects on the individual can be minimised by a range of measures designed to eliminate the casino operator's ability to exploit the casino patron.

In regard to organised crime, the report states:

The committee finds that Australian casinos as currently operated appear to be free of any manipulation or organised crime but that unless adequate controls and surveillance is maintained it is an open invitation to be penetrated at any time and at any level of the casino/hotel operations.

That appears at page 107 of the report. The subject of poker machines has given me far graver cause for concern than have casinos. I have always been concerned about poker machines, and I believe that there is a general feeling throughout the South Australian community that they should not be allowed in this State. Recently there has been some promotional activity on behalf of the Licensed Clubs Association, activity which has been promoted by officers of certain clubs—

**Mr McRae:** That puts it very kindly.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** It has been moderate activity as far as I am concerned, and I am certain that the promotion in which they are indulging is well intentioned. I believe that in most cases they have the highest motives on behalf of the members they serve, but I cannot move past the evidence presented at page 98 of Mr Vibert, who is closely associated with poker machine supply and promotion, and licensed club promotion. I quote a question from page 98 as follows:

Does it get down to this, that you have a dual operation; on the one hand you are retained by certain companies in the poker machine industry, and on the other hand you are retained by the Licensed Clubs Association?

The answer was an unequivocal 'Yes'. That was picked up again on page 194, as follows:

Before examining the Licensed Clubs Association, the committee refers to the evidence concerning the activities of Mr Vibert at pages 95-99 of this report. The committee notes Mr Vibert's belligerent frankness on those matters put to him and his dedication to the cause of establishing poker machines as an alternative form of gambling. However, the committee cannot accept him as a witness of credit, as there is a clear conflict of interest between the submissions he presented as chief spokesman for the Licensed Clubs Association and his involvement and associations with Ainsworth Consolidated Industries, the chief poker machine company in Australia.

The Licensed Clubs Association made the only submission seeking the introduction of poker machines. The committee finds that many of the bland arguments put forward are strongly denied by Detective Sergeant L. Hanrahan of the New South Wales Police Task Force whom the committee accepts as a witness of truth. The committee further accepts his evidence that the rigging of

poker machines in New South Wales clubs has resulted in an estimated \$20 000 000 being skimmed from the machines.

It seems to me that, while the motives of licensed club members who have promoted the use of poker machines in their clubs are sincere, there is a very real risk that they have been misled by poker machine promoters, who obviously have a great deal to gain from the introduction of poker machines into South Australia and by the participation of clubs in poker machine operations.

Any added financial benefits to clubs that may have been held out to them by the promoters of such schemes, it seems to me, would be very greatly reduced by the creaming-off of financial benefits that would go to poker machine operators and the promoters. That is a fact of life. Therefore, I am totally in favour of retaining the principle of clause 27, which prohibits the possession or control of a poker machine by a person in this State, regardless of what happens to this Bill.

I am implacably opposed to the introduction of poker machines, and I strongly recommend to those who advocate their use that they examine the evidence taken by the committee most carefully. I hope that I may be able to make further information on poker machines available to this House soon.

As far as my personal situation is concerned, it is well known, I believe, that I had modified my previous opposition to casinos some time before the question was again brought into this House. Decisions taken at the annual general meeting of the Liberal Party and indications of majority community support, as expressed through surveys and through decisions of the Adelaide City Council, have caused me to reassess my position, and the denigration thrown across this Chamber by the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader have done nothing but strengthen me in my conviction that I was right to so change.

I have had informal discussions with the former Tasmanian Leader of the Opposition (Mr Bingham), the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory (Mr Everingham), the Queensland Premier (Mr Bjelke-Petersen), and Dr Llew Edwards (Deputy Premier of Queensland), and it has become quite apparent to me (I have great respect for them and for others) that they had considered the subject carefully and had concluded that casinos were a fact of life. Their advice, variously given, was compelling, and I have reached a similar view. Summed up, if we oppose casinos, we should also be opposing the T.A.B., horse-racing, dog-racing, and every other form of gambling.

**An honourable member:** Soccer pools?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Yes, we should be opposing soccer pools if we oppose casinos. I do not particularly like casinos. It would not worry me particularly if we did not have one, but I do not believe that I can oppose a casino with any sort of conscience in these circumstances, provided that adequate arrangements are made for control and surveillance of its operation. The report of the select committee has convinced me that many of the commonly held concerns relating to casinos and their operations are not confirmed by the expert witnesses who were called.

Those witnesses have had a wide range of experience. They have been associated with the control and surveillance of casinos in Tasmania for quite a few years and they could be expected to know a great deal about the matter. There are people who would be required to supervise and regulate the operation of a casino in South Australia, the people who would be expected to control any form of criminal activities associated with a casino in this State, and those officers have expressed no concern. No suggestion has been made that they would not be able to perform their duty and do it well.

As I have said, I remain implacably opposed to the introduction of poker machines but, provided the amendments proposed by the select committee to strengthen community control over the operation of the casino are accepted, I will support the Bill.

**Mr PLUNKETT (Peake):** I oppose the Bill, but my reasons for opposing it are vastly different from some reasons I have heard today, particularly from the member for Glenelg.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I do not want to interrupt the honourable member or any other honourable member, but I point out to the House that at this juncture we are debating a motion for noting, not a Bill.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** I thank you, Mr Speaker. I refer to the member for Glenelg and the reasons that he has given for opposing the noting of the report. It amazes me how the member for Glenelg can change his mind about matters such as this in such a short time. The last time I spoke on the Casino Bill I pointed out what some other members had said in this House when the Bill came before it on two previous occasions. It appears that the member for Glenelg changes his mind every time the subject is raised. I turn to the time that we considered in this House the matter of pools. From what the honourable member for Glenelg said tonight he obviously classifies that as a type of gambling. There can be compulsive gambling with the pools, lotteries or racehorses if a person is so inclined. That sort of person will not be stopped because another type of gambling is not introduced, as he has the existing forms of gambling in which to indulge.

**Mr Gunn:** You're gambling on horses, are you?

**Mr PLUNKETT:** I will let the member for Eyre go for a little while, because I have never denied that I am a gambler. So, he is not scoring points from me. I would like to bring to the attention of the House how hypocritical the member for Glenelg has been. That member recently supported the introduction of soccer pools in this State. Those pools are run by Mr Sangster and Mr Murdoch, people from outside this country. Fortunately for this State, that was a complete flop, and I hope that it stays a complete flop, because I object to those sorts of people running soccer pools in Australia.

The member for Glenelg has said that he would like to protect the young people, the 'juveniles', in this State. I have been in licensed casinos and unlicensed gambling places such as the two-up school at Broken Hill. I love playing two-up. Although two-up was illegal in New South Wales it was accepted up there and even the police came through and had a meal while the game was being played.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr PLUNKETT:** I must admit that I have played that game, as have many others. I have been reading *Hansard* of 18 February 1981 and a speech made by the member for Glenelg about the pools. I wish that that honourable member were in the House now to hear what I am saying. He said that the pools were a great way of raising finance for sports. Why could a casino not be a great way of raising money for sport?

The member for Glenelg mentioned what sort of sports casinos supported and then gave a resume of his trip overseas. Then, in answer to something said by the honourable member for Unley, the member for Glenelg went on to say how countries such as Canada and States like British Columbia finance their sports. He remarked what marvellous facilities they have. Then, following an interjection by the member for Unley, he went on to say that the U.S.S.R. and countries such as Romania, Poland and India finance their sports from lotteries.

Before I heard his speech tonight I thought the member for Glenelg would have been in favour of any type of

gambling just to raise money for sport. The reason for a casino that is being put forward is that it is a great tourist attraction. I think a casino could bring in a lot of money through tourism if it was introduced in the right way. I oppose this measure because of the way in which this Government wishes to introduce it.

The member for Glenelg went on to say 'It's our State, mate' and that he had a sticker stating that on his car. He said that this State must spend much more money on sport and this was a very good way to raise that money. That is Mr Sangster's and Mr Murdoch's donation to Australia from the pools, which has not been forthcoming.

**An honourable member:** Friends of yours?

**Mr PLUNKETT:** Yes, they would be friends of mine. If the honourable member listened to my speeches he would understand that. I wonder what the member for Glenelg has done with the sticker on the back of his car. Has he taken it off? Has he broken his window? I do not want to waste more of my time on the member for Glenelg, but I do not believe in being hypocritical. When people talk about supporting one type of gambling it is no good saying they do not support another type of gambling because it is not the type available in England. People in England are familiar with the pools, and that may be why he supported them. I have always played two-up in Australia: it is as Australian as is *Waltzing Matilda*. It is part of Australia and one of the fairest games I have played. It was a fair game until it was played in the casino in Tasmania, and that ruined the game. Anyone who has played two-up in the casino knows there are hidden ways of robbing people. It is not just heads and tails, every now and then a boxer gets an additional cut.

*Members interjecting.*

**Mr PLUNKETT:** I am not answering interjections because I do not want to waste time. I have a certain amount to say.

**Mr Ashenden:** You've wasted 10 minutes getting into the member for Glenelg.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** The honourable member wastes his time when he gets up, and I think he will find my contribution will be every bit as good as his because I have moved around a bit further than car salesmen. I have been around the country a bit. I want to make myself clear, because I am not a hypocrite. This Bill may come before the House again in a few years time and I do not want people getting up then and saying what I said the last time it was discussed. If this casino was to be introduced and run by the Government, fully controlled by the Government, that would be a different matter. Some people would scream, but they should look at the lotteries and the T.A.B. One can travel all over Australia and one will find that the T.A.B. in South Australia is the best in Australia and is recognised as one of the best in the world. Anyone interested in T.A.B. facilities will find that we supply the world with a lot of the material we use. The Minister of Recreation and Sport will know that this is one of our industries. The computer system in the T.A.B. and on the racecourses is recognised as superior to anything in the rest of the world.

I support a casino with the condition there are no poker machines, and I said this when I spoke on the second reading. I made it clear that I was not opposed to casinos. I do not believe a lot of the submissions claiming that people become compulsive gamblers overnight. I do not completely believe that that is the case. I believe poker machines should never have been allowed into Australia, let alone into South Australia. I have had plenty of experience with poker machines. People can become like robots—any person visiting some of the New South Wales clubs sees such people playing the machines. It makes one wonder whether these people walk around pulling their arm back-

wards and forwards all day. That is all they do. The only enjoyment they get out of poker machines is hearing the click every now and again.

I would like to congratulate the committee as a whole on the report as it has been presented to us. A tremendous amount of work was put into it and I would like to congratulate every person involved, including the member for Glenelg. I inquired of one of my colleagues who was on the committee to see whether I could criticise the Minister or the Government for members generally not having had enough time to go through the select committee's report. I think that every honourable member would agree that we did not have sufficient time to go through the report from Thursday of last week, when it was received, to the present time. It was unfair to expect honourable members to do so.

My education may not be as good as that of other members in this House, but I think that many members in this House have had a lot of trouble going through it correctly. I have done it as well as I can and have now risen to speak on it. That is the reason why I said that I would not speak for more than about 15 minutes, and I do not intend to do so. I have not had time to go right through this report and if other honourable members tell the truth they will agree.

I see no reason why the State Government cannot own the casino. If it was owned by the State Government, with all profits coming to the State, that is something I would most certainly support. I am afraid that I cannot support this legislation when a casino is to be given to private enterprise. That is typical of the State Liberal Government; it has done it on every other occasion and it thinks that everything has to go to the private sector. I do not think that that is so, and I most certainly do not support it. I could not support a casino in South Australia if it was let out to private enterprise. If a casino is established it will bring with it plenty of restaurants, which will be of advantage in the city or the area in which the casino would be built. People will still build international hotels and other such facilities. I do not believe that a casino licence should be given to private enterprise; they will still come along, let us not worry about that.

If a casino is established it will attract a great amount of tourism. The fact that a casino is owned by the Government does not mean that it would not attract money or interest to the State. Anyone who argues that we miss out on these things unless we give the casino licence to private enterprise is talking nonsense. I would be disappointed to hear any honourable member speaking like this, especially one who was a member of the committee. I have no more to say about the matter; I have had my say in 15 minutes.

**Mr GLAZBROOK (Brighton):** I will make a brief opening statement and follow on after the dinner break. Some people may be surprised at the line that I intend to take, bearing in mind I regard myself as a Christian, and the belief that I have approached the task of this report with a degree of Christian concern for my fellow man and for the future of South Australia and South Australians. I have tried to adopt, as far as possible, a pragmatic attitude to the benefits which a development such as this can produce. In fact, I was rather alarmed at the weekend when I read the report attributed to Sir Alan Walker when he suggested that any politician who votes for a casino in this State is morally and spiritually blind. I certainly do not regard myself in that light. In fact, I would be surprised if Sir Alan Walker really meant what he is reported as having said.

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

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** In Sir Alan Walker's comments made and reported in the *Advertiser* of 14 August last, he made a statement about Lifeline workers in Hobart. He said that

they had terrible stories to tell about the effects of casinos. I was rather interested in those comments because the committee, during its deliberations and in taking evidence in Tasmania, had sought information from Lifeline in Hobart. Indeed, a telephone call was made to that agency, but it commented that it really did not have any statistical evidence that it could produce for the committee that would be of any great value to us.

I also add that similar action was taken in Darwin during our visit. Indeed, the member for Semaphore telephoned Lifeline in Darwin and asked specifically whether someone would come before the committee to discuss the problems associated with gambling and compulsive gambling in the Northern Territory. The reply given when the honourable member rang Lifeline was, 'There is a problem in Darwin but gambling ranks after housing and alcohol.' The people spoken to could not say specifically that the casino caused problems. What was said seemed to support the fact that they did not have any statistical evidence on which to make any valid judgments. I was indeed surprised to read those comments made by Sir Alan Walker, when the agency of which he was the founder could not provide to the committee the evidence which it sought.

Be that as it may, the approach I have endeavoured to adopt in participating in the committee has been one that has troubled me greatly. Because, as a member of this House, I have had dealings with people in less fortunate circumstances than ourselves, I tried to take a moral stance which balanced the problems I had come across with the potential problems which people told me I should expect from the introduction of a casino. As the witnesses came before the committee, I endeavoured to find the substance of their fears. That is where we struck great difficulty because, in looking for the substance of fears, we could find no substantial evidence that a problem existed.

There is no doubt that something exists but it could not be quantified in any way. There were no statistics. I was surprised that agencies which were looking after those less fortunate than ourselves, who had gone off the track whether through gambling or alcohol, did not keep specific details of their clientele, particularly in the area of gambling. When we were looking for some substance, we were wanting to say, 'Here is a problem that is identifiable and quantifiable.' However, it was not there.

We then sought to find out why people in the community believed they had these problems. It seems that many people had been influenced by what they had heard from people speaking on the matter, what they had read and what they had seen on television. Indeed, I may have been one of those self-same people, as I had previously thought of casinos in the light of what I saw on television in crime shows, and what have you. One's impression of casinos may be built up by an impression obtained from reading, listening to someone, or watching television shows. Therefore, it is very difficult to understand what is meant.

The committee then sought to ask questions of psychiatrists and psychologists who tried to explain to us how one might be able to identify a person who is a compulsive gambler—the characteristics that make up a person who is compelled to gamble. Even that was hard to grasp and to quantify, so the committee had great difficulties coming to grips with that aspect.

However, the committee did not rest and kept seeking the information required. We then found problems concerning the question of the moral argument and the problems relating to the figures from the United States that were given to us: I refer to the figure of 0.77 of 1 per cent of the community, the figure identified in the United States as being at risk in the gambling field.

What would happen if a development such as a casino and supporting complex came into being, and what could it provide for those people with whom I come into contact so often, as do other members of this House, namely, the unemployed? Here we have 7.6 per cent of the population crying out for something to do, needing something to do, yet the percentage of people at risk is 0.77 of 1 per cent. I considered both the moral argument and my responsibility to try to help some people to find work.

I am referring not only to the creation of jobs within a casino complex *per se*, but I am considering the overall effect of the development of a casino complex and its becoming a catalyst for development or encouragement of development in the area of tourism. It is my belief (and I have expressed this in this House on many occasions) that tourism is a great provider of employment, stretching across a wide range of occupational skills, from labourers through to people interpreting foreign languages for foreign visitors coming here.

It is well known that every dollar expended on capital development in tourism will return \$2.59. There is no dispute whatsoever about the value of capital investment in a field related to tourism. Thus, I was interested in an article which appeared in today's *News* wherein it was stated that there was more than one gamble in relation to the Casino Bill. The article got down to the nitty-gritty of talking about the value of development and what it could do for this State.

We have heard mentioned today (and indeed this is also mentioned in the casino committee report) the value of tourism, as expressed in terms of the anticipated number of visitors. On page 121, the report listed several things that might possibly enhance the advantages of such a casino in South Australia. The figures and comments provided to us were in a submission made by the Tourism Development Board.

The board asked itself the question, 'What visitor growth might South Australia achieve if a casino were to be established in this State?' Several reasons were given why the board believed that to be so, but the pertinent point was the fact that it estimated that the opening of a casino in South Australia could sustain visitor growth of between 8 per cent and 12 per cent, which would be in addition to the expected normal growth over a year. The board estimated, therefore, that in one full year of operation between 50 000 and 75 000 visitors could be attracted to South Australia, in addition to any visitors who might be expected to arrive as a result of other pursuits in chasing tourism.

From the board's figures (and I have no reason to think that it would provide us with false information), it seemed that in a full year between \$13 200 000 and \$19 800 000 would be expected from those additional visitors. When we consider that in terms of employment, we realise that the complex would initially provide from 630 to 950 full-time jobs. There would be a multiplier effect for people in the community such as the butcher, the baker, and those on the land, because, as additional visitors come into this State, the demands on retail sales and other industries increase. Therefore, there is a multiplier effect and more people are employed in other areas that are totally dissociated at first, it would seem, from a casino complex.

It could be estimated on figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics that the additional number of jobs that might be created from 50 000 to 80 000 people coming into the State would be about 1 400 to 1 500 overall. In my conscience I was struggling between the problem that there would be 0.77 per cent of the people at risk and, on the other hand, the point that people would find employment. Because I am such a strong advocate of the value of tourism for this State and because I believe that we should spend more time and more effort in encouraging tourism, I could

understand the advantages that we could get from a casino. What also worried me was that other problems are associated with casinos and their operations. I was concerned that people were worrying about what was happening in Nevada and Atlantic City and what had happened in the United Kingdom.

When I read of those reports and the concerns in those countries in regard to the crime and corruption that was obviously evident in those places, I felt that something had to be done. We should learn from overseas experiences. It struck me that, if legislation could be introduced in this State that so tightly committed people to a particular line of action, there might be a possibility that a casino could be developed in this State that would place at risk very few people, if any. The Bill and the amendments that are recommended in the report would provide the strongest and toughest legislation for private development anywhere in the world. Nowhere in the world is there legislation that is so tight and so strict on any developer. This has occurred solely because the committee was concerned about the possible chance that there might be some infiltration into such a development. I regard Messrs Bottom and McAuley very highly for the way in which they presented their evidence.

Both of those witnesses said, 'If you are going to do anything in South Australia, for goodness sake tie the legislation up tightly.' They told us exactly what to look out for and they were right. The committee took their advice, aided by the help and expertise of one member of the committee, the member for Playford (and the member for Glenelg paid tribute to him before). His expertise came to the fore and was greatly appreciated.

The committee came up with such tough legislation that it would not pay any criminal element to even try to get in. If one looks carefully at the amendments incorporated in the back of the report, one will see that it is virtually impossible to do anything illegal. In fact, one could say that outside in the community there are far more illegalities occurring in business than would ever occur in a casino complex under this type of legislation. The legislation needs to be studied carefully. It should be particularly acknowledged that it is the toughest legislation in the world, because we have said that we will learn from the mistakes made by other countries.

I now turn to the possibilities and potentialities of the convention market. In my second reading address I referred to the convention market and its potential for development. Reports given to the committee by the Tourism Development Board and the Director-General of Tourism in South Australia drew our attention to statistics produced by Qantas in relation to the convention market. That information indicated that some 7 000 conventions held throughout the world last year were attended by 3 000 000 delegates.

It is a wellknown fact that in Australia the largest number of people that can be accommodated in a convention at any one time is around 2 000. Indeed, members have probably read that Federal Pacific, which also believes in the potential of the convention market, will spend \$13 000 000 on the Wrest Point Casino complex in Tasmania to develop a convention area that will accommodate 2 500 people. In fact, that company's complexes around Australia are geared for the convention market. Some of the criticisms made by operators around Australia related to the fact that there were very few areas in this country which could be developed as convention centres.

The committee concluded that what is needed is not a casino *per se* but a complex comprising a good hotel development, a first-class convention centre and an entertainment area. That entertainment area should be designated as a casino for the purposes of this Bill and the report. The committee decided that any casino should be part of a

complex, and arguments were developed along those lines. The committee believed that there was some future in looking at the convention area.

I now turn to the crime angle. The Premier previously referred to comments made by Mr Ted Vibert of the Licensed Clubs Association and comments he made to the select committee. I believe that one or two comments are extremely important and should be aired in this House. Member's will recall that certain claims were made in the press that Mr Vibert had been involved in paying money to political Parties. It was not his payment to political Parties that concerned me as an issue: what did concern me about his evidence was that he openly admitted to the committee that he would use clout, his money clout, to persuade political people to conform to his ideas about poker machines.

He said that he would use his efforts to change people's views by getting them kicked out of Parliament. When I asked him about changing people's philosophies and whether he would do it again he said, 'Yes, I would if it was necessary'. He stated:

If we have club people in South Australia or Queensland who wish to stand for election on the same basis, we will do precisely the same thing again.

What did he do: he paid for their electoral campaigns. He tried to use money as political clout to change the democracy of this country. It is a sad day indeed when we have people in this community trying to use such methods to inflict their selfish will, a monetary-inspired will, to manipulate the political system.

I am glad that that was brought out in the report, so that people can see this attitude for what it is. In fact, in other evidence given to us it was obvious that this witness did not even tell the committee the truth. He had given much more than he said he had, and he was involved far more than he was willing to tell us at that time.

Someone said to me the other day after reading the report, 'Why did you spend so much time on the crime side?' I said that I was glad we did because, when we smelt an inkling of problems in that area, we knew that we had to address ourselves thoroughly to what was going on. We needed to assure ourselves that it could be controlled because at that stage, and I am sure that the member for Gilles would agree, several of us were changing our minds for the third or fourth time. As evidence was examined and discussed, more evidence came in which suddenly tipped the scales the other way.

When this crime issue came up we needed to pursue it, and the committee pursued it to a great depth and breadth, so much so that much of the evidence that we took, as stated by the member for Glenelg, could not be documented: it was heard *in camera*, because people feared for their lives. They did not want what they knew to be publicised and attributed to their name, because some of the information was so delicate that it was obvious that it could have come from only one or two sources. We took the view that, if South Australia were to have a casino, what was needed was tough and strong action in regard to the legislation: it needed to be tied up to a tight degree. We faced these questions, and I believe the committee has answered the queries raised in relation to them. Generally speaking, the witnesses before the committee were genuine in their desire and united in their thoughts as to what they wanted to express in relation to the casino.

They wished to express their fears, but the problem all the way through has been that they were fears in the mind, because it was almost impossible anywhere to gather relevant statistics, and for this reason the very first recommendation that the committee came up with and supported was the one that the Tasmanians supported. They said that there must be a national inquiry, that they must find out for sure



what is going on. This committee made that its very first recommendation, too. If we look through the level of recommendations and the way they have been presented for members to understand the arguments for and against, it will be seen that the report has been based on the facts presented to the committee.

We tried to distinguish between what was fact and what was fantasy in the sense that it could not be supported. We considered the matter and said that the committee needed to present those views to the Parliament so that Parliament could make up its own mind. The member for Gilles urged people to read the report from cover to cover. We not only have had the opportunity of talking to witnesses but we also have had the necessity to read the report, not once, not twice, not three times—

**Mr Slater:** We wrote it.

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** We wrote it, but we probably read it again six times. It became embedded in the mind and we said that we had to get these arguments over or explain what was meant by a particular belief. I think that, if members honestly consider this report and base it on its merit, they will understand that the recommendations were made with a strong desire to keep crime out and to provide a facility for South Australians.

I would hate to be (and I probably would be incapable of being) a judge and to be in the position, solely on the evidence presented without having all the facts, but knowing that somewhere there were facts, of having to make a value judgment on a matter of life. We did not have such an ability, and, because all the facts were not there, we could only do our best.

In conclusion, I want to say that a development such as a casino complex would be a catalyst for further development, and it is that development that can provide the impetus needed for more jobs in this State. Without some development of that magnitude, which would have a flow-on effect, we are denying many people the opportunity to obtain jobs. The 0.77 per cent at risk in a system that was no good, compared to developing a system that is so controlled as to be the strongest and tightest in the world, and considering the probabilities of being able to provide some jobs for 7.6 per cent unemployed, weighs very hard on one's conscience. People commit suicide because they cannot get jobs; families are breaking up every day because there is insufficient money to maintain the family; and children are going without food because their parents cannot get jobs. What moral conscience difference is there between that and a small number of people at risk? If we have a development, we should chase it.

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

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I do not intend to belabour this question a great deal, because we have already had three discussions on it this year. However, I commend the committee's report. It is an excellent report, and I know that the members of the committee approached their job conscientiously. I think they had 37 meetings and visited all parts of Australia where casinos were in operation.

The casino report is detailed and comprehensive and one on which I believe the committee members ought to be congratulated and commended. However, in the past, until earlier this year, I had been a fairly strong supporter of a casino operation in South Australia. For varying reasons that I will explain in a moment, I have now changed my mind about the establishment of a casino in this State. Many things have led me to come to that conclusion. First, it has been a problem for me, as a matter of conscience, as

to whether I supported the proposition now before the House, or a casino operation at all.

I must confess that I like to gamble. I like to go to the races, the greyhounds and to the trots occasionally. I do not even mind playing two-up, the great Australian national game. However, other people like to gamble in different ways. Those people do not go to the greyhound races, horse races, or the trots or do not play two-up. However, they may like to play roulette or some other game that is associated with casinos. The mere fact that one comes to a conclusion not to support the establishment of casino legislation means, at least on my conscience, that I am standing in the way of people who like to gamble in some way other than I do and preventing them from doing so. I will still have the dogs, the races and whatever forms of legal gambling that exist now in South Australia. Therefore, from that point of view, one, when making a decision about this proposition, could be described as being selfish. The report, in my view (as I said before), is an excellent one. It goes some of the way, but not all the way, that I would have liked it to go.

I said, when I spoke about this matter on the last occasion that was before this House, that I had come to the firm conclusion that, unless a casino was a Government-owned and controlled proposition, I would not be able to support the recommendations of the select committee. This report does not do that, although it goes some of the way: it allows for equity by the Government in the establishment of the operation. We have no indication as to how much that equity might be. It could be as low as 1 per cent, or as high as 99 per cent, I imagine, but we have not been given any indication as to how much that equity might be.

**Mr Slater:** It is up to the Government of the day.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I realise that it is up to the Government of the day, but that is not good enough for me. The Government of the day, according to its philosophical stance, would decide how much equity that it wanted in a casino and, according to that philosophical viewpoint, the amount of equity in such an operation could escalate or decrease. Therefore, the committee has not fulfilled its obligation in relation to Government ownership. I must confess that, with a Liberal dominated committee (because quite obviously the Liberal Party had the numbers on the committee), I was surprised to find that the committee allowed for Government equity at all. I can imagine how difficult a job it must have been for the Labor members on that committee to convince members of the Liberal Party that there ought to be any Government equity at all in such a project. On that basis, I congratulate the committee for bringing down that recommendation.

**Mr Mathwin:** They might have done it to get you on side, Jack.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I thought you were opposed to a casino, John.

**Mr Mathwin:** I am, but we wanted to get you on side.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I cannot understand why the member for Glenelg wants to get me on side when he is opposed to a casino being established in this State. If the honourable member wanted to get me on side, he could have done so by going into Government ownership. If during this debate a Government-ownership amendment, or something of that nature, is moved, I could easily change my mind. However, there are also other reasons for my attitude to this Bill. I said that I had searched my conscience on this matter, and I have done so. I have also searched my files, and last Monday morning I went through all my files since 1973, when this matter was first raised in the South Australian Parliament.

We can all recall that on that occasion the Liberals voted *en bloc* against the proposed legislation. The Liberal Party on that occasion did not allow a conscience vote. These

records are kept in my office, and I have checked all the correspondence. There are some 70-odd letters. Most of the letters on this occasion (58 of them) I have presented to the Parliament. Many involve petitions from my own constituents and others. One that I presented recently contained 2 200 signatures, although they were not all my constituents. All those letters and all those petitioners within and outside of my district have been opposed to the establishment of a casino.

If one is to take notice of one's constituents, quite clearly in these circumstances one would have no option but to be opposed to the legislation. I know the polls indicate that the vast majority of people support this type of legislation, so it could be that the silent majority, if they support something, do not bother to write and tell one. However, it would be handy, if one was trying to assess how one should vote, to be able to establish the clear thinking of one's own constituents.

