

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 19 August 1982

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Commercial Bank of Australia Limited (Merger), The,
Commercial Banking Company of Sydney Limited
(Merger), The.

PETITION: CASINO

A petition signed by 58 residents of South Australia praying that the House will reject the proposal to establish a casino in South Australia was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PETROLEUM
FRANCHISE PROVISIONS

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN**: The Commissioner for State Taxation has told me of a potential problem in the administration of the State law. On Tuesday evening, the Commonwealth Treasurer announced that, as from then, all diesel fuel would bear the full rate of excise duty irrespective of its end use. That meant that the exemption from excise duty on diesel fuel for use off public roads would no longer be effective. It is the State Government's intention to continue the exemption for off-road use which applies under State law in respect of petroleum franchise fees.

The Commissioner for State Taxation has accepted Commonwealth certification for purposes of administering the State law, that is to say, the same people have been given the exemption. However, with the end of the Commonwealth scheme, the problem arises of how to arrange for exemption under the State scheme. For the moment, the Commissioner proposes to accept as eligible for exemption those people who were eligible under the Commonwealth law as it applied on 17 August 1982.

The Commissioner informs me that the administration of State law needs the co-operation of the oil companies. It is not clear at the moment whether, in their billing, they will be able to make allowance for the State exemption over the next few days or weeks. If it turns out that they have to bill at full rates, then the State will make appropriate arrangements for reassessment and refund to any people eligible for exemption who may be affected.

QUESTION TIME

The **SPEAKER**: I advise that, in the absence of the Chief Secretary, questions directed to him will be taken by the honourable the Premier.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr BANNON: In view of the prediction that the Premier made in July last year that unemployment in South Australia would be at 5.3 per cent by the time of the next election, is the Premier now prepared to answer the question I put to him yesterday concerning unemployment in South Australia during 1982-83 and explain to the House the precise nature of his Government's job creation schemes referred to by him yesterday? In July last year the Premier said:

The rate of new job creation between now and the next election needs only to be consistent at present levels for South Australia's unemployment rate to fall by two percentage points, which I am confident can be achieved.

At the time the Premier made that prediction our unemployment rate was 7.3 per cent, which means, that he was confidently predicting an unemployment rate of 5.3 per cent by the time of the election. Yesterday, in response to a specific request for his estimate as to likely unemployment he refused to give any such estimate. At virtually the same time the Premier was on his feet in response to my question, the Federal Treasurer and Federal Minister of Employment and Industrial Affairs were saying quite clearly they believed that unemployment would reach 8 per cent by the new year.

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN**: I apologise to the member for Newland, who had provided me with information in preparation for an answer to him, but I will have to use that information in my answer to the Leader of the Opposition. Let us deal with the Leader's foolish question of yesterday, to which he has referred today. Yesterday he used figures in the Federal Budget to project what he said was likely to be South Australia's unemployment at the end of the year, and he confidently predicted that it will be in excess of 57 000.

Mr Bannon: I said between 57 000 and 60 000.

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN**: Well, 57 000 was the figure used. If we use the same approach the Leader of the Opposition has used in projecting figures for unemployment we should look at the last three years of the Labor Government, from August 1976 to August 1979. Using exactly the same basis as the Leader of the Opposition used yesterday on the Budget figures, we could well project that the number of unemployed now, if it had continued at the rate of increase during those three years of Labor Government, was far higher than that from August 1976 to August 1979.

Unemployment in South Australia then rose from 24 700 to 45 300, an increase of 83.4 per cent. That was in the last three years of the Labor Government. If we used the rather specious reasoning the Leader has used to project figures ahead yesterday on the Budget figures, and applied them to the same figures of the Labor Government, we would find that if that rate had continued in the following three years to August 1982 the figure would be 83 080. That is a fair measure using the Leader of the Opposition's own methods of calculation and projection, of the performance of the former Labor Government in containing unemployment.

Indeed, it did not because in the last three years of the Labor Government in South Australia unemployment continued to rise while the national figures peaked at 7.4 per cent in February 1978 and went down after that time. It was after that time that we came to office and inherited an unemployment level that was the highest in Australia. I will not go into the general figures again. I refer the Leader to the number of answers I have given in this House. I will simply refer to the fact that in the last 12 months South Australia had a fall in unemployment where every other State had a marked increase. That is something that indicates the success that this Government has had in containing the pressures of unemployment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Certainly last year we were looking at holding the line of unemployment under those conditions. I remind honourable members that the whole question of unemployment throughout Australia and the world has become far more serious over the last 12 months. Overseas unemployment rates have increased tremendously. Economic pressures have increased tremendously. Excessive wage claims have been promoted excessively. It is about time that some of our trade union leaders had a little more concern, not just for their members but also for people who have no jobs and who are not members of their trade union. They should contain the excessive wage rises which are the basic root cause of much of the unemployment we have now.

Finally, the Leader of the Opposition asked what job creation schemes we have and their details. I repeat that it astounds me that he is not able to understand the good sense and reasoning of this. If we create industrial expansion and development and get on with the job of resource development, we will create new jobs. There is no way that this is not going to happen. Those new jobs are being created at the present time at a rate which means that South Australia is able to record a fall in unemployment over the last 12 months where every other State has had an increase. Those figures speak for themselves. Once again I believe they are a satisfactory endorsement of this Government's determination to pursue resource development, to pursue Roxby Downs and the Cooper Basin and all of the other expansion programmes for manufacturing industry and commerce that it possibly can. If ever there was clear proof that this Government's policies are working in terms of containing unemployment, those figures provide it.

CRAFT TEACHERS

Mr RANDALL: Will the Minister of Education explain to the House why we are recalling retired craft teachers to fill short-term vacancies in high schools? Recently at a school council meeting it was brought to the attention of the school council by the Principal in his report that a retired craft teacher was re-employed at the school to fill a short-term vacancy. During discussions on that issue questions and concerns were raised that there were a significant number of unemployed teachers and that they should be used to fill those short-term vacancies. The other comment was that they believed it was not only in the area of craft teachers that vacancies existed but also in other areas. I believe that the matter needs to be cleared up.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I thank the honourable member for his question. The situation is not unusual. It is not unusual in the sense that at this time of the year (that is, term 2) we normally have a peak of staff who have applied for long service leave. Members will be aware that the Treasurer this year made a sum of approximately \$5 000 000 available for long service leave in the Education Department to be taken as it accrues. We have a peak in the winter term when teachers generally move to warmer climes in search of their long service recreation leave. However, in this case we have a compounded problem. We have a relative shortage of craft teachers in the Education Department because there are very few exit students emerging with skills in that area.

In addition, quite a number of the department's craft teachers retired earlier than usual, and I understand that some five or six craft teachers, who retired before age 65, have been invited to fill short-term vacancies. There was also another unusual circumstance this year in that for an unexpected reason several teachers were hospitalised for

hernia operations, and that, of course, was quite unpredictable. Therefore, the combination of those three circumstances means that this year we have an unusual shortage of craft teachers. Those teachers aged between 60 and 65 years who retired early have been invited to come back simply to cover short-term contracts.

HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT APPRENTICES

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Minister of Transport advise this House why apprentices in the Highways Department were advised by letter a fortnight ago that their services were no longer required following the completion of their indenture, but why the following day these letters were withdrawn and the apprentices told that in no circumstances were they to release details of the letter? The letter that the apprentices received stated, in part:

The honourable the Minister of Industrial Affairs has stated that the employment of apprentices in all Government departments must terminate on the day the terms of the indenture are completed.

I am therefore advising you on behalf of the Commissioner of Highways that your employment with this department will cease as from the normal close of business on the date on which your indenture terminates. You will be informed of the actual date later this year. I recommend that you take the opportunity of actively seeking alternative employment immediately.

I am told by these apprentices that they were given this letter on Wednesday 4 August, but the following day they were told that the notice of termination had been withdrawn, and that, unless the letters were handed back, there would be serious repercussions.

I am also told that the decision to withdraw the notices was made for political reasons; that is why the apprentices were instructed to keep quiet about the whole matter. It has been further put to me that the Government is acting like a banana republic immediately before a coup.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would ask the Minister of Transport to answer the question, but not the comment.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: In regard to the last part of the question, I point out that I am unaware of any instruction that the letters were to be handed back: I have no knowledge of that whatever, and I will investigate that matter, as there is nothing to hide. Mr Virgo instituted the system whereby additional apprentices were taken on by the Highways Department on the basis that those apprentices understood their employment was not guaranteed at the end of their indentures. It has always been the policy of the Highways Department to give apprentices adequate notice—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I know that the honourable member is not. I will get to his question in a minute. It has always been the department's policy to give apprentices adequate notice that their services would not be retained. I think that is fair and that it is a good system.

However, at the moment the Government is considering the question of additional apprentices, which matter is very much in the sphere of the Minister of Industrial Affairs, and, in fact, that part of the honourable member's question relating to that matter should have been directed to him. The Government will be coming to a decision shortly on what it intends to do in this field.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ORGANISED CRIME

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I thank members for the opportunity to place on the record information that has

come to me only recently. In the early hours of this morning the member for Playford made the following statement:

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 is 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.

Those are the words of the member for Playford. The Attorney-General now informs me that he is not aware of the 'records of all that information' to which Mr McRae refers. This morning he asked his departmental officers to search the records of the Attorney-General's Department to ascertain whether there could be any docket that may have the 'records' referred to. They have not been able to find anything which could in any way be described as 'records of all that information'. The Attorney-General's officers will continue to search, but all the work done so far suggests that the 'records' do not exist. To assist in that search, it would be helpful to have more detail as to what the honourable member was referring.

The thought did come to mind that the honourable member may have been referring to information which the former Attorney-General, the member for Elizabeth, may have received when he was Attorney-General and on which he based Ministerial statements about Mr Saffron in the House of Assembly on 7 and 15 March 1978. If he was, then no evidence has been found of any Attorney-General's departmental docket in which those statements appear. At the moment one can only presume that the member for Elizabeth may have the 'records of all that information' to which the member for Playford refers on files which are not Attorney-General's Department files. However, the Attorney-General will have his officers continue their search, which is, however, as I have said, difficult unless more specific details of the alleged records are made available.

COFFIN BAY

Mr BLACKER: Will the Premier undertake to convene a round-table conference with all parties concerned in the impasse relating to the long-term provision of services for the Coffin Bay township and the proposed dedication of the Coffin Bay Peninsula as a national park? The District Council of Lincoln has been endeavouring for some 13 years to provide for the future development of the Coffin Bay township. More recently, the National Parks and Wildlife Service has been endeavouring to have the Coffin Bay Peninsula dedicated as a national park.