Another example occurred in this House this morning. Four or five weeks ago, I was asked whether I would show a group of 20 through Parliament House this morning, and I did so. The group comprised 19 women and one man, and I was explaining the way the House operates. They asked me what legislation was being considered today, and I told them. I said 'How would you feel about the establishment of a casino?' Seventeen were opposed to the establishment of a casino, and three were in favour. It really shocked me, that the majority was so high, and the 'noes' were very strong indeed. I do not know whether we are getting wrong information from the polls that are being conducted outside by professional people, but here was a group of 20 sitting here this morning, 17 of whom were opposed to a casino.

**Mr Slater:** Where did they come from?

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** I did not have their names and addresses, but if the honourable member wants me to get them I will write to them. They were South Australian men and women: constituents of mine. I am not completely satisfied either in my own mind that a casino will to any great extent bring many people into South Australia.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** Hear, hear!

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** I am not satisfied about that, although I am satisfied, without any doubt, because there is clear evidence of this, and the committee must establish this as well, that in every casino operation in the world that I have visited (and I have been to a few of them, lost in some and won in others) the management has informed me that it is not tourism but the local clientele that keeps them going. In fact, in most countries they say that it is 85 per cent of their business.

If those figures are accurate (and I have nothing to dispute them), it seems to me that the people who would be keeping the casino alive in South Australia would be our own people. I am not convinced that that is a proper attitude to be taking at this stage, and I believe there are other types of development which we can easily establish in South Australia and which would not give opportunities to people to lose more money than they can afford. So, it is also the social impact that is concerning me about this legislation. I know that the committee looked at all aspects of this matter, but committee reports can be wrong, just as other reports and polls can be wrong.

This is apparent to me from letters I have received and from petitions I have presented to this House. For the benefit of the member for Gilles, a person brought me a petition, which I presented to the House this week, and almost all of the 123 people who had signed it were from Marleston.

**An honourable member:** Is that right?

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** That is right. If the honourable member doubts this, he can check the petition, although it is probably down under by now. I do not know what happens to those petitions. In my view there is only one course I can take. The stand I am taking in opposing this legislation is based on the matters I have raised and is in support of what I believe my constituents want me to do on this matter.

**Mr ASHENDEN (Todd):** It is not very often that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and I would be in agreement, but there are many points that the Deputy Leader made that I totally agree with.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** I might be wrong.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** The Deputy Leader has just said that he might be wrong. If he is wrong, then I am in good company. Before outlining the reason for the action I will take on this vote, I congratulate the committee, particularly the Chairman, for undertaking what was obviously an extremely difficult job. Obviously, the committee spent a tremendous amount of time and effort in preparing the report that it has brought before the House. I believe that the Chairman and the committee have to be highly commended for the standard of the report.

I have found the report and the detail it contains very helpful indeed. I believe that the committee's action in not coming out with a specific recommendation is good. The committee has provided all members with a lot of detail and members have been able to absorb that information, go away, and make up their own minds as to the way in which they are going to vote.

I refer specifically to some of the comments brought forward in the report. Since this issue was first raised, I have been very careful to try to determine within my electorate how my constituents feel about this matter. I said earlier, and I will now say it again although the member for Stuart disagrees with me, that I believe a member of Parliament is elected not to push his own barrow, but to represent the interests of his own electorate. When I made that point previously, the member for Stuart pointed out to me that I was not elected to represent the interests of my electorate in issues such as this, but in fact to put forward my own beliefs on this type of matter. I stated at the declaration of the poll in Todd—

**Mr Keneally:** There are times when you have to stand on your own feet as a member of Parliament. You can't always put the blame on to your constituents.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Stuart will be able to make a contribution when he is invited to stand on his feet.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** I do not intend to lay any blame at the feet of my constituents. The decision I am going to make is a decision that I have made based upon the information and feedback I have obtained within my electorate. If my constituents disagree with my decision, I will certainly wear that blame. So, in no way is it my intention to blame my constituents. However, what I have done is to get as close as I possibly can to my electorate, to speak to my constituents and determine how they feel about this issue.

Three years ago, when the declaration of the poll in Todd took place, I said then that it was my intention to always attempt to represent the interests of my electorate in the Parliament. I certainly intend to carry that out in relation to this vote. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has just mentioned that a group of his constituents were in here and that they were predominantly women. In my electorate I have found that the women particularly are opposed to the idea of a casino being opened in South Australia.

I believe that is understandable. It is the women, after all (and I hope the Minister for Health will forgive me as I do

not intend to be sexist), who have to balance the budget, provide the food, look after the children, and ensure that they have a home for their family. It is the women in particular who have indicated to me that they are fearful of what could happen if a casino were operating in South Australia. On the other hand, I must be honest and admit that generally speaking the men have favoured the opening of a casino in South Australia.

The concerns of both women and men that have been raised with me about the operation of a casino are reflected in the findings of the committee. I refer particularly to the social impact section of the findings and the recommendations of the Select Committee on the Casino Bill, which states:

The committee concludes that drawing on the experience of Tasmania and the Northern Territory casino, gambling is relatively—

and I stress the word 'relatively'—harmless for the majority of participants.

In other words, I read between the lines and find that the committee is saying that it is not completely harmless and that a minority of participants could be disadvantaged. The report goes on to state:

However, there is a minority group (indeterminable at this stage) who are vulnerable or who may be potential compulsive gamblers. Moreover, casino gambling, because of the environment and the characteristics of the activities and games available, provides powerful psychological reinforcement of the criteria necessary to induce compulsive gambling, i.e., speed of game, continuous betting, and likely return.

My constituents who have expressed concern about the operation of a casino in South Australia have very much dwelt on that point. I refer now to the section headed 'Crime', which states:

The committee finds that the main concern is to ensure that organised crime does not increase and the corruption of police and politicians does not occur in this State.

Again, the point has been made by my constituents that they are extremely concerned that organised crime could come into South Australia if the casino was operating. I appreciate very much the feelings of the committee members who believe the recommendations they have made will not allow this to occur. However, I have gone to casinos and have asked questions. I have not been sufficiently convinced that two main areas of crime could be kept out of casinos in South Australia. One is prostitution and the other is the laundering of money.

**Mr Peterson:** You haven't read the report.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** I have read the report. The honourable member may have his own opinion. This will be a conscience vote, and I do not intend to pick on other members and their beliefs. I am able to make up my own mind. If the honourable member disagrees with the grounds upon which I have made up my mind, that is his right. However, I ask him to let me make the points that I wish to make.

**Mr Peterson:** You don't know, you are just mouthing.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** I resent that comment from the honourable member. I am not mouthing.

**Mr Peterson:** How do you launder money?

**Mr ASHENDEN:** I will tell the honourable member how money can be laundered. A person who has obtained money illegally can go to a casino with \$10 000 in his pocket. He can buy chips and he only has to bet on the black, on the roulette wheel, and the odds are that he will walk out with \$5 000 worth of clean money. That is how laundering can occur in any casino.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Every member will have an opportunity in due course, but not together.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** I point out to the member for Semaphore that this decision has not been an easy one to take,

as I personally am not opposed to a casino. However, I believe that my electorate is opposed to it. As I represent the electorate of Todd, I will be voting according to what I believe are the wishes of my constituents. I am not putting forward a point of view that is coloured by my own beliefs. The report points out:

In addition, the committee finds that Australian casinos as currently operating appear to be free of any manipulation or organised crime, but that unless adequate controls and surveillance is maintained it is an open invitation to be penetrated at any time and at any level of the casino-hotel operations.

Again, that is a concern that was brought home to me by my constituents. I believe that there are still enough doubts in that area to cause me at this stage to be opposed to the development of a casino in South Australia. I refer to further points that are contained in the report. With regard to ownership of a casino, I note that the report states:

... that the Government have the right to obtain an equity in a hotel convention centre casino complex.

Members opposite might be extremely surprised to learn that in no circumstances could I support a privately operated casino in South Australia. In a speech that I made in this House some three months or so ago, I mentioned that I had visited the Federal Hotel casino in Alice Springs. As most members would probably agree, I am pretty well private enterprise to the bootstraps, but I have never been more disappointed or disillusioned in private enterprise than I was during the three days I spent at the casino at Alice Springs. That development certainly proves what can occur in a situation where there is a monopoly. Although I certainly support private enterprise, in no circumstances can I support a monopoly.

I note that the member for Baudin has just come into the House: I got a bit of a serve from him when, in a previous debate, I outlined a number of things that occurred during my stay at the casino in Alice Springs. The member for Baudin asked me why I had not let them know who I was, and my answer was 'Definitely not', because I wanted to see the operations of the casino from the point of view of a private individual.

I do not intend to hold up the business of the House at this stage referring to the things which I mentioned previously and which can occur when an organisation is given *carte blanche* and knows that there can be no competition. As a tourist, I can honestly say that, if I return to Alice Springs, in no circumstances will I stay at those premises.

I will listen to the amendments that are moved tonight relating to that recommendation, and I point out that I would certainly be looking for Government control if a casino were to be operated in this State. I note that the report states:

Any development should be developed as a multi-million dollar complex with associated hotel, restaurant, and convention centre facilities, as opposed to a one-purpose gambling club-type casino.

I would agree with that recommendation. Although if a casino were to be developed in South Australia I would be most happy if the premises were privately owned, I stress that the casino must be controlled by the Government.

In summary, I again point out that, although I have no personal objections to the operation of a casino, I represent my constituents in the electorate of Todd many of whom have indicated that they have objections. I have received telephone calls, letters, and petitions about the matter, but I would be the first to acknowledge that usually it is the people who are opposed to a measure who will be most active in making their thoughts known. However, my constituents have made their feelings known when I have attended social and sporting functions, and so on, where I have deliberately raised the issue of a casino in an effort to obtain information from my constituents on a general basis.

I make the point again that from the feedback that I have received from all areas it appears that in my electorate a majority—although not a very great majority—of my constituents do not want a casino in South Australia.

A great majority of women in South Australia do not want a casino, but certainly a majority of men want a casino. I have listened very carefully to the objections that have been raised, and I have dealt with organised crime and the social difficulties that could confront some families. I commend the report and the committee, but I have not been convinced that these difficulties do not exist. While there is a risk of their existence, I believe that I must support the majority feeling in my district. Therefore, I will certainly vote to adopt the report to allow its consideration but, at this stage, I cannot support the present Bill. I therefore oppose the casino development, but I will listen with great care to the amendments that are brought forward.

However, for the reasons I have already outlined, it will take a powerful lot of argument from those people who move amendments to convince me that I should change my mind. I believe it is my duty to represent my electorate, and my electorate does not want a casino; therefore, at this stage I must indicate that I will not support the development of such a facility in South Australia.

**Mr CRAFTER (Norwood):** I am pleased to support the noting of this report, but I do so with much reservation. I want to point out to the House at the outset that I do not propose to support the establishment of a casino on the basis of the Bill that is before the House this evening or the amendments that I understand are to follow. I do not know accurately how my constituents feel about this matter: I have certainly had many representations, and those constituents who have taken the trouble to talk to me about this matter have represented a wide spectrum of views. I very much appreciate and respect their taking the trouble to point out their feelings to me, because that has assisted me in arriving at a decision about my responsibilities on this important issue.

I have come to my decision not because I oppose gambling or its extension in the community in a moral sense. I accept the fact that there is widespread gambling: indeed, it is part of the Australian way of life. Whether that is a good or bad thing, it exists, and there is already legislation to provide for numerous forms of gambling in our community. The feature of legal gambling in this State has been that the proceeds are returned to the community by way of the Hospitals Fund. The feature of the extension of gambling that has been brought about by the present Liberal Government in this State is that it has transferred the proceeds of gambling to the private sector, through the establishment of games such as News Bingo and soccer pools.

In this case we have a Government measure to place the control of a casino once again in the hands of private enterprise. I believe that is a most undesirable feature, since the money that could well be going to support hospitals and other useful purposes in our community will, in the main, go to private interests. We see that Mr Robert Sangster has just purchased a house in Sydney for \$7 100 000, where, presumably, he and his wife will reside for a few months each year when they are in Australia for the Melbourne Cup and other festivals. I dare say that some of the money that went to purchase that house resulted from profits that Mr Sangster earned from soccer pools in Australia, including those in this State. I would rather see those proceeds going to our community use. That was the Opposition's wish when that matter was debated. I simply do not trust the Government's motives in this matter. We have seen over a long period of time—

**Mr Ashenden:** It's a conscience issue; it's nothing to do with the Government.

**Mr CRAFTER:** I point out to the member for Todd that it is a Government measure. The honourable member can dissociate himself from his Ministers and from his Premier, but this Bill has been introduced as a Government measure.

**Mr Ashenden:** It's a conscience vote.

**Mr CRAFTER:** It is, but it was not introduced into this House by an individual member of Parliament as a private member's measure; it is a Government measure. I point out to the member for Todd that there was a substantial vote against a similar concept previously before the House as a private member's measure. That measure was introduced by the member for Semaphore and was debated some months ago. At that time the Government had a chance to adopt that measure.

**Mr Ashenden:** This Bill is very different from that Bill.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Todd was protected; the honourable member for Norwood will be equally protected.

**Mr CRAFTER:** I understand that the Government chose to introduce this measure following a decision taken by the State Council of the Liberal Party, which was very critical of the Government's off-handed manner in disposing of the measure introduced by the member for Semaphore. We saw an about face and now we have the rapid introduction of this official measure. This is a conscience vote but undoubtedly it has been introduced as a result of a Cabinet decision. I must admit that if those circumstances are true one can only conclude that some pressure was applied to Cabinet and the Government by members of the Liberal Party and perhaps by others to introduce this measure, and I do not know the motive behind that.

It seems that there has been a clear about-face by the Government. That is my first concern. My second concern all along has been whether the Government will have the ability to really control this proposal if it is placed into the hands of private enterprise. My concern is based on an experience I had several months ago. One of my colleagues raised a matter of concern in the House relating to the Government's decision to allow the establishment of licensed premises on Crown land in the hills face zone. My colleague made some inquiries at the Corporate Affairs Commission and found out that the company that had been granted the lease of land and permission to build those licensed premises was a \$2 company. There were no other records at the Corporate Affairs Commission to indicate the *bona fides* or substance of that company. He raised that matter in the House in the community interest.

As a consequence, the principal of the company involved offered to show the company's books to my colleague. My colleague asked me whether I would look at the books for him to check the substance and *bona fides* of that company. I did so in conjunction with the principal of that company along with his lawyer and accountant. As the matter had been raised in the House, an assurance was given at that time, I think by both the Premier and by the Attorney-General, that the Corporate Affairs Commission had investigated the company in question. One would presume that the company had been thoroughly investigated before approval was given for its establishment and undoubtedly before it received assistance through the Industries Assistance Committee.

When I inspected those books I asked on three separate occasions during that interview whether the records and *bona fides* had been checked by the Corporate Affairs Commission. Each time I was told that the records had been checked. Following my persistence I was told that that checking involved a telephone call from an officer of the Corporate Affairs Commission. Presumably, as a result of

that telephone conversation, the Attorney-General and the Premier were satisfied that the company had substance and that it was a *bona fide* company to establish its activities on Crown land and receive Government support.

I am most concerned that such a casual inquiry could have resulted in the approval being granted for such a substantial development in this State. Once again, it was a licensed premises on Crown land, and so a matter of great controversy in regard to where the premises are to be established.

Certainly, my inquiries revealed that it was a company of substance. I did not have the opportunity or the time to investigate those books as thoroughly as would officers of the Corporate Affairs Commission, as I presumed they would when making a thorough detailed inquiry into such a matter; nor did I have the ability or opportunity to check the *bona fides* of the principal of that company. I can only presume that they are reputable persons.

If the information given to me then is true, and my subsequent inquiries reveal that it is true, then I can only doubt very much the motives and intentions of the Government to carry out the necessary corporate checks and balances that would be so necessary before private enterprise could be given permission to enter into an arrangement with the Government to extend gambling in this State in this way.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** Have you looked at the amendments?

**Mr CRAFTER:** Those on file, yes, and they certainly do not satisfy my concerns. Also, I congratulate members on the work that they have done on the committee. It was a most unenviable task. The report disappoints me because it was beyond the time and capacity of members to investigate the terms of reference as set out. I notice in the report's foreword the following comment was made:

Rarely has a select committee had to conduct its investigations under such pressure and in such an atmosphere of recrimination and accusation.

I would have thought that for those reasons alone it was an error to have this matter investigated by a committee comprised of members of Parliament. Perhaps it should have been investigated in the same manner as in the majority of other inquiries, that is, by an independent judicial officer or someone apart from Parliament, at least.

At this stage I should briefly refer to some aspects of the report that concern me in addition to those I have already mentioned. First, there is lacking in Australia at present a national viewpoint about where it is desirable across this nation to develop casinos. In fact, we see almost a race between the States to establish casinos for one purpose or another. At this stage casinos have been established only in the Northern Territory and in Tasmania, but approvals have been granted for casinos to be established in Queensland.

Last weekend a historic and most beautiful hotel—Buchanan's Hotel—was destroyed by fire in Townsville. I have often visited that hotel. On the day after the fire I believe the Townsville council declared that hotel to be unfit to renovate, and bulldozers moved in. I understand that that site is to be the site for a new international hotel and casino to be established in Townsville. Members know that approval has been given for the Thiess Company to establish a casino on the Gold Coast. Victoria has a judicial inquiry at present investigating the establishment of casinos in that State.

Of course, there is discussion about the establishment of legal casinos in New South Wales. I should have thought that there would be some inquiry at the national level into the whole aspect of casinos, and we could have had some proper balance in the provision of these throughout Australia so that there could not have been competition for the tourist dollar, in particular, by petty State jealousies.

I noticed that at the outset the committee decided that its purpose was not to report to Parliament on whether or not a casino should be established in South Australia but, as one reads the report, one sees that it is clear that the committee did develop arguments that were in favour of the establishment of a casino. In one section the committee objectively stated the points for and against. It is interesting that there were 14 points for a casino and 24 against. Of course, each of these points must be weighted and it is not fair or just to simply add up the numbers of points scored for and against.

I believe that the evidence that came forward raises more questions than it answers and that is why I do not think the committee was the suitable structure in which to investigate this problem. At page 54 of the report, the committee grappled with the problem of the extent and nature of gambling in Australian society. If the evidence brought forward is anywhere near accurate, there is a great deal of evidence to show that this is a problem in Australian society.

If we have a figure as high as has been suggested, the highest figure in the world for the level of gambling in our society, and if about 1 per cent of our population are compulsive gamblers, this is a problem and a matter of great concern to those of us in the community who are being asked to extend gambling in this way. However, I suggest that the committee could produce no really firm evidence on this matter and that it has just raised further questions for discussion.

It was in the area of crime in connection with casinos that I think we saw perhaps the more disappointing evidence in the report. The committee dismissed quite out of hand the evidence that had been given about this problem in the two States of the United States where casinos are established and the problem in Great Britain, and the committee said that, very simply, South Australia had nothing remotely like the background history apparent in those places and then said that that was a mafia-organised crime connection. I should have thought that that was a simplistic conclusion to draw.

The report went on to say that that was not to say that the committee was complacent. I must admit that it did, to the best of its endeavours, explore the problem. However, when I worked in the Attorney-General's Department some years ago the reports that I saw in the course of my duties that dealt with aspects of organised crime in licensed premises were far more detailed than those that appear to have been put before this committee and, on my inquiries, before the select committee on prostitution. I have always had grave reservations about the amount of evidence that came before the committee in this most important area of the extent of organised crime, particularly in licensed premises in this State. This is a matter that causes me great concern.

Consideration of the impact of establishing a casino is an important matter, which my colleague the member for Gilles raised. I know that he has studied this matter seriously, and it is something that concerns all of us who want to see development in this state and more jobs created. However, it was with interest that I noted previous statements of the Minister of Tourism about the likely impact of a casino on tourism and employment in this State. I was disappointed that the Minister was not called to give evidence before the select committee. The Director-General of the Tourism Department—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr CRAFTER:** The Minister could have volunteered to give evidence. Statements were made during previous debates on this matter that I see as being quite important and as being in conflict with what I would have thought was the real position. The submissions not received by the committee were, I think, quite significant. First, there was the statement

by the Minister of Tourism that in her opinion a casino would not have a great impact on tourism in this State. I notice that the Chamber of Commerce and Industry did not wish to comment on the Bill and did not present evidence to the select committee. I think that is quite significant.

**Mr McRae:** Nor did the United Trades and Labor Council.

**Mr CRAFTER:** Yes, to be fair, the United Trades and Labor Council stated that it was not in a position to estimate the likely employment opportunities. I would have thought that the United Trades and Labor Council's contribution would be much more limited than that of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, which is vitally interested and has vested interests in the development of industry in this State, particularly the tourist industry and those spin-off industries that it is alleged will flow from it. That, I think, makes this report that much more deficient.

On the subject of organised crime, I thought that a significant contribution was made by the Commissioner of Police in the Northern Territory. He is obviously one person who has had first-hand experience in policing casinos. I thought that he made a pertinent point about this matter when he said at page 101 of the report:

Many people in Australia who are suspected of association with organised crime in terms of police records would appear to be respectable citizens.

I think that that comment is pertinent, because one of the great difficulties in investigating corporate crime is that it has the cloak of respectability, and the most apparently respectable citizens, business men and companies turn out not to be so. That is why I think that the amendments mentioned and the safeguards proposed in this Bill are quite inadequate to deal with that problem.

**Mr McRae:** What is the difference between the banking industry and the casino industry?

**Mr CRAFTER:** I think that that requires a much more detailed response than the one I am prepared to give. I notice that we are likely to be granting further extensions to established banks and business people in this community, but that question will have to be faced at the appropriate time.

I think the committee's suggestion that the remedy to this problem raised by Commissioner McAuley is the reverse onus of proof 'by requiring any applicant to demonstrate his company's suitability and lack of connection with organised crime' is a facile attempt to tackle this problem, as I explained in the instance when I had to go to inspect the books of a company. I believe that the other suggestions of the committee are quite inadequate in this regard.

I mentioned earlier the need for gambling proceeds to be returned to the community through the Hospitals Fund, for example, in this State, and the considerations of the committee in this regard are quite telling indeed. Obviously there is a limit to the gambling dollar in any community, and it can only be stretched to a certain level. The evidence that came forward about the extent of S.P. bookmaking is, I think, a red herring. If that is seen to be the answer to the taxability of the gambling dollar, it misses the point. The evidence given to the select committee by, I think, the Manager of the Totalizator Agency Board in Tasmania pointed out that the takings of the T.A.B.—

**Mr Slater:** It was the Tasmanian Racing Commission.

**Mr CRAFTER:** The takings of that racing authority in Tasmania were diminished when the casino was established, and it proves that there is a limit to the gambling dollar. As we have seen to some extent with soccer pools, there could be a further diminution by the establishment of a casino, with less money flowing to what I consider are more useful public purposes, for example, hospitals, sport and recreation.

For these reasons, I am most unhappy about the Government's attitude and intentions in this matter. Even if an amendment came forward from the Government to support a so-called Government-controlled casino, I still could not support that, given the track record of the Government and my recent experiences in this area. I do not believe that the Government is ideologically committed or has a will to see a Government-controlled enterprise of this nature in the State, because it is firmly committed to place the ownership, and indeed control, of a casino in the hands of private enterprise, and that is something that I find quite intolerable.

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** At the outset, I would like to state that I was most impressed with the attention that the select committee gave this issue. When the motion was previously before the House to set up the select committee, I was critical of the need for its appointment. I was critical of the amount of money that would be spent on this issue. This matter having been raised on numerous occasions since I have been a member, I felt that the majority of members would have been well informed on the subject of casinos.

I was very interested to note in the introduction to that report, under paragraph 1.3 headed 'Methodology', that the committee held 34 meetings and took evidence from 55 organisations and individuals, that it also visited Tasmania, Northern Territory and New South Wales, as well as taking evidence from witnesses from Victoria. Paragraph 1.4, headed 'Background to Report' (and I think it is important to refer to this tonight) states:

It is the committee's belief that many people are unfamiliar with the background and history of casinos. Although this knowledge is not crucial to any debate on the question of legalising casinos in this State, the committee considers that such background is important so that a perspective of casinos in different parts of the world can be gained.

Further, the committee gained the impression that many people are quite unfamiliar with the various types of casinos in different parts of the world, the controlling legislation, rules and regulations, casino management, and the extent of Government involvement.

It must be stressed that this committee's purpose was not to report to the Parliament on whether or not a casino should be established in South Australia. The committee also believed its mandate was to examine all facets of the casino industry and to report on the advantages and disadvantages that can come with the establishment of a casino.

Therefore, members of the committee have, from time to time, adopted the devil's advocate's role with witnesses in an attempt to explore the issues.

For these reasons, the report is framed so that the Parliament and the public will become aware of the subject of casinos, and it is hoped by the committee that this report will provide an informative and factual basis for further debate.

In conclusion, the committee places on record its appreciation of its hard working support staff. Rarely has a select committee had to conduct its investigations under such pressure and in such an atmosphere of recrimination and accusation.

The committee acknowledges the competence and ready assistance of the *Hansard* reporting staff and the Secretary, Mr Geoff Wilson, who coped admirably under difficult conditions.

In particular the committee's research officer, Mr Chris Sargent, has had to extend himself to the limit in sifting through the enormous volume of evidence, and his diligence and application should be recorded. To all the above, the committee extends its gratitude.

This Parliament should also place on record at this stage its appreciation to all members of the committee, because it owes them a sincere debt of gratitude for taking the time and effort, and for the contribution that each member made in his own individual way in addressing the whole topic that Parliament gave members of the select committee.

It is very rare that we ever hear in this Parliament a vote of thanks to members of select committees. I am prepared to take back what I said previously when the motion was put to establish a select committee, namely, that I did not believe, in a cynical way, that a committee of this Parliament

would go to the trouble to address itself on this subject in the way that it did.

It is a tribute to the Chairman and all members of the select committee, irrespective of their political persuasion, that they did honestly, sincerely and diligently go about their duties. I am surprised, pleased and proud to think that in this House we have members who are capable of doing this for us.

**Mr Keneally:** All the select committees have always performed in that way.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Stuart will be the third speaker from now. He will have the opportunity to speak.

**Mr BECKER:** What the honourable member for Stuart says is correct; there is very little reason to doubt the integrity of members of select committees. But, the number of times that this issue has been raised in the Parliament would, I should have thought, be sufficient for the majority of members to make a decision.

I want it placed on record that this select committee report is one of the best reports that I have had the opportunity to read. The committee commented on the background of casinos around the world. It is interesting to note an article in the *Age* on 17 January 1980. Under the heading 'Chips Down for Casino', the article states:

The British Gaming Act of 1968 is an admirably, even alarmingly, comprehensive piece of legislation. Its 105 pages of closely packed provisions and schedules are intended to ensure that British casinos are free from any taint of crookedness, illegality or corruption.

The act established a National Gaming Board with wide powers to 'keep under review the extent, character and location of gaming facilities'.

The board advises licensing authorities on all applications for casino licences, and its word is law. It even decides who can work in casinos by issuing employment certificates to casino managers, supervisors and operatives.

In his current annual report the Gaming Board chairman, Lord Allen of Abbeydale, notes that the Gaming Act 'embodies the intention that no more casino clubs should be allowed to open than are capable of providing sufficient facilities to meet the unstimulated gaming needs of the population. Our advice to licensing authorities has always been based on that concept'.

Guided by this principle, the board has allowed 127 casino gambling clubs to open in 53 localities throughout the United Kingdom. Most are in London, where up to 25 plush casino clubs have been allowed to operate.

The casinos, dominated by roulette and blackjack, have become huge business. The amount of money exchanged for gambling chips in British casinos is estimated by the Gaming Board to be close to £1 000 000 000 a year. The casinos employ nearly 6 000 people.

But despite close monitoring, despite the big force of Gaming Board inspectors with Draconian powers to enter and search casinos and to inspect machines and books, something is rotten in the British casino industry.

Last October the Home Secretary, Mr Whitelaw, told the House of Commons, 'It cannot unfortunately be said that the gambling scene in this country is now free from all criminal elements. The increasingly international nature of the industry adds to the risk'.

Mr Whitelaw was supporting recommendations by a royal commission into gambling which had urged that 'the corporate veil of secrecy' over Britain's casinos should be lifted at once. The royal commission, which investigated gambling between 1976 and 1978, was dissatisfied with the information it obtained from casinos on proprietorial control and financial administration.

The article further states:

Casinos run by the Coral group of companies were raided. As a result, Mr Bernard Coral resigned as head of the casino operation and is facing charges of conspiracy to pervert the course of justice and other charges relating to alleged contraventions of both the theft and gaming Acts.

Second, the Knightsbridge Crown Court upheld a decision by licensing magistrates last July that the Ladbroke group were not 'fit and proper persons' to run their three luxury London casinos. . . . These developments alarmed all British casino operators because they fear the adverse publicity will drive away the big foreign punters on whom they rely.

The article continues to give other examples. I can remember that while I was in England last year the Playboy club ran into trouble with its casino in London. An article under a New York dateline, appeared in the *Herald* on 8 April 1982. Headed 'Hefner unfit: No to casino', it states:

*Playboy* magazine founder Hugh Hefner was refused a licence for his year-old \$150 000 000 gambling casino in New Jersey today.

**Mr Bannon:** That's all dealt with in the report.

**Mr BECKER:** My point is that—

**Mr Bannon:** The point that you are getting at is that—

**Mr BECKER:** The Leader of the Opposition does not have to get grumpy with me.

*Mr Bannon interjecting:*

**Mr BECKER:** It is not irrelevant. I am reading the points out to give reasons for making my decision. The article further states:

New Jersey's Casino Control Commission approved a licence for his partners, Elsinore Corporation, and said they would consider licensing Playboy if Hefner left the firm.

But commissioners who voted against him said they believed it unlikely he would sell his 66 per cent of Playboy's stock.

The casino partnership agreement provides that if one of the partners cannot obtain a full licence, the other will buy the interest. The casino, one of nine gambling resorts established on the beachfront boardwalk of New Jersey's rundown Atlantic City, has been operating since last April on a temporary permit.

I remind members of the House that Atlantic City last year was known as the crime city—so much for the impact of casinos in that city. The article continues:

The commission's division of gaming enforcement recommended last month, after a two-month hearing in which Hefner testified, that the licence be refused. A government attorney, summing up the case against the *Playboy* publisher, told the commission it was the opinion of New Jersey's Attorney-General and the gaming enforcement division 'that Hugh M. Hefner and *Playboy* are unfit and unwelcome to operate a casino in the state of New Jersey.'

Deputy Attorney-General James Flanagan said *Playboy* and Hefner were ineligible for a licence under the state's Casino Control Act because 'they committed the crime of bribery' in making payments to New York officials 20 years ago for a liquor licence for the New York Playboy Club. He said they also permitted the company's British subsidiary to violate Britain's casino regulations.

That refers to the point that I was making, namely, that under the British Gaming Act Hefner was also one of those involved in breaking the regulations. The article continues:

British authorities refused last year to relicence two Playboy casinos in London. Playboy decided not to appeal and sold its gaming interests throughout England.

The manager was sacked and given a substantial golden handshake. The committee also looked at the involvement of organised crime in Victoria. In that State a considerable study into casinos was made two years ago. I think it is important to note the comments that were made following that study. It was stated:

The main attraction of Melbourne as a major base for organised crime is the fact that it is the only eastern Australian city with an international airport that operates the full 24 hours of the day. In latter years Sydney's international airport has been curfewed at night because of noise problems with local residents.

Thank goodness that Adelaide will have a curfew on its international airport. Further, it was stated:

This was the critical ingredient that caused organised crime to select Melbourne as the site for a casino, though other attractions were also important, such as Melbourne's prominence in the political and financial life of Australia. The casino is essential to organised crime in Australia for two major reasons and one minor reason. First, it provides the last link in the crime chain—the washing of money. This process turns black money from illicit sources such as drugs, pornography, armed robbery and prostitution into legitimate money.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** You can do it on the race track.

**Mr BECKER:** Nowhere near to the extent that one can do it at a casino. It was further stated:

Furthermore, as earnings from gambling are not taxable in Australia no losses are incurred by the use of this particular process for washing money.

There are two situations at which I am looking at present. As the Minister said by way of interjection, one can wash money on the race track.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** Or in my pharmacy.

**Mr BECKER:** I have been pulled up many times for relating stories about the bank at which I used to work, but unfortunately, one of the officers of the branch embezzled \$32 000, and claimed that he had lost all that money on racecourses in South Australia. Two leading bookmakers banked at the branch with which I was involved and I asked them if it was possible for one person to lose that amount of money over a six-week period. I was told that it was physically impossible, because they would know about it. They had not noticed any large punter on the racecourses within this State. Subsequently, after the person was found guilty and had served a sentence, the police did not let up on him and found that he had buried the bulk of that money somewhere else; he had not lost the bulk of it at the racecourse, as he had claimed in court. I would point out to the Minister that anyone trying to launder large sums of money would soon be noticed on the racecourse, because, human nature being what it is, everyone wants a slice of the action.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** You are really talking about changing money.

**Mr BECKER:** Yes. There is another system of laundering money in this country, and I referred this matter to Senator Messner. I cannot remember all of the details, except that through the Foreign Investment Review Board companies are being established in Australia. One company has just received a Federal Government contract in South Australia, and that company will lose more than \$500 000 in the first year—there is no doubt about that. It is a substantially paid-up company, with significant capital.

The idea is that the company loses this sum and for every \$1 it loses, it can legitimately bring in \$2. By losing \$500 000, it can legally bring into this country \$1 000 000. While this is a very high percentage to pay for washing money, this money is coming through Hong Kong and we still think it is involved in the shades of the Nugan Hand organisation. There are some pretty smart operators in the world and there is a lot of off-shore money. We are talking about \$100 000 000 here and \$50 000 000 there at 4 per cent or 7 per cent. Money is available for investment or use in this country if anyone wants to be involved in it. Some of these people are prepared to pay up to 30 per cent to wash money. I have no fears that that is happening and that it is about to happen.

I also understand that certain gambling syndicates are extremely interested in the South Australian situation, and would be very interested in the outcome of this debate, because South Australia would complete the South-East Asian link. It is a wellknown fact that syndicates of gamblers will come down through Darwin and Alice Springs, they will go to Hobart, Launceston, and then out. If Adelaide can be added to that link, no doubt we will see the presence of extremely wealthy and honourable South-East Asian gentlemen. That would be the first area of clientele.

I have it on very good authority that this is part and parcel of the reason why these people are very interested. This syndicate is not frightened to spend money on first-class accommodation, facilities and entertainment. From a purely tourist point of view, it would be very hard to resist attracting that sort of person, but that is a very minor by-product of casinos. We must consider the type of person that we would bring into this State. These travellers (and I would not call them tourists) are big professional gamblers.

We are talking again in terms of millions of dollars Australian. Certainly, those people live well and they spend well over and above what they spend at casinos. It is further stated:

There are in fact numerous ways in which black money can be washed including other major forms of gambling and investment in legitimate business enterprises such as land, property development and reputable companies. However, casinos of the large 'supermarket' type or the smaller 'club' type facilitate the washing of money at great speed, volume and profitability with a minimum chance of detection. All casinos throughout the world are used by organised crime for washing black money to a greater or lesser degree. With most casinos there is also usually a syndicate involvement in ownership and management. Recent British experiences indicate that even the most stringent regulation by government cannot keep organised crime out of casinos.

Over the past few months organised crime in the United States has temporarily stopped using the Las Vegas casinos for large-scale washing of money, because of an F.B.I. crackdown. Instead, they have purchased enormous quantities of gold in Mexico and brought the gold back to the United States. However, there is little doubt that, when other priorities and manpower problems cause F.B.I. pressure to ease off, organised crime will revert to using the Las Vegas casinos as normal.

As far as the Wrest Point casino in Hobart is concerned, two authoritative domestic sources state that 60 to 70 per cent of the volume of money going through the casino is black money being washed. The Darwin casino will increasingly be used for the same purpose. Nevertheless, as neither the Hobart nor Darwin casinos has immediate access to a 24-hour international airport they do create a certain logistical inconvenience for organised crime. Hence the attraction of a casino in Melbourne—

I point out that this report finally opposed the establishment of a casino in Melbourne—

which would enable couriers to move in and out around the clock from the U.S. West Coast, South-East Asia, the Pacific, South America and South Africa. As Melbourne is in a convenient central position in relation to domestic air routes, it would also be of great advantage in washing internally generated black money.

The second major reason organised crime is working towards the casino in Melbourne is to establish a general administrative headquarters that is centrally located on the Australian continent. Sydney and Canberra are in a similar position, but for political, financial and transport reasons Melbourne offers the best location from which to exert effective influence over the vast bulk of the Australian population.

This report was compiled for me before the announcement of international facilities at Adelaide Airport. The report continues:

It is apparently anticipated that the casino in Melbourne would act as a point of focus for organised crime in Australia and the South-East Asian and South Pacific regions. Syndicate leaders from Australia and overseas could meet each other there, hold conferences, conclude agreements and generally use the casino in much the same way as executives of a multi-national corporation would use their head office.

It is big business. The report continues:

The Hobart casino is already used for this second purpose, but the already mentioned logistical problems do limit its effectiveness as an administrative headquarters. Apart from the two main reasons discussed above, Melbourne has a third minor use as a casino location, namely, generating some revenue from prostitution. Several domestic sources have made reference to the existing sophisticated brothel facilities at Wrest Point, which include the use of Asian girls on a contract basis. In Darwin, one domestic source has given information that one of the first actions of the casino management was to buy out the largest local escort agency. Melbourne would of course provide both a larger potential market for casino brothel services and wider scope for the recruitment of girls and boys, particularly in view of the significant control already exercised over Melbourne's massage parlours and escort agencies by organised crime.

It is apparent that casinos are an integral part of the operations of organised crime and that it is virtually impossible to exclude such interests from casinos. Therefore, a refusal by both Federal and State Governments to license further casinos in Australia would be a major impediment to the growth of organised crime. It would also be of great advantage if existing casinos were closed forthwith.

By reading those extracts, I am trying to demonstrate the difficulty that would face a select committee. It is also the problem that faces members of Parliament in making a



judgment on the information provided, including the source of the information, its reliability and accuracy. At the same time, we must use the best facilities available to us.

I am grateful to the select committee for going to the trouble of preparing such an extensive report for presentation to Parliament. As I have said, the whole matter has been debated on many occasions in this House, and I have very closely considered it, from a personal point of view, as well as an electoral point of view. As I have said before, I am not prepared to support a licensed casino in this State in any shape or form.

**Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition):** I do not enter this debate with any great pleasure, because I have found the whole sorry saga of the examination and evaluation of a casino by this Parliament to be one that does little credit to the Government and the way in which it has handled this matter. I say immediately at the outset that I find the report of the Select Committee on the Casino Bill a very useful, thorough and valuable document, and I congratulate the committee on the way in which it tackled a large task, collated that material and gave us concrete information on matters about which much speculation has been rife and on which there has not been much factual information.

In making his contribution, the Premier talked about the Government's intention to allow full and informed debate. He saw the report as being conducive to such quiet and informed debate. Certainly, it is true that debate on this matter previously in this Parliament and, I would imagine, in other places has relied much on emotional feelings, on what one might call 'gut reactions', rather than on fairly objective evidence. It is important in assessing the report that we take it on that basis: that it is the considered views and assessment of a group of members with no particular axe to grind. That is not to say that they did not commence the exercise with certain views about casinos. Obviously, some members of the committee felt *prima facie* that there was a case for the establishment of a casino, and probably others felt *prima facie* that there was not. That in itself was a good thing. I imagine that the committee was able therefore to examine the witnesses and the evidence in a way that allowed their joint discussions, which resulted in the presentation of this report, to create some sort of consensus of views amongst them. Therefore, it is a document that we should consider closely and objectively.

A number of contributions have been made so far in the debate, and certainly I do not take exception to much of what has been said. There have been some well thought out and considered views expressed on both sides of the House on what is essentially a conscience issue. I will single out only two or three contributions on which I will speak specifically, because they need to be singled out.

I must admit that the contribution that I heard earlier in the debate from a member of the committee, the member for Glenelg, I found to be quite alarming. I was surprised that someone who had participated in the exercise and who had associated himself with this report could speak in the way he did about the issue and about the report. Where is the honourable member's minority report? The views he has certainly do not square up with what we are told are the committee's findings in this report. I searched in vain in looking at it for a statement saying, 'The committee recommended ABC with the exception of the member for Glenelg, who takes the view that XYZ.' That is not there anywhere.

I looked in vain for an appendix indicating that the member for Glenelg had some specific viewpoint or variation from some of the committee's findings, but that is not there either. Instead, we had to wait for his contribution in the debate today, when he seemed to canvass matters that I

thought were canvassed and discussed in the report. Whether I agreed with those findings or not, I would have thought that, as a member of the committee, he could at least voice his objections within the committee and, if the committee was unable to accept his particular views, he could find some way of expressing them in the course of the deliberations. He did not, and I thought it was a pretty odd way to perform. I guess that it is all part of that process by which we see, in particular, the Chairman of the committee being exposed by his colleagues in a way that I find quite despicable, and I will come back to that in a moment.

The honourable member talked about the effect of a casino on other industries, that they could not be allowed to go down, yet if one reads the report that point has been dealt with in a number of passages, and I would like to refer to them.

For instance, the South Australian Tourism Development Board made a submission. Incidentally, Mr Inns, the Director of Tourism, is Chairman of that board and not only presented figures from his own department but also, as Chairman of that board, submitted that there had been no adverse effect on other forms of gambling in Tasmania. The report deals with that point on page 141, as follows:

The committee believes that the problem facing the racing industry—

the committee was looking at the particular effect there, which was alluded to by the member for Glenelg—

is not so much competition for the 'gambling dollar' but competition for the entertainment dollar generally.

I suggest that that certainly does not support the propositions being put by the honourable member. At page 143, in the report with which he was associated and in which he concurred until he got to his feet tonight to unload his colleagues, this is stated:

In the end, the situation may be that instead of competing, the different aspects of gambling will have to be complementary. This would also apply to casino gambling.

That is the point dealt with in the report, and, if the honourable member disagreed with that, he should have presented us with substantive evidence in contradiction of what the report tells us. The honourable member also talked about the impact in Nevada on lower income earners and how they were affected by casinos. Again, I understood from this report, with which he was associated, that the specific finding was that lower income earners by and large did not patronise casinos, that casinos were pitched at and attracted the custom of those at what one might call the upper end of the market, and that it was not, if you like, a vice of the working class but something that the more affluent in our society used.

Again, I suggest that it is extraordinary that, if the member had those views, they were not expressed in the course of the committee's deliberations. He has quoted from the report a passage with which he apparently does not agree and he says that this is fixed by what the Morin Report suggests. They are his words. The member quoted at length from that report. I ask the simple question: was that report not before the committee? Are there not a number of passages in which that report is specifically referred to by the committee? If that is so, why did the member for Glenelg not at that stage insist that the findings of that committee be incorporated in those particular areas if he thought it relevant and, if the committee would not accede to that, why did the honourable member not produce a minority report?

I thought that his contribution was not only confusing to those of us who have to try to make a decision on this report, but also downright dishonest in terms of his participation on that committee. I wish he had told us earlier either that he felt he could not be associated with the committee or that he had very divergent views from it.

The next contribution with which I will deal is the one we have just had from the member for Hanson. He spent about 50 per cent of his time giving us a discussion on the position with United Kingdom casinos and what happened there. Again, I ask the simple question: has he not read the report? I have read it and I noted that point in particular, because I was concerned about the position with the United Kingdom casinos and what I thought was a bad position and an unhealthy way of organising those things.

I was very interested in what the committee thought about this. As I understand the report, the committee specifically and directly rejected any kind of reproduction of the United Kingdom casino system in South Australia, so I ask why the member is wasting his time reading extracts on what has happened with casinos in Britain, when the committee, whose report we are debating, has said that it does not believe that is relevant and we certainly do not want to reproduce that experience in South Australia.

Again, I suggest that that is an example of the sort of muddled thinking that has gone on in many of the contributions in this debate today. People have simply taken the report and imposed their particular prejudices and attitudes on it. The member for Hanson's contribution perhaps started from his thinking about casinos based on his reading about the United Kingdom experience and so he thought, 'That is a bad thing; therefore, I do not like this idea.' That is fine, but why has his thinking stopped there? Why has he not looked at what the committee actually said?

The next bit of his speech consisted of something about Melbourne and organised crime. Again, I would suggest that organised crime, its role, and the dangers involved there are well and thoroughly canvassed in the select committee report. Those dangers are acknowledged, and specific and positive proposals are made as to how those problems can be minimised or overcome. However, there was no mention in some of the contributions today of those very constructive recommendations made by members of that committee.

Let me turn to the contribution made by the Premier, because I was extremely interested in that. I was hoping, again in vain, that in his contribution he would tell us fairly directly why this particular Bill was introduced in the circumstances in which it was introduced. Why was it that a Government which had consistently set its face against this proposal produced a Bill to this Parliament and demanded that there be a select committee to examine it?

Members will remember the sequence of events and the two matters that we had before us last year—the specific Bill produced by the member for Semaphore and the motion moved by the member for Gilles. Neither of those matters was taken up by the Government—both were rejected. It is irrelevant for the Government to say that the Labor Party did not support the member for Semaphore's Bill. We did not support that Bill because we were supporting the proposition put forward by the member for Gilles because we thought that that was a better proposition.

However, if the Government felt that an investigation into a casino in South Australia was a desirable and useful thing, it could easily have picked up either of those propositions and ensured that it was carried and that there was an investigation in consequence of that happening. However, the Government did not do that; it opposed both of those propositions and opposed them very roundly while it reaffirmed the things it had been saying for the previous two years. Then, out of the blue, a Bill was presented to this Parliament on this matter.

A Bill has to be drawn up by the Parliamentary Counsel who, in turn, has to receive instructions from somebody. Those instructions, in the normal course of events (if it is a Government Bill), come from Cabinet. Those instructions represent a Government decision. A Minister, or the Premier,

puts to Cabinet a submission advocating that a Bill be drawn along certain lines or principles. Then, the Parliamentary Draftsman, in consequence of a Cabinet decision, is given his instructions to draw that Bill. On this occasion the Bill was presented, had been drawn by the Draftsman, presumably after research and after Cabinet had considered it, yet, at no time have we had a satisfactory explanation as to the change of policy by this Government.

I searched this select committee report in vain (and I think this is one of its major deficiencies) for any reference as to what were the circumstances under which this Bill was presented to us. I guess that the committee could argue that that was not in its terms of reference, but I think if committee members had noted the second reading debate that occurred prior to the establishment of that committee they should have taken that into account. All the Premier could say about that matter tonight was that the Bill was introduced to allow full and informed debate. It was not, he said, a measure that had Government sponsorship or endorsement.

That has typified the actions of the Government throughout, and I guess that is where we come to the role of the somewhat hapless Minister of Recreation and Sport who, once again, will be left high and dry on the beach by his Cabinet colleagues in a quite outrageous lack of solidarity. He was given the task of chairing the committee, of steering legislation through, and of taking the running. He is in a marginal seat which makes their willingness to unload him more—

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** He has made that seat safe.

**An honourable member:** It is not marginal any more.

**Mr BANNON:** I am glad that members opposite have the confidence that I suspect the Minister has not got. Nonetheless I am not attempting to put pressure on him: I am simply suggesting that, having been put in charge of this measure, he now may realise that it is pretty scurrilous that he has been unloaded by his colleagues and his Party. We know some of the background: this is the smart, tactical thinking of the Premier. He thought, 'A casino might be a popular thing. It will at least indicate my Government is doing something and, heaven knows, we have very little to point to. How can we achieve that? I know a number of the Party will oppose it. What we will do is to get Cabinet to agree to a Bill to be drawn which we will introduce. However, I will not bind Cabinet members to it: I will allow them to publicly distance themselves from it.'

**Mr Ashenden:** It is a conscience vote.

**Mr BANNON:** It is a conscience vote. The Premier's thinking continued, 'We will take this Government decision; it is not a private member's Bill. We will introduce the Bill as a Government measure and, while I know we will not be able to get unified support from my Party over it, I believe the Labor Party will be prepared to support it. Indeed we win both ways. All the acrimony of those who oppose casinos can be turned away by saying to them as they write in their petitions and letters, 'Dear me, the Labor Party was responsible because it gave its support to this and, without its support, this could not have got through'. That is what you say to that side. To the others who support the casino, you say, 'Look at this great achievement of my Government. I have done what Dunstan and everyone else in the past could not do: I have got you a casino'. So, as the Premier saw it, it was a no-lose situation, a smart tactical manoeuvre.

I suggest the way the debate has developed has blown that up, but he was not honest enough in his contribution to the debate earlier today to talk about that. All he did was to distance himself by saying that it did not have Government sponsorship and endorsement: the Minister can float free and look after himself when the time comes.

The Premier indicated he was going to support the report. He says it confirms the most attractive aspects of a casino. The first and most attractive point is that it indicates it will be a boost for tourism: it will bring in extra visitors.

A little while ago the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was expressing his views on the Bill, and he doubted this tourism aspect. I thought it was very interesting that, as he was making those comments about what he felt was going to be the tourism effect of it, the Minister of Tourism said very loudly, 'Hear, hear!'. In other words, she agreed that a casino would have no impact whatsoever on tourism and was not desirable for tourists. Yet, the Premier, her Leader, is telling us that the most attractive feature of this report is that it demonstrates there will be a boost for tourism. What is the answer, and what is the Minister on about? At page 122 the Minister's own Director of the Department of Tourism, Mr Graham Inns, said:

Thus it is estimated that the opening of a casino in South Australia could sustain visitor growth of between 8 per cent and 12 per cent, in addition to expected growth, over a two-year period using the year 1980-81 as a base.

He then goes on to extrapolate that on the spin-off effect on employment and prosperity. Later, that very same Director who reports to the Minister of Tourism says in his submission:

It has been demonstrated throughout the world that large-scale convention facilities would not operate profitably by themselves. They are not self-supporting.

He went on to say:

That is not to say it always requires the presence of a casino to make them viable.

But the implication is very heavily that a casino would make a considerable difference to their viability. Later in the Select Committee's report that message is reinforced. If all that happens under the name of the Director of Tourism, with the Minister saying it has absolutely no effect and the Premier contradicting her, just where is the Government going? What is its view? I will answer that in a second. I am asking the Government, which is in charge of decisions. I know that it has become its practice to ask us what the Opposition would do, and I appreciate the compliment. The Government sees the Opposition as definitely being in the position of making those decisions, and we soon will be. Thank you for the compliment, but just remember that the Liberal Party is in Government, and it has totally contradictory attitudes to the Bill from the Minister of Tourism and the Premier; total disagreement. In fact, a senior Government officer supports the Premier against the Minister. Either the Minister should resign or the Director should resign. I would like to know who will, because that is the position.

The Premier says that the casino will lead to a multi-faceted development, as an open style, and that that makes the inquiry worth while. In certain respects, I agree with the Premier. I believe that, on balance, a casino can assist tourism and can lead to a major multi-faceted development, which heaven knows we need in this State at this moment.

I believe that examining the report, bearing in mind all doubts and problems, the committee has established safeguards within its recommendations that make it worthy of support. Let me say, though, that I would have felt very much easier and happier if the committee had recommended a fully Government-controlled and Government-owned casino. This has been suggested by a number of speakers on my side of the House. From my own experience I know, having been to Vienna where there is such a casino, that that can be run very successfully, that it is financially profitable and provides a good tourist outlet, but is not gawdy or elaborate and certainly is not a place where money is laundered and major crime gathers. It is run in that way.

I think that that sort of thing can be done in South Australia and that is why I am looking forward to the amendment that has been canvassed by the member for Fisher which I understand he will move. I am prepared to support the member for Fisher in his amendment, and I know that there are probably other honourable members who also will support him, because I find that a preferable view to the findings of the committee. If in the end that amendment to be moved by the honourable member is not supported, we must fall back on the report.

Despite the total cynicism of the Government, the disarray within Cabinet and the conflict between its views on what tourist development should involve, I am prepared to say that, on balance, the recommendations the committee has made should be supported. In saying that, I recognise that not all my colleagues agree with me. It is a conscience vote, and I am exercising my conscience. I make clear that there is an enormous difference between a private member's Bill based around a conscience vote and a Government measure introduced with the concurrence of Cabinet. Let that not be forgotten. Let us get this whole debate into perspective, and also the attitudes we take to it.

I come to the decision that I am making very reluctantly indeed, but I come to it because I believe that an objective, unemotional study of the evidence presented supports the committee. But it is in the interests of South Australia that the sort of development envisaged takes place and I believe that it can be achieved if the recommendations of this report are put in place, although more particularly the suggested proposal of the member for Fisher.

I suggest that if members look at the position in that light they may feel inclined to support it. However, I fully understand those members on this side of the Chamber in particular who are disgusted with the way in which this measure has been promoted and feel that, in the circumstances of its presentation (notwithstanding the honest and thorough job the committee did) the proposal is such that they cannot support it. I respect that view, and I respect their right to uphold it.

I simply reiterate that, with considerable misgivings in a sense of having to be associated with some of the skulduggery that has gone on among members opposite, I will be supporting the committee.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture):** I recognise that the primary purpose of this debate is to note the report of the Select Committee on the Casino Bill, 1982. However, in proceeding I am aware, from remarks that have already been made by members who have spoken on this issue and from the widely discussed numbers situation, that the Casino Bill will not pass this House at this time.

**Mr Hemmings:** How do you know?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** The term 'casino' has become a magic word. It seems to attract a climate of mystery and even fear when it is discussed, particularly when it is debated publicly in the Houses of Parliament. That has certainly been the case on each occasion when the subject has been raised in this Parliament. From reports of debates in other like places, that is very evident. It is readily conceded that I, too, was concerned about and strongly opposed to the clumsily presented legislation before this House in 1973 and, indeed, with a tonne of justification again in 1981, when there was a fair dinkum political debacle to say the least. I believe now, however, with the benefit of the select committee's report, a copy of which every member has received, that we are in a better position to debate the subject on its merits, indeed, without an imbalance of emotion. There are still those who either refuse to read the select committee report thoroughly or who have deep conscience

reasons for declining the opportunity to debate the matter in this House. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted.

**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.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I respect those people who have, for the reasons ventilated, either declined to read a report thoroughly or for deep conscience reasons have chosen not to debate the matter in the House. I also, of course, respect the views of my own constituents who have, at least in the 1973 situation, expressed their views on and opposition to a casino being established in South Australia. However, I propose on this occasion to meet the subject head on in order to deal with the relevant and positive issues without being overcome by the kind of emotion to which I referred earlier. With both further personal experience and a great deal more research in the interim I, too, feel better qualified this time to debate this subject and give it the rational attention it deserves.

Let us not kid ourselves: the gambling games of roulette, baccarat, keno, club pooton or blackjack, as it is commonly known, as well as two-up, have for generations been played and will continue to be played in every State of Australia. I challenge any member to dispute that claim, namely, that illegal gambling of the type described has occurred and will continue to occur, despite attempts from time to time to stamp out that illegal practice. Because those efforts are not successful, these games will bob up again and again.

Apart from the wellknown premises set up for illegal gambling in Sydney and Perth, for example, here in our city of Adelaide on 23 September 1977 the practice was revealed in a Government building at Netley, from which building a truck load of gambling equipment was removed. There is evidence before us to indicate the undesirable features of such illegal activities and the real problems that can and clearly do emerge if these practices are undertaken. I hasten to acknowledge the enormous amount of effort and expense incurred by our respected Police Force in South Australia in its attempts to stamp out this sort of practice and, indeed, other similar illegal gambling practices.

The underlining question referred to in the select committee's deliberations, and now effectively before this House, is whether or not the cited games should be licensed, and thereby legalised, controlled and subjected to Government audit and taxation, such as race horse betting, X-lotto, instant money, bingo, pools, chance raffles, art unions, and so on.

The term 'casino' merely refers to the premises in which the games are played or housed. The stigma, the fear of alleged criminal connections with casinos, in other countries has not been sustained here in Australia, at Hobart, Launceston, Alice Springs, or Darwin. Certainly, such a fear has not been sustained by hard evidence, following vigorous surveillance of those licensed premises established in Australia.

The official report, on which we are all bound at this time to rely, plus my personal observations in recent years, lead me to firmly support that view. I believe, therefore, that the games to which I have referred should be collectively legalised, but be under tight scrutiny, supervision and control of the type identified in the Government's Bill, together with the proposed amendments and the recommendations put forward in the select committee's report.

Given the successful passage of the amendments, it is my intention to support my colleague, the Chairman of the committee (the Minister of Recreation and Sport) in this measure. It is interesting to note that one of the earlier

remarks in the select committee's report refers to the fact that many people are unfamiliar with the background and history of casinos. Indeed, I believe that many people are not the slightest bit interested in the background and history of casinos, but, for the benefit of those who are, it is appropriate that the homework on the matter be done and be seen to be done. I believe that in this instance it has been done by my colleagues on the committee.

Generally, I would describe as rather historic the history and background associated with overseas casinos. However, there are one or two matters to which I want to refer and which I would like to have incorporated in *Hansard*. In regard to the feeling of the population on this matter, reference is made on page 7 of the report to a United States study, as follows:

Slowly but surely the pendulum began to swing towards legalisation. Despite persistent opposition from the clergy and various reform and women's groups, the Nevada Legislature in 1931 finally passed a new 'wide open gambling Bill' that legalised all forms of casino gambling. However, it was at least 10 years before grandiose casino developments occurred.

The reference on page 9 to the current situation in South Australia simply identifies the premises that have been legalised and their specific State locations. On page 10, in relation to the nature of casinos, it is stated:

A customer may enter a casino with \$500 in his pocket; two hours later he may have only \$300; after three hours he may have \$600. The final determinative figure is complete when the player leaves the casino with either more or less than the \$500 he had initially.

That is an incredible statement to be incorporated in a report of this kind, if I may say so, but at least it demonstrates that someone did his homework to a finite degree. It is further stated:

This is to be contrasted with the situation that exists at race-courses where individual transactions are recorded by the book-maker.

The interesting aspect of that paragraph is cited further down on page 10 of the report, where the following is stated:

The revenue or profit of the casino is derived from its operation of the percentage return, which is determined by mathematical probabilities concerning a particular game.

Alternatively, it takes a commission on winnings. In return, it provides the facilities and amenities for the playing of games. This aspect is not apparent in any Australian casinos.

The last line at the top of page 11 of the report is significant, and we should all remember it. On page 12, one paragraph captured my attention. In regard to open-style casinos, it is stated:

This is the only type of casino which is now in Australia or projected for Australia. It is based on the philosophy that it is another form of business which will add to the capital development and infrastructure of the State.