The two objectives, while being most commendable, come into conflict, in that additional land is deemed to be required for the development of services for the township. This is necessary because further applications for subdivision of large blocks have already been refused because of a potential health risk. In order to overcome this, it is necessary for the Minister of Planning to make provisions for the township. This brings the Minister's two portfolios of environment and planning into direct conflict, and there is also some

conflict with the departments of the Minister of Health and Minister of Tourism.

In the hope that common sense will prevail, I request that a round-table conference be convened with all departments previously mentioned, the Progress Association of Coffin Bay and the District Council of Lincoln.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It seems to me that the very best form of round-table conference that can be held in these circumstances is a meeting of Cabinet. While I give no undertaking as to the exact time, I assure the honourable member that the matter will be considered by the Government in the relatively near future. I am well aware of the difficulties that have been raised in this matter. I do not believe that the so-called conflict of interest to which the honourable member refers is a serious matter. I am quite certain that it can be resolved by discussion in Cabinet and, if necessary, by consultation with the people concerned. The member for Eyre has given me some other details which will be very helpful indeed, and, as I appreciate the honourable member's concern and interest, I can assure him that the matter will be dealt with quite speedily.

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Education say whether the Government will maintain the present level of services to students in English as a second language programme, given that Schools Commission funding has been reduced by at least \$523 000 for 1982-83? Concomitant with that, will the State Government undertake to make up further losses in funding as the Schools Commission non-dislocation grant expires? The English as a second language programme is at present funded entirely by the Commonwealth Government. Recommendation 16 of the Schools Commission, in its recommendations for 1983, proposes the phasing out of the dislocation grant for South Australia and Victoria. It reads, in part (paragraph 5.1):

... immediate substantial decreases in funds to some systems, e.g. Victorian and South Australian Government schools, South Australian and Western Australian Catholic schools. The Commission therefore recommended a two year phasing-in period (1982 and 1983) to minimise to some extent the dislocation in established programmes and especially the necessity to retrench E.S.L. teachers.

As a result of that dislocation, the effect of the cut-back this year will be a reduction of \$326 000 in Government schools and \$197 000 in non-government schools. In other words, there will be a cushioned impact, but even that cushioned impact will result in the potential loss of 25 E.S.L. teacher salaries in the primary, secondary and language centre areas, despite the fact that the intake of non-English speaking students in South Australia has remained steady.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The allocation of funds for 1982 and 1983 has been based on a formula, and that formula will not be changed for the next school year. I think I should make that obvious from the outset. We will be using the same formula as we have used for the past five years. We have already based the budgetary estimates on the anticipated needs for next year, irrespective of which programmes were being funded.

We share the member's regrets that the Federal Government has reduced in some way the funding for these two specific areas of education but it should come as no surprise to the member that we have been staffing these areas on a contract basis, partially in anticipation of reductions by the Federal Government. That is not to say that those contracts will be terminated. These students will still be receiving the same service next year as they have received this year.

Mr Lynn Arnold: We are picking up the tab?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Yes, we will be picking up the tab. The money will be transferred from normal funding to these specific areas of need. That is one reason why both the former Government in South Australia and the present Government have resisted the request to provide far more permanent staff in a number of areas—

Mr Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: To provide more permanent security than has been provided by the Federal Government. The fact that the contracts will be renewed next year is an indication of our intention to continue with those programmes. The Federal Government funds on an annual basis. We had sought a triennial commitment in a number of areas but that commitment was not forthcoming. I remind the House that another area in which the State Government has picked up the tab is in the area of pre-school education, where the Federal Government's involvement of \$3 700 000 for the past five years without change has meant that the State Government commitment has increased from 20 per cent of funding to 80 per cent. The English as a second language programme is on a much smaller scale but nevertheless it will be funded next year.

ABERFOYLE PARK HOUSING

Mr EVANS: Will the Minister of Environment and Planning ask his colleague the Minister of Housing to carry out an immediate investigation into the Housing Trust design and construction programme taking place at Aberfoyle Park? I have had a large number of complaints from people in that area about the trust's programme, and I have heard that the plans are for the future of the area.

The complaints by people in the area are that, when they went there and bought their blocks of land to build their homes or when they bought existing homes, they checked with the local council as to whether there was a Housing Trust area there. They were told, 'No'. These people spent a large amount of their life savings and have large mortgages. They point out to me now that, because of the design and construction programme taking place in their area, the houses are of a smaller type. They point out also that there are long lines of galvanised iron fences that detract from the area, with the value of their properties being decreased day by day by this design and construction programme.

They also pointed out to me that they have been told that at the north-eastern end of Sunnymeade Drive, on the western side of the road, a piece of land that had been zoned for shopping has been rezoned for housing for more design and construct housing. This area has been established for about five to six years.

The residents point out that they are concerned not about Housing Trust tenants as such moving into the area but about the type of house being built and the number of houses being built on one block. They suggest that it would be acceptable to them if perhaps one such house could be built on every five blocks or if some method of scattering that type of house could be devised. It would be more acceptable to them also if there were no tin fences in long continuous lines.

These people have suddenly found that the values of their properties have decreased overnight (that is their view) because of a Government agency over which they have no control and, when they made a deliberate attempt when they were buying their houses to find out about such development, they were told that they would not be affected by such a development. If they had known what they now know they would not have spent the money that they spent to buy or establish their houses. I ask the Minister to ask his colleague, the Minister of Housing, to treat this matter

with the seriousness with which the people in that area are treating it.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I had the opportunity recently to visit the Aberfoyle Park area and I was made aware of some of the concern that is being expressed by residents in that area. I will be happy to take the matter to my colleague in another place, the Minister of Housing, and ask him to bring down a report on the matter.

YOUTH REMAND AND ASSESSMENT CENTRE

Mr ABBOTT: Has the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Community Welfare, any information on the alterations that are being made to the two units for girls at the South Australian Youth Remand and Assessment Centre? This is a residential centre for girls and boys aged from 10 to 18 years. There are five units: two for girls on remand for a training period, two for boys on remand and one for youths on detention orders. One of the units for girls was designed to deal with minor offenders or non-serious offences such as a first offence or running away from home. Those girls were kept separate from the more serious offenders who occupy the second unit.

I understand that the first unit is now to close and that all offenders, including habitual offenders, will be housed together. This is causing great concern and is considered to be most undesirable. I would like to know from the Minister whether this is another cost-cutting exercise and a change in Government policy.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I will ask my colleague for a report for the honourable member.

AGRICULTURAL LAND

Mr BECKER: Will the Minister of Agriculture say what action his Government intends to take to counter the large losses of agricultural land annually for other purposes? I noticed an article in the *Weekend Australian* of 14-15 August entitled 'The Disappearing Earth'. It states:

Australia is losing about 400 hectares—1 000 acres—of good farmland every day. In New South Wales alone, the State which is under heaviest pressure from land speculation and subdivision, the Department of Agriculture estimates that between 1970 and 1979 592 000 ha (1.5 million acres) was lost to farming.

Subdivision of farming land is a continuous process around most of Australia's population centres. But the areas under greatest pressure are the North Coast of New South Wales and the south-east corner of Queensland where there is attractive countryside and a semi-tropical climate, the Adelaide Hills of South Australia and the countryside fanning out from Canberra where some of Australia's best grazing land has been cut up for weekend escapes for A.C.T. workers.

The article also states that 100 000 hectares have been salt-affected in four regions of the State since white settlement began, and continues:

The loss of land through alienation and erosion has been accelerating in recent decades. Its potential danger to the economy is enormous: nearly 45 per cent of our exports (or \$9 000 million) come from the primary sector.

I am concerned about the future impact that this disappearing area could have on our economy in South Australia.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The honourable member's question is extremely important and it is one that I am unable to answer in the detail that it deserves at this stage. In this vast country we have a very limited amount of highly productive agricultural land, and in South Australia the proportion is even less than that in the rest of the nation. This matter concerns me, and indeed it concerns all people who are genuinely interested in the cultivation of arable and agricultural land. The reasons for the present

situation, as cited by the honourable member in the report to which he referred, are multiple. Regarding soil erosion, I recognise the significant amounts of money that the Commonwealth has been allocating and intends to continue to allocate to the States for soil conservation. In South Australia, I also recognise the amount of complementary funding being put into that scheme by the State Governments.

A little nearer to the fringe area of the State, where the higher rainfall area is specifically involved, it has been disturbing to note that so much of our highly productive agricultural land is being cut up for other than commercial agricultural purposes. I acknowledge that a number of hobby farmers, who have chosen to take up farmlets or small areas in that category, have exercised good management control and have applied themselves very well on their plots, whilst others obviously have not performed so well.

To continue to take food-producing land out of circulation is a cause for concern, not only in this State but across Australia and internationally. It is true that we pay a price for other forms of development where that development is structural and occurs in the rural community, or at least in the broadacre rural community. Once valuable food-producing land is covered with concrete or bitumen for structural development, it is lost forever. There is no way, under our system of land ownership and land occupation, that we can ever have access to more land. As was rightly pointed out by the member for Hanson, each day we are losing more and more of the type of land to which he has referred. I am not in a position, as Minister of Agriculture, to do other than express concern about this matter. My colleague the Minister of Environment and Planning reminds me that under supplementary development plans (that is, plans produced by local government) councils in their own right may identify the best use to which land may be put when applications for subdivisions or the cutting up of agricultural land are put before those councils for their consideration.

I would hope that local government would exercise, with the benefit of sound local knowledge, its powers in that respect. I am pleased to say that from both departments—that of my colleague and my own—co-operation has been offered and, indeed, is being accepted by some local government authorities in South Australia. It is a very important question that the honourable member raised. It is one for which we are paying and for which we will continue to pay dearly. Certainly within my interest areas, wherever subdivision can occur on land which is not the best land for agriculture, the better it will be not only for us but also for future generations.

I cite one example, namely, the Willunga Plains area immediately south of Adelaide, which is an area consisting of some of the richest soils in Australia let alone South Australia, as has been proved in respect of dairying, almond-growing and grape-growing. It is quite disturbing to see each year yet another few hectares of that land cut up or sold for purposes other than food producing. It is not too late for the authorities at both State and local government level to exercise their powers and good sense and try desperately to preserve for agriculture purposes not only that area but similar areas around the State which we need now and which our successors will need even more desperately in the future.

MINERAL WATER

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister of Health ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs to investigate the apparent deficiencies in regulations concerning the labelling of mineral water in South Australia? Whilst journeying to Parliament House on Tuesday morning I heard a programme on the

A.B.C. being broadcast from Victoria pointing out deficiencies in the labelling of mineral water in that State. I asked the Research Library to check this out and was informed that the labelling and quality of mineral water in South Australia is controlled by regulation 67 of the regulations under the Foods and Drugs Act. The regulations seem to me to have certain deficiencies; for example, there is no requirement to state whether the water has been obtained from a natural spring or has been artificially manufactured. Soda water could apparently be sold as mineral water or vice versa.

Many mineral waters on the market contain what *Choice* magazine considers to be unacceptably high levels of sodium chloride. There seems to be no standard regarding this matter. I am informed that there is a link between sodium and hypertension, and this could have an effect on people's health. There is no standard method of placing on the label the minerals analysis of the water. In some cases this is described in milligrams per litre and in other cases in percentage terms. Converting one figure to another can be confusing and difficult. In the June edition of *Choice* an article states:

Your own tap water may be better value than an expensive imported mineral water, for both taste and mineral content. This is what *Choice's* chemical and taste tests reveal about several Australian capital city tap waters compared with the bottled variety, including still and carbonated mineral waters. Bottled from underground sources, these last are supposed to be especially health-giving.

The article goes on to point out that in the past three years sales have increased by 25 per cent and the current retail sales are something like \$25 000 000 per year. It continues:

We don't see why we need to pay up to \$1.90 a litre for water which, as our tests show, isn't necessarily better than tap water, and for some people, maybe less healthy.

The article continues:

Health authorities around the world now generally accept the link between sodium and hypertension, and perhaps one person in five is sensitive to sodium.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Although the honourable member's question was directed to me for reference to my colleague, the Minister of Consumer Affairs, I am inclined to think that it may be more appropriate for a report to come from the Minister of Health, but in either case I will see that a report is provided.

Mr Hamilton: About the labelling as well.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes.

MARGINAL LANDS ACT

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Agriculture confirm that it is not now his intention to repeal the Marginal Lands Act within the life of this Parliament? The Government announced fairly early in its term of office that it intended to repeal the Marginal Lands Act, causing a great deal of concern among many people in the community. Amongst those people were those associated with the conservation movement, who went to the Government, I understand—

Mr Gunn interjecting:

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I know that the member for Eyre is not at all interested in conservation or people involved in that movement.

Mr Gunn: They know nothing about this subject.

The SPEAKER: Order! This is the explanation of a question, not a debate.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Thank you, Sir—condemned out of his own mouth. As I understand, the effect of those discussions with the Government was that in the event of the Government's proceeding with this measure it would

be accompanied by a package involving soil conservation and various other things. In view of the fact that this package has not been forthcoming, and the fact that in His Excellency's Speech to us at the beginning of this session, the only reference to this matter that could have tied into this was, 'certain obsolete enactments', it is hoped by those concerned that indeed the Government is having second thoughts and that the Marginal Lands Act will not be repealed. However, I seek an assurance about this from the Minister.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: When the Government came to office in 1979, in the agriculture portfolio I inherited more than 70 Acts of Parliament, many of which had accrued, even though obsolete, over a long period of years. Part of the Government's deregulation policy was to identify those Acts that were clearly in the obsolete category and to collectively have them repealed at some time during the term of this Parliament.

I will undertake to investigate the current list of Acts that it is proposed to repeal and report back to the honourable member as to whether or not the Marginal Lands Act is among those. I say that with all respect to the question that has been raised: I point out that I do not have at the tip of my tongue the 32 individual Acts cited by His Excellency the Governor in his Speech. However, I am aware that a number of the Acts which have been identified for ultimate repeal have had, or are subject to having, the relevant parts drawn from them and ceded to Acts that we propose to retain. Therefore, the balance of the Acts to be repealed will go without any impact on the community, in particular the type to which the honourable member referred. I am very conscious, as indeed are my colleagues in Cabinet and throughout the Government Party, of the need to ensure that there is adequate machinery for protection of our soils in South Australia.

There is no question of this Party in Government being remiss in that regard. Accordingly, I did not believe that the interjection from the honourable member in response to the member for Eyre was either necessary or justified. That particular honourable member has been extremely co-operative and, indeed, conscious and experienced in the field of soil conservation in his own right and on behalf of his constituents. He has conveyed to me considerable information that has helped the Government's soil conservation programme. The honourable member need have no fears that not only do we have a policy and not only have we put our money where our mouth is in that direction, but also we are conscious of the need. I will come back to the honourable member with the detailed element of his question.

LICENSED CLUBS

Mr EVANS: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport establish a committee of inquiry into the South Australian club industry? I have had a lot of representations in recent times from members of clubs, who point out the following concerns. First, the clubs are losing a lot of their top competitors in sport and, in some cases, athletics, to other States. They have difficulty retaining people in the semi-professional, sometimes professional, and amateur areas, because of the lack of ability to employ top coaches because of the shortage of financial resources. At times in the semi-professional or professional areas the clubs are unable to pay the fees that clubs in other States pay.

It was also pointed out that, in regard to big raffles and the raffles that support clubs, there is a declining contribution from the community: the tickets are much harder to sell, so that the clubs are finding it more difficult to be viable

in that area. The clubs are very dependent on bingo as a means of raising funds to support their operations, and they fear what might happen in the future if the potential is decreased in any way.

At one time hotels closed at 6 o'clock and some of the old standing clubs had memberships which found a benefit in belonging to a club because they could patronise them after the hotels closed at 6 o'clock. Over the years hotel operations have changed and they now stay open not only until 10 p.m. or 10.30 p.m., but perhaps to 1 a.m., 2 a.m. or 3 a.m. The hotels supply entertainment in the form of cabarets, vaudeville shows and discos, as well as drinking facilities. The effect on the clubs has been quite disastrous in regard not only to the loss of trade but also to the loss of membership, which has affected the clubs quite seriously, because people no longer see a benefit in belonging to a club.

The potential of Sunday trading in many areas will have another effect, and this has occurred in close proximity to my district. The industry is quite concerned (if one could call the club field an industry) and I have been asked what can be done. Will the Minister establish a committee of inquiry into the serious situation that is faced by our clubs in this State?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I would be glad to talk to the member for Fisher about this matter later. Such a decision will have to be taken by the Government. The only answer I can give at present is that I will be prepared to consider it.

NURSE TRAINING

Mr PETERSON: Will the Minister of Health say whether there has been a change of policy by the Government regarding the methods of training young people entering the vocation of nursing and whether it is believed that the new policy is what the public wants? It has been put to me that, from the interim report of the South Australian Health Commission dated April 1982, it appears that the system of apprentice nurses will be abandoned. This course of action will severely limit access by young people to a nursing career.

I understand that it has also been suggested that an academic qualification will then be required. This disadvantages people in two ways, first, by the academic requirement for entry to the college and, secondly, by the expense. I understand that a first-year trainee nurse at present receives about \$7 300 a year, whereas if a trainee nurse goes into the academic course, she will receive a TEAS payment, with the new Budget, of about \$2 000 if she lives at home and about \$3 000 if she lives away. It appears that the very successful apprentice scheme at St Andrews Hospital for many years has proved that scheme and it should be retained.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The honourable member is correct in his statement that new policies are being developed for nurse education. The nursing profession right around Australia has been urging a change from hospital-based nurse training to college-based nurse training for some years. Indeed, the Sax Report, which was commissioned by the Commonwealth Government, suggested the adoption of that course. I am curious to know on what basis the honourable member believes that college-based training would limit the opportunities for young people in nursing, because I am not aware that college-based training limits opportunities for people to go into other health vocational courses such as occupational health, physiotherapy, radiography, and dental therapy.

I cannot see why it is asserted that it would limit the opportunity for nurses. The honourable member may not

be aware that there is already an academic entry requirement for nurses for hospital-based training, so I would see no change in that. Early this year, or it may have been late last year, the South Australian Health Commission developed a policy on nurse education that called for the gradual transfer of nurse education from hospital-based training to college-based training, and a proportion of that training is undertaken and has been for some years at what is now the Sturt campus of the South Australian College of Advanced Education.

The Government has not yet considered that policy, because the feasibility of it is being examined by a working party consisting of members of the Health Commission and TEAS. When that working party has reported to the commission, the matter will no doubt be considered by the Government. It is important to recognise that Directors of Nursing, including, I understand, the Director of Nursing at the hospital that the member has mentioned are supportive of this policy, and it is important for the community at large to realise that in these days nurses do not nurse solely in hospitals. They undertake a wide variety of nursing duties in all kinds of environments, not only in hospitals, and it is certainly not a good preparation, for example, for someone who is going to spend a career in occupational health or community-based health to spend the training years in an entirely acute clinical situation. I would be happy to provide the honourable member with a copy of the commission's policy, which was released when I announced it and which, interestingly enough, received very little media publicity at the time.

EDUCATION BUILDINGS

Mr GUNN: Will the Minister of Education say whether his department has any surplus buildings that it could make available for a pre-school in my district? I have been approached by parents who have formed themselves into a committee to provide pre-school facilities at Poochera. They are currently using a small and inadequate classroom situated on the old Poochera school site. However, as the facilities are far from what could be described as being reasonable, my constituents are interested to know whether the Education Department has on Eyre Peninsula any surplus buildings that could be transported to the site in order to provide reasonable accommodation in which this necessary education facility can be carried on in that part of my district.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: As a general principle, there is a shortage of transportable accommodation within Government departments, including the Education Department, and transportables for early childhood education are constructed as required. I will refer the matter to the Early Childhood Education Advisory Committee, in the first instance, and I will also check with the Education Department to see what the possibilities are. I will discuss this matter also with the Minister of Public Works, who may have some ideas on the matter. However, the honourable member can rest assured that the matter will be given careful consideration, although I can make no definite commitment at this stage.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

Mr TRAINER: Following the Minister of Health's reply to my question on Wednesday 11 August, I now ask her whether the long waiting times for treatment at the Flinders Medical Centre eye clinic will be reduced, and when, and whether similar improvements can be attempted for elective surgery waiting times.

On 19 February 1980, the Minister assured us that matters would improve. Last week in her reply she said again that she expected things to improve soon, after I had raised the case of an 86-year-old man who had had to wait two months for an eye clinic appointment in July before having it postponed another six months to January 1983.

Since then other cases have been brought to my attention by a local G.P. One relates to a Mr Skorpos, a 70-year-old pensioner, whose spectacles fell off into the sea while he was on, I believe, the Port Pirie wharf a few hours before he came to Adelaide. On approaching the Flinders Medical Centre eye clinic on his arrival here, he was advised on 12 August that no appointment for arranging replacement spectacles could be made before 18 March 1983.