That is probably the embracing paragraph in that section of the report, and it firmly implies the advantages of development of other associated facilities and infrastructures in the State, matters that the Premier canvassed in his supporting remarks to the Bill. On page 16, regarding the situation as reported by the Western Australian Royal Commission into Gambling, it was stated:

Certainly as far as we ascertain, the many reputable casinos in France, Monaco, Germany and Italy, where the gambling laws are far more liberal, do not appear to have generated the organised crime and other social evils which are said to have resulted from gambling in the United States. We do not think a properly established and effectively controlled casino in Western Australia would bring very significant increase in crime or in drug taking or prostitution in its train. The Tasmanian experience is that it has not done so, and there is no reason for thinking it would be very different in Western Australia.

I do not know how much more the members of this place or, indeed, members of the public need in reassurance following a statement of that kind, and there are many more such comments if one wants to see a balanced expression

of the select committee report as a whole. Even in the United States, where allegedly crime and/or drugs were the ingredients of casinos over a long period of years, a report by a commission review in that country stated:

Compared to the situation 15 years ago, the presence of organised crime in Nevada is negligible.

Clearly, in each case where the subject of associated crime is reported, as the controls, surveillance and security measures are installed, the alleged crime factor diminishes. I repeat that, according to this very report, it is not only seen as negligible in more recently established casinos around the world, but it is just not evident in Australian based casinos. The Morin Report, which has been mentioned tonight, albeit selectively by a number of speakers, stated that Nevada has used its 45 years experience in gaming to develop a regulation system that is sophisticated, efficient and, on the whole, capable of maintaining the integrity of the gaming industry at an acceptable level. The Morin Commission went on to report:

Because scrupulously controlled private enterprise has proven successful in Nevada, the commission recommends that basic framework to any State wishing to legalise casinos.

Again, I believe a significant amount of evidence has been identified to support the contention that there is an absence of criminal elements in legal casino premises and, in this particular instance, the select committee report has identified a commission report which recommends that private enterprise involvement be prominent in the establishment of such premises. The commission further reported:

Should a State decide to legalise casinos, the commission believes that private enterprise is the best vehicle for ensuring that they are effectively maintained.

A casino should not be built simply for the purpose of instituting a facility in South Australia, if a casino is established at all, but to ensure on behalf of the public and, indeed, on behalf of investors and patrons that the premise is maintained at an appropriate level of control.

Another matter that has been mentioned is the subject of the possible impact on the existing racing codes. The committee found in its own right and reported that there is a possibility—although that is yet to be determined—that other existing forms of legalised gambling, such as race tracks and lotteries, will find their revenues decreased as a result of competition from the new source.

The Report on the Inquiry into the Legalising of Gambling Casinos in New South Wales, conducted by the Hon. E. A. Lusher, Q.C., recommended that key casinos be legalised in that State. I certainly do not have time in this debate to mention all of the points made by all of the reports and studies that have been undertaken on this subject. However, that report recommended in the general section that a casino be identified as a casino and nothing else and be limited to the playing of casino games in the approved form of French and American roulette, dice, blackjack, baccarat, and two-up. I certainly agree with the report that poker machines should be kept out of any premises which may be installed in this State in the future.

The Standing Committee on Tourism and Recreation has been mentioned by members on both sides of the House. I do not have much to contribute in that regard. I readily concede that I have not studied the financial economics of this subject to the extent that other members have. It is interesting to note on the bottom of page 21 of the committee's report the situation that has developed in Tasmania. The select committee and its staff spent four days at Wrest Point and formed the opinion, having talked with representatives of the casino, Government inspectorate and a wide cross-section of the Hobart community, that a casino was now an accepted part of the Hobart community's entertainment lifestyle. I do not know that we could find any better

evidence of publicly favourable comment from any further study and consideration of the position in that State.

The select committee recommended an additional legislative requirement that all employees within such a casino be licensed. I believe that detailed matters of that type need no response in this debate because, as I said at the outset, there is no way in the world, on the numbers that have signalled their views on this subject so far, that this Bill will pass this House.

It is too early of course to make intelligent comment about the situation in the Northern Territory, where the Darwin casino is presently operating in temporary premises and, until the final structure is completed and licensing of the new casino is conducted, I am not in a position to comment on that. The interesting situation is in Queensland, the State that purports to be of such right-wing views, especially when one has regard to some of the attitudes on other issues by the Premier of that State. The Queensland recommendation and decision to provide two such facilities is startling news, to say the least. However, Queensland is adamant that a high standard of casino facility and an impeccable operation will be the guidelines for its premises.

The report contains an enormous amount of evidence supporting the financial benefits that may be derived from such an operation. Certainly, I am not in a position either to support or object to the findings but, from a straight-out revenue point of view, I am amazed that members have not made more reference to the details of the report. The Premier touched on it and one or two other members have lightly touched on this subject, but it would be interesting to know, if and when such a facility were developed in South Australia, whether that would be new money or money from the current racing codes or other forms of gambling available to the public at this time.

As I said earlier, in regard to the references to tourist facilities, that is something about which I would rather not speak. The next point that I would like to make in the debate refers to the committee's reaction to petitions bearing 12 000 signatures presented to Parliament during the process of this investigation. They are 12 000 signatures purporting to be from residents of South Australia opposed to the establishment of a casino in this State. Referring to receipt of the petitions, the committee stated, at page 48:

Nevertheless, it is conceded that there is a *prima facie* case that gambling is an integral part of Australian life. This has been heavily subscribed to by some witnesses.

Again, I have had no chance in the few days that the evidence and the report have been before us to read the evidence put forward by the witnesses, but I have had a chance to talk to the staff about the subject in general terms. It appears that an enormous amount of repeat petitions was put before the committee.

Somewhere along the line, certainly not on this occasion, now that it is clear that the Bill will not be successful in its passage through the Parliament, members should look at the fundamental function and the duty of a government. I did this, and I am pleased that the committee saw fit to incorporate a couple of paragraphs expressing its view, and it is worth recording its opinion in *Hansard*:

There is, however, one function and duty of government so fundamental that the consent of the governed to it must be assumed—namely, the maintenance of what is called 'law and order', upon which the very existence of the community depends. But this implies also that the rulers shall not impose their own will on others under the name of law but regard themselves as 'holding the ring' so that a natural law, which is acknowledged to be higher than the Government's law, may operate in society, preventing the imperfections of men from upsetting its balance beyond recovery. *The Just Tax*.

I gather that that was a reference submitted by Dr Geoffrey Dobbs. I am satisfied that the aspects of law and order can be incorporated in this proposed legislation if and when it

is successful. In this instance the committee has not only taken on board the evidence of witnesses but it has clearly identified for us all the measures that it believes are appropriate, and certainly significantly more control and surveillance than have ever been cited in an accompaniment to a casino Bill that has been before this House previously. I believe that, given those security and control measures that are proposed, there is no way in which our undertaking to ensure that law and order are upheld can be upset in this instance. I agree with the paragraphs that refer to our responsibilities, and the committee has cited sufficient evidence, in my view, to protect that aspect of the proposal.

I do not know that at this stage I should continue to contribute to this debate. I feel a little flat in this whole situation, because a few weeks ago it was clear to me from conversations with members of this House that there were sufficient numbers among us to support the legislation, sufficient members who declared their desire for a facility that was properly controlled and properly managed and was secure from the public safety point of view. I felt that those members would support that measure but, when the measure has come to the House, it is quite incredible that, for one reason or another best known to those members, they have drifted away from the subject.

**Mr Keneally:** But you're the same.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I do not believe that I am. I believe that there was good evidence, when the measures were before this House in 1973 and 1981, to oppose the proposals that were before us. However, with the enormous amount of work that has been done this time, it is incredible that members can receive that material, have the opportunity to read it, and beyond all doubt, in my mind and in the mind of most of those members, agree that it should proceed, and then for those members to get into this House and back away. That is unbelievable but that is the way it is in this place. I believe it is fair enough for them to exercise their vote and right in these circumstances. I am somewhat disappointed, as it would appear that a tremendous amount of work has been done and wasted.

**Mr KENEALLY (Stuart):** I support the noting of the report and, hopefully, my contribution tonight will be brief, as previous debates on this subject clearly indicate my consistent view on this important issue. I want to take up the concluding remarks made by the Minister of Agriculture. I do not know how many members who were here in 1973 have formed a consistent voting pattern on this subject, but certainly the Minister of Agriculture is not one of them. On every occasion that a measure of this kind has come before this House, I have supported it, and perhaps of all members I doubt that there is one who gambles less than I do. Nevertheless, I have always supported measures of this kind.

I do not reflect on anybody who changes his mind, as this is certainly a matter on which members can quite freely do that. I do not think that it adds anything to the debate to overhear the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture. I have no moral objection to a casino. It is merely another form of gambling in a society well accustomed to gambling. I have often argued in this House that it is not the role of Parliament to legislate for morality. As I have already mentioned, I am not a gambler, and frankly consider it a great waste of time and money. I have visited casinos, nevertheless, at Hobart and Darwin, and on one strange evening I even found myself in an illegal casino in Sydney. Even so, the only game on which I invested any money (and lost of course) was keno.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** That's pretty exciting.

**Mr KENEALLY:** As the Minister says, that is pretty exciting, but frankly gambling does not excite me at all. It

might be useful to say (and I was trying to remember earlier today just what my gambling performance might be) that I have had the odd bet on the Melbourne Cup. I did invest once on the T.A.B. and that was pretty complicated so I have never troubled to do so since. I have never bought an instant money ticket. I do not buy lottery tickets. Frankly, I do not gamble, because I think it is a waste of time. That does not mean that my money is not invested in all those worthy causes, because my wife and family do not always share the view I have about getting rich quick. I am quite happy for them to use my money in that way—it is just that I do not take that trouble.

Having said all that, of course, it is quite clear that I have never felt any compulsion to stop other citizens from exercising their right to make their own gambling choices, and I will not be doing so tonight. I do not intend to put forward any argument for or against a casino, because the report does that much more ably than I can. I am merely explaining the reasons for my voting decision. In my view, South Australia would not be enriched by a casino; I do not think it would be deprived of any virtue if the State did not have one. On the other hand, I do not envisage any of the dangers many people claim naturally flow from such a project. Because of my neutral view, never strong enough to compel me to vote against a casino, I was eagerly awaiting the report of the select committee. I do commend that committee for its report. I believe it to be a valuable reference document on all aspects of a casino project, but I believe it to be no more than that—it is a reference document.

I do not believe that this document will in any way change the mind of any person who has previously thought through their position on casinos. It merely confirms many of the views and prejudices already held by people. I will not take the trouble to quote from the report, but there is something there for everyone. There is something there for everyone to use and, if people are concerned enough to read *Hansard*, they will be equally concerned to obtain a copy of the report so that they may know for themselves exactly what that report contains.

I am strongly committed to the principle that a casino should be controlled by the Government and not by private enterprise. I was interested to see the member for Fisher on television tonight making a strong point about that issue. He stated that private enterprise is more subject to corruption and crime than a public venture would be. As a general principle, that is something with which I strongly agree, and I welcome to the ranks many of the Government members in this view.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** Can you explain what you mean by a Government-owned casino?

**Mr KENEALLY:** I mean Government-owned and Government-controlled.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** The whole complex?

**Mr KENEALLY:** Yes, anything to do with the casino at all I would want controlled by the Government. I know that the Minister is going to say that the Government could own it and lease it out. I would prefer a statutory authority established to run the casino in South Australia. I hope that answers the Minister's query.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** Are you opposed to the latter suggestion?

**Mr KENEALLY:** I have already indicated that I am voting in favour of the noting of the report and I will be voting in favour of the measure, so long as there is an amendment, as I understand has been suggested will appear before the Committee, to the effect that the casino is to be owned and controlled by the Government. That will get my wholehearted support. If that amendment is not moved and we come to the third reading with the measure as we have it now, in view of all the comments I have made before,

the Minister and supporters of this measure will lose me. It is important to my voting intentions that the indicated amendment be moved—that is of course if the Minister of Agriculture's forecast is correct, and he obviously has a more intimate knowledge of the voting patterns of individual members than I have. If we do reach the third reading stage, that will be my position.

One or two things have come out of the debate on which I wish to respond. First, there is the question of the electorate view. My position on the casino is clearly known to my electorate: I have voted consistently in the same way since 1973. I suggest to all members that, if one's electorate sees that the *status quo* will be changed, one is more likely to receive letters and approaches seeking that action not be taken than one will get approaches seeking one's approval of that action. The community at large sees this Parliament as moving towards creating a casino in South Australia. Those people who support that intention do not feel as compelled to contact a member of Parliament as do those people who oppose that intention. If we had a casino in South Australia and there was a measure before this House seeking to abolish that casino the bulk of approaches that members would receive would be from those seeking that the casino not be abolished. People desiring abolition would believe that Parliament was going to do that for them. That is one reason why the views one receives from one's electorate cannot always be relied on.

Secondly, the suggestion that on each piece of legislation coming before this House a member should have a referendum within his or her own electorate to find out the majority view is so impracticable as to be stupid. It just can not be done. However, there is a responsibility on members, as far as they are able, to judge the view of their electorate. I have no sympathy for those members who come into this House, make a decision not knowing their electorate's view, and say that that is what their electorate wishes them to do. They have no idea whether that is what their electorate wishes them to do, yet they hide behind that excuse for the decision they make.

By and large, members are elected to this place, first, because they represent a political Party, and, secondly, because the people within the electorate have some regard, and respect for the integrity and judgment of that person. So, the member should not always sublimate that judgment to the electorate at large. A member should take note of what the electorate says he should do, but he has a responsibility to make some of the more difficult decisions. He then holds himself responsible to the views of the electorate every three years (or every two years, as has been the recent practice in South Australia and Canberra). Generally speaking, I know that I have been elected because I represent the Labor Party: there is absolutely no other reason than that for my presence here.

If I did not have the A.L.P. tag on my candidature at elections, I would not be in this place. As this is not an issue on which the Labor Party has a policy, members are free to vote based on their conscience. I still say that honourable members ought not to hide behind the excuse that this is what their electorate wishes them to do, because not one member here, I suggest, knows accurately what his or her electorate wants them to do.

I believe that the Leader made a very telling speech. He highlighted one or two factors that ought to have been considered by this House. Before I come to that I want to get back to the matter of what the electorate's wish is. The Chief Secretary knows full well that, when legislation was suggested to establish a casino in South Australia, the council fathers of a city in which both he and I have a great interest, Port Pirie, immediately asked for that casino to be established in that town. We all know that that would be a very worthy

place for the casino to be established. One of the councillors at Port Pirie suggested that the State ought to reintroduce the old gulf trip concept and that the casino should be a floating casino. That is not all that strange an idea. I think that it has a lot of merit. It certainly would bring benefits to Port Lincoln, Port Augusta, Whyalla, Port Pirie and those other gulf towns. I mention that to indicate that the councils in my electorate, which sometimes disagree with me, on this particular occasion are at one with me.

Regarding tourism, the report says that a casino will increase tourism. I believe that one of the benefits of a casino in South Australia, as it is related to tourism, is that not only will it encourage people to come to South Australia, but it will hold in South Australia those people who are currently leaving the State and going to Alice Springs or Hobart to gamble. If this facility is established, it will be here for these people to spend their money. So, there are obviously tourist benefits in the establishment of a casino.

So, when we hear from those people in South Australia who are responsible for making tourist policies, for implementing policy and encouraging tourism, we would expect to find the Minister of Tourism and her Director as one. When the Leader of the Opposition pointed out the difference in views between those two persons, Ministers on the front bench tended to disagree with that. I ask any of those Ministers who are currently in the House, or those who are taking the trouble to listen, to tell me whether they would be prepared to have their departmental head giving to a select committee a completely opposite view to the view held by the Minister. Either the Minister is right in her view as to tourism and what should be done with a casino in South Australia, or the Director is right. They both cannot be right. The Minister of Tourism has a responsibility to members of this House to clearly state the official position of the Department of Tourism in South Australia. There is a conflict, and that conflict ought to be resolved.

I understand that the Minister of Tourism is not going to take the opportunity of speaking in this debate. That is shameful, because she has a responsibility. We have been told by the Premier that one of the reasons that he supports a casino in South Australia is related to the tourist benefit to the State. It is important that his Minister, the Minister of Tourism, participate. It is quite unbelievable, in my view, that she will not speak.

One other matter about which there seems to be quite a deal of confusion amongst members currently sitting on the Government benches, particularly those members who are in the Ministry, is that they do not understand the distinction between a private member's Bill that is a conscience issue that every member in the House can vote on, and a Bill that comes from a Cabinet decision.

Whilst I am prepared to admit that there have been occasions over the years when, for special reasons, members of Cabinet have not always supported a measure that has been introduced by Cabinet, overwhelmingly the contrary has been the case. A Bill that has been introduced as a result of a Cabinet decision can be expected to receive support by members of Cabinet. We have the example where the Minister for Recreation and Sport has, on two occasions in the life of this Parliament, been required to bring to the Parliament a select committee report on two very contentious issues. The first was the Prostitution Select Committee, of which I was a member. That was a very good report and was worthy of the support of this House. Because of a change of Government, the Minister was charged with bringing that report before the House. I do not believe he had the support of any of his Cabinet colleagues. Yet, he was required to carry that measure before the House. Now, on another occasion, he has been required to be the Chairman of a select committee on another con-

tentious social issue. It seems that many of his Cabinet colleagues are going to desert him again. I do not believe that any Minister should ever be placed in that situation.

**Mr Bannon:** It is nothing to do with recreation.

**Mr KENEALLY:** Exactly. If it was not going to be supported by all members of Cabinet, the Government ought to have got a private member to introduce the measure so that a Cabinet Minister would not be embarrassed in this way.

I did not intend to speak at length. However, I thought that those matters needed some comment. I will be supporting the noting of the select committee's report. I will be supporting any amendment that might be introduced to ensure that a casino in South Australia is Government-owned and Government run through the agency of a statutory body. I am not so strongly compelled one way or the other to move such an amendment but I will support any such amendment if it is moved. If no such amendment is moved and if it is going to be a privately run casino in South Australia, at the third reading I can forewarn the House it will not have my support.

**The Hon. J. W. OLSEN (Chief Secretary):** I support the noting of the report of the committee and commend the Chairman, the Minister of Recreation and Sport, and members of his committee for the thorough report that has been brought down and presented to the Parliament. However, I also indicate at this early stage in my remarks that I do not intend to support the establishment of a casino in South Australia. I will expand on my reasons for that in due course.

Some comments have been made by the Opposition that the Minister has brought this measure into the House and has been placed in a difficult and embarrassing situation, particularly in view of the fact that he holds a marginal seat. Far from that, I am quite sure that the calibre of the Minister of Recreation and Sport will be seen by the electors in Torrens and it will be seen that he is a man prepared to take issues such as this, have them thoroughly investigated, have the proceedings of the committee facilitated so that a comprehensive report of this nature can be brought before the Parliament, so that an informed view can be taken by members of the House. It is indicative of the calibre of the man. That will be, in my view, acknowledged by the electors of Torrens. That will be shown in the ballot-box at a later stage.

It does not matter how long the Leader or some of his colleagues try to perpetuate the view that there is disarray on the Government benches because different Ministers have a different conscience in the way they want to vote on the matter. It is a conscience vote and we are entitled to vote as we see fit and deem appropriate in the circumstances. It should be viewed as such.

Any criticism of Government Ministers or members exercising that right is shallow and shabby to say the least. I have found this issue to be a very complex and difficult one to resolve. On the one hand, as a Parliamentarian, I believe I have a responsibility to look at what prospects there may be for development in this State and what job opportunities will be created by a proposal of this nature, together with the benefit of a reduction in social problems generated by unemployment and other such issues. In other words, it is a matter of the advantages of a casino versus the social consequences and ill effects of a casino that may well flow from such a development.

Additionally, I have a responsibility to respect the views of my electors and, despite what the member for Stuart has said, I make no apology for having attempted to identify the wishes of people in my electorate and reflect their views in this Parliament and in the vote that will ensue in due

course. No other matter has generated as much correspondence coming into my office as has this issue. Whilst the correspondence may well be from the vocal minority expressing its view, as opposed to the silent majority within my electorate, at least those who have responded have at least taken the trouble to express their views quite clearly and concisely. I feel bound to respond to those views and to respond directly to those representations. As I have said, members of Parliament have a dual responsibility to the State as well as to their electors, and it has been the process of determining the order of those priorities and those competing interests that has been difficult.

**Mr Slater:** It might be up your way in the Bible belt.

**The Hon. J. W. OLSEN:** The honourable member refers to my electorate as the Bible belt. I am sure that those in my electorate who would acknowledge that would do so with pride: far be it for the honourable member to denigrate those people in my electorate who closely follow the Christian faith.

As Minister responsible for police services in this State, and thus crime prevention and detection, I have a responsibility to place every impediment in the way of organised crime. Whilst the report addresses that question and places a qualification on it, as well as indicating that in some areas, in fact, organised crime does not automatically flow from a casino, it seems to me that, despite those general assurances in the report, I would rather take the safe option in rejecting the casino proposal and thus avoid another opportunity for the development of an element of organised crime in South Australian society. Perhaps that could be said to be a cautious approach.

However, I must commend members of the committee for the diligent and thorough manner in which they investigated this matter and for their bringing a very detailed and excellent report before this Parliament. I hope that members of the general public who, to date, have shown an interest in the matter will write to express a point of view as well as take the opportunity to read the report and become informed on the issue surrounding casinos in general as well as the casino proposal in South Australia.

I believe that the Government in this instance, and the Minister particularly, should be commended for bringing the matter before the House in a concise piece of legislation and with a detailed report so that the House can clearly indicate its attitude. The Bill before the House last year was not clear or concise, and we as members of Parliament were not afforded an opportunity to debate this issue appropriately prior to a vote. That is not the case on this occasion, and the Government has facilitated the option for members of the Parliament to express their point of view quite clearly.

Total rejection of poker machines in South Australia is another aspect for which the Government should be commended. Certainly, some elements that are associated with poker machine operators interstate are most undesirable, and I certainly would not like to see those elements introduced into this State at any stage, whether associated with a casino or with any other aspect of community life. The Government, in making quite clear from the outset that poker machines were not on, made a very positive, responsible and decisive stand, and I commend it for that approach.

It is not my intention to speak at length in this debate and canvass issues that have already been raised by other members. In summary, while accepting the report, I advise the House that I will vote against the establishment of a casino in this State, in accordance with the wishes, as I perceive them, of the electors of Rocky River.

**Mr McRAE (Playford):** With pride, I support the motion and, secondly, I support the Bill, provided that the amendments are carried. I want to say one or two reasoned words



because, quite frankly, in many respects I have been sickened tonight, first by the lack of interest that some members have shown in reaching their judgment and, secondly, by the political arbitrariness with which some members have reached their conclusion.

I put to members that the true situation is that the Parliament as a whole sent this select committee upon an expedition to find the facts, to come to reasoned judgments and to report back to the Parliament accordingly. I am very proud to be associated with that committee, and I am also proud of its members and the Chairman. May I draw an analogy between the sort of activities on which we have been engaged and the deliberations of a court of appeal that is considering the decision of a lower court, because really that is the exercise. The Parliament as a whole is considering the soundness or otherwise of a decision of one of its constituent parts. I put to members that the judgment of the whole consists of a consideration in a number of matters. First, the test of a sound judgment or report lies in whether the people who produce the report did their research exhaustively.

I assure members that every single member of the select committee worked very hard and exhaustively on the whole brief given to the committee by Parliament, although, at times, I did not agree with every member of the committee. I suppose the second question that would be put by a court of appeal would be whether all the proposals for and against have been considered. I put it to members very seriously that all those proposals for and against have been considered in great depth and with great effort by all members of the committee. Any reasonable court of appeal would then ask whether the judgments and decisions reached have been fairly made in accordance with the evidence. I suggest that those judgments and decisions have been made fairly and justly in accordance with the evidence.

If there is a member of Parliament who has a moral view that all gambling is wrong, of course, everything that I have said to date counts for nothing at all, because that member has a perfect right in conscience to say, 'No, notwithstanding the committee's exhaustive examination of the evidence, I just do not believe that gambling in itself is right. Therefore, I will not support the committee's report; nor will I vote for the Bill or amendments.'

Any member who took that stance would have a perfect right in doing so. I must confess that I have been somewhat sickened tonight by the hypocrisy of some members of this Parliament. First, I refer to those members of Parliament who have referred to casino gambling as though it were some aberration of other forms of gambling. It is not. We know from evidence given by the South Australian Police Force—and what better evidence is available, because we have the best and cleanest Police Force in Australia, if not the world—that the biggest form of organised crime in this State is SP bookmaking.

Every single member of this House, if he is not a complete hypocrite and a liar, will know that within his electorate SP bookmakers are operating openly in hotels and other places, ripping off the taxpayer and the Government. What is more, the police told the committee that the amounts involved were not mere crumbs but amounted to between \$60 000 000 and \$200 000 000 in one year. I ask every member to consider that matter. That is the biggest form of organised crime in this State. Later in my speech I will consider the various forms of crime which I have always considered to be the most important part of this whole matter.

Reverting to the considerations of an appeal court, I suppose such a court would say 'If the questions that have come to us from an inferior court, a court that we set up to determine something for us, have been found to be positive, we should be able to decide whether the evidence

has been properly dissected and whether the judgments have been made objectively and fairly.' I assure all members that there is no doubt in my mind that every member of the select committee exhaustively considered, on some occasions to the detriment of their own health and welfare, every single consideration that was put before the committee.

Also, it is to the great credit of the Secretary of the committee, Mr Geoff Wilson, and the research officer, Mr Chris Sargent, that they worked as hard as they did. It is quite wrong to imply, as people have implied, that these answers that we have given were given from stress: they were not. We worked hard because we were required to work hard, just as we require our courts of appeal, criminal courts and juries to work hard and objectively. That is not to say that we are wrong: we worked objectively and clearly.

I am staggered and sickened at some of the hypocrisy that I have heard tonight. The facts of the matter are that the Minister, who was Chairman of the committee, was a very fair Chairman who worked hard and exhaustively at his task and deserves every credit for it. On the last occasion when he was given a task like this, he was let down by his colleagues.

**An honourable member:** The whole lot of them.

**Mr McRAE:** I will not go any further into that, but he was let down by his colleagues. The point I make concerns the hypocrisy of the whole matter. I am referring to the Prostitution Bill and the recommendations of that select committee, and pointing out that the report that we made then had been secretly carried out by administrative orders so as to buy off the churches on the one hand and, on the other hand, to keep the support of those who want to keep those brothels open. That is disgusting and sickening.

I will not stop short of that: I will name the organisations involved. First, there is Caesars, in Pulteney Street, the biggest brothel in Adelaide, still operating blatantly four years after our committee considered the matter. I refer to the hypocrisy of any Government that dares to say that it considered the matter dispassionately. That absolutely sickens me.

Secondly, I am disgusted at the number of members—putting aside those members who appropriately, because of their conscience decision, because they are against all gambling in any circumstances and who have said, 'No, I will vote against that Bill'—from both sides of the House who have not bothered to read the report or, if they have bothered to read it, have read it in such a cursory manner that it does not matter at all.

In the short time that is available to me, I want to deal with those aspects that the committee in its wisdom committed me to deal with. Other of my colleagues have dealt with the tourist and economic aspects. I want to deal with the types of crime that can be involved with a casino, and I begin with a most illuminating quotation from page 196 of the report in regard to what constitutes corporate crime. It is put this way:

White collar criminality in business is expressed most frequently in the form of misrepresentation in financial statements of corporations, manipulation in the stock exchange, commercial bribery, bribery of public officials directly or indirectly in order to serve favourable contracts and legislation, misrepresentation in advertising and salesmanship, embezzlement and misapplication of funds, short weights and measures and misgrading of commodities, tax frauds, misapplication of funds in receivership and bankruptcies. These are what are found in abundance in the business world.

That was a quotation from an American article entitled Sutherland, white colour criminology, American sociological review, volume 5, number 1, 1940. I should make clear that the late and unregretted Al Capone referred to that as 'legit crime'. There is no way the committee or any other committee can guarantee that a casino or any other form of

business in this State will work correctly and legally throughout its existence. People used to say that the Vatican was a good example of it until they found out about the grant from Mussolini of two billion dollars in 1935 and I, as a Roman Catholic, feel sick about that.

I am further sickened to find that the Bank Ambrosia apparently has gained five billion dollars from the Vatican in the past three years, and in the process, has destroyed the confidence of Roman Catholics throughout the world in giving money to people anywhere. If we are talking about corporate crime and asking the select committee to find a formula that will eliminate corporate crime, we are just damn foolish. I repeat the challenge that I made to the member for Norwood when he was speaking and raised matters like this.

Clearly, in the next few years, because of the Campbell Report, we will have merchant banks and other banks set up in Australia, and I defy anyone to suggest a totally foolproof programme that will prevent that sort of crime. Let me now turn to the second sort of crime with which we are concerned, namely, organised crime. Organised crime has to be clearly understood. Unless members have understood this correctly, they are failing in their duty to the electorate and to the people of South Australia. Organised crime is the most vicious and pernicious evil that can insinuate itself into any sort of society. That must be understood.

There was no-one on the committee, let alone myself, who did not understand that point very clearly. Organised crime really exists in two forms. First, it can exist in what is called the mafia form, where it is a type of pyramid where there is a boss on top and down through the pyramid levels there is a series of lieutenants who deal with different functions. That is not how organised crime has evolved in Australia. It has evolved mainly in the Eastern States and principally in New South Wales in the form of an aztec pyramid, a flattened top pyramid, with five or six key people at the top who form a kind of club.

Some of the most famous people associated with this kind of club are people like James Paddles Anderson, known as one of the worst criminals in this country, James Leonard McPherson, Abe Saffron, and others. So far as the South Australian police are concerned, there is only one connection with organised crime in South Australia and that is in the form of Abe Saffron. We were wisely advised by Professor Alfred McCoy, who was called at my request and who has world-wide knowledge on organised crime, that the best way to deal with people like that was to indelibly print their names on the minds of the people, and it should be well known that Abraham Saffron has been associated with organised crime in South Australia for many years, and that has existed in the hotel industry and the nightclub industry.

It should further be known that Saffron was involved with a man called Cerutto, who was well known to many people in this House, at least by reputation, in the late 1970s, and the drug racket that was organised between the two of them was considerable and damaging. Records of all that information are held in the Attorney-General's Department but were only uncovered by your committee, Sir, because one of the witnesses, Professor McCoy, decided to produce it to us. In other words, Sir, your own Government, having access to that information, did not give it to the committee. If this committee is to be criticised, as it has been tonight, for not going into things in depth, then I ask that your Attorney-General stand in his Chamber tomorrow, face his own members and address the public, telling them where organised crime stands in this State and where corporate crime stands in this State. I make that a deliberate challenge to him. I want to see that done.

How does one deal with a situation like that? It is impossible to compare a city like Adelaide, which is a small city, with Melbourne or Sydney, and quite impossible to compare it with Las Vegas or New Jersey. The reasons for that are perfectly obvious; none of the reports that have been quoted, either from America (the Morin Report) or from Britain (the Rothschild Report) are in any way relevant to this city, for obvious reasons. First, the Morin Report was dealing with an American structure which we know is saturated with Mafia influences. We know on all the evidence from the Watergate scandal onwards that it is saturated through to the White House. If it is saturated through to the White House, it is obvious that it saturates Las Vegas and New Jersey. That is the effect of all the expert evidence we have heard.

So far as London is concerned, it is quite clear that one cannot take the Rothschild Report as meaning anything relevant apart from the London area because the British authorities have quite clearly made a decision that the nobility and the rich people of London and the provinces can gamble as they wish, because there are 140 casinos and, as the Minister said, 30 inspectors to police them. It is ludicrous to believe that there can be any sort of policing of such a system.

The point I put to the House is that, unless honourable members have read this report and understood its implications before making their vote, then I put to them seriously that they are failing in their duty to their constituents. As to the points made as to the petitions put before this House, I think the member for Glenelg said that 12 000 persons signed those petitions. I doubt that any of the 12 000 persons who signed those petitions have read any of the reports or done any of the research that this select committee has done in an exhaustive effort on all our parts and on the part of all those who served under us. I also ask that the House note that 12 000 out of more than 600 000 adults in South Australia is a ludicrously small figure.

I want it to be noted that if this Bill is defeated then I will, as a matter of honesty (and I give notice of this), move within my Party room for the most exhaustive inquiry into horse racing, trotting and dog racing in this State, because I believe that all those forms of coursing are more saturated with potential manipulation and rottenness than casino gambling in the form we have known it in Australia could ever be.

In fact, in a jocular manner, one witness who appeared before the committee hit the nail on the head when he said that the fairest game in Australia was two-up. That witness was a man called Nappy Ollington, and he said, 'If you want to do anything, put a two-up stadium in Adelaide. That will make it very different. It is an honest game.' I think that it is an honest game, and it would make us different.

Before turning to my final topic, I want to turn to the Minister of Tourism, who I note is now present, because I did not want to speak in her absence. I am disgusted at the attitude that the Minister has adopted—not her attitude of conscience; she has a perfect right to her own conscience the same as all of us. However, I am very disturbed at the way in which it was incumbent upon this committee to try and get somebody from her department to attend before our hearing.

**Mr Slater:** She tried to veto the Director.

**Mr McRAE:** Indeed. As I am reminded by the member for Gilles, it was only because of the persistence of the committee that we finally got Mr Inns to appear before us at all and, even then, not in his capacity as the head person of that department, but in his capacity in a *quasi* governmental authority. I am disgusted with that. As for the Minister's own conscience, that is a matter for her and I

leave her with it. But, the Minister's attitude towards the committee was nothing short of shameful. Whether, in view of the attitude that the Minister adopted towards Mr Inns one can now place a great deal of trust in either her or Mr Inns, one is left in a great deal of doubt.

I turn finally to the question of licensed clubs. If there is one matter on which I can agree with the Government it is this: if there is one avenue for organised crime in this State it comes through licensed clubs and arises in this way. Let me make it fully public. There is no doubt that the biggest poker machine manufacturer in this country is Ainsworth Consolidated Industries. In turn, the agent for that organisation is a man called Mr Ted Vibert. Mr Vibert, the committee found, was not a witness of credit, but we found that Sergeant Hanrahan, who was investigating the activities of Ainsworth Consolidated Industries, amongst others, was a witness of truth.

Let me go on to say that Mr Vibert's activities throughout the country should lead every Parliament to consider its position very carefully indeed. There is no doubt, on Mr Vibert's blatant admission, that he gave \$30 000 to the Labor Party in Queensland, a large sum of money to the National Country Party in Queensland, that he gave money to other political Parties in Queensland and that he gave money to selected persons during the last Victorian elections.

I am forced to say—I have no alternative but to say—that the Licensed Clubs Association in this State is smeared by its association with Ainsworth Consolidated Industries. Why is that? On researching the report, honourable members will know that Ainsworth Consolidated Industries has a traced link with the Bally Corporation of the United States and that, in turn, a well-known Mafia connection, Mr Sam Klein, was connected by the F.B.I. with the Bally Corporation in the United States.

Therefore, any reasonable and reasoning person who belonged to any body which belonged to the Licensed Clubs Association should start to ask themselves three questions. First, what is going on between the officials of our organisation and Mr Vibert? Secondly, what is going on between our officials, Mr Vibert and Ainsworth Consolidated Industries? Thirdly, what on earth do we propose to do in relation to the policy that Mr Vibert has been forcing on us for the past two or three years?

I regret very much that I have had to approach what should be a very carefully constructed argument in the form of a sprint or a gallop—to use betting terms. On the whole of the evidence before me, I believe that what the committee found was true and correct. I believe that many of the conclusions reached by witnesses before us were preconceived, were wrong and were coloured by prejudice—not only by prejudice, but also sometimes by hysteria and, in the case of Mr Vibert, by veiled threats. In the case of Mr Vibert I can say that the veiled threat was that if we did not support him, his licensed clubs and Ainsworth Consolidated Industries we would be attacked at the next election. I certainly support the Premier on that.

So far as other groups are concerned, I would urge them (and I know that many groups such as the Womens Electoral Lobby, the churches, and so on were well meaning and, as far as they could be well prepared) to consider, in the light of the report now presented and in light of the reasonableness of what has been put before them, their preconceived position. If they do not do that they will lose South Australia its last chance to get a casino. I live in an electorate where 10 per cent of adult males and over 20 per cent of juveniles are unemployed. I know that in Hobart about 750 people are employed in the casino. Such employment will not happen overnight but, if we can do something about it, we have a duty to do so. There is nothing wrong with a casino,

and I urge the House to support the Bill as amended by the Committee.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Tourism):** I support the noting of the report and reiterate my previously expressed opposition to the establishment of a casino in South Australia. I am intrigued that the Opposition on each occasion that this measure has come before the House has, somehow or other, intimated that I would not have the courage to stand up and speak on this Bill because of the perceived conflict between my personal views, as a member of this Parliament with the right to a conscience vote, and my responsibility as Minister holding the portfolio of Tourism. I reiterate that I see no conflict in those dual responsibilities—that of a member of Parliament with a right to exercise a conscience vote, as I note was graciously acknowledged by the member for Playford when he spoke. I thank him for that.

I read the report with great interest. I congratulate the Chairman of the committee for his chairmanship and the committee for handling an extremely delicate and difficult task with resolve and competence. I find the report somewhat difficult in so far as the first conclusion that is reached is that not sufficient is known about the social impact of gambling. The first recommendation calls for a national inquiry into gambling. In other words, there is an acknowledgment—

**Mr Slater:** Into all forms of gambling.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** That is correct. There is an acknowledgment that we do not know or have not documented the social effects of gambling. Having acknowledged that, the committee then proceeds to say, 'Let us go ahead with the Bill,' admittedly with amendments. To me that cannot be construed as a responsible attitude. If one were to take that attitude and apply it to any other decision of the Parliament we would be laughed out of court, and rightly so. Yet, there does not seem to have been much emphasis by previous speakers on the difficulty of reconciling the committee's first recommendations with its subsequent recommendations. I feel that that difficulty should be highlighted.

The member for Playford, and indeed his Leader, categorised various members of the House in terms of their attitude to this Bill. If we are to be categorised, I suppose it would be fair to say that I come into the category of those who are opposed to all forms of gambling, and therefore, regardless of my Ministerial responsibilities, regardless of the views of those in my electorate, I feel bound to oppose the establishment of a casino. If, in doing so I countermand the wishes of those within my electorate, they will deal with me accordingly. I have received many letters, as have other members, opposing the Bill, but there may well be a silent majority in the electorate of Coles that may want the Bill to pass. Whether that is so or not, I must publicly state, as I have done on many occasions, that I cannot support the Bill.

As a citizen, a woman, a wife and a mother, I would like to outline the reasons why I am opposed to the establishment of a casino. The member for Hanson touched on a number of factors which he said are inextricably linked with casinos; he referred to prostitution, to pornography, to drugs and to organised crime. Regardless of the merits of his case in dwelling on the English situation (which apparently, in the view of some people, cannot be related to the Australian situation), the principles stand firm, namely, that there is overwhelming evidence throughout the world that those activities invariably follow the establishment of a casino. Those activities are recognised by people who hold to be dear the security, both financial and emotional, of their

families and who regard as important the security of the community at large in respect of human values.

Such people cannot countenance the thought of anything that would adversely affect those values. I think that is why women's groups all over the State and the nation (every women's group from the National Council of Women, which might be said to represent a conservative view, to the Women's Electoral Lobby, which might be said to represent a radical view) oppose the concept of a casino. The instinctively womanly reaction is that somehow or other a casino would threaten the security of our families and the stability of our community.

As far as my Ministerial responsibilities are concerned, I want to deal with the arguments put forward by the Leader of the Opposition in what I consider to be a real dog-in-the-manger speech. The Leader is not opposing the establishment of a casino, although one hardly knows where he stands on the matter, as his speech was an on-the-one-hand and then on-the-other-hand type of speech. He did not decisively make clear any of his attitudes other than the fact that he objects to what the Government is doing. My impression of the Leader's attitude is that he does not want a casino to go ahead for the simple reason that he would not wish a Liberal Government to receive any of the assumed kudos that might come from it were it to go ahead with the accompanying economic development that is said to be likely to accompany it.

That was the clear message that came out of the Leader's speech: it was full of humbug and contrasted markedly with the speech of his Deputy, who honestly admitted his doubts and apparent inconsistencies. While being sincere enough to acknowledge those doubts and inconsistencies in his attitude, he came down firmly on the side of opposing a casino. One cannot help but admire that kind of honesty and sincerity. It certainly showed up his Leader for all the hypocrisy that his speech contained.

I think that the allegations that have been made against me by members of the Opposition in regard to my attitude to the Director of Tourism appearing before the committee need to be dealt with. I want to make quite clear that I had grave reservations about Mr Inns, as Chairman of the Tourism Development Board and as Director of Tourism (in other words, a person with a dual role, one as a public servant and the other as a head of a quasi-Government authority), appearing to be compromised by stating his views before that committee.

I discussed with the Director the difficulty that he might face in expressing, as a departmental head, a view on a matter which was to be regarded as a conscience issue by the Government and on which he knew (and the community at large knew) his Minister had expressed strong views. I did not want my Director to be put in an invidious position and I was concerned that that should not occur. As a result, I resolved (and conveyed my resolve to him) that, while I thought it was inappropriate for him to appear before the committee as Chairman of the Tourism Development Board (in other words, promoting the case for a casino), I believed there was no reason why he should not appear before the committee as Director of Tourism to answer questions in a factual manner about the effect that such a development might have on tourism in South Australia.

The Opposition has it wrong on two counts: first, I did not forbid the Director to attend and, secondly, he attended in his capacity as Director of Tourism, as a public servant providing information to a select committee, and not as Chairman of the Tourism Development Board promoting a case which I believe that he, as a public servant, would have been in a difficult position to promote.

Finally, I want to refer honourable members to the speech that I made about this Bill on 31 March (page 3847 of

*Hansard*), in which I addressed the question of the alleged relationship between casinos and tourism development, and consequent economic prosperity. It seems to me (and I believe that the facts bear out what I am saying—and it is not in any way a contradiction of what the Director of Tourism said to the committee) that tourism growth is not necessarily dependent upon the establishment of a casino. That has been my position all along. I do not deny that the establishment of a casino can create growth in tourism—I have never denied that. I simply say that growth in tourism is not dependent upon the establishment of a casino.

The speech I made on 31 March demonstrated that, in this State, at least in the past three years, we have achieved significant and measurable growth without a casino, and I believe that we can do even better in the years to come. For that reason I do not think that we need to regard a casino as the be all and end all or the El Dorado of tourism. That belief is borne out by my discussions in Canada with Ministers of Tourism in the provinces. I was interested and, indeed, intrigued to learn when I was in Canada earlier this year that there is not one casino in that country. I put the question to the Minister of Tourism in British Columbia, Mrs Pat Jordan, why that was the case, and her answer was, 'We believe that all tourism development should be designed to enhance the lifestyle of our citizens, and we would not countenance anything which might adversely affect their social or cultural development or which would create social conditions that might cause disruption and disharmony in the lives of our citizens.'

It was a simple statement, which I endorse fully, and I believe that the example of British Columbia, where tourism development has taken place at a quite outstanding rate, demonstrates that we can achieve what we want to achieve in the way of economic development based on tourism, without the necessity of resorting to a casino. I refer members to the speech that was made in the Legislative Council by the Hon. Don Laidlaw on 22 July 1981, in which he outlined the British Columbian experience.

It is interesting to note that women Ministers of Tourism seem to have a capacity for addressing the tasks at hand and creating growth in that industry in their States and Provinces. I refer to page 107 of *Hansard* as follows:

When the Social Credit Party regained power in 1976, Mrs McCarthy, then Deputy Premier and Minister of Tourism, reorganised the Tourist Development Authority, and a five-year marketing plan was prepared. In 1976 there were 9 900 000 tourist trips but by 1980 the number of trips exceeded 14 000 000, half of which were by local residents.

That was a 40 per cent increase in four years, without the establishment of a casino, in fact, with the deliberate rejection of the concept of a casino.

As I have listened to my colleagues on both sides of the House address the select committee report I have gained the distinct impression that this Bill is unlikely to pass. I am grateful for that, because I believe that inherent in this Parliament (and we are seeing it tonight, we have seen it before and we will see it again, because it is the nature of Parliaments that they reflect the wishes of the people) and the heritage of South Australia is a tradition of maintaining an extremely cautious approach, and rightly so, to any type of development which contradicts the best values on which this State was founded.

I believe the establishment of a casino would contradict those basic values and for that reason I oppose it. At the same time I pledge my total commitment to the expansion of tourism and all the good things that that expansion can bring to the residents of this State through jobs, prosperity and enhanced facilities for their use and enjoyment. I want it to be well understood that casinos and tourism growth

are not necessarily inextricably linked. We can have the good things of one without the bad things of the other.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury):** I certainly support the noting of the select committee's report, but I will be opposing the Bill even in its amended form, if it is amended according to the select committee's recommendations. I will certainly be looking very closely at every amendment during the Committee stage. In commending the select committee's report I believe it is a very interesting report. I believe it will find its place as a significant contribution to the ongoing debate, not only in this State but around the nation, about the contribution or lack of it in relation to casinos.

On the one hand the report has certainly sought to tie together evidence that is already available and make some commentary on it. On the other hand, it has sought to add evidence of its own. Whether or not the Bill to establish a casino succeeds, and I repeat that I hope that it does not, the committee will have played a positive part to that extent alone. In my second reading speech on 31 March I indicated that in the absence of apocalyptic revelations I would be voting against the establishment of a casino. That phrase became something of a witticism amongst some members over succeeding months.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** Almost a cliché.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** Yes, it certainly did become a cliché. When I questioned one member of the select committee about revelations in that regard, he somewhat irreverently, nevertheless very humorously, suggested that any revelations of that sort coming from the appropriate witness were obviously *in camera* and the committee was not able to reveal them. That probably explains their absence from the final report and certainly does a lot to convince me about my attitude. Before making general comments about the whole issue I will make some comments about the recommendations in the report, being conscious of the lateness of the sitting and the shortness of time available to me.

I take the point made by the Minister of Health, because indeed it was something that struck me, and I am amazed that it did not strike other members. Interestingly, we had the committee indicating its endorsement of the recommendations in Tasmania that there be a committee to measure the social and economic aspects of gambling (of course, the Tasmanian inquiry was referring to the situation in that State).

At another point the committee even calls for a national inquiry into these problems, and we are commended to consider that not only should the Bureau of Statistics be involved but also the police, community welfare agencies and voluntary agencies. I commend fully those recommendations, which are most sound. If it is important that such inquiries take place, and if the committee felt that there was something to be investigated, surely it is premature to introduce another significant form of gambling prior to receiving the findings of such a committee.

The member for Gilles, by way of interjection during the speech of the Minister of Tourism, indicated that the inquiry was one into all forms of gambling. That point is taken, but still the point can be made that the establishment of a casino is not merely a simple extension of the gambling that presently exists: it is a creation of a new form for this State. Therefore, it is qualitatively quite different. To my mind, that is sufficient evidence almost in itself to indicate that we should not support this Bill, and even members who have any predilection towards casino gambling should consider that very point alone and oppose this Bill. However, there are other points to which I will refer in due course.

Going through some of the other points raised, I notice in recommendation 6.4 the finding that casino gambling is

relatively harmless for the majority of participants, but it does acknowledge that there are compulsive gambling problems for some. In fact, the point was made that the proportion of people who are victims of compulsive gambling is very small. I suppose that is small comfort to the families of that small percentage of compulsive gamblers. They, too, have the right to be considered and that point ought to have been investigated. However, I cannot find any such reference in the report.

Is there the possibility of that small percentage being expanded by the introduction of a qualitatively different sort of gambling? One should remember that casino gambling is of the instant type of gambling that is conducive to compulsive gambling addiction. It is not like lotteries or other forms of investment where there is a period where one has to wait between the investment and the decision: the decision is very rapidly known.

One makes an investment on the tables and should know the decision within seconds. Even horse-racing has a lag time between the investment and the knowledge of whether one has won or lost and, therefore, the intention for the compulsive addict to put on another bet and try to make good the losses so far sustained. The committee acknowledges that gambling addiction does exist, but I believe that it did not necessarily pay enough attention to, first, the needs of those few people who seem to be suffering from it and, secondly, to how it might be expanded by the creation of this instant form of gambling.

Another point covered in recommendation 6.4 is the committee's wish to have strict regulations to eliminate casino owners' ability to exploit investments in casinos. Certainly, that would have to be the case. If a casino went ahead, that provision would certainly have to be there just in terms of natural justice.

Further, I ask about the control on the amount of bets. I do not see anything in the report actually stating what checks exist on how much can be invested. Through an examination of the appendices, I see that the capacity exists for the establishing of maxima on the various forms of betting. By questioning members of the committee in private conversation, I found that the situation is not entirely satisfactory with regard to Tasmania, for example.

I understand that in the public gaming rooms there is a maximum of \$200 per bet at the tables, yet there seems to be a number of hedging devices for the doubling of bets, and the like, that can build that amount up quite significantly. The real undermining of any effective setting of maxima comes when one finds in the special gaming room that there are, in fact, no maxima: one can bet whatever one wants to bet. That represents, to my mind, a problem for the person investing money that he does not have to invest (he is over-investing himself), and it seriously brings into serious question the laundering of money, with which I will deal later.

At paragraph 6.5 the committee comments on overseas experience and, I believe, makes some sound judgments on the way in which the United States or United Kingdom experience may not be all that relevant to Australia, but the committee makes the point that we should not be complacent, not sweeping about passing it up, yet to my mind it seems to become sweeping itself in disregarding the evidence in those countries. I would use that as other evidence that we should not be hasty in this matter and add that to the committee's own call to measure the social and economic aspects of gambling.

The committee, at paragraph 6.5, also acknowledged the potential for small-scale organised crime to grow and the need for increased specialised preventive measures and vigilance. I believe that one major problem that we would face with a casino in South Australia may not be the big interstate

syndicates, the crime combines: it may be the fact that we would be presenting to local crime a local agency or 'local bank' that they could use to sort out some of their money problems or the cleansing of their money. That would enable such small-scale organised crime as we have in this State to move up the market, so to speak, which is something I would hope we would not want to do. No doubt investors may have another opinion on that.

At paragraph 7.1.1 the committee acknowledged that the revenue potential would be no more than applied to Tasmania. I seriously suggest that the revenue potential could be a lot less but, on the first point, what a mess of pottage it is to sell this State off for a small amount of revenue for State coffers! As I say, the amount could be less, because we have the question of how much is charged and what is the Government tax take on investments and gross profits. There is no control of what different State Governments set on casinos, and I strongly fear that the proliferation of casinos around Australia, attempting to bring in this elusive tourist traffic, will see price-cutting between casinos. Already the Tasmanian casinos have had their Government tax take reduced from 30 per cent to 15 per cent. In Queensland, discriminatory taxation is to be established at the Gold Coast and Townsville casinos.

On the ownership proposals, at paragraph 8.2.1, I accept the recommendation that a club type of casino would be elitist, and I believe that a wholly South Australian owned one is to be sought if we have to have one, but no examination seems to me to have taken place of exactly what is wholly South Australian owned. One of the problems that arises is the question of nominee ownerships, the question of exactly who is the owner of certain assets of this type. We may well have South Australian names being the technical owners, but the reality may be different. There are many examples in the international money market, not in areas connected with casinos but in areas connected with business and commerce, where the use of the nominee-type company is getting around legislation requiring local ownership. In many cases a foreign company may want to invest in a country, and the country requires a certain level of local ownership. Companies effectively circumvent the power of that legislation by nominee structures. What guarantees did the committee examine that will prevent that happening here?

Point 8.2.2 refers to the fact that the licence should be a privilege and not a right. That would certainly have to be the case if the casino goes ahead. Likewise, the licensing of key personnel is to be supported. The licensing of supplies of goods and services is, in fact, a significant point, and I commend the committee for addressing that issue. I believe that it probably took note of the problems facing New Jersey, for example, where one of the major corruption causes there involved the suppliers of goods and services to casinos in that State. Likewise, the annual renewal is to be commended.

Point 8.2.3 (1) talks about an inspectorate of 10 officers, but I am concerned about this, because it seems to mention in the second part more than one Government inspector at all times of operation. That can be interpreted in two ways: 'more than one' could be interpreted as two. If one is dealing with a big casino, two inspectors at one time is not a large commitment to keep an eye on all the tables, including the special gaming rooms. I find that quite inadequate. Point 8.2.3 (2), referring to the requirement of one entrance and the separation of the entertainment area from the gambling area, is certainly a reasonable one. However, 8.2.3 (3) concerning the hours of operation I cannot support. It states that the casino should not open earlier than 6 p.m. If we are genuine in trying to solve the problem of those who may be trapped into gambling by various social and economic

imperatives, we surely ought to make sure that it is well and truly an evening function away from the work day. There should be the requirement that people would have to go home before they came out again. A time of 6 p.m. does not provide for that to happen. I would have thought, at the very least, that the time of opening any such facility should be 8 p.m.

Point 8.2.3 (4) concerns the laundering of money, and I will comment on that later. Point 8.2.3 (6) refers to standards of dress. I know from personal observation that this is strictly adhered to at the Wrest Point casino, where one has to wear a jacket. In fact, one of the party I was with when I went to the Wrest Point casino had difficulty getting in because of the absence of a jacket. The recommendation here really does not try to make any such difficulty for people, in the sense that it does not try to encourage people to go home first. It would be possible to go to the casino straight from work because the standard of dress does not present an opportunity to require a change which is, in itself, a disincentive to go. I think that the report could have done something useful here. Point 8.2.3 (7) on security I have no real objection to, except that I put in a plea that whoever is employed to provide security at any casino that might exist here should not have had experience at Buckingham Palace.

Point 8.2.3 (8), providing for the exclusion of certain people from entry and for the right of those who fear their own capacity to gamble to exclude themselves, is again commendable. Point 8.2.3 (9) concerns the private gaming area. This worries me greatly, and I will come back to it with regard to the laundering of money. A lot of the other recommendations are quite reasonable if one has to accept the existence of a casino. I make the point, of course, that we do not have to accept that. Certainly, I adamantly believe that we should see no sign of poker machines in this State.

I now come to another few points I want to make, leaving the rest of the recommendations because of the brevity of time left to me. There was a comment made about compulsive gambling and the sort of person who is a compulsive gambler. The evidence seems to suggest that low-income people are not, on the whole, compulsive gamblers but that it is mainly the middle-income people who are compulsive gamblers.

I want to put in another possible category of gambler, namely, the desperation gambler. I think that there have been, throughout history, examples of people who, reaching very tight economic circumstances, feel that their options rest in the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow—that the only way they can come good is if somehow they are able to win something.

I know from my own electorate the number of people who are in serious economic troubles because of the present recession. I know this on a daily basis by virtue of people who ring and come into my office and whose homes I go to visit. I feel that an element of those people may be incited to take part in desperation gambling, to try to see their way through their problems. Of course, the statistics will not allow that to happen. Those desperation gamblers will lose, because that is the way statistics in relation to casinos work. However, these gamblers will, in the process, have heightened their own suffering.

Regarding the laundering of money, the committee seems to be of the opinion that it has solved that problem, or at least has rejected it as being a possibility. However, I believe that the committee missed one of the main possibilities for the laundering of money. The committee entertained the possibility that someone could go into a casino with a large amount of money to be laundered, cash it in for chips and then return later, cash those chips in and ask for a cheque,

that cheque then being used as proof of winnings at the casino, those people never having played at the tables.

I accept the regulations and provisions that the committee says exists in casinos to make that very difficult to happen. But there is another possibility for the laundering of money, particularly in the special gambling areas. Why cannot the money simply be played on the tables? The information given in the appendices indicates that 79.7 per cent of the money invested on the tables by Tasmanian investors goes back to the investor, so that if people want to invest a large sum of money they are getting back nearly 80 per cent, which is more than they would get back if they declared it on their tax.

**Mr Evans:** Or if they had stolen it by some means.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** Yes. So, it is a healthy return. All those people must give up is 20 per cent and what they get from that 20 per cent pay-out to the casino, some of which goes to the Government, is first, the legitimisation of their money and, secondly, perhaps some entertainment value. That kind of laundering I cannot see as having been addressed in the report. People can show me the paragraph where it is referred to, but I have not yet found it.

The other point is that the suggestion was made to me privately by certain members of the select committee that inspectors will know people: they will look for people and remember them, and will keep an eye on those people who seem to be using the place quite often. It is for that very reason that drug syndicates do not use their head people to bring in drugs from South-East Asian countries. Drug syndicates use paid couriers to get their products from one country to another.

I believe that it could easily happen that these same people who want to cleanse their money would use launderers at casinos. They would pay people to do the investment for them and then pay a marginal sum to have the money cleaned up. There are many people who would do such a thing because they need the money. There would be such a variety of these people that any attempt to try to prove the network would be incredibly difficult.

Regarding the amount that is returned on the casino, I made the point before that, when we have a lot of casinos, if there are ever a lot of casinos in this country, there will then be price competition between the casinos from the point of view of Governments reducing their tax take. Tasmania has already done it and Queensland has done it discriminately in their casinos and this would happen between States. It would also happen in casinos themselves, reducing the percentage that they take in profit.

I notice that in Tasmania the profit from investments to the management company, some of which goes to the Government, etc., is 20.3 per cent, yet, in Monte Carlo this percentage is 2.7 per cent. So, in other words, there is a lot of room where various casinos between each other around Australia could enter into price competition and effectively reduce a lot of the economic value that it is claimed could be available from them.

I also make the point that it has been suggested that there would be a positive incentive for tourism. However, from the figures provided by the select committee I note that in 1977-78 the ratio of local investors to visiting investors with regard to the handle—in other words the amount of money that they supposedly put on the tables—was 1.78. In other words, a local visitor would invest 1.78 times the amount of a visitor from interstate. In 1980-81, according to the information provided, the figure became 1.94. This indicates that, although there may have been some tourism effect in the early years of the 1970s (and certainly the figures suggest that), the later figures seem to suggest that there is an erosion of interstate attractiveness. That would be because of the establishment of other casinos in other parts of Australia.

In any event, I believe that, if we are to have a sound tourist industry in this State, surely we should be promoting tourist activities that cater for family tourism and not those that cater for this esoteric form of tourism that I do not believe motivates people to go interstate.