I am advised that no person is available to conduct many of the examinations needed at the eye clinic, because of financial restrictions, and that 146 appointments originally scheduled for the next six months have been cancelled because the necessary specialists are not available. However, there was no medical assessment of the urgency of each of these cancelled cases, and apparently the cancellations were made on a random basis.

Similar hold-ups have occurred with elective surgery. I am advised of one constituent with a painful urinary blockage due to a prostate condition who has already waited seven weeks for surgery and has now been told that he has to wait another six months. Patients are sometimes turned away at the last moment, after making all the necessary arrangements for elective surgery—for example, a mother who had arranged care for her children.

I have also been advised that delays in operations may have led to the death of patients. One patient, aged 80, was admitted, through his G.P., to Flinders Medical Centre at Easter last year for an operation on a bowel blockage. He had been fully prepared for the operating theatre (in other words, he had been shaved, X-rayed and received all the other necessary pre-operational treatment), but he then waited 48 hours outside the theatre for his operation. His G.P. believes that the two days delay in removing the fatty cyst that had blocked this elderly patient's bowel led to his death a few days later.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The answer is 'Yes', and the initiatives will be announced when the State Budget is introduced.

FERTILISER BOUNTY

Mr BECKER: Can the Minister of Agriculture state what benefits will flow to South Australian farmers following the passing of legislation in the Senate restoring the fertiliser bounty? An article in today's *News*, headed 'Democrats dodge poll on bounty "row"', states:

South Australians are to get their fertiliser bounty—and get it back-dated—after political second thoughts by the Opposition Parties in the Senate. The Labor Party and the Australian Democrats abandoned efforts to change the Federal Government's \$50 000 000 a year bounty legislation . . . The bounty, suspended on 30 June, will now be paid, and back-dated . . . The Democrats' primary industry spokesman, Senator Macklin, told the Senate last night it was a 'political fact' that the Government would like to see the fertiliser subsidy legislation defeated to use it as an election issue . . . With the successful passing of the legislation by the Senate last night, the subsidy will be restored to farmers in its new form with back-payments to 1 July to compensate for losses caused by the Senate's delay.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Money saved is money earned and, indeed, money saved by the primary producers—*Members interjecting:*

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Money saved by South Australians in this instance is indeed money earned for this State. I think the question might be better approached by

identifying the losses to this State if indeed the Commonwealth Government declined to reintroduce the superphosphate bounty which, incidentally, has been not only reintroduced and reaffirmed in the Budget announcement but will also apply retrospectively to 1 July, so that there is no hiatus period involved between the conclusion of the last agreement and the commencement of the next arrangement.

The \$12 a tonne on superphosphate that South Australian farmers, and indeed all farmers in Australia, have enjoyed over recent years may not sound a significant sum or may not even be important to Opposition members, but a farmer who can avoid paying that additional \$12 a tonne by virtue of a rebate under a bounty system can spend that \$12 on other agricultural goods or, for that matter, on anything else within this State; so one way or another we all benefit from that bounty or subsidy.

The other factor that I think is even more important is that farmers, out of their income, are only able to budget for a certain land or pasture maintenance expenditure, and in agriculture, particularly in our higher rainfall areas of this State so far as those areas extend, the application of superphosphate is a real ingredient in management. Indeed, each \$12 a tonne that is taken off in most cases comes off the tonnage purchased. Any reduction in the application of superphosphate or nitrogenous fertiliser where it is required can only cause deterioration of the land involved.

For those several reasons, it was extremely important and responsible for the Federal Government to insist on the reintroduction of the bounty and/or any other incentives that can be extended to primary producers in this country to ensure appropriate maintenance of the land from which they derive their living.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: CASINO BILL

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Earlier today the Premier made a Ministerial statement in relation to comments that the member for Playford made in this House early this morning. In making his Ministerial statement, the Premier referred to me, as follows:

The thought did come to mind that the honourable member may have been referring to information which the former Attorney-General, the member for Elizabeth, may have received when he was Attorney-General and on which he based Ministerial statements about Mr Saffron in the House of Assembly on 7 and 15 March 1978. If he was, then no evidence has been found of any Attorney-General's departmental docket on which those statements appear. At the moment one can only presume that the member for Elizabeth may have the 'records of all that information' to which the member for Playford refers on files which are not Attorney-General's Department files.

At least I give the Premier credit for not making allegations that the files have been taken from the department. The situation can be clarified quite simply; the two Ministerial statements I made in this House were based on a report which was prepared in and by the Police Department. Quite obviously, there would not have been a file in the Attorney-General's Department. I called for a report in the Police Department and it arrived fairly urgently. My press secretary immediately prepared the statement in consultation with me on the first occasion and quite obviously there would not have been an Attorney-General's Department document.

Mr McRae was making his statement on the basis of the evidence that was given by Senior Lecturer Alfred W. McCoy to the select committee on the Casino Bill. I think it is

interesting to quote from this evidence because it puts this whole matter in context and it is easy to see, when referring to this, how this situation has arisen. The evidence states:

Q. In your investigations did you find any connection between organised crime in the Eastern States and South Australia?

A. I did not look for that specifically. I was attempting to analyse the evolution and the changes in organised crime primarily in New South Wales. In the course of my investigations particularly after the collapse of the Dunstan Government in South Australia several files landed on my desk and some reports that appeared to have been written by the police for the Attorney-General during the latter stages of that Government. Judging from marginal notes they were done prior to the allegations made about the activities of Abe Saffron in South Australia.

Interposing there, that is quite correct; the police report was prepared prior to my making statements in this House. To continue:

I have been in South Australia on two occasions very briefly, but I have no detailed specialist knowledge about that State. My primary purpose is in New South Wales. I am aware of some of the contacts between New South Wales and South Australia in relation to organised crime, but that is based on documents I have been given. Those documents are of an official nature and came from the South Australian Government. I have also closely read the transcript of the New South Wales Drugs Royal Commission. I believe that enough evidence has emerged to argue that there has developed over the past decade links between senior and middle echelons of organised crime between here and South Australia. The syndicates in Sydney appear to have achieved fairly substantial and economic influence in South Australia over a short period of time. A disturbing feature about the quality of our knowledge of organised crime in South Australia with the exception of the Attorney's witness's remarks about the influence of Saffron in South Australia is that there has been very little publicity or public revelations about the nature of organised crime and its influence in South Australia. At the moment we only have fragments of information that indicate a potentially serious situation. South Australia has been penetrated by syndicates but almost nothing is known about that.

The report that was prepared in this matter is a police report. No doubt it is available to the Government and would have been available to the select committee if it had been called for. As I understand it, the report was made available to the committee from other sources and so it seems that all of the documents that are known to exist were put before the select committee. For my part, I can simply reiterate that during the time I was Attorney-General I took the matter of organised crime very seriously and, I think all members of this House concede the fact that more was done during that period than before or since.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: CASINO REPORT

Mr McRAE (Playford): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr McRAE: I support the remarks of the honourable member for Elizabeth. I was quoting from the evidence given by Professor McCoy. I suggest to the Premier and the Attorney-General that they write to Professor McCoy to get the information—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Playford asked to make a personal explanation. I believe he is transgressing the bounds of a personal explanation by suggesting a course of action for other people to take. I want him to relate the matters specifically to his own position.

Mr McRAE: There are certain matters which the honourable gentleman could not make publicly available. If the Premier or the Attorney was prepared to write to the University of New South Wales and ask Professor McCoy whether he would like to make available certain information which he made available confidentially to the committee, they would be in a better position to make a judgment on me and, for that matter, the former Attorney-General.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

NORTH HAVEN DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CASINO BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 18 August. Page 6.)

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I move:

That clauses 2 to 20 be postponed and taken into consideration after clause 21.

The reason for moving this amendment is that the Committee has before it a fairly complicated procedural matter where it has several series of recommended amendments before it and in particular a series of amendments which have been circulated today in my name. The amendments were circulated after consultation with members of the select committee and some members of this House. By going to clause 21 first it will be possible for the Committee to make a decision, using clause 21 as a test clause, and the Committee will be able to decide whether to adopt the new proposal contained in the series of amendments circulated in my name today. Whether or not that is adopted, the Committee will then have to vote on clause 21.

As clause 21 is a key clause in the whole Bill and virtually means whether there will be a casino or not, it will be possible for the Committee to decide at this stage whether honourable members want that facility in South Australia or not, by merely voting on clause 21. Obviously when that particular clause is decided, we then have to go back to clause 2, but members of the Committee will be aware by that stage of the wish of the Committee.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I unfortunately missed the debate which was in relation to noting the report of the select committee. I came into this debate cold in that sense. Nonetheless, my attitude to a casino in South Australia is, I think, well known. I spoke during the earlier stages of the Bill and made perfectly clear that it would take a lot of evidence from the select committee to convince me to vote for a casino.

Mr McRAE: Mr Chairman, on a point of order, the Deputy Premier's remarks have no conceivable relevance to the motion.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order and point out to the Minister that there is a postponement motion before the Committee and that that is the only matter which is subject to debate during this period.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I support the motion.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I wish to raise a matter for the guidance of the members of the Committee. As I understand it, we have two substantive questions before us, the basic one which is canvassed by clause 21 as to whether or not there will be a casino.

There is a subsidiary matter that could well affect members' attitudes to that, namely, the nature of the ownership and control of that instrumentality. As I understand it, the way in which people would now have to proceed is that those people whose support for the casino is conditional on some

measure of public control and ownership would have to support clause 21 in order to keep alive the issue of the casino. If they lost out in relation to public control and ownership, they would have to leave it to the third reading before they could then express their opposition to the total concept. Could we have some clarification?

The CHAIRMAN: I will endeavour to clarify the situation. As the Chair understands the amendment, a vote for it is a vote for Government control of the casino through the State Lotteries Commission. If the amendment is passed, members will still have the opportunity to vote against the operation of a casino by voting against the question that clause 21 as amended be agreed to. If the amendment is lost, consideration of clause 21 as printed will be resumed.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I apologise to the Deputy Leader and other members because of the short notice. It was my intention after negotiations with the member for Playford and others that we would deal with this matter on clause 2 which would have been the normal course of events. I was advised by the Clerk only 10 minutes before Question Time that, because of the wording of clause 2, it may be procedurally impossible to deal with all matters under that clause. It therefore became logical to move to another clause where the whole question of ownership could be debated and decided because of the amendment before the Committee. Once that had been decided the question of whether or not we have a casino could also be decided—after the question of ownership was decided first on the same clause.

Mr McRAE: I also—

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order. I understand the motion before the Chair is that this clause be considered ahead of the other clauses. It is a procedural motion. Is that so?

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the Premier's point of order. The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (37)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, L. M. F. Arnold, Ashenden, Bannon, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, M. J. Brown, Chapman, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Eastick, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Hamilton, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, Mathwin, Oswald, Peterson, Plunkett, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, and Slater, Mrs Southcott, Messrs Tonkin, Trainer, Wilson (teller), Wotton, and Wright.

Noes (5)—Messrs Abbott, Hemmings (teller), McRae, Payne, and Whitten.

Majority of 32 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Clause 21—'Activities in pursuance of licence to be legal.'

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: As the Minister has indicated, this is a test clause. As I interpret it, the amendments that have been contemplated can be canvassed in relation to this clause.

As I interpret it, a certain amount of latitude will be permitted in discussing the clause. Although I missed the debate last night, I made clear earlier that I had no intention of supporting this legislation unless there was some compelling argument of interest, none of which I could foresee as a result of the deliberations of the select committee.

I have now looked at the committee's report, and I make clear that there is nothing in that which changes the basic attitude that I had when the Bill was introduced. Moreover, if one believes in representative democracy, as I indeed do, one should reflect in one's votes in this House the views of one's constituents.

Mr Slater: What about the State in general? Don't you worry about the State in general?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I worry about the State in general, but how on earth are minority groups to

have a voice unless one is prepared to get up in this place and speak for them?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not saying that minority groups are in favour of this, but it so happens that I am speaking for the majority voice of those whom I represent. I do not know what the Labor Party's ground rules are; we know that they sign a pledge. However, Liberal Party members are charged with representing the views of their electorates and they are accountable first, second and last to the people who put them in their positions, namely, their constituents. Liberal Party members do not sign a pledge, and we do not get the mailed fist brought down on us if we do not toe the Party line: but Liberal Party members are answerable to our constituents. It might be of interest to members to know that the electorate that I represent (the electorate of Angas, as it then was) was the only electorate in South Australia that opposed the introduction of the State lottery at the earlier referendum.

I have been at some pains to ascertain the views of the people whom I represent in this place. I do not think there has been one approach to me in my electorate in regard to supporting this legislation. I have had an enormous amount of contact and correspondence from those opposed to the very idea of a casino. So, that is a fairly compelling reason for one who believes in representative democracy not to be too enthusiastic about the Bill.

Having looked at the proposed amendments to this clause, it seems to me that they simply complicate the issue, with all due respect to the Minister. The proposal as originally drafted was that there would in fact be a commission charged with selecting a suitable applicant to run a lottery, and I understand that an amendment was envisaged which would enable the Government to have up to 49 per cent equity in that lottery. It is now suggested that a third party be interposed in the form of the Lotteries Commission to issue a licence to someone to run the casino.

With all due respect to the people who framed the amendments, it seems to me to be a particularly clumsy way of ordering the affairs of the lottery. I do not want to belabour the point, but I simply want to point out that I believe that this is the test case. As the Minister has said, I believe that the Bill stands or falls on this clause. I can only say that, if I am to take heed of that, I would urge all members who are opposed to this Bill to oppose this clause.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I ask members to show some tolerance when debating this clause, because it is a very difficult matter for all of us and it is becoming very complicated. To understand it exactly will test most of us. I move:

Page 8—

Line 5—Leave out 'a licensee' and insert 'the Commission'.

Line 6—Leave out 'his' and insert 'its'.

At present paragraph (a) of clause 21 (1) states:

It shall be lawful for a licensee to establish and operate a casino . . .

In the amended form it would read:

It shall be lawful for the commission to establish and operate a casino in accordance with the terms and conditions of its licence. During debate on the noting of the select committee's report, it was quite obvious that many members on both sides of the House expressed strong preference for Government ownership. In its deliberations the select committee gave a great deal of attention to the question of ownership. Indeed, the committee recommended that the Government should be allowed to acquire an equity in any casino complex. However, since that debate on the noting of the report, I have consulted with many members on both sides of the House, including members of the select committee, to see what their attitude would be to a fully Government-owned

casino located in a private enterprise development. In other words, if a developer was constructing, say, a hotel convention centre complex, as has occurred at Wrest Point in Hobart, those members saw no objection to the Government owning the actual casino operation in such a complex. Obviously the complex itself would be built using private capital or perhaps a combination of private capital and Government involvement. There are all sorts of permutations on that example.

This clause gives the Committee an opportunity to address the question of whether it wishes to have a Government-owned casino in what could be a private development. In other words, I imagine that a private developer would lease a floor of his premises to the Government, in this case the Lotteries Commission, and the Lotteries Commission would run the casino in that operation. I have heard from private developers, indeed during the time of the select committee, that they would not object to that proposal. They particularly want the attraction of a casino to their establishment. The whole purpose of this amendment is to pick up the main point of the arguments advanced by many members last night, that is, they wanted to see a development in South Australia and jobs created for South Australians. However, many members were unhappy and said that they could not live with a completely privately-owned casino because they were worried about organised crime and the like.

Despite the select committee's report, many members felt that such an operation was open to infiltration by organised crime. The member for Norwood was one who made much play of that, as did the member for Peake and the Deputy Leader. They said that, if there was to be a casino, despite the fact that they had no objection to casinos *per se*, they were particularly concerned that it should be Government owned rather than privately owned.

Mr Chairman, I am asking you to allow me a little latitude so that I can further explain what this series of amendments does, because not only does it require that the Lotteries Commission be the instrument that would own and operate the casino but it also replaces the Casino Tribunal provided for in the present Bill with a Casino Supervisory Authority. This is very important, because the authority would have similar powers to those that are held by the tribunal in the original Bill. The functions of the authority would be to determine the conditions of the licence to be issued under the Act, to supervise the operation of the casino, and, as is very important, to hold a public inquiry for the purpose of determining the premises in respect of which a licence should be issued.

In other words, the Casino Supervisory Authority would have a watching brief over and above the Lotteries Commission. It would supervise the casino, report to Parliament every year, and hold a public inquiry and determine where the premises in respect of which the licence is issued should be. That is very important, because the Government is not deciding in what premises the licence will be issued. The Casino Supervisory Authority will do that. Once that decision has been made, the Lotteries Commission would run a casino within that complex. I will leave the matter there at this stage, because other members may wish to comment.

I reiterate that these amendments have been introduced because of concern expressed by members on both sides that they were not happy with a privately-run casino. The other committee members and I believe that it is still possible to attract the development that this State requires, and consequently employment for South Australians, by taking this decision. I repeat that, if the Committee accepts this, the Committee will vote on clause 21 as amended and then members who wish to vote against having a casino in South Australia will be able to vote at that stage.

The Hon. B. C. EASTICK: It is traditional that the Chair takes no part in any action that would prevent the total discussion of a matter that is before the Chair. It should not, however, be an indication of the Chair's attitude, which will only be given if the opportunity should arise at the end of final debate. Because it is traditional for the Chair to assist further debate on any issue, it would be my intention to support any motion for amendment that is before the Chair through the balance of deliberations this afternoon, and I strongly suggest that that action be not taken in the context of any final decision that the Chair may be called upon to make.

Mr McRAE: As a member of the select committee, I strongly support these amendments. The Minister was kind enough to give them to me before 1 p.m. and I have spent the intervening time consulting Parliamentary Counsel so that I can be certain of what they mean.

Quite clearly, during the four months or five months of deliberations of the committee, one of the very important matters that did concern us was the whole question of control. One of the very important matters which I raised and which was accepted by the committee was an investigation panel as well as a tribunal, in order to ensure that there be control.

As I understood, many members in their speeches to the House yesterday said that even that was not good enough, mainly because of the difficulties raised by organised crime and corporate crime in the definitions that we have given. It now seems to me that, if the basis on which people were opposing the casino was the fact that there was still the possibility of a loophole, these loopholes have now been removed in so far as one can place trust in the Lotteries Commission, and I, for one, certainly do place my trust in the commission. Its track record has been excellent indeed.

Clearly, what is provided in this series of amendments is, first, that the Lotteries Commission will be the only body which is capable of gaining a licence. It is not possible under these amendments for any person or body other than the commission to have a licence. That is the first step. The second step is that if the authority, having determined the location of a casino and what extra controls, and so forth, are required in consultation with the Lotteries Commission, and does all that in public, once that has occurred then only the Lotteries Commission can have control of the premises. But, even then, the authority will be able to lay down extra guidelines so that, for example, even if the Lotteries Commission was to be as tough as the committee suggested the investigation panel should be, in its original report, even if that were to happen, but the authority thought that that was still not tough enough, then the authority could step in and demand far more controls.

In those circumstances, it seems that the public of South Australia is now protected. I do not intend to canvass the other matters. I believe that to get a casino in South Australia is an important developmental matter. It is immaterial which political Party gets it. If there is to be one at all, it will be achieved only because members of both political Parties will have crossed the floor this afternoon. In my belief it would be a tragedy to lose it. It would be a double tragedy to lose it, and the employment that it will bring, with the controls that are now provided. I sincerely believe that those controls have been provided, and I will be pleased to hear from members on this matter, because now is the time for anyone to bring forward questions to the Minister or members of the committee about anything else that should be there, or about any doubts that they might have. As far as I am concerned the key issue of public ownership, control, investigation and public inquiry have now all been covered in addition to everything else that was in that report. I am only too pleased to support the motion.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I support the motion. I believe that, throughout the report that we dealt with in last evening's debate, one can find that underlying message from the committee insisting upon the ultimate controls for the casino, if one were to be established in South Australia. The findings of the committee state, in part:

The demand for casino-type gambling has developed as an alternative to other forms of gambling because of the growing sophistication of citizens, the effects of greater opportunities for overseas travel and experience of casinos overseas, the demands of overseas tourists and familiarity with the Wrest Point casino in Tasmania, and atmosphere.

There is a touch of class, for sure, in that paragraph of the report. In the lead-up to the argument sustaining the amendment, I further quote from the report, as follows:

Depending on the type of casino ultimately chosen, it can provide Adelaide with an exciting convention centre or additionally a more complete entertainment complex, or it can rejuvenate and redevelop older areas or develop new tourist areas. With a casino strategically placed, tourists from interstate can be drawn to South Australia in large numbers.

It goes on:

Legalised casino gambling will encourage and foster tourism and the tourist industry generally. It will provide opportunities for employment in many fields such as office staff, croupiers, inspectors and entertainers, musicians, as well as catering and liquor requirements. In its initial stages, it will give impetus to the building, renovation and furnishing industries and to other service industries.

Then, the vital paragraph in that portion of the report states:

Given proper controls and supervision, legalised casino gambling can function in an environment such as exists in South Australia virtually free of any taint of organised crime, corruption, or dishonesty.