I, like a number of other members in this place, take strong exception to the reference by Mr Vibert, as quoted on page 99, that if club people in South Australia or Queensland wish to stand for election on the same basis, precisely the same thing will be done. I regard that as an attempt at intimidation that deserves the contempt of this House and all members in it. It certainly has my contempt.

It was also said that a lot of gambling is already taking place in South Australia. For example, reference was made to ethnic clubs and the fact that illegal gambling goes on within them. We need not overbuild that situation, seeing in them mini-Monte Carlo's existing in the suburbs of Adelaide. I know of one ethnic club, of which I am a member, where dice and card games are played, and the total prize is that those who win get a free bottle of beer from those who lose. I suppose that that is illegal gambling, although I am not sure of the rules. I have considerable contact with that ethnic club. I suggest that sometimes the rumours about illegal gambling may be greater than reality. The Minister and other members of the committee may be able to point me to other examples that are different to the examples that I have given.

*The Hon. M. M. Wilson interjecting:*

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** No, but the committee did identify it. People have suggested that, for one to be against a casino, one must be against all forms of gambling. I am not against all gambling: in fact, I buy a lottery ticket. Being a member of Parliament, it is hard not to do so. I have even been to a casino and to Las Vegas. I am most unimpressed with the form of entertainment available in casinos, but I have been there. There are qualitatively different forms of gambling. I repeat the point I made earlier: casino gambling is one where the investment is made and the decision is almost instant, so the capacity to re-invest and make good one's losses takes place very quickly.

**Mr Evans:** Action impulse gambling.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** That is right. That is precisely one of the major criticisms that I have of poker machines, as the same problem applies in relation to them. It is indeed also a criticism that I have made in the past regarding instant money. It is not a form of gambling of which I am enamoured. It contributes towards the same. One has merely to look at the queues at counters selling instant money tickets to see that that is happening. I take the point, as I did in my second reading speech, that, if any Government wants to look at ways to raise revenue, the international lottery idea that I suggested is worth serious examination. It is undertaken by a number of Governments with some success. I hope that at some stage some agency of Government in South Australia will give it that consideration with a view to possibly introducing it here.

I have had very quickly to go over the select committee's report. I repeat the comments that I made before, namely, that it is an interesting report and has covered a number of areas in considerable detail: I have identified a number of areas that it has not identified. I hope that the report adds to the state of the art, the study of the issue. I conclude my remarks by indicating that I will not be supporting the Bill, because I do not believe that the serious problems of casinos and gambling, together with the associated problems that they cause, have been answered. I do not believe that that is because of lack of effort on the part of members of the committee, because I believe that they genuinely tried as hard as they could, but that is indicated, for example, at 4.6 and 6.4, where it was stated that much more inquiry

into those areas was needed before they could be actually understood. So, the committee acknowledged that very problem. I do not think that casinos would be of any benefit to South Australia. I hope that other members of this place will likewise hold that opinion and that South Australia will not in the near future have a casino.

**Mr RUSSACK (Goyder):** As I have spoken quite a number of times in this House on this matter, I intend to be brief tonight, because I am sure that honourable members as well as my constituents know exactly my convictions and feelings in regard to casinos. I commend the members of the committee for the work they have performed and for the report that has resulted from their very intensive inquiries over a number of months. The Minister of Recreation and Sport and the other members of the Committee are to be congratulated on the report that has been produced, because I believe that it is a balanced report.

As members are aware, it contains no recommendation as to whether or not South Australia should have a casino. In fact, on page 2 of the report the following statement is made:

It must be stressed that this committee's purpose was not to report to the Parliament on whether or not a casino should be established in South Australia. The committee also believed its mandate was to examine all facets of the casino industry and to report on the advantages and disadvantages that can come with the establishment of a casino.

It is my belief that the committee carried out the commission that it was given, and so I took exception to some of the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition. I want to defend the member for Glenelg and his position as a committee member: the Leader suggested that the member for Glenelg had in some way been disloyal (and he almost used the word 'untruthful') in having agreed to the report, but then in this House saying in his speech that he would not support the establishment of a casino in South Australia. I believe that the member for Glenelg accepted the fact that the report contained all the pros and cons of every aspect of the establishment and conduct of a casino in South Australia, including the moral aspects, the dangers, the advantages and the disadvantages, and that that was why he supported the report, I believe that he was justified in doing so. I know the member for Glenelg to be a very honest, enthusiastic and genuine member, a man of integrity.

*[Midnight]*

I am sure that he accepted that report, as the committee's report suggests, in light of the fact that the committee was not established to report to the Parliament on whether or not a casino should be established in South Australia but to investigate every aspect of the matter. The honourable member accepted and carried out his responsibility as a member of the committee, and, in my opinion, he had every right to speak as he did and to adopt the attitude that he adopted tonight.

I do not wish to go into all the aspects of the report, but I will refer to one or two matters. The report covers very extensively the conduct of casinos in other countries, and it is very gratifying to note that the conduct of casinos in Australia has been kept free of the crime element that exists in casinos in other countries. What worries me is that the report illustrates and demonstrates that it would be absolutely essential to take strict precautions and institute controls to the degree that croupiers and all employees would have to be licensed so that the risk of crime was avoided. I am concerned that there is no doubt that casinos attract crime. So that crime will not become involved, there must be strict controls.

There are certain reasons why I believe that a casino is unnecessary and undesirable in South Australia. The report referred, on pages 46 and 47, to polls conducted in this regard. Between 1968 and 1980, admittedly throughout Australia, there was a slight increase (from 41 per cent to 46 per cent) in the number of people who approved of the establishment of a casino. However, I am interested in South Australia and, if I am reading the table correctly, 45 per cent were in favour of a casino in South Australia in 1980, 40 per cent were against a casino, and 15 per cent were undecided. Those polls were conducted by the Morgan organisation.

A poll by that organisation in 1981 indicated that in South Australia the number of those in favour of a casino had decreased by 2 per cent to 43 per cent, the number of those against a casino had increased by 5 per cent, to 45 per cent, the number of those undecided decreased from 15 per cent to 12 per cent. Therefore, the trend indicates that fewer people in South Australia (according to the Morgan research organisation) want a casino, more people are opposed to a casino, and fewer people are undecided.

However, recent polls published by Peter Gardner and Associates have produced a similar result. In fact, a recent report in the *Adelaide Advertiser* of Monday 3 June stated that 53.5 per cent of a survey group supported the casino proposal. If my memory serves me correctly, the report that came over the electronic media stated that fewer members of the Party to which I belong wanted a casino in comparison with the other major Party, the A.L.P. At page 48, the committee's report states:

However, the committee notes that the majority of those who gave evidence were opposed to the establishment of a casino.

In addition, quite a number of petitions opposing the establishment of a casino have been presented to this House in the latter part of last session and during this session. It is worth noting that 12 673 people have so far signed those petitions. I personally had the opportunity to present petitions with approximately 2 000 signatures. I point out that not all of those signatures were collected in my electorate, but they were all citizens of South Australia.

I have also received several scores of letters from people who are genuinely opposed to the establishment of a casino in South Australia. I do not recall receiving one letter asking that I support legislation to establish a casino in this State. I refer, too, to the views of people living in my electorate. The member for Stuart said two things tonight: he asked how one can really assess what the electorate needs and, secondly, he said that a member of Parliament is a person who the electorate believes has the ability and the integrity to make these decisions and is elected to do just that. I believe that a member of Parliament has a certain sensitivity and can estimate the thoughts of his electorate. Of course, a member circulates throughout his electorate and discusses issues with certain groups of people in the same way as a poll is taken. If we are to take notice of polls, surely it is more reliable for a member himself to assess how members of his constituency feel about these matters. I have been re-elected by the people of my electorate on a number of occasions, and people know my views on this matter. Therefore, I believe I have the support of my electorate when I make a decision.

Another thing that worries me about the establishment of a casino is the fact that this afternoon the Premier said that in no circumstances would he agree to the introduction of poker machines in this State. I believe that every member of this House feels the same way. However, I asked one member of the select committee today whether, after being a member of that committee, he believed it would be easier for poker machines to be introduced in this State if a casino



were established. He was truthful and said 'Yes'. I believe that all social legislation proceeds step by step. If in life we do not progress we become stagnant. I do not believe that the establishment of a casino is progression, but it would progress to a stage where it would attract poker machines.

In conclusion, I reiterate that I believe a casino is unnecessary. It has been suggested in this House today that most members voted in favour of soccer pools. However, there was no division in this House in relation to soccer pools. In my speech on that occasion, though, I indicated that I was opposed to soccer pools.

**Mr Slater:** How did you vote on that occasion?

**Mr RUSSACK:** There was no division, but I indicated in my speech that I was opposed to soccer pools. Therefore, I am consistent in my outlook in regard to gambling. In opposing this measure, as I intend to do, I am being consistent having regard to what I did in 1973 and 1981 and to what I intend to do in 1982, and that I have already done by voting against the second reading of the Bill.

I am certain that the establishment of a casino in South Australia would make no contribution to the quality of life in this State. In fact the establishment of a casino would be inherently dangerous and there would be a reduction in the quality of life and our social life in South Australia. Therefore, for the reasons that I have outlined, I cannot support this measure.

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** I have read the report of the select committee with great interest. I must express my congratulations to the committee on the amount of the work that has gone into the report. Obviously, the committee addressed itself objectively to its task, which would not have been easy. The arguments for and against the casino would have been put to the committee at great length. Its members had to sift through the information and come out with a balanced and objective report that could be tabled in Parliament so that members could study it and use it as an aid in trying to form a conclusion about how to vote on the third reading.

I devoted most of last weekend to the report because there has been a conflict in my mind for some time about what my final approach would be. When I addressed the House on this subject some time ago, members will recall that I did not have any great enthusiasm for the Bill. However, I was willing to support its second reading so that the Bill could be referred to a select committee and members of the public could come forward to give evidence enabling the production of this balanced report before us.

I indicate that I do have pleasure in supporting the noting of this report but, having studied it, I believe that it contains nothing that would make me change my view. Although I support its noting, it is my intention later to vote against the Bill, mainly on social and moral grounds. Further, I would like to refer any of my constituents who may be reading my contribution tonight to my speech of 31 March 1982 (page 3811 of *Hansard*). I do not intend to canvas the subject material that I presented then, when I spoke at length on my reasons for being extremely luke-warm about a casino in South Australia. There are some figures in that speech which refer specifically to the Glenelg area, and I believe that those figures could be of interest to people who do research in the future on community attitudes towards a casino in the Glenelg area of which I am a representative.

My personal attitude, as I said earlier, has been one of a lack of enthusiasm for the concept of a casino in South Australia. Certainly, I have visited casinos. I have travelled through Alice Springs on a couple of occasions and on each occasion I have visited the casino, and once I visited it twice. I have also been overseas in years gone by and visited casinos there. There is no doubt that when a visitor enters

a casino for the first time, there is a certain amount of glamour involved. Casinos are set up purposely to entertain and attract patrons. Attractive women work behind the tables and the games are exciting to them; there is no doubt about that.

That particular feeling of excitement, which impressed me, after the first few visits soon wore off and I was able to stand off and look objectively at what was going on around me. A couple of factors were very obvious, when I saw the games and how the public reacted to them. One was the speed of the games. The committee brought this point up and I know that this aspect is mentioned in the report but the speed of the games worries the life out of me. I go to the races occasionally. There are only eight races a day and then there is a cooling-off period of seven days before a person goes back if he is hooked on chasing money at the races. That is not the position at the casino. There is a spin of the roulette wheel every few minutes. It is on all night, and is on again next night, so you have had a chance to raise credit and you are back into the system.

Patrons also become carried away with the glamour and excitement of a casino. Perhaps they have had dinner beforehand, they arrive with a few glasses of wine on board, and they become carried away. They also become carried away because, as soon as they go to a casino, paper money disappears and they get plastic chips. If people see paper money disappearing, that has one psychological effect but, when they are only playing with plastic chips, they lose touch with the reality of what is going on around them. People lose money that they would not lose if they were playing with paper money. This has been alluded to as being like monopoly money being thrown around on tables. It worries me that one finding of the report states that a small minority will become compulsive gamblers and will not be able to control themselves at the tables.

The committee has done an extraordinarily good job in weighing up the views of the community; the committee is to be congratulated to a man on that. My conflict when reading the report last weekend was in coming to grips with my personal view on casinos and whether it was the view of the community. Although there is a conscience vote on this matter, all of us try to represent the view of our constituents as well as we can.

I am very conscious of the subject of civil liberties. It is a subject for which I have a fair amount of support and, in this regard, if a person wishes to do something in this life, I often ask who am I to stop that person. I referred earlier to my previous speech on the subject in March this year, and to a survey that I undertook in Glenelg. During that survey I interviewed 1 300 constituents in the district and, in round figures, some 60 per cent said that they personally would not object to a casino. However, when I had a discussion with them, most of them were of the same view as I was—that they probably would never go there, but who are we to stop those who want to go? This is where we get into the conflict on the matter of civil liberties. I am sure that most of the 60 per cent will never go and I believe that many of those 60 per cent are still basically opposed to casinos but, in this day and age, they did not feel that they should deny others the opportunity to go.

It might be interesting to note while I am on figures that around 24 per cent or 25 per cent of the people I interviewed are very opposed to a casino on social, ethical and moral grounds. If one adds a factor of four, which I think is acceptable in street polls, one can probably say that 30 per cent of the people in my district are totally opposed to a casino on religious, ethical or moral grounds. There are other people in my district who would like to see a casino established purely as a source of entertainment. The member for Gilles alluded to this earlier, that there is a connection

with the entertainment industry, and there is a point to be made there.

A lot of these people are not particularly concerned about that small minority of gamblers who are going to get hooked into this particular form of gambling, succumb to it and have all the inherent social and family problems that a lot of us hope desperately will never be seen in this State. I do not want to take up time reading into *Hansard* all the arguments listed in the report between pages 59 and 66 other than to say that if any of my constituents wants access to it I will certainly supply them with a copy of the report or any part of it they may want access to. However, I would like to refer to one specific argument in the anti-casino argument on page 62 of the report where it states:

Laws should be not merely descriptive but rather prescriptive in negative and positive ways, reflecting higher moral values that are alive within the community. The law should set a standard of behaviour and should encourage the citizenry to conform to the higher values of life. To legalise gambling positively endorses the moral values of gambling and encourages citizens to conform to such values.

It is my conviction that the laws that originate from this Legislature should reflect the perceived moral values of the community and that those laws should reflect the minority view if that view is justified by reference to previously accepted moral and ethical standards as represented by the Statute Book of the day. In other words, if we are changing a law which is already established on the Statute Book and which refers to moral and ethical standards within the community, then before we change that law we should have due regard for the minority viewpoint.

I think it is terribly important that as legislators we address ourselves to that particular question and do not move to change the law and bring in social change without giving careful consideration to how large the minority group really is. Some members may disagree with me, but I believe that over the past 10 or 15 years there has been a slow reduction in community standards brought about by changes in legislation in this place.

The Casino Bill, if passed, will be seen by many members of the public as another such legislative attempt to erode community standards. As I said, members may disagree with me, and are entitled to do so because this is a conscience vote, but personally I do not believe that South Australia needs another gambling outlet. Quite frankly, I believe it is just not necessary. I would like now to briefly refer to some of the recommendations that appear in the report.

On page 210 of the report under the heading 'Findings and recommendations' the committee refers to a national inquiry. I support that recommendation. It is well founded, and any move in that direction would receive my support. Regarding the social impact recommendations, the committee concludes that it is relatively harmless for the majority of the participants and, from a study of the report, that is probably quite right. I have not had time to read all the details, but the emphasis is that it is harmless for the majority of the participants. The report states:

However, there is a minority group (indeterminable at this stage) who are vulnerable or who may be potential compulsive gamblers.

These people have to be considered in the context of this legislation. Regarding the recommendations about crime, much concern has been expressed about the ability of organised crime to get in and manipulate a casino. From reading the report I acknowledge that Government controls can overcome that and, if the numbers in the House tonight are such that the Casino Bill is passed, I trust that the amendments proposed by the committee will go through so that there is a far more workable Bill and, if a Government ever has to implement this legislation, then the teeth are there to do it.

Regarding revenue, I note that the committee suggests that the potential is there for no more than the level of revenue obtained in Tasmania. As I understand it, that would be about \$3 000 000. I question whether we need to introduce that extra form of gambling into the State for the sake of that \$3 000 000. I do not agree with that.

Regarding the ownership of a casino, originally I was against the private ownership of this particular enterprise. Upon reading the findings of the committee, I have totally changed my view on that and I support the committee in its findings as regards the ownership of a casino. However, having carefully weighed up all the arguments for and against a casino, it is my view that the adverse social effects on the community far outweigh the advantages as I see them to South Australia from a casino. I support the work that has gone into the report by the select committee by endorsing it. As I said initially, I congratulate the members of the select committee on their objectivity in putting together a first-class report which is very easy to read. Given more time, we can further grasp and understand it. Be that as it may, it is my intention to vote against the Bill at the third reading stage.

**Mrs SOUTHCOTT (Mitcham):** I support the noting of this report. In doing so I say how much I have enjoyed taking part in a conscience debate in this House. I find it very refreshing to hear what individual members believe. I record my appreciation of the many hours of work of the select committee, resulting in a very useful reference document. However, I deplore the rapid passage of this Bill through the House, as I believe that there has been insufficient time available for a careful study of the document by members or by the community.

As much of the ground has already been covered, I shall restrict my comments to a few key points. The first matter I raise is the strong point of view conveyed to me by my constituents since my election, which is one of opposition to the introduction of a casino in South Australia. The opposition appears to be strongly based on concern for the social consequences of a casino, in particular, and of any further extension of gambling in South Australia. My constituents' concern is covered in the first two recommendations of the select committee, recommendation 11.1 and recommendation 11.2, on pages 210 and 211 of the report, calling for a national inquiry into the effects of gambling because of the lack of such evidence in Australia. I support this call and urge the Government to act on the matter as soon as possible, even if the Casino Bill is defeated. I believe that many women in the community could give useful evidence on the effects on their family of gambling.

I would be interested to know whether the Minister of Community Welfare called for a family impact statement on the matter and, if so, what was the result. I would endorse the comments of the member for Salisbury on desperation gambling. I am seeing it more and more, particularly by supporting parents, unemployed and others who see the only hope of replacing a worn-out car or getting ahead at all lying in the winning of something by gambling. I believe that no proper consideration can be made of the likely profit of the casino to the State until we know something of the cost to the community as a result of the proliferation of gambling. I believe it is premature to make a decision on a casino for South Australia until more facts are available. I argue against the view that a casino is necessary to attract tourists to South Australia. I believe that Adelaide has a character of its own which attracts tourists without it being necessary to become a copy of other cities.

I would also draw attention to the understanding at the time lotteries were first introduced into South Australia that

there would not be undue promotion and advertising. The dismal record is that, in an effort to raise more and more money, new forms of lotteries have been introduced which has resulted in increased advertising, not only of the new forms but also of the old forms. In fact, last year we saw the delivery into letter boxes in the metropolitan area of promotional material on gambling which was readily accessible to children. The member for Goyder referred to tables on pages 46 and 47. I was amazed to find that they showed the results of polls of a cross-section of men and women aged 14 and over. It is my understanding that the age of adulthood is 18. Whether this is why we have seen literature in letter boxes accessible to children, I am not sure.

We have since seen the operation of soccer pools handed over to private enterprise with the result of increasing competition between the soccer pools and bloc-lotto run by the Lotteries Commission. We see both our hospitals and sporting bodies looking for funding from one or other of these ventures. I would comment particularly on recommendation 11.6.2, under the heading 'Ownership of Casino' on page 214, which states:

(2) That the ownership of the casino should, as far as possible, remain:

- (a) wholly South Australian;
- (b) and, that if that is not possible, the ownership remain wholly Australian;
- (c) that, the only concession that could be made in allowing foreign investment would be to permit no more than 5 per cent;
- (d) that, the Government have the right to acquire an equity in a hotel/convention centre/casino complex

I find it strange that recommendations (a), (b) and (c), on South Australian or Australian ownership and no more than 5 per cent of foreign ownership were not included in the amendments brought forward by the select committee, although it did include an amendment relating to recommendation (d) on Government equity. I am advised that these recommendations could be encompassed in clauses 14 and 15 of the Bill. I would strongly recommend such an action. I find the amendment of only up to 49 per cent Government equity unacceptable. I believe that if we do have a casino in South Australia it should be under Government control so that all profits would be available for use by the Government. In conclusion, I record that I will be voting against the Casino Bill, although I strongly support some of the recommendations of the select committee, particularly the need for a survey into the effects of gambling in Australia.

**Mr LEWIS (Mallee):** It is well known by members of this House that I oppose the proposition, and I have given my reasons for doing so in my second reading speech. I intended to participate in the proceedings of the select committee but found it undesirable for me to continue to do so when, at the outset, there were instances of either information being leaked from that committee or journalists speculating on the proceedings of the committee and finding from other sources the names of witnesses appearing. I found it to be so unpalatable in prospect that I decided I would not participate in the proceedings as an observer any further.

During the course of time that I attended the committee I was impressed with the diligence of the members of the committee and with the way they applied themselves to the task, but I was disappointed with the way in which six of them cross-examined witnesses, this being more particularly the case with some members than with others. Rather than taking a role of devil's advocate at times some members were taking the role of being an opponent to the witness and of engaging in debate.

Upon reading the report, I have found that there are a number of instances where the committee could have come

to alternative conclusions had it taken the trouble to use more elegant and well established scientific statistical analysis techniques. Originally I intended to incorporate into the record those analyses that I have done, but I do not intend to do so tonight because the explanation of them would take considerably more time, patience and attention of the House than would be possible at this hour, that is, 12.35 a.m.

However, certain matters in the report require comment, and I refer to matters concerning which the committee has failed to find evidence or recognise the evidence that does exist and where a contrary view has been put. In connection with the Tasmanian experience, a statement on page 30 is made as follows:

However, with the opening of the casino there have been major increases in tourism with associated employment and income opportunities.

Since the casino in Tasmania opened, there has been a large expenditure programme undertaken promoting Tasmania and package tours to that State. Because the campaign occurred following the opening of the casino, it is impossible to discern which of the two events affected the increase in the number of people who visited Tasmania. Further, publicity was given during that promotion to the natural assets of the landscape in Tasmania, and also the controversy about the wild rivers of the South-West was raging at that time as it had done throughout the 1970s and until last year. The pictures and documentaries shown about that part of the island no doubt attracted public interest in Tasmania, and the power of suggestion would have increased people's propensity to choose that place as a holiday destination.

Whilst the figures in the report state that 69.2 per cent of all adult visitors to Hobart visit the Wrest Point complex, I wonder what percentage of them engage in gambling. It is possible to create a complex of that type, which in itself is a novelty, without the gambling complex being in place. To illustrate that point I refer to the Old Clarendon Winery. Prior to the establishment of that complex here in South Australia, I wonder how many people visited Clarendon, for instance, on Sunday as compared with the number that do so now, whether simply to have lunch there or to browse and shop for either crafts or bread and other products from the bakery. Anyone with an inclination to observe the situation and compare it with the situation that existed previously would find, I am sure, that the increase has been enormous.

As a State, South Australia can do as Tasmania did by providing and encouraging the establishment of facilities which attract people and conventions here. The Minister of Tourism has pointed out in previous speeches on this matter that this could be done without the necessity of a complex containing a casino, which would thereby expose our population to risk and expense.

I want to save myself and the House the boredom of reiterating arguments that have already been presented by other people who have stated the reasons for their opposition to this proposition. Of those that I have heard in some detail, I commend members to the speeches made by the Minister of Tourism, the member for Salisbury and the member for Goyder.

The report (page 63) indicates that the anti-casino lobby and other speakers (without my certain knowledge of the content of their speeches) seem to be saying the following:

The acceptance of gambling funds into Government funds by way of revenue effectively silences and impedes initiatives and efforts which might be made to reduce gambling. The Government will tend to become dependent on the revenue collected and to stimulate the demand for gambling in order to maintain and even increase revenues.

That very point illustrates the reason why we have seen a proliferation of forms of gambling in South Australia in recent times. I would bet London to a brick, if I were a

betting man, that in some part at least that is behind the motive of the introduction of this Bill.

The committee considered the social impact, and on page 67 of its report it states:

However, the committee could not establish conclusively whether a casino places the community at a greater risk than do other forms of gambling.

I would have thought that it was axiomatic that it would. No member of the committee to whom I have spoken denied, and nowhere in the report is there any evidence cited or any opinion that denies, that people will not become compulsive gamblers as a consequence of their gambling in a casino. Accordingly, I would have thought that to make a statement like that was quite unnecessary and not a reflection of the real situation.

As it is certain that welfare problems will flow (because people will become bankrupt as a result of their addiction to gambling, particularly in a casino), I would have thought that the committee would make some recommendations as to how the welfare costs might be offset. It is my sincere belief that, if it is profitable and worth while for any entrepreneur or group of entrepreneurs to seek to obtain a licence which imposes a welfare burden on that State, it would also be reasonable to expect that licensee to make some contribution towards the cost of, for instance, rehousing those families that are broken and destitute as the result of the losses made by one or both of its adult members. Therefore, I believe that we could quantify that cost by taking the figures which the committee did not dispute and which showed that there are about .77 per cent of compulsive gamblers in any sample of the population of a society like Australia.

If in South Australia for one reason or another we said that at no time would 200 000 or 300 000 people in their lifetime ever enter a casino, of the remaining 1 000 000 that leaves 7 700 to 10 000 people. If only half that number who are potentially compulsive gamblers become hooked on gambling in a casino at some stage of their lives, about 4 000 to 5 000 people requiring housing accommodation, valued in present money terms at at least \$20 000 a unit, would incur a bill to the State of \$100 000 000. If that were amortised at 12.5 per cent to obtain the annual cost of furnishing the housing required by dispossessed families, there would be a far greater potential drain on the State's economy through the welfare budget than could be gathered through gambling taxes.

If it is profitable for an entrepreneur or group of entrepreneurs to seek and obtain a licence, they should be required to establish welfare housing equal in value to the value of the premises, buildings and improvements on the land on which the casino is established and the facilities with which it is established. If the entrepreneurs are prepared to use facilities worth \$10 000 000, they should be prepared within six months of obtaining a casino licence to invest \$10 000 000 in the construction of welfare housing. That same welfare housing should be administered by the Minister of Housing.

I believe that certain aspects of the report could more effectively have addressed the proposal than has been the case overall, as I am not able to summarise those omissions in such a short time. Nonetheless I pay a tribute to the efforts made by the committee during the short period of time that it sat and regret that it did not have longer. I think that there ought not to be, for instance, a provision in the legislation enabling the Government to alter the terms and conditions of the license; that ought to be done by Parliament. Further, I think that, in the event that a licensee failed to comply with the terms and conditions of his license, that license should be forfeited. No penalty is adequate other than the forfeiture of the license.

It is unfortunate that whenever a casino is mentioned by those who advocate its establishment it is always dressed up with sugar plum extras. Accordingly, a description of the complex to be established at Launceston included those sugar plum extras attached to the gambling facilities in order to dress it up, make it attractive and attract the public to it. That is acknowledged in the committee's report. I wonder why it is necessary to pay into the Hospitals Fund the revenue which is derived from tax on the gambling turnover, knowing full well that this is merely sleight of hand and that it cons the average unthinking citizen into thinking that it is helping the Hospitals Fund.

How ridiculous! Clearly, by paying into the Hospitals Fund it simply reduces the amount that comes from general revenue and, as politicians, we should be honest about the fact and simply pay it into general revenue and not try to con the public.

Whereas the committee saw that there was no adequate evidence collected by any scientific authority (with the means to do so) of adverse consequences of gambling, both social and economic, it did not recommend that casino operators be required to keep account of the number of customers gambling in casinos on a daily basis. I can see no reason why the number of people who cash money for chips cannot be kept as a daily record. In the first instance they could be given a clearance chip to enter the casino to avoid any double counting.

**Mr Slater:** What if they just wanted to look?

**Mr LEWIS:** They would not have to cash any chips, and they would not get counted. I cannot see any reason why the numbers attending daily and cashing chips cannot be counted.

**Mr Slater:** What is the purpose of that?

**Mr LEWIS:** It makes it possible for society in future to differentiate between those who merely attend the casino to visit out of curiosity and those who visit to play. The committee expressed some difficulty in coming to conclusions about that aspect, yet it did not see fit to include that matter in its recommendations of conditions under which a licence would be issued.

Also, it struck me as being odd that the committee did not impose or recommend the imposition of more severe penalties for breaches of the licence conditions of the kind to which I have already referred, and such as can be found in clause 25 of the Bill.

**Mr Slater:** Capital punishment!

**Mr LEWIS:** They are serious. I have heard everyone who supports the establishment of a casino say that we will not have organised crime entering or being allowed access to the facility, yet the penalties prescribed are peanuts compared with the gains that can be obtained.

The other argument that I would like to take up concerns the proposition to amend the Bill to have a casino owned by the Government. That would be a most unwise step. If it is considered to be improper and unwise to trust private corporations and individuals, even though they be (as far as any exhaustive search determines) wholly resident in South Australia, or at least Australia. Furthermore, if it is thought that that imposes greater risk or such a great risk that they should not be trusted with ownership, then it is an even greater risk to our society to expose the institution of Parliament and members of Parliament to the kind of temptations that organised crime would offer members during the course of the years of operation in the future. The mores of the community at present may mean (and I sincerely believe that they do mean) that the community elects members of the kind and calibre that we have at the present time.

However, in time, things change. Things change every day. Today things are no longer the same as they were yesterday. Taken over 50 years, those changes may mean that interested organisations which had mischief in mind would seek to get their own men into positions of political influence so that they could influence the Government to favour their position and extend their privileges to make profits through the habits of gambling and, accordingly, subvert the legislation of the day.

I am therefore flatly opposed to the proposal of Government ownership of a casino for that reason. I think that politicians ought not to be exposed to that kind of harassment. In the United States, sociological research has indicated that it takes those undesirable elements in society that Government instrumentalities are set out to regulate, by establishing a tribunal or similar statutory body, less than 20 years to catch the regulating body out. Once the body set up to regulate that operation in society has been caught by the people whom it is regulating, it is doomed. A classic example of that right now is the South Australian Egg Board.

**Mr Slater:** What is it gambling on?

**Mr LEWIS:** Nothing. It has been caught by the large producers. But it was set up originally to protect the small producers, who are, at an increasing rate each year, being phased out of the industry. I think it is a pity if members cannot recognise that this is the fate of regulatory bodies which we establish as a phenomenon in our society. Personally, I recommend this measure should only be made under sunset legislation, to the extent that it is debated by Parliament once every three years to remind Parliament and the public that such an operation (if it ever operates legally in South Australia) is being conducted by the licensee.

**Mr PETERSON (Semaphore):** I support the motion and the Bill. I thank the Parliament for giving me the privilege of being on the select committee. It was a privilege to serve on that committee. It served as an experience of people, places, philosophies and interests, and I think I can say that I enjoyed it. I learnt a lot. I congratulate the chairman for doing a remarkable job and I congratulate other members and thank them for their assistance. There will be a conscience vote on this matter. There is an interesting snippet in this morning's newspaper by Father John Fleming on what conscience is and I quote that report as follows:

Conscience is not a tiresome little voice that stops us doing what we want to do. Conscience is that part of our intellect which deals with what is right or wrong. Conscience therefore must be informed and rational. We have an obligation to identify our prejudice and irrational desires and superstitions.

We must have an informed and rational view on the matter that we are debating. I think the Premier commented that he wanted a full and informed debate. The member for Playford said he was disgusted at the lack of interest shown by members. To support that situation, I checked with officers of the Parliament to see how many members had taken the trouble to refer to the evidence gathered by the committee.

There have been a lot of words spoken in this debate about a casino, and a lot of points put forward. The last time I checked, not one member of this House had taken the trouble to refer to the evidence taken by the select committee. As a matter of fact, going by some of the debates in this place I do not think some members have read the report. If members are going to make points in this debate, there are nearly 1 000 pages of transcript that contain a lot of information that will enable members to make those points. That is the place to get that information.

I think that the whole of the debate in this House has been based on snippets of the report issued by the select committee and opinions formed long before the debate

came to this Chamber. That is a sad thing. In fact, I heard two members discussing this motion in the corridor tonight and they were talking about development potential. One member said, 'It is not the development I am worried about, it is the politics that worry me'. That is a great way to enter a debate on whether or not we should have a casino. How are we going to have a full and successful debate with that sort of attitude existing?

As the member for Playford also mentioned, many people who gave evidence to the committee took a moral stance. There were people here tonight who took a moral stance, and I fully support their right to that stance and their right to that view if that is what they wish. However, I think that there are a few people hiding their real reasons behind a moral stance. I believe that this matter is too important to the State for people to do that. I did say when I presented my Bill last year that the path of legislation of this type has never been an easy one and that the fear of electoral backlash has apparently created reluctance among members of the major Parties to present a Casino Bill. I was wrong and the Bill has been presented by a major Party, but I do not think we are having an honest debate on it.

Much has been made in the debate this evening about the commissions and hearings around the world on gambling. I have statements from two hearings that I would like to quote; both were royal commissions that made findings upon the rights of Parliament, or the rights of people to dictate to the community what they should do. The first appeared in the report of the 1949-51 British royal commission on betting, lotteries and gaming, and states:

We are left with the impression that it is extremely difficult to establish by abstract argument 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 are 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 possible. This point of view was put to us by some witnesses but we do not think 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 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 to the community in general.

The other commission to which I refer is the New Zealand royal commission of 1946-48. The view of that commission was as follows:

We conclude therefore that the proper function of the State is to impose restraints and restrictions only in respect of gambling which is, or is likely to be, productive of detrimental social consequences. That does not, of course, mean detrimental consequences in sporadic instances, but consequences on a scale more widespread and more general.

Since no other honourable member has referred to the evidence, I will now do so. The evidence presented to the committee includes a letter written by the Tasmanian Commissioner of Police where, under the heading 'Effects on family life and changes in community attitudes' (and this refers to the effects of a casino upon the community in Tasmania), it states:

In 1978 the Tasmanian Government set up a committee to examine the social and economic effects of gambling in this State. No substantial evidence of serious social, moral or economic consequences of gambling was forthcoming. The committee did note, however, that in cases where gambling was a factor in family breakdowns, it was usually one among several contributing factors. There is no evidence to suggest that the operations of the casino has created any significant changes in community attitudes or in lowering social or moral standards. Neither has there been any marked effect on community life.

The Tasmanian Police Commissioner answered questions put to him by Mr Mathwin on page 129 of the evidence.

Mr Mathwin asked, 'What about the effects on the family, are there any detrimental effects to your knowledge?' Mr Robinson, the Tasmanian Commissioner, answered, 'Certainly, there have been isolated cases that could have been attributed to the casino.' Mr Robinson goes on to quote a couple of cases and I might come back to them if I have the time. Mr Robinson continues, 'Isolated cases such as that occur, but it has been our experience that that is just another avenue for them. If they do not have the casino, they will do it at the races, or fly to Sydney and do it on the poker machines.'

Mr Mathwin then asked, 'Has there been any increase in the number of compulsive gamblers.' The answer was, 'Not that I am aware of.' Mr Mathwin then raised the matter of juveniles and asked:

Another aspect that worries me is the teenagers. We legislate so that they are not supposed to drink under 18 years, or see R films. In the case of casinos I presume that that is in the legislation, too. Policing that problem is a problem. Have you had much trouble with under-age people.

The Commissioner replied, 'We have an under-age drinking problem in this State, and it causes much concern, but it has not presented itself as a problem at the casino.' So that covers another argument. The Department for Community Welfare in South Australia, when it was asked to make a submission, referred to the social impact in Tasmania, as follows:

As part of the Department for Community Welfare's investigation into the potential social impact of a casino in South Australia, the department contacted the Tasmanian Department of Social Welfare. Ms Murnane, Deputy Director-General, stated that while no research had been specifically carried out on the effect of the Wrest Point Casino on the Tasmanian community, her department was of the opinion that the casino had not had any effect on the social problems presented to the department.

This view substantiates the evidence provided to the 1981 A.C.T. Select Committee on the establishment of a casino in the A.C.T. by the following agencies: Tasmanian Commissioner for Police, Mr M. Robinson; Lifeline, Director, Mr Bill Rae; Gamblers Anonymous, Mr Garth Summers; Salvation Army of Tasmania, Major J. Kirkham; Catholic Family Welfare Bureau.

The report of our Department for Community Welfare concludes:

This select committee [in the A.C.T.] concluded 'that available evidence did not indicate that the establishment of a legal casino was the causative factor in any increase in social problems'.

And this is the place where it has been operating since 1972-1973. If there were going to be any problems in a small community, one would think they would be apparent by them. Another investigation was carried out by the *Examiner* newspaper, a Launceston paper, in 1978. The article states:

We set out to find the negative things as a result of the casino's setting up here and its subsequent operations. We did this because no-one had tried to find out the real truth of the matter before. Overall, we found very few bad things. For example, we discovered that of the 500 people known to be addicted to gambling in Tasmania there are very few previous non-gamblers who have been attracted to, and then hooked by, casino gambling.

We concluded the hotel casino was not generating a chronic gambling habit that did not already exist. We are surprised these figures were not worse.

That is the Tasmanian experience. We also went to the Northern Territory. Again we tried to find out what went on. We spoke to the casino manager in Alice Springs and, in regard to compulsive gamblers, the question asked was:

From your experience as casino manager, have you any knowledge of anyone being seriously embarrassed by over-gambling?

The answer was:

No, I have knowledge of people who may have done that but my management staff were able to intervene and stop it. We do not want people to get into trouble.

In that case it was the operator who stopped it. It was suggested to us that gambling in Alice Springs was causing problems with traders. We checked it out with the Treasurer of the Confederation of Industries, which is the Alice Springs

equivalent of the Chamber of Commerce. The question was in regard to people not paying their bills and booking up groceries. He stated:

No-one books up groceries. The biggest indication would be that a third of my trade is in cheques and I have not had an increase in bad cheques.

So, the traders in Alice Springs have not been affected. The juvenile situation was raised by the member for Glenelg. We spoke about the juveniles to the Assistant Police Commissioner in Alice Springs. He was asked:

Do you think casino security staff are better at preventing under-age people entering the premises and similar situations in the hotel?

He stated that they were much better. He also went on to say that there was no problem with juveniles. In Darwin, we spoke to the social worker of the city council who deals with people day after day with all sorts of problems in their life. We asked about the effect of the casino on those people. Mr Taylor stated:

In regard to an ordinary Darwin working family, a Public Service family or Army family, they are back where they started and the casino is not affecting them a great deal. Some had big splurges when it first opened, got badly burnt and have not been near it since. I have met many people throughout the community as I have been a social worker in Darwin for 20 years. We could not care less for the casino, except as a pub up the street. After the initial rush, the casino has not caused individual hardships as a specific form of gambling.

Mr Taylor also said that young people were not a problem when answering Mr Mathwin. We tried to find out what a compulsive gambler was. We were given personality profiles from psychiatrists. One witness referred to a volume, and gave an outline of a gambler, as follows:

I refer to a description set out in the chapter to which I earlier referred. It sets out what a compulsive gambler is: he is full of go, he is intelligent, witty, gives the impression that he understands people and he is part of people . . .

So, the psychiatrist gave the impression that the gambler has a certain personality. Another definition was given in an article in the *Australian* of 4 June. The committee spoke with the clinical psychologist who wrote that article (Mark Geoffrey Dickerson). I am referring to the evidence that the committee took; as I pointed out, no previous speaker has done so. The question was asked of Mr Dickerson concerning the number of compulsive gamblers and the figure that he gave was that about 0.77 percent of the population fall into that category. Of course, what that means is that 99.23 percent of the population is perfectly safe and can gamble at any time they wish. I would have thought that, if those odds existed concerning the things that we undertake in our lives, and that if we had a 99 percent chance of getting by, we would consider ourselves very lucky; however, that figure of 0.77 is used very much in the argument against having a casino. This information was given to us in evidence by a clinical psychologist. He gave that evidence as an expert and it was taken by the committee in that spirit.

*Mr Slater interjecting:*

**Mr PETERSON:** That is true. Mr Dickerson was talking about the effect that gambling has. He pointed out that:

The Rothschild Committee gave 0.1 per cent of the adult population as going to casinos regularly. If we start to combine those two figures one is talking about people who lose control and it is only a tiny percentage. It will be a small percentage of the regulars.

The next question he was asked was:

Only a small percentage of the 0.1 per cent would be compulsive gamblers?

His answer to that was 'Yes'. So, that clinical psychologist said that it was a very small percentage of people who were compulsive gamblers. It was also suggested that because of the establishment of a casino here, people would suddenly change their gambling habits. Mr Dickerson was again asked the question (page 811 of the evidence):

It has been suggested that because South Australia has Instant Money, T.A.B. and lotteries our gamblers will home in on a casino. Do you support that type of view?

His reply to that question was:

No. When a gambler loses control it is usually in relation to only one form of gambling. Some gamblers are only interested in poker machines and only lose control in relation to poker machines. That type of gambler would have to go through a whole new type of experience before he lost control in relation to, say, a casino.

So, those are the thoughts about people who have suddenly been torn from the streets and thrown on the mercy of the State, because they have started to gamble at a casino. I refer to another study undertaken, an American study which I have not read but it is contained in the record. That study indicated that:

That as the level of gambling increases, increases are observed in the proportion of divorces and separations, disagreements about money matters with spouses, lack of understanding between marital partners, more reported problems amongst children of gamblers. In addition, it was observed that the percentage of respondents expressing job dissatisfaction increases, with heavy involvement in both absenteeism and tardiness more prevalent among debtors compared with non-debtors. Alcohol consumption is also reported to increase as the volume of betting increases.

It further states:

However, it has proved impossible in both this and other studies to determine if gambling is a cause or a result of those related conditions.

There is nothing at all in any of that to say that gambling causes the problem or to indicate whether it is just a factor of the situation. The member for Gilles referred to the effects of a casino on other forms of gambling, and there is no doubt that those other forms are under some stress. I do not know and no-one else seems to know whether it is because of the attitude of the people.

Perhaps they have had enough of the other codes. No-one seems to have the answer. Whether or not South Australia has a casino, there will be problems in that regard. The member for Glenelg stated that crime is not at the level in Australia as it is in the United States and the United Kingdom, and that is obvious. I believe we all appreciate that, and if one even skims through the report he will note that fact. The honourable member also referred to the evidence that was given in camera. I think that was a little unfair. He had the privilege of hearing that evidence, and to refer to it here, when other people did not have that access, which was a little unfair.

The member for Albert Park talked about the social and welfare consequences. I have been through all of the evidence, and there does not seem to be anything in that regard. Witnesses who appeared before the select committee very aggressively told us that they were aware of problems in that matter, and they said that we were not looking for evidence of those problems. Where do we look? No-one could tell us. There was a lot of anecdotal evidence and we were told stories about compulsive gamblers and families that were breaking down, but no-one could tell us who and where they were. That was a problem.

The honourable member said that the statistics on gambling are insufficient, and that is true. The committee supported that assertion. Comments were made by other members to the effect that saying that there should be an investigation and that the casino should be supported are two different things, and that those statements seem to be contradictory, but I do not believe that they are. We must look at the effects of gambling in this country. We do not know anything about the effects, but I do not believe that that should necessarily bar a casino. Very soon, every State in Australia will have a casino except South Australia, and I do not see why we should sit and wait for a survey to be undertaken, if a survey is ever undertaken.

The Premier referred to conscience votes, and I have covered that matter. Tourism must be lifted by a good, multi-purpose complex. There is no other way in which we can get that sort of thing, and I hope to come back to that point shortly. It was said that the number of compulsive gamblers will not increase, and I agree with that. The member for Peake supported the casino, without poker machines, and I would not support poker machines in this State for any money. Honourable members said that they had insufficient time to read the report. That is a matter of contention, and, anyway, we all had the same time.

The member for Brighton said that development would result from a casino, and that is significant. We also referred to the strictest controls in the world, and that is a point that most members missed. If honourable members went through the evidence, compared it to the report, and looked at the controls that apply, they would find that, in isolation, away from the effects of organised crime in the first place, we have an opportunity to set up a casino in a clean and controlled atmosphere. I believe it is possible to keep organised crime out altogether. The member for Adelaide said that, of a group of 20 people, 17 were against the establishment of a casino. It is funny thing: the majority of a group of 20 young adults who were here today (and I will not say what they were here for, but it is a profession) supported a casino.

The member for Norwood mentioned S.P. bookmakers and said that they have a turnover of \$200 000 000 a year, but no-one does anything about it. We must do something about that. The Chief Secretary stated that he did not believe that organised crime applies in this State: he should speak to his Deputy Commissioner, because, at page 869 of the evidence, the Deputy Commissioner said that he believes he can keep crime out and control a casino.

In conclusion, I refer to an article in the *News* by Frank Jackson entitled 'More than one gambler in the Casino Bill'. He is right, because this is the last chance to develop this project. If one looks around Australia, one sees that \$15 000 000 was spent initially in Hobart and another \$18 000 000 is envisaged. However, it has been said that it is not working and that no-one goes there! The casino in Alice Springs has been built at a cost of \$15 000 000, and I think \$25 000 000 has been spent on a casino at Mindil Beach, plus the \$1 000 000 spent on the Don Hotel in the first place, and \$25 000 000 at Launceston.

We should also look at the jobs created in the establishment of casinos and once they are operating. This State has problems. We now have a means of creating employment, to attract some investment here and to establish some credence and standing in Australia and perhaps the world. We will not do that if we let this opportunity pass by. We will not attract that investment of \$15 000 000 or \$20 000 000, or whatever the final figure will be, to this State unless we have a development like this.

People will not come to South Australia and spend money unless they receive some return for their investment. That is a basic argument. Many of us put money in building societies to obtain the interest. We should look at this proposal as a means of helping the State. I do not believe that the social consequences are as severe as have been mentioned. We are supposed to be looking after this State. We are supposed to set it up and make it a good place for the people living in it. I do not think that the consequences of a casino are that bad.

I believe that a casino will improve the State. It is a facility that will help us sell South Australia as a tourist facility. A casino will not deter tourists. A casino will give South Australia an opportunity to enter the convention market, which I believe is a huge untapped market. However, if we do not develop this project, we cannot do that. Every

member has an obligation to make the right decision for the State and the people he represents. This is probably the last chance we will have to do that. Let us think about this issue seriously instead of advancing some of the puerile arguments that we have heard. Let us look at it seriously with a view to attracting some investment to this State in the future. As I have said, we are in the doldrums at the moment, and we have a long way to go.

**The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Billard):** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Henley Beach.

**Mr RANDALL (Henley Beach):** It is my privilege to rise in this debate and present my point of view as an elected member of an important area of this fair State. First, I clearly compliment the committee. One could almost express some jealousy at not being able to be part of the committee's deliberations and sharing the members' experience. Having been a member of a select committee and seen the benefit to be derived from personally questioning witnesses and gaining the opportunity to formulate one's point of view, I know that serving as a member of a select committee is certainly worth while.

On that basis members should very seriously consider the report of a select committee presented to this House. We have appointed a group of our colleagues to specifically inquire into a question, and they have had the time and developed the expertise to do that. They have had the opportunity to bring before this House a good, solid report which will be a valuable document for many years to come. The conscience and social issues of gambling will not go away; they are part of our community life.

The previous speaker said he thought that not one member of Parliament had examined the evidence collected by the committee. I assure him that I have done that. I suppose he is quite correct in saying that perhaps all members who spoke before him may not have looked at the evidence, but I assure him that I have spent some considerable hours over the past few evenings plodding through the evidence gathered by the select committee. It was interesting to hear him quote some of that evidence. I would have liked to do the same to demonstrate some of my arguments.

Members must wonder where I stand on this issue. Personally, I cannot support the concept of gambling and casinos, as I believe that they are a waste of time. It is non-investment of a dollar or two, often for little return, if any.

**Mr Slater:** Some people get pleasure from it.

**Mr RANDALL:** True, and there is the dilemma concerning people who desire such a facility to provide entertainment. But what sort of entertainment would it be? It was put to me while door-knocking, when I raised the question of a casino, that often the lady of the house wanted a night out and somewhere to go for entertainment. I am amazed that more members opposite had not supported the concept, because I would have thought that they would be happy with this method of redistribution of funds from the rich to the poor.

**Mr Slater:** How do you work that out?

**Mr RANDALL:** Only people who could afford it would go there. I would have thought that Opposition members would jump at that. Having expressed my personal view, I would like to explain why South Australia needs a casino. I refer to the high unemployment levels in my district. South Australia is about to have an international airport and a subsequent influx of overseas visitors. Glenelg and other areas on the foreshore provide an attraction for someone to build a major gambling complex. An ideal location may be adjacent to the *Buffalo*. Already there are many multi-storey towers, and one such building could house a casino. On the basis of such development, South Australia needs a

casino. That argument has been advanced often tonight, and I agree with it. Not only building jobs but also other jobs would be created, whether it be part time or full time, perhaps providing jobs especially for young people.

As I have stated previously, I am particularly concerned about young people under 25 years who are unemployed and who have no job prospects. The siting of a casino along the foreshore could provide opportunities on the western side of town to obtain work in that area. I note that the committee wrote to some unions about this matter but did not get a satisfactory reply.

*Mr Slater interjecting:*

**Mr RANDALL:** The committee wrote to the United Trades and Labor Council for an opinion on union membership, but it chose not to give an opinion. There should be an opportunity to create employment prospects in South Australia if that is the sort of development that we are talking about, and I believe it is. At page 214 the report states:

Any development should be developed as a multi-million dollar complex with associated hotel, restaurant and convention centre facilities as opposed to a one-purpose gaming club-type casino.

That is one suggestion with which I agree. South Australia needs more of such developments. Paragraph (5), on page 214, states:

... although the existence of a casino complex outside the metropolitan area would tend to minimise any adverse social impacts, it is considered that a casino established in a city or metropolitan location would not necessarily be harmful to a residential population and that a location in Adelaide or near Adelaide is preferable to ensure the accessibility and therefore the viability of any casino proposal.

Paragraph (6) states:

The selection of a site would form part of the submission by an applicant for a casino licence and would be considered by the Casino Investigative Committee and the tribunal.

There are a few reasons why one would like to support that form of development in the metropolitan area. The member for Semaphore referred to tourism, and I do not want to pursue that matter further, but I am sure that, if South Australia came up with something unique and a casino were located in an area where it would attract tourists, it would help as a major investment. If a developer wants to spend money and put a multi-million dollar development in that area, he needs to recoup some of the costs, and one way to do that is by establishing a casino.

Entertainment is an attraction which brings people to an area and, as I have pointed out, there is little on the western side of town in the way of entertainment. Leisure centres and amusement centres are becoming popular. Again, Glenelg has had some vision and I believe that other councils along the foreshore are looking to develop leisure centres, part of which could be allocated for casino gambling.

The member for Glenelg said that our crime rate did not compare with that in the United Kingdom or the United States. The evidence seems to be the Morin Report, which some members have used to establish their basis for an objection to a casino, but I believe that that is based on the presumption that crime is linked inextricably with casinos, and then it was related back to the U.K. and U.S. experience. That is the problem that I have faced in my district when I have talked with constituents in Henley Beach. I have gone door-knocking and have asked constituents whether they would like to see a casino in South Australia. Those who opposed it expressed a viewpoint and they raised the matter of crime, and so on.

One then puts another proposition that it may be that one or two floors of a large international-type hotel should be set aside as an area where adults can play adult-type games, such as roulette and two-up, and that those games should be licensed by the Government. The people were



not worried about that. I believe that there is an image in the community about casinos that is unjustified. The dilemma that I face as a member is whether I become a leader who has access to all that information, and make a leadership-type decision, or whether I take notice of an electorate that may be uninformed and are thinking of a casino on the basis of a perception they have gained from their television sets. From time to time, as the committee found out, people were referring to that *Four Corners* programme that involved an emotive look at casinos in America.

It has helped to formulate the opinion of people in this State. I believe that the ground work for the anti-casino lobby was laid when that film was shown. I find this from time to time throughout the community. As I read the evidence taken by the select committee, and the sorts of letters that were coming in, I realised that many people were referring back to that video tape shown on the *Four Corners* programme. Obviously it made an impact and has scared some people into the position of not supporting this Bill.

As a member of Parliament one finds that, if one says that one follows the Christian tradition, churches communicate in order to put viewpoints. I, like all other members, received documents from the Festival of Light in the form of a case against legal casinos in South Australia. I know that members of the committee received a copy of that document. On page five its report states:

Lifeline in Hobart is already coping with people who have lost all savings, cars and houses.

That statement was made to the committee along with the statement in section D, as follows:

Compulsive gamblers increase wherever casinos are opened. Casino gambling can be likened to the sudden 'rush' of an addictive drug like heroin—reason is suddenly replaced by the pull of a fantasy experience. Withdrawal can be painful and even impossible, encouraging a resort to crime to raise money for the addiction.

I am concerned that that document, which was sent to all members of Parliament, contains many statements that cannot be substantiated. I believe that the committee, quite rightly, investigated that document. I believe, from talking to committee members and from evidence that I have read, that they experienced a lot of difficulty finding any evidence to substantiate the document.

I think I heard a member refer tonight to Gamblers Anonymous and its representative appearing before the committee but not bringing any evidence that would cause concern in the community about addiction to gambling. I think I read in the evidence that the member for Semaphore, when in Darwin or Alice Springs, tried to contact Gamblers Anonymous, but apparently it had no evidence to produce to the committee.

**Mr Slater:** It was Lifeline.

**Mr RANDALL:** Anyway, one of the groups that should have been concerned in that area had no evidence to give to the committee to substantiate any concerns that it had about casinos in that town. Again, statements are made without any substantive evidence being produced to go with them. Nothing concerns me more than to pick up Saturday's *Advertiser* and to find an article appearing under the heading 'Evangelist warns of casino "evil"', as follows:

A casino would bring poverty and family breakdowns and boost crime and prostitution in South Australia, the Rev Sir Alan Walker said yesterday.

I believe that people should read that article and form an assessment of it. I believe that it is not based on facts, and it includes emotive statements such as when he refers to politicians by saying:

Any politician who votes for a casino in this State is morally and spiritually blind.

Statements like that do not help the argument or the issue. I believe that if church-based people want to put a viewpoint to a politician they can do so and, if they want to put it to the public, they should do so. However, they should base that view on facts. That is my concern: when church leaders in the community speak out, let us ask them to give us the facts and let us see them substantiate their claims. I attended a Festival of Light meeting in order to show an interest in what they were saying.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr RANDALL:** Is there something wrong with my attending a Festival of Light meeting? I attended it with the member for Salisbury and the member for Mallee. I went to that meeting out of interest because I thought that the casino question was going to be debated. The Festival of Light group advertised widely on the media in order to attract a large number of people to put its viewpoint. On going there, I was somewhat surprised to find that there were not many people there—I would say around about 100, if that.

The other thing that not so much annoyed me, but amazed me, was that the Festival of Light put only one side of the story. That organisation gave its viewpoints, and I do not deny it the right to give its viewpoints. Most members of Parliament have strong viewpoints and have expressed those viewpoints publicly. Honourable members should have been able to go to that meeting if they wished. I am not critical of that, but during the same week a witness from this group appeared before the committee to present his viewpoints on his English experience with the Festival of Light people. I was a little concerned about that.

My personal assessment (and I am not critical of the people who went to or conducted the meeting) is that I believe that most of the people really went there to find out why they should oppose the establishment of a casino in South Australia. I do not think that that is a healthy approach for people to take. I believe that, if a public meeting was to be called, it would have been better to wait and call it during the past few days, when both sides of the story could be put and some public debate could have taken place on the basis of the report which is before Parliament, with some intelligent debating of facts and figures that had been put before the committee, allowing those who attended the opportunity to form an assessment. I am not attempting to be critical and damning of the Festival of Light, but I hope that it reads these comments, takes them on board and reviews its operations.

Another thing that concerned me was a letter written by the Adelaide Crusade Centre, which letter was of no value to a person trying to formulate a viewpoint. I was concerned that that organisation was using its position to hammer home a message and that it expected supposed Christian politicians to become the moral leaders via legislation in the community.

That is the point that leads to a dilemma for any member of Parliament on any social issue. I have expressed that dilemma previously, and it is the difficulty that one faces: what role do politicians play in the community? My position is as an elected representative of a group of people who, I believe, at this stage do not want a casino and who would expect me to vote 'No'. This is a dilemma in that I, as a member of Parliament, have access to information that would cause me to make a decision that may be different from that generally held in the electorate that I represent, based on facts and figures presented earlier.

My decision must be made at a later stage, my having reviewed the amendments. The longer that I waited before speaking tonight, the more amendments I have seen floating around the Chamber. The final decision that I must make will be during the final appearance of the Bill before the House, and, if I am not happy with that, I must err on the

side of conservatism, and retain the status quo by voting vote 'No'.

**Mr Slater:** There you are, he has done a complete turn-about.

**Mr RANDALL:** I have not indicated a complete turn-about: I have indicated, as all other members have, that there is some dilemma in an issue like this, but that there are also some positive points. It is a matter of weighing up and forming an assessment of the received gains of revenue to the State, increased entertainment and leisure facilities and tourist attractions, as against the trauma of the potential destruction of family life. That is when one must make the final decision on that point.

**Mr BLACKER (Flinders):** I rise at this time to reiterate my views expressed on previous occasions in relation to this measure. I think the first time I spoke in relation to a proposed casino was in 1973. Since that time the matter has been raised on a number of occasions. In all of those debates and discussions and in evidence that came forward on those occasions nothing has come to light which would convince me that I should change my mind or my attitude towards it. I would commend the committee on its report and the detailed way in which it went about it. I was sceptical when the select committee was established, doubting that a committee could undertake such a wide-sweeping task and report to this House in a relatively short time in a comprehensive manner as it has done. I commend every member of the committee and the Chairman for what must have been a mammoth job, not only in receiving the evidence but also in compiling it and putting it together in the way in which it is presented to this Parliament. I believe the report will become a well-recognised document now and in future years as South Australia's assessment of a casino's potential or otherwise. I commend the members of the committee for that.

As I said before, my association with any form of gambling has been very remote, as an outsider observing the damage done to society and, to a lesser degree, the benefits individuals have received as a result of their gambling pursuits. Some 18 months ago I visited the Wrest Point Casino in Tasmania, and I was tremendously impressed on the way in which that casino was conducted. The staff were professional in overlooking the operations at the tables. From that viewpoint I could not find fault. Good dress was demanded, people had to be respectable and had to respect the wishes of the staff and other clients on those premises. As I have said before, and repeat, I could not in any way fault the operations of that gambling floor.