Those few paragraphs capture the matters canvassed hour after hour last evening. They convey the message that there should be, and it is essential that there should be, the utmost control. I can think of no better method of ensuring that on behalf of the public of South Australia than by having the Government right in there and directly involved. It does not concern me in the slightest where that initiative was promoted, whether from the Opposition or the Government side. I give full marks to those in the Opposition who sought to have that factor reconsidered, as indeed they indicated during the debate yesterday. Now that the Minister has come forward with an amendment picking up that initiative and identifying its merit, that merit being linked and consistent with the message implicit in the report, I have no hesitation in supporting it. I urge other members who may have been concerned before about that important control and surveillance factor to support the amendment.

Mr KENEALLY: I intend to support this amendment because it overcomes the one problem that I indicated during my previous contribution that would come from the establishment of a casino in South Australia. I have taken the opportunity today, being somewhat masochistic, to read my speech, because I read in the *News* that I was one of the persons who spoke in the House last evening against a casino. I would suggest to Mr Jackson that he should read my speech, because it appears that he did not listen last evening. If he had he might not have recorded me as such. That has caused me a considerable amount of embarrassment in my district among those people to whom I have spoken about this matter over some time. To see myself registered as being opposed to a casino, and having my face appear with all those other people opposed to it, has caused me some embarrassment. I would like that to be made clear.

My only objection to the establishment of a casino in South Australia was that it might have been under the control of private interests. Now that the Minister, his committee and those other members of Parliament who were privy to the discussions last night have agreed that an appropriate amendment should be that the casino is owned

and controlled by the State Government so that all of its benefits flow to the people of South Australia and not to private entrepreneurs, then that measure will get my support.

Mr SLATER: This is the greatest political con trick of all time. I am not going to wear it; I will not support the amendments. If anyone on the select committee had suggested Government ownership of a casino, members on the other side of the House would never have copped it. What changes their political philosophy suddenly to have Government ownership? It is the greatest trick of all time. The Government cannot get the numbers on its side of the House, so it is trying to con Opposition members. It is not on! I am satisfied with the five months of deliberations that this House gave to this matter. I said that yesterday and do not deviate from that stance. This is a con trick! I am not going to cop it and I advise members on this side of the House not to cop it either!

Mr RUSSACK: I do not feel that these amendments conform to the report of the select committee. I have looked through the suggested amendments and there is no proposed amendment to clause 21 of the Bill. Therefore, I feel that the select committee spent a long time (and there was much money spent on this report's being produced) and did not come forward with any suggestion such as is contained in the amendments put forward this afternoon. Therefore, I feel strongly that these amendments have been drafted because of the debate that took place in this Chamber last night. If that has influenced the drafting of these amendments, then the sittings of the select committee were a waste of time and money—they were all for nothing.

It is no secret that I have always been opposed to the establishment of a casino in South Australia. I said so and voted that way in 1973. I explained my position and voted that way in 1981. I explained my position last night and in this same Bill during the second reading voted against it. Because of the reasons I have given, I feel that, had this been a worthwhile and genuine approach to the establishment and proving of a casino in South Australia, that would have appeared in the report of the select committee. I will, therefore, not support the amendments.

Mr HEMMINGS: I have listened to the Minister's rather plausible explanation as to why these amendments have been introduced at this late stage. I did call across to him during the last division and asked why the *Adelaide News* had this information before we did. The Minister replied, 'Don't believe everything you read in the newspapers,' but the paper states quite clearly: 'Wilson fights to save casino Bill'.

That is exactly what my colleague is saying: this is a political ploy by this Government to ensure that members on this side vote for the amendment and, subsequently, vote for the Casino Bill, because the Minister cannot guarantee members on his own side. They are going to use the Labor Party to ensure that this Bill gets through. Therefore, I am placed in this position: I am against the casino but because of my philosophy I approve of Government-owned enterprises, so a little carrot has been dangled before me. You know—it's Government-owned, it's everything you people want on this side, so that is the carrot that has been dangled so that I will eventually vote for the casino to be built or allowed in this State.

I am really tempted to vote for the amendment but I cannot be sure ultimately that this is going to be defeated so, against my wishes, my own thoughts, I have to vote against this amendment. If the Minister and the select committee had put forward this proposition I would have believed in it but they did not. They just floated the idea that the Government should have some equity. The Minister of Environment and Planning laughs, but this is a really serious subject.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: I wasn't even listening to you.

Mr HEMMINGS: That is right. The Minister never listens: he is not interested in what we say. He has been let down so many times by his own Cabinet colleagues that I feel some sympathy for him.

Mr Mathwin: It's a conscience vote, Terry.

Mr HEMMINGS: It is not a conscience vote and you know that. You are relying on the Labor Party to get this Bill through.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Napier has been in the Parliament long enough to know that he should refer to members by their district.

Mr HEMMINGS: I did not speak last night because I think most of the points canvassed represented my point of view. There is nothing that will convince me that there were two private members' Bills in this House and the Liberal Party overwhelmingly, to a man, opposed those—

Mr Randall: And so did the Labor Party, don't forget.

Mr HEMMINGS: The Liberal Party overwhelmingly opposed those private members' Bills and yet suddenly we have this Bill introduced and they thought it was going to get off the ground—they got it through a select committee. They then found that there was still opposition from this side: the side that they desperately needed to get the measure passed. So, at the last minute, we have these amendments. We have a situation that if the Bill gets defeated the Government can say it was the Labor Party that did it. If the Bill is passed they will take the credit. I am not going to be a party to any of that kind of political diatribe. I shall oppose the amendment and I shall ultimately oppose the Bill.

Mr ASHENDEN: Can the Minister advise me whether the proposed amendment will guarantee that the licence will be held by the Government or an instrumentality and will not be provided to a private entrepreneur by the commission?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: No. The owner of a casino and the proceeds of a casino will go to the Lotteries Commission but the Lotteries Commission could contract with a private operator to run the casino. That private operator of course would be on a contractual basis with the Lotteries Commission. The Lotteries Commission would accrue the profits and would, in fact, be the owner of a casino and have control over its operations, but it could contract with an operator to provide that service.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I wish to put one thing straight for the member for Napier. In his attack on the Minister, he suggested that the Minister could not deliver the numbers from this side of the Chamber. Let there be no mistake in this Chamber or anywhere else: this is a conscience vote as far as the Liberal Party is concerned, and that includes every member of the back bench and the front bench. The member for Napier should not be allowed to make that sort of vitriolic comment in this place. The Minister of Recreation and Sport has had the responsibility of chairing the select committee and has seen fit to bring in some amendments which he believes improve the Bill.

I have made my position perfectly clear: I am opposed to the amendments, and I am opposed to the Bill. Members cannot suggest that it is the job of the Minister of Recreation and Sport to whip up the numbers on this side of the Chamber: it is not, and the Minister has not done that. This is a conscience vote as far as the Liberal Party is concerned, from the beginning of debate to the end. If it was otherwise, do members think that I, as Deputy Premier, would be speaking against a Minister of the Government? That is a ludicrous suggestion, and it is an insult to the Minister for the member for Napier to suggest that.

Having said that, I have made my position perfectly clear. If the Minister seeks to bring in amendments that he thinks will improve the Bill, that is his right, although in my

judgment I do not think that those amendments do improve the Bill.

Mr Slater interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the honourable member opposite does not think that those amendments improve the Bill, that is his right, but the Minister of Recreation and Sport has every right, in a conscience vote such as this, to bring what he chooses into this House. To get that sort of vitriolic diatribe from the honourable member, who says that the Minister cannot get the numbers together, is absolute nonsense. I do not know how members opposite behave, but when we on this side of the Chamber say that it is a conscience vote we mean that it is a conscience vote.

Mr Crafter: It's a Government measure, and you know that.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is not a Government measure. The Government brought this Bill into the House to settle this question once and for all. I agreed to that, knowing full well that I was going to vote against it. I was one who agreed that this Bill should come before the House. It was a matter of public controversy, and it was bubbling away in the media. The Government decided to introduce this Bill, which it believed would be the best sort of Bill if we are to have a casino, but it was brought in only on the clear understanding that some members of Cabinet would be voting against it, and I was one of those members. To suggest that the Minister has not been successful in rounding me up is absolute nonsense.

Mr GLAZBROOK: I support the amendment. In saying that, I draw members' attention to page 175 of the report. On that page, members can see in the penultimate paragraph that the issue which is now before us in this amendment was canvassed by the select committee, at a time when discussions were taking place about the possibilities of ownership and about the private sector versus the Government sector.

I commented at that meeting that I would like to see in the report the possibility of a complex being built by private developers and the premises then being leased in that development for a casino to be run by a Government department. I wanted to have that idea floated, because I knew that there would be people who would disagree with the first concept. It seemed to me to be quite a logical and sensible idea to have included in the report. So, it is not a matter that has not been canvassed previously: it was canvassed and the reference is in the report. If members read the report they can find it on page 175. It is most important that members realise that the committee acknowledge that there would be differing points of view as to the type of ownership.

One must realise also that in trying to get a conscience vote one must be prepared to weigh up one against the other. When one considers that we are looking at an investment for the future of South Australia, we must consider all matters. As I said yesterday in my speech, I was concerned about unemployment, the prospects of development and the opportunities for those of our young in gaining jobs as well as the percentage that could be given jobs against the percentage that may be at risk. I said then that the legislation proposed with the amendments was the strongest, tightest control put on any development anywhere in the world. I am not disagreeing with the new concept or change of thought simply because I remember what people said in this Chamber yesterday. We gave that opportunity in the report. It seems sensible enough to me that we can adjust our thinking to this line that has now been put forward in the amendments. Therefore, I ask members to think rationally and clearly. It is not a trick or a political thought that we need to change. It is one simply of common sense. If

most members believe that this is what is necessary, this is what they should support and I urge them to do so.

Mrs SOUTHCOTT: I said in this Chamber last night that I was pleased to be part of the debate. I was enjoying the fact that it was a debate that people could take part in honestly and conscientiously. I am disappointed today to see the way the debate is developing. I am not tied to either political Party and I am in a position where I believe I should speak on this amendment. I will be voting against the amendment because I am against the concept of a casino. I will be consistent in my voting and in what I believe. Part of the remarks I made last night were that if I had been in favour of a casino I would certainly want Government ownership and control.

I believe that, having listened to the debate last night in an unbiased way, it was quite obvious that one of the stumbling blocks for many people was private ownership and control and the possibility of abuse, as well as the principle that if any benefits or profits are to be made from gambling in this State they should be applied to the use of people in this State. I believe it is perfectly proper and, indeed, very logical that this is one of the options on which we should vote. Obviously it had been canvassed by the committee and was included in its report. I see it as a perfectly proper amendment to be put forward despite the fact that I will not be supporting it. I think the evidence of whether it is a political matter or not will come in the votes which will be recorded. I believe the public can judge from that.

Mr RUSSACK: I support the remarks of the Deputy Premier, concerning the member for Napier. It was immediately after I spoke that he suggested that the Minister could not win the support of his colleagues. The Party of which I am proud to be a member has been aware of my stand on this matter and I can honestly say that in discussions with the Minister I have never been asked or persuaded to change my stand on the matter. I am sure that that applies to every member on this side of the House. Therefore, I cannot accept what has been said in that respect by the member for Napier.

The member for Brighton has not influenced me at all as far as his comments concerning this matter being brought forward and discussed by the committee and being contained in the evidence of the select committee. If the committee felt that it was important enough, after having discussed it, it would have been in the proposed amendments. Therefore, the Committee must have rejected the fact.

Mr Slater: It was not put up in that way.

Mr RUSSACK: That influences me all the more to oppose the amendments rather than support them.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Last night when I spoke in this debate I made seven major points spelling out my opposition to a casino operation in South Australia. One of those points concerned public ownership versus private ownership. During the early hours of the morning the Minister was good enough to release the proposition that was crossing his mind. I make no criticism of the Minister for that: I have been a Minister myself and I understand that if there is a Bill in the House one needs to find solutions to the matters involved. Nevertheless, I suppose that it could have been canvassed much earlier than it was, and I can understand the objections from the members of the Committee, particularly the member for Gilles, who is objecting to its coming in at this late hour.

Out of the seven matters that I raised last night, in my view the major one, involves the major obstacle to this measure, and I refer to public ownership versus private ownership. I indicate to the House that I will be voting for the amendment: I think it is a quite legitimate amendment. I agree with the member for Mitcham, who is taking an

opposite viewpoint to mine overall. Although she agrees that it is quite legitimate to bring in the amendment she is going to oppose it. In the circumstances, I am going to support it, but that does not mean necessarily in any circumstances that I will support new clause 21 when it comes before the House. I think that is a reasonable stand to take.

It is no good the Deputy Premier coming to this House and exploding as he usually does and making caustic remarks about members on this side of the House when the matter concerns conscience voting. I was in this House in 1973 when the former Premier of South Australia (Don Dunstan) introduced a Bill into this House and when the Liberal Party *en bloc* crossed the floor and voted against the establishment of a casino. The only exception was Steele Hall, who was the only person who voted against that decision. Therefore, do not let the Liberals kid the people of South Australia that they do not, when it suits them, get away from a conscience operation.

I am not making any allegation against the Minister. I think he is a fair man, and I am not suggesting that he has gone around canvassing. However, there have been occasions when one would have expected genuine Liberals to support a casino. There are members in this House now who were here in 1973 but who are now supporting a casino. I wonder what has changed. I wonder what the bait is at the end of the barrel; I wonder whether there is a great development around the corner that the Premier wants to announce. Let us be honest about this new move: this is a Labor Party move—there is no question about that, and it cannot be denied. This is the sort of thing that the Labor Party would do in Government and would recommend in an initial report. In fact, one could say it is a socialist plan, and I refer to public ownership of casinos. I would imagine that certainly it will be a first in Australia, although probably not a first in the world as there are other such operations in Austria and so on. However, no-one would have expected a Liberal Government to do this.

An honourable member: What's the bait?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The bait, of course, is development, and one would have to be a fool not to understand that. The debate on this matter is quite legitimate and I am not complaining about that, and that is the reason why I am supporting this measure. However, I am complaining about the fact that people have been hypocritical and have made allegations against members on this side of the House who exercised a conscience vote on a previous occasion when in fact six Labor Party members crossed the floor. Further, when the Minister was replying last night he made the allegation, which I heard over the speakers as I was not in the House at the time, that there were Ministers who crossed the floor in 1973. I dispute that.

Mr Slater: There was one.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I do not need any help from the member for Gilles or from anyone else. There was one Minister only who was given relief in the Cabinet. That was the decision that was made, and I am referring to the Min of Development and Mines, as he was known at that time.

Let us get our facts straight. If members are going to rise in this place and refer to members who crossed the floor and who did not cross the floor, let some of the staff check *Hansard*. When I heard the Minister over the speaker I gained the impression that he was depending on information given to him by the member for Hanson. That information was not correct. One Minister crossed the floor on that occasion.

An honourable member: One abstained.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: One may have abstained, I am not quite sure, but only one crossed the floor. I am hostile at the hypocritical attitude taken by the Deputy

Premier. It was interesting to hear the member for Mitcham say that she was very impressed with the debate last evening. She said that members rose and spoke conscientiously about their thoughts and principles in relation to this matter. I thought the debate went fairly well last night. However, it has not gone too well today, because certain things have happened that did not happen last night.

I hope the debate gets back on to a proper keel, because we are examining a very serious matter. I believe that members are approaching it seriously. I make no allegations about whether members are out after numbers or whatever. I sincerely hope that every member who has indicated a view on this question will at least support their initial view. I am sure that will indicate whether or not there has been any assessing of numbers by the Liberal Party.

Mr PETERSON: I think I can claim to have adopted a consistent view about this matter of Government ownership in this Parliament since the debate on 16 September last year, when I stated:

It should also be apparent to all of us that any potential return to private interests is also available to an enterprising Government, and if it were within my power to write into the legislation for it to be operated by the Government I would have done so.

I would have done so at that stage, because I have always believed that is the way it should be run. However, I could not do that because of the constraints placed on private members.

I fully support the Minister's amendment. There has been talk of political ploys and what goes on. Every day we see political ploys and arrangements being made in back corridors, with Bills being amended and changed before they even reach this Chamber. Members use political ploys every day. Of course there are political ploys. Surely, if this measure is supported by both Parties and the Opposition and the Government combine to get this Bill through, it will be very hard for the Government to sit back and claim that it is theirs.

We sit in this place day after day and hear the Government make claims about the great things it is doing for the State; we as an Opposition criticise it for what it has not done and tell it what it is doing wrong. We are really here to develop the State and do what we can for the people of this State. That is what it is all about. I can see no other way of obtaining a million dollar development of this nature. We need this complex in this State. We need the casino hotel convention centre complex development. There is no other way we will get it except with a casino.

We need the jobs that will be created in the construction of this complex, and the jobs that will be created in running it. Are we here to protect our own little private and public images or are we here for the good of the State? I suggest that we should really be here for the good of the State. I am not aware of any project, unless it is a secret project under the Government's or Opposition's hat, that will come anywhere near the development that will occur with a casino. My conscience is clear on this matter. I have supported and spoken of Government ownership whenever the question of a casino operation has been raised in this Parliament since I have been a member. I want the development and jobs for South Australia.

Mr Mathwin: Where will the money come from?

Mr PETERSON: The money for the construction of casinos does not seem to be a problem in Australia. Initially, \$15 000 000 was spent in Launceston, and another \$18 000 000 is being spent there right now.

Mr Mathwin: By the Government?

Mr PETERSON: We are not talking about the Government constructing it; this amendment provides for the Government to run it. In Launceston \$25 000 000 will be spent; \$15 000 000 has been spent in Alice Springs; \$1 000 000

went into the Don development; \$30 000 000 was spent at Mindil Beach; and \$200 000 000 has been spent, I believe on a development in Queensland. The money is available. I have been told by people who have contacted me that South Australians have the money and that there is money available in South Australia to develop a casino. That is a significant point. I do not know anyone with \$1 000 000, but I am told there are developers with that kind of money in this State. People have telephoned me and told me that they know them. What do we want?

I will support the Bill and the amendments because I believe that doing so will be good for South Australia. The social consequences have been mentioned, but they have fallen away. They have not been brought forward any more. They are not significant, because the select committee did investigate that matter. It did every possible investigation of the social consequences and there would not be a committee member, apart from one (and I respect his views), who would say that there was any significant problem. One member believes there is, and that is his right, although I do not agree with him. It is about time we began making decisions for the good of the State, and put public images or trying to win an election aside. I think the amendments are for South Australia and the people of this State, and I think we should all do our job here in that light.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am very grateful to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, because I hope that what he has said recently will explain the position of the Minister of Transport and other Ministers in the Cabinet. I would like to put on record again what the Deputy Leader said. He said that a Minister on a previous occasion abstained from voting and another was given relief by Cabinet. Being given relief by Cabinet is a term that I have not heard in this Chamber previously, but it is very descriptive and the Deputy Leader will understand, therefore, better than anyone else that all members of Cabinet have on this occasion been given relief. They have acted according to their consciences, and will do so. I am grateful to the Deputy Leader for bringing that matter forward in this Chamber. I hope that it reassures his own colleagues as much as it reassures me that he understands the position.

I am grateful, too, to the member for Mitcham. I think she has summed up the situation very well. The Government was determined, when it undertook this step, which was not taken lightly, that every possible facet of casino operations and the impact of a casino in South Australia should be considered by members of this place, and that they should have every possible skerrick of information available to them, and every possible alternative action to be considered.

In the move made by the Minister today, I believe he has properly reflected the wishes of members of this Chamber as expressed during debate yesterday and has brought forward what he sees to be more than reasonable amendments. I congratulate him on the step that he has taken. It is not easy to act in charge of a Bill knowing that it is not a Cabinet Bill or a Government Bill but a Bill that is truly being voted on by all members as a matter of conscience. I suggest that we would get on more amicably and do this Bill and the people of South Australia more service by considering the amendment under discussion and ceasing to impute motives to members on either side.

Mr SLATER: I refer to comments made by the member for Brighton that the select committee gave great consideration to the question of ownership. That is not quite true. At pages 173 to 176 the report states the types of controls and ownership that could occur. The report gives arguments supporting Government ownership and operation, and also gives contrary arguments. Although it gives arguments supporting private ownership and operation, but the conclusion (and I had a part in this report) states:

The committee has examined this question in detail, and, should Parliament pass the Bill, it makes the following suggestions to assist in determining the ownership.

The first recommendation is not really relevant, but deals with a club-type casino, with member qualifications and restricted entry. It would tend to provide an elitist gambling facility and therefore should not be supported. The second recommendation is important, and is as follows:

(2) That the ownership of the casino should, as far as possible, remain—

(a) wholly South Australian;

(b) and if that is not possible, the ownership remain wholly Australian; and

(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.

That is the recommendation of our committee. We debated it for 10 hours or so yesterday and everyone, even those members who tended not to support the Bill, praised the report. I emphasise that the Minister mentioned to me yesterday evening the proposal that he has put forward today, but not in great detail. I went away and said I would think about it, and I have thought about it.

I am not satisfied that that question was ever canvassed sufficiently by our select committee. In fact, the question of Government equity never came into discussions until two weeks before the final conclusions, and I proposed them and they were accepted. After the debate that occurred yesterday, at this stage I am not willing to accept the Minister's amendments.

I believe in the concept of a casino and that it should be Government-owned. However, there has been so much double dealing in this matter that, as far as I am concerned, this is the last straw, and I cannot support the amendments. It was not discussed fully by the committee, as might be said by the member for Brighton. I would have liked it to be discussed. Arguments were given both for and against Government and private ownership. I repeat that this is a political con trick, and I do not intend to fall for it. I hope that members on this side do not fall for it, either.

Mr ASHENDEN: I indicate to the Committee how and why I am going to vote on this matter. I made my position clear last evening, and already today the member for Mitcham and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition have pretty well put the feelings that I have on this matter. As I indicated last evening, I will be opposing the development of a casino in South Australia because I believe that that is the wish of the majority, albeit a small majority, of my constituents. I said last night that I would much prefer a Government-controlled casino if a casino were to be operated in South Australia.

I have not changed my mind. I will still be opposing the development of a casino for the reasons already outlined, although the amendment will improve the wording of this clause. When the vote is taken on the amendment, I will vote in support of the insertion of the new words, so that the provision will read that 'it shall be lawful for the commission to establish and operate a casino in accordance with the terms and conditions of its licence'. However, on the vote that clause 21 as amended be agreed to, I will be voting against that because otherwise I would be supporting the development of a casino in South Australia. Therefore, I will be voting for the wording to be changed but against the proposed clause as amended. I hope that members can see quite clearly the reasons for my action.

Mr HEMMINGS: Yesterday the Premier stood up after the Deputy Leader had spoken and said that all Government Ministers were free, in effect, to make a conscience vote on this issue. Although I was not in the House at the time, I recall that Premier Dunstan introduced his Bill as a private

member's Bill. This Bill was introduced as a Government Bill and it was introduced in Government time.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: You are being repetitious—

Mr HEMMINGS: The Premier says I am being very repetitious and non-productive. I cannot recall at any time in this Committee stage that I brought up this problem. We cannot have the Premier saying that all members of Cabinet have been freed to vote on their conscience and, at the same time, relate that back to the fact that this is a Government Bill. I ask the Premier (because I am sure that the Minister does not need the Premier to give him advice, because that advice would be bad) whether, if this is a Government Bill, it met with the full approval of Cabinet before it was introduced in this House.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Premier has already made quite clear that the Government decided that this issue should be resolved, and of course it was a Government decision that the issue should be resolved. The Bill was introduced and the Premier was quite right: this is a conscience issue for every member of the Party and for Cabinet.

Mr SCHMIDT: I have listened with some interest to the debate this afternoon, and I endorse the comments made by the member for Mitcham. I hope that some common sense will begin to prevail in the debate this afternoon. I am somewhat surprised at the outburst from several members in this House. In an issue like this, I doubt whether we should be talking about this or that side of the House. Rather, we should be talking about the issues at hand. It has been stated over and over again that this is to be a conscience vote. It has also been stated, contrary to the comments made by the member for Gilles, that reference was made in the report (pages 172-176) to the other possibilities of running such a casino.

I have made clear during the second reading debate where I stand on the casino issue. I therefore endorse the comments made by the member for Mitcham. I think that it was an apt proposal put forward on this occasion by the Minister who has the responsibility of guiding this legislation through the House. In so doing, he has emphasised the fact that this whole issue is being debated by this Parliament. We are not bound by the comments of a select committee. If members of the select committee want to argue backwards and forwards as to what was implied or not implied during their deliberations, that is between them. We are taking a consensus of the Parliamentary vote, and that is the final arbitrary decision. It is the Parliament that decides—not this or that side, or individual Parties or individual members of the committee. We should be analysing the debate and listening carefully to what is going on.

Those of us who have already committed ourselves know where we stand. I urge any member of this Parliament, if he or she is undecided, to listen carefully to the debate, and accept that the Parliament has the right to put forth a last-minute proposal if it endeavours to get the situation resolved. That is basically what the amendment to clause 21 is doing. It is an attempt to resolve the impasse that we have reached. That was the idea coming from the debate last evening: members could not agree on the form of control.

More and more during the debate the idea of Government control of a casino came forward. So, the Minister is quite right in what he has done. It does not matter if it is two minutes before, or during the debate: if he can see a method of resolving an issue, he can put that forward and the Parliamentary consensus should arrive at the final decision. I urge all members to view the matter in that light.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: In moving that progress be reported, I must mention that I have been told that dinner will not be provided in the House tonight.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: CASINO

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: In the House last night statements were made by Opposition members which are reported in today's *News*. The answers that I gave to the allegations made by the Labor Party in this House were not reported. Because of the serious nature of those allegations, I believe that I should reiterate for the record what I said in response to those charges, in the hope that there may be some balance in the reporting of this event. The *News* report states:

During the debate, the Opposition Leader, Mr Bannon, said either the Tourism Minister, Mrs Adamson, or her departmental Director, Mr Graham Inns, should resign because of their conflicting attitudes over a casino.

Mr Bannon said Mrs Adamson was opposed to a casino, but her Director had given evidence to the Parliamentary Select Committee indicating a casino would boost tourism in South Australia.

Later, a Labor member of the committee, Mr Jack Slater, interjected during a speech by Labor's Mr Terry McRae that Mrs Adamson had attempted to stop Mr Inns appearing before the body.

Mr McRae agreed, and said the Minister's attitude towards the committee was 'nothing short of shameful'.

I draw members' attention to my response to those allegations, in which I said:

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.

Here is the crux of the matter:

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.

I add, having just conferred with my Director, that neither the board's submission to the select committee nor any evidence that the Director gave to the select committee implied or inferred that a casino would boost tourism, and the Director advised me that there is no evidence to suggest—

The SPEAKER: Order! I fail to see what the statement by the Director has to do with a personal explanation by the honourable member.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I will try to link up the two. The Opposition has charged that the Director and I were at odds on this matter. I wish to point out that we were not, because the gravamen of the case for the board was that a casino has advantages from an infrastructure point of view in that it attracts developers. In other words, it is the icing on the cake, but it does not, and the board has never said it does, in itself, constitute a boost to tourism.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MINISTER'S REMARKS

Mr SLATER (Gilles): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr SLATER: The Minister has just referred to a press statement regarding the debate in the House last evening which states, in part:

Later, a Labor member of the committee, Mr Jack Slater, interjected during a speech by Labor's Mr Terry McRae that Mrs Adamson had attempted to stop Mr Inns appearing before the body.

That referred to the select committee. The fact is that Mr Inns spoke to me at a social function and said these words, 'The Minister has stopped me from attending or giving evidence to the Parliamentary select committee.' I was rather amazed because the Minister had then, if I understand it correctly, gone overseas. Mr Inns subsequently appeared, and I wish to correct the Minister in the statement she made today—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not correcting the Minister. The honourable member has sought leave for and been granted the opportunity to make a personal explanation.

Mr SLATER: Thank you, Sir. I point out, in making that explanation, that I spoke to the Director of Tourism, and he indicated quite clearly to me that the Minister had indicated to him not to appear before the select committee. I mentioned the matter to the Chairman of the committee, and consequently Mr Inns appeared before the committee, not as the Director of Tourism but, as the evidence will show, representing the Tourism Development Board, of which he is Chairman.

CASINO BILL

Adjourned debate in Committee (resumed on motion.)
(Continued from page 6.)

Mr MAX BROWN: I did not speak in the second reading debate, because I have made clear over some years how I stand on the establishment of a casino, and that position stood until this afternoon. I have to agree with what the member for Mitcham said about the standard of the debate last night: it was quite good, although it was lengthy. But we have come this afternoon to the situation we are now in on the matter of this clause and I believe, in all sincerity, that it was caused through the headline in today's *News*. If the Minister was responsible for that headline, then he has just about wrecked the vote.

I do not know whether or not the Minister was responsible, but this sort of journalism, when we are dealing with what I consider a major development as far as the State is concerned, is just not wanted, whether it be in the Murdoch press or anybody else's press. I think that it is bad journalism and is in very bad taste. The Minister can say what he likes. There is no question that there are many innuendoes contained in that article. Let us take that sub-heading, 'Government control bid may sway the day'. Every member in this House knows that a number of Labor Party members were going to support this casino 100 per cent, particularly

if it was Government controlled. There was no question about that. The only way in which the Bill could be saved was to make sure that those members on the Labor benches would support it. The easiest way to do that would be to make sure that the casino was Government controlled.

I do not believe that the Minister's amendment is what I desire as far as a Government controlled casino is concerned. In the Minister's own words, he has already admitted that he could not guarantee that the casino would be Government controlled. The second point I make is that, even assuming the amendment was passed, I anticipate that it could be controlled, for example, by the Lotteries Commission, under a lease arrangement with private enterprise. There is no guarantee that that would be Government control at all.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: They would own the operation.

Mr MAX BROWN: They would not own the building and would not own the other parts of the exercise that go with a casino. Let us be frank about it: it has already been stated that the Wrest Point casino does not rely 100 per cent on its gambling activities. That has already been said. I want the Minister to know that, after supporting the ideals of a casino for various reasons over many years, as I have pointed out in this House, that article and this amendment have just about lost me.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I do not expect to change the mind of the member for Whyalla, but I thought that I would take this opportunity to clear up the matter in today's *News*, which has been referred to by the members for Whyalla, Gilles and, in particular, Napier. I do not really care what members think, but I am telling them that I had nothing to do with that article. If honourable members want to read innuendo into it, they can. I had no contact with the press at all about the matter. Honourable members will realise, if they read my concluding remarks at the end of the debate on the noting of the report, that I said that it may be possible to canvass the matter of ownership during the Committee stage of the Bill. As I say, I do not really care what members think, but I am telling them that I had nothing to do with the article.

Mr McRAE: I want to take only two minutes of the Minister's time, and I hope that this whole mad hatter's picnic will then come to an end. Unfortunately, what I believe was a very good exercise by a very good select committee has been turned into a mad hatter's picnic. The fact of the matter is that political Parties will, on both sides of the fence, use every measure to denigrate their opponents and have always done so throughout history.

That is the reality of the matter. I have no doubt that a great deal of the allegations made by members of my Party against members of the Liberal Party