I think one of the matters that causes me concern is the way in which gambling has become part of the Australian way of life. I note on page 45 of the report a quotation taken from *Choice* magazine of July 1979, which states:

Australians are the world's heaviest gamblers—by a long shot. We make the rest of the developed world look like beginners when it comes to throwing money away in pursuit of Lady Luck. It has been estimated that the per capita expenditure on gambling in Australia is \$710 a year, compared with \$440 a year in the United States of America, \$95 in the United Kingdom and \$87 in Canada.

When one considers that we are talking about a per capita expenditure and takes into account the average family of four, the mind boggles when we are talking in the vicinity of \$2 840 per family, that being husband, wife, and two children. That is where the home truths come home to roost and make one wonder how much damage it is doing to many families in our community. Whilst I have quoted a figure of \$2 840 per family, there are families in the community that do not gamble in any way. Every family that does not gamble compounds the effect on those that do gamble. On one end of the spectrum we have a large sector

of the community who do not participate in the sport of gambling (if we can call it a sport), right through to the extreme of the heavy gamblers who obviously must wager in very large sums.

This is an issue that is difficult to get into its correct perspective, and one that causes me some concern, and I have referred to a figure of \$710 per capita per year. One of the interesting aspects of gambling concerns the question of where does one stop. If a casino is introduced now, what will be the next step? There is always someone looking for a new gambling pursuit, for a forbidden apple is an attraction that seems to be just out of reach of citizens in the community. I venture to say that, if we have a casino, there will be a further quest for another. During the past few years we have seen a number of smaller gambling games introduced, from the basic lottery right through to instant money and various other schemes. Each time it is something new designed to attract people's eyes and their attention and hopefully raise a few dollars for the Government. How far can it go, and where does one stop?

An interesting comment in the report concerned the impact of a casino on visitor arrivals in South Australia. The comments of the report in this respect are worth recommending to everyone, particularly those involved in the tourist industry and those who believe that a casino could be of some benefit to the tourist industry. No-one would deny that there is an appeal, that there is an attraction for visitors to the capital of the State. The tendency to visit a casino would be much greater than if it was on one's backdoorstep. I know that when I went to Tasmania I had to go to Wrest Point; I did not go there to gamble but simply because of all the promotion about Wrest Point; the fact that one should go there had been noted in almost every tourist pamphlet in Tasmania. Obviously that type of promotion has flow-on effects—not necessarily the money that the Government directly receives through commission from the casino, but the fact that visitors are attracted to the State, part of the attraction being the casino, and thus had an influence on other sections of the tourist industry. How one could actually estimate those effects, I do not know. I think that those in the tourism industry have some idea of how they could estimate that, but that is something beyond my comprehension.

Reference is made (at pages 96 and 97) to Mr Vibert's evidence. This is one of the disturbing aspects of the report. Many of his comments leave one to wonder how much was not said. After talking to some of the members of the committee and after noting some of the evidence, I had found that much more information was given to the committee than that which was actually noted in the report. The amounts of money suggested by Mr Vibert in trying to entice political favour through respective Governments of the day, irrespective of the political colour of the Parties involved, causes me a great deal of concern. Obviously, there is a man prepared to spend thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of dollars, to win a favour or favours from Governments. That situation causes me a great deal of concern and requires very close investigation of the extent of this activity and whether in fact it is a one-off situation or whether it could become a common occurrence in relation to any matter concerning a casino.

I appreciate that in the example given the direct relation was not to a casino but to poker machines. Nevertheless, there is a flow-on effect. I raised that point, because I would imagine that committee members were very concerned to hear evidence of this kind about operations in other States. We must recognise that that could occur here.

I gave an undertaking that I would not speak for very long, but I want to raise one other point. I received correspondence late last year and early this year asking me to

endeavour to impress on the Government that there should be a referendum. I appreciate that a select committee gives members of the public an opportunity to contribute to deliberations, and to that end I would have to agree that there has been a fair public assessment in those terms.

I also recall that in September 1973 the Government of the day gave an undertaking to hold a referendum in relation to a casino, and I am rather interested that we have not heard further views on that matter. I wonder whether, if Opposition members were in a position of power, they would hold a referendum. Many groups and individuals in the community would like that. I raise that point at this time hoping that, before the conclusion of this debate, we will be told whether that is the policy of the Opposition and whether it will pursue that line of thinking.

Again, I commend the committee for a very comprehensive report. I have absolutely no doubt that it will become a very respected report and an important reference work for deliberations in regard to a casino in this State. One does not really know where it will go from there. Having commended the committee for its report, I cannot support the principle of a casino, and at the appropriate time I will vote accordingly.

**Mr EVANS (Fisher):** I suppose that over the years I have uttered more words in relation to my views on a casino than has any other member. Because of my background, I have some doubts about gambling, but I will refer to that matter later. I appreciate the work that the committee has put into the report. I know that all of the members of the committee are dedicated politicians and their philosophy and work effort can never be challenged. The report that they have brought down is the best that they could put together with the available resources and the time constraints that were placed on them in presenting a report to Parliament. The time for presenting the report had to be extended on a couple of occasions. I also recognise the efforts of officers and other people in helping the members of the committee with the report.

I appreciate the evidence that has been made available in the report. I am sorry that the member for Semaphore is not present in the Chamber. He was one of the hard-working committee members, but in a way he was one of the few who were privileged (if I can use that word) to hear the evidence without having to read it. It is unfair for the honourable member or any other person to suggest that it was possible for others to read not only the evidence in the report but also the reports referred to, including the Morin Report, between 12 August and 18 August, and to assess and carry out the necessary research to track back and cross-check evidence. That was a human impossibility. Whatever happens to this Bill in the end result, that was an impossibility placed on all Parliamentarians, except perhaps the members of the select committee and, again, I appreciate the work they put into taking that evidence, reading and considering it.

Within life all of us at times place our own interpretation upon written or spoken words. Because of our own bents, if the evidence is balanced we will follow the evidence that suits our line of thinking as individuals. None of us can change that position as human beings. I am surprised, I suppose, that we have discussed gambling as an industry. People have heard me say before that the racing industry, as it is termed, did not create the interest; that was created by the gambling. I still hold that view today.

Members opposite would know from my background that I employed and worked with a lot of people, men and women, in the hard yakka part of life where people did not receive very high wages. The point made by the member for Salisbury about people gambling out of desperation is

very true in some cases. There were cases where people who did not have a high income and who had a build-up of debts, illness or who got into difficulties through bad management of their finances suddenly took a punt by going to the races and trying to raise money. In those days I had 60 or 70 men and some women working around me. Racing was the only form of gambling available at that time. Lotteries and bingo were not available, and I will return to those forms of gambling later.

Members will know that I am not a heavy gambler or a heavy drinker. Before I entered this place I was virtually a non-participant in either field. The things I have seen happen to men and women and their families developed in my mind a desire to be in this place and to have some bearing on the attitude of Parliament towards the people it serves. I have found in my experience in Parliament that Parliaments are mainly concerned with majorities when in fact the most important sections of society are the minorities.

The committee's report refers to one witness who said that we should not stop people from doing what they want to do with their own time, bodies and money. The implication was that we should not interfere with people wanting to do what they want to do. That argument is true in relation to Parliament making laws. However, if one accepts that argument one must also accept that if something goes wrong with the individual participating in that area the rest of society should not have to pick up the tab or concern itself. Once one moves into this area one knows that as members of Parliament we should be concerned.

Recently, I have heard people from all walks of life express the view that we are taxed too highly, that taxes are too large for us to pay to provide services to the community. A large part of those services are social security services, welfare services or other aid services for people who have gone wrong through their inability to handle their own affairs or sometimes through sheer bad luck. In a significant number of cases it may be sheer bad luck, but I do not talk in terms of investing money but in regard to accidents or situations in which people are placed through something having gone wrong in their family.

**Mr Slater:** Supporting mothers?

**Mr EVANS:** If the honourable member means that in the way that the mother could not avoid being pregnant or took the risk of using no precautions, I do not accept that interjection. Unfortunately, the female species has to 'carry the can' quite often in those circumstances, and that was not the area about which I was talking: I was speaking in general terms. Parliament has an interest where it provides an opportunity for people to participate in particular fields. As I have said before, I do not oppose a casino in this State on that moral ground as my main objection.

I will participate to a degree in a casino, because I have been and seen them in 20 overseas countries when I studied them. I should put on record that I was invited to the Hobart casino and given free accommodation by the management. A bottle of every form of liquor was in the cupboard for me and I was told that it was there for me to use. I told the person who took me that I did not drink very much, and he said that I should take it home. Some is still available if people want it, even though it is from about 1974. I suppose that people may have thought that they were going to convince me that it was a good idea. I do not know. However, I make the point that it is the only incentive with which I have ever been provided by anyone to be convinced that a casino is a good idea.

**Mr Slater:** Who invited you—Federal Hotels?

**Mr EVANS:** Yes, and I could tell the honourable member who were the people who made the goods available.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** When was that?

**Mr EVANS:** In 1976, when I went overseas. I am conscious of the casino scene in many countries, but I will not refer to that aspect tonight because I have been through it previously. However, I pick up the point used by most members as an example to justify the establishment of a casino in South Australia, and that is the situation in Tasmania. At page 30, the report indicates that once the building was established, there was a big increase in tourism because of the casino, or so it is suggested. The report continues:

... the Tasmanian tourist industry in 1981 was worth \$150 000 000 per annum, compared with \$110 000 000 per annum two years previously.

If one applies a 10 per cent or 15 per cent inflation rate which prevails in that industry, there is virtually no increase at all over those two years in tourism in real terms. On the same page the report continues:

There would appear little doubt that the establishment of a casino has been a major catalyst in the revitalisation of the tourist industry, and this is evident by the official surveys, which show that 69.2 per cent of all adult visitors to Hobart visit the Wrest Point complex. It is estimated by Federal Hotels, the licensee, that some 8 000 000 people have passed through the doors at Wrest Point since it opened in 1973. The Department of Tourism in Tasmania has produced annual estimates of Tasmania's visitor arrivals since 1968-1969, and these figures show an 89.3 per cent increase to the end of the 1979-1980 financial year.

That sounds great but, if one looks at the Australian figures for that time, one finds that in 1969 there were about 300 000 people coming from overseas to visit Australia. In 1980 the Australian figure increased to 900 000. The Australian tourist industry had a gain of 200 per cent.

**Mr Slater:** That is in international visitors.

**Mr EVANS:** The honourable member is right. The idea of a casino is to attract international visitors and there was an 89 per cent increase in tourism to Tasmania, yet the number of tourists to Australia increased by 200 per cent. Tasmania could not even attract the percentage increase that came to Australia. In addition, for 12 years Tasmania has been spending more money per head of population on tourism than has any other State in Australia. If the member wants to look at overall figures, he will find that that is the sort of trend that Tasmania will be moving into to attract people, and I can understand that. A report in the *Tasmania Year Book* states:

Tasmania is unique among the Australian States because it is an island with relatively short distances separating population centres. The populated areas of the State are serviced by a main road network of a high standard and, in addition, the scenery and topography (see also the section 'Physiography' in Chapter 2) is fascinatingly varied. Without travelling for any great distance one can encounter long white beaches, coastal heaths and sand dunes, dense rain forests, rugged mountains, alpine moors and snow country, undulating hill country, fertile river valleys, numerous lakes and rivers, lush green pastures, orchards.

Tasmania is unique in that it is an island, has a tourist attraction, and has great potential, but, with all the plugging and a casino, that State could not gain the same percentage of tourists as Australia at that time, and then it was the only State that had a casino. I want to go back to a point that other members have been speaking about. That is the effect on other gambling. In this State, even though some major licensed clubs have failed, no-one has suggested, nor did the committee have time to consider, how many clubs are struggling, even though they have the opportunity to conduct bingo. It is interesting that we do not allow bingo to operate for all sorts of hours as has been suggested for a casino. I wonder why we make that provision for bingo not to operate for long periods. If any member of Parliament had time or if Parliament made people available to do a survey of licensed clubs and the charities in this State, particularly licensed clubs, it would be found, that, if the clubs lost bingo, they would fail.

We all know, from the committee's report, that in the other areas of gambling, such as racing, lotteries and soccer pools, there is a decline. We know that the South Australian Jockey Club is concerned about even surviving. That club would be interested in the licence if we could make it available to it. Doubtless, many other people would apply. Let us consider the position of Darwin, Alice Springs and Tasmania before they got casinos. I wonder whether members were in Tasmania before a casino was operating there and saw how many clubs, restaurants and hotels for tourists were open after 11 p.m. Nil!

Even now, with a casino in Tasmania there are only about two establishments that run through to 3.00 a.m. or 4.00 a.m. during the latter part of the week when the town wants to move. Naturally, when Tasmania was the only place in Australia that had a casino there were people going there to use that facility and there was a chance for local people to kick on after they came from the theatre because the casino was the only place of its kind available. If one goes to Alice Springs or Darwin one finds that that is the case there also. There was not a lot of nightlife in Darwin before the casino was established. There were about three places open at night and one of them was a place one would not go after the pictures wearing one's best suit. It was not the sort of place where people would want to hang around for too long.

**Mr Slater:** How do you reckon we're situated in Adelaide in that regard?

**Mr EVANS:** Adelaide is a different city from those places and it is also different from places such as Nevada and other places in the world. We do not have the crime here, or the corruption in areas of public entertainment that they have in those cities. Is that because we have kept control of the sort of scene that we are talking about now? I take up the point raised by the member for Playford about corporate crime. I believe that we still have a lot of corporate crime in our State and that that is an area we need to catch up on. I do not disagree with the comments of the member for Elizabeth that it is an area where we are falling behind. There are other areas of the city that are not in the best of hands when it comes to the nightlife of Adelaide; we all know that.

However, some suggestion is made that if a casino comes here we will be able to keep out any of the other elements that come with it and keep them out for all time. I believe we are kidding ourselves in saying that. However, that is not one of my major objections to a casino. My objection, in the main, is that it will put some of our licensed clubs out of business and, more particularly, because we have more licensed places such as restaurants, hotels and that type of establishment per head of population than virtually any other State in Australia. When we get a casino here, if that is the goal, and that casino is open for all hours of the night, we will find that many of the small business operators will go to the wall. However, there are people in this Parliament who say they are concerned about the small business operator. I do not believe that they are concerned, because in the case of every casino built in Australia so far those casinos have been built in places where there have been few hotels and restaurants.

If one looks at the number of beds created in Tasmania since the advent of Wrest Point, as against the number of beds created in South Australia during the same period, members will find that South Australia has moved out in front in percentage and actual terms without having a casino. Therefore, why do we move so quickly towards having a casino? It has been agreed by committee members in the report that what we need is a national survey to find out what effect gambling has on individuals. I know from personal experience gained from watching others and helping

others (giving them their wages in advance) that gambling does have an effect on people. I would hope that we as a Parliament could have said that we would stop any decision being made in this area until such a survey has been carried out, if not nationally then within this State. However, that is not to be. A decision has to be made, as the Bill is before us now with whatever amendments will be made to it.

I have tabled certain amendments suggesting that if a casino is established it should be Government owned. If it is suggested that we should go on with a casino then why have such a casino as a profit-making institution? Why not have it as a Government-owned non-profit making facility? It could be a facility where people who want to gamble go and have less chance of losing their money, or about which, if one is talking about tourism, we can advertise anywhere in the world and say that Adelaide is the place to get the best odds, that we do not set out to make a profit from gambling, but offer the best odds in the world. This could be done if we are genuine about tourism and if that is what we want to do. I suspect that that is not our main goal.

Virtually everywhere in the world in the early part of this century when casinos become prominent (up to then there were very few), Governments, countries and States moved to casinos because of the money involved. Those countries and States decided that they could not tax any more and that one way of getting money was to move to give people a greater opportunity to spend their money in an area where it could be taken from them, either value added tax or, as we see has happened in many parts of the world, with casinos.

People talk about there being no problem with gambling (several honourable members said that) but why is it that we have to bring in such stringent controls to control gambling, and to stop people moving in with bad intent—gangsters of all types? Why are laws made with stringent controls if there is nothing wrong with gambling? Why is it that in France, for example, where there are 147 small casinos in each local government area (one area got one, so they all had to have one), that local people are not allowed to gamble in their own casino? Why are the residents of Monaco not allowed to gamble in Monte Carlo? Why is it that in Greece or Italy, public servants, members of the police force, people who run trust accounts and members of the armed forces are not allowed to enter a casino? It is because, like the Minister of Finance said to me in Italy, all Governments know that gambling inherently is not a good thing and they make it legal in the areas where they think they can make money.

Why did the State of Nevada go to casinos? It was because it was a dry desolate State that wanted to get revenue and thought that it could take it from neighbouring States. Why did Tasmania move to have a casino? Because it needed revenue as it was one of the smallest States and hoped that the casino would lift it out of its crisis. Has it? Definitely not. Tasmania's population has increased since 1968 by 9 per cent; the Australian population has increased since that time by 25 per cent.

What about unemployment? We are told that the casino is the thing that will suddenly boost employment for South Australia, yet Tasmania, with the smallest population increase in Australia over that period of time, has the worst unemployment figures. Where is the proof that a casino in Tasmania has brought job opportunities? People have been leaving. Tourists have been going there, but unemployment figures have been rising and staying high.

We know that the story about a casino creating jobs in Tasmania is fictitious and cannot be proven with any facts. Jobs may have been created in some areas, but they have been lost in others. It is true to say that if there is an

activity, whether a bingo hall or a casino, some people will be employed there. One of the greatest job creators in our community is alcohol because not only are the commodities produced, but if alcohol is used foolishly there are jobs for people who make coffins, sell flowers, dig graves, make artificial limbs and all sorts of things.

I am disappointed that we have not been able to carry out a survey in Australia to find out what the effects have been before we have moved in this direction. I am disappointed that a survey was not conducted to find out how badly off our own clubs are in this State and the position we are placing them in, considering that soccer pools are slipping down the ladder and will slip further.

Nobody has convinced me or the member for Salisbury that the laundering of money will not occur in these places, as I am sure it can. Most of the western economies are now desperate for money, and we are running out of ideas. I hope we are not going to make money out of this. If the Bill passes the Parliament, I hope that the casino will be a non-profit organisation and the best place in the world one can go to place one's bets. I finish on that note, knowing that I have had some interested people listening to me. I can tell by the way that they have been interjecting throughout the debate.

**Mr RODDA (Victoria):** It would be difficult at this stage of the debate to say something that has not been said. As a member of the committee it is incumbent upon me to express my version. The member for Fisher commented on the time, as did the member for Flinders. It is a pity that there was not more time, although it is always short. There was, in essence, a contract.

Under the leadership of the Hon. Michael Wilson as Chairman, we made a diligent study, travelled a lot and saw much in a period of nearly five months. It is a pity, now that the committee has reported, that we did not have perhaps another week. Here again time is the restraint. The affairs of State have to be dealt with through the Budget. We become used to living in these circumstances, and I am sure the House is not unfamiliar with that. In this debate, as in the evidence, there has been a fear of the evils of gambling and the sundry things that come with it. Some of the expressions of fears were touched on by the Minister last week when he laid on the report and tabled the evidence. He said that some witnesses virtually accused the committee of having predetermined views, and I detect some of that in the debate we have heard this evening.

I was a little surprised to hear our colleague the member for Mallee expressing his concern that six of the seven members of the committee were fairly rugged with the witnesses, or words to that effect. I believe there were some devil's advocates in the discussions that took place when the evidence was being taken. Indeed, I found myself, as docile and genteel as I am, calling some witnesses 'padre' in error, discovering that they were doctors of philosophy. Some witnesses were old dogs on hard roads. When one meets an old dog on a hard road, if he does not bite he will not wag his tail.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** The Speaker could give a professional opinion on that.

**Mr RODDA:** We should have had the Speaker with us, as some witnesses could have done with some professional advice that only the Speaker could give them. He may have been able to shut them up. Points were made by some of the witnesses who came in for their share of treatment by the devil's advocates, and this has been reported in the evidence and referred to in the report.

To borrow a cricketing term, there were flighted balls.

**Mr Slater:** They tried to rip your bails off!

**Mr RODDA:** And it involved ripping the bails off. Today I received a letter from a dear lady, whose name appears in the list of witnesses. The letter is dated 23 August 1982.

**Mr Slater:** She is looking a week ahead.

**Mr RODDA:** Yes. Roma Kidd, of 16 Weewanda Street, Glenelg South, 5045, stated:

I am writing to ask you to vote against the Casino bill when it comes before Parliament this week.

Her information must be a little crook. The letter continues: There are already ample opportunities in this State for those who wish to gamble and, as the economy worsens and un-employment increases, people will be tempted to solve their problems at the casino, with dire results for many families. The presence of a casino will inevitably be accompanied by other undesirable elements and we have more than enough vice, crime and violence in our society now. Also, tourists are not going to rush to South Australia's casino when there are so many already operating in other States and bigger cities.

That is open to correction, though. The letter continues:

We need courageous men in Parliament these days who will stand up for what is best for the State, and I hope you will decide that a 'no casino' vote will be the best for South Australia.

It is the right of that lady to write to me, and undoubtedly when she reads *Hansard* and notes that I have raised this matter she will want to see me. Indeed, when she notes the way in which I vote she will be even keener to see me.

The main issues concerning the majority of witnesses were compulsive gambling, corporate crime, organised crime, prostitution, laundering of money, and so on. A number of other witnesses had other views, although there were not many. Also, there were witnesses such as Mr Inns and other people who came along with professional views on the benefits of tourism. One witness amused me when he had something strong to say about prostitution. He said that the anti-lobby group were saying that prostitution would flourish with the introduction of a casino. He then made a time-honoured observation. He said, 'Prostitutes would starve if only criminals and non-Christians used their services.' Needless to say, that witness was a strong advocate of casinos.

There are not many ex-servicemen presently in this Parliament: there is only Mr Russack, myself, the member for Mitchell, and the Hon. Murray Hill in another place. Also, I think the Minister of Education sports a badge of significance. Those who were in foreign countries during war-time saw how the system works with people making use of other people's goods or whatever one wants to call them. Indeed, a large number of people did not frequent such places, although a large number did. I remember those characters who characterised the Middle East—wogs, they called them, but really the refined called them Western oriental gentlemen. There was one personable fellow who operated an establishment, and at times when there was a long queue up he would say, 'One at a time, gentlemen, there is enough for all of you.'

*The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:*

**Mr RODDA:** No, Jenny, I am talking about the oldest profession. We should not be upset listening to the views of some of these people, although none of us want to promote it. Indeed, the committee does not want to do so; nor do I. It is well and truly entrenched, as the member for Playford stated. It is in this city of Adelaide: it is everywhere.

We were treated to every courtesy by Federal Hotels. The company gave us every assistance. Regarding the way in which its establishments are run, there are no Western oriental gentlemen, but there are people who police the premises and who have an efficient code of ethics. I have never supported a casino, but, as a member of this committee, having seen the way in which casinos are run, I have changed my mind. We considered the question of corporate crime and organised crime. We had evidence from

the Police Commissioners, who are charged with responsibility to ensure that law and order is kept, from the top officers in the corporate crime area, and from the Organisational Director and Business Manager of Federal Hotels. Those people gave conclusive evidence that skimming and laundering of money are very tightly controlled. The member for Fisher alluded to this matter and said that he has doubts in that regard.

Every door was opened to the committee, and nothing was kept back. The report has made no firm recommendations, but the thrust of it is that a casino should be established with a convention centre as a multi-million dollar venture, which would fit into the chain that is coming to this country. I refer to the businessmen that we saw in Darwin, some of the South-East Asian people, and evidence from Mr Haddad, the General Manager of Federal Hotels, who talked about a convention industry involving about \$900 000 000, on which Australia is missing out. We can be part of that. People want to come to this country and they want somewhere comfortable to lower their heads. They will go to the Barossa Valley, Kangaroo Island, Port Lincoln, or other parts of this State, and they will see Tasmania. I do not accept what my colleague said about the smaller percentage: that is not the way it comes out. If 300 000 visitors come to Australia only a small number go to Tasmania; Tasmania could not handle any more. Australia, and indeed South Australia, must get on the band waggon.

I have spoken about the evils of prostitution and corporate crime, but our officers can ensure that those matters are kept in order. The measles and colds come to South Australia, and we must have antibodies to cope with them. It is not an evil day for nervous nellys. We had an opportunity to take up the challenge. I want to pay a tribute to my colleagues on the committee, to Geoffrey Wilson, Chris Sargent, and the *Hansard* staff, and all the officers who worked their tails off to bring down this report. I have much pleasure in commending it to the House.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Recreation and Sport):** I do not think the House would thank me if I retraversed, which is a word used in the report, or recanvassed all the points that had been made in this debate yesterday and today. Indeed, all the points were canvassed during the original second reading debate. I must say that some members who have spoken in this debate have really shown that they have not read the report. However, some members have given the report great attention, and I commend them.

I will say a few words about the Leader of the Opposition's contribution. Once again, as he did in the second reading debate, he has taken the opportunity to attack members on this side for what he regards as serious breaches of Cabinet responsibility. In fact, he also attacked the member for Glenelg in a most unwarranted fashion. I will deal with those two matters. It was pointed out in a previous debate on this matter when the Casino Bill was debated in this House in 1973 that some Ministers in the then Government voted against the measure. That has been pointed out to the Leader before, and I make the point again that on a conscience issue there is no reason at all why all Ministers should support the measure. In fact, as was enumerated before (and I will not do it again), several Ministers in the previous Dunstan Government voted against the 1973 Casino Bill.

**Mr Slater:** Get it out and we will see whether you are right.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** It is in *Hansard*. The honourable member can look in *Hansard* and he will see it laid out for him. The member for Hanson quoted the *Hansard*

of that time. However, I will not go into that in great detail. The facts remain, and they are there for everyone to see.

In relation to the member for Glenelg, this select committee obviously had members who were basically in favour of a casino and other members who were not in favour of a casino. I am not a leading protagonist for a casino in this State. Certainly, in the early stages of the select committee I was veering towards opposing the measure, but evidence brought forward in the latter stages of the committee's hearings convinced me to support the measure. The member for Victoria is another who was not committed to a casino at the beginning of the committee's hearings. Certainly, the member for Glenelg was a member who retained his opposition to the measure right through the select committee's hearings.

I point out that no member of the committee worked harder than did the member for Glenelg in trying to bring about what is generally regarded as a well balanced report. That report canvasses all opinions in relation to matters surrounding casinos. There is quite enough evidence in the report for someone who has deep feelings of conscience in relation to casinos to still oppose them, given the fact that the committee did not recommend in favour or against the establishment of a casino. Given that fact, the member for Glenelg had every right to say what he did yesterday. (I think he spoke before midnight).

*Mr Slater interjecting:*

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** I thank the honourable member for confirming that. He had every right to say that. I commend the member for Glenelg for his diligence and I respect his feelings on the matter and the deep conviction that he showed.

On the general subject, obviously, from the speeches made, it seems to me that this measure as presently before us will not pass. It seems that the majority of members are opposed to the Bill as it stands and they have given their reasons. I echo the comments of the Minister of Agriculture: there is a majority of members against the Bill.

One reason widely advanced, especially by members on the other side of the House, results from their deep belief that it should be a Government-owned casino. The committee gave much attention to the question of ownership, as it should have. It felt strongly that the Government should have a partnership, at the very least, if it is so wished, in any casino operation. It was put by one or two witnesses who were developers that they could see nothing wrong with the Government's having a share in such an operation.

My feelings about the provision of a casino in South Australia are based strongly on the fact that I believe that it would bring with it a large multi-million dollar development and concurrently provide jobs for South Australians. It just so happens that I think the economic situation, not

only in South Australia, but also nationally and around the world, is serious. Unemployment is the most serious social problem facing governments in the world today and it seems that, where one has an opportunity to attract a multi-million dollar development, one should proceed. I am talking about \$10 000 000, \$20 000 000, \$30 000 000, \$50 000 000 or \$100 000 000 dollars. Development on casinos in Queensland exceeds \$100 000 000 for both casinos, and no one can tell me that such development will not provide employment.

It will provide significant employment for South Australians if we were to attract a similar development. If we talk just about a casino *per se*, with no associated development of a major kind, then I am not particularly interested in it. I am interested in a casino for this State because I believe it will bring large development and create jobs. I understand from the information given to the Select Committee that the Wrest Point casino complex employs about 600 people, and that is just direct employment at the complex. I make it clear that it is not just the casino, but the whole complex, that employs that number. However, Adelaide could get a complex of that nature, but much bigger, and it would employ at least that number of people. If one looks at the employment generated down the line through service industries, one could confidently say that it would employ many more people.

To me, that is extremely important. It may well be that it would be possible to attract a development of that nature if the casino was Government-owned and if developers, as I understand, regard the casino as an attraction for their particular development. In other words, if the developers were to put up proposals that there should be a convention centre, together with a hotel, for instance (and perhaps a trade centre; I do not know: all sorts of things can go with these developments), then the fact that there is a casino in that development, even though it is Government-owned, may encourage developers to put up proposals.

We may be able to canvass this matter more in Committee, but I believe that, in the end result, it is very important that we give strong consideration to the ways and means by which we can benefit this State to the extent that we can attract multi-million dollar investments and the employment that goes with them.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

## ADJOURNMENT

At 2.58 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 19 August at 2 p.m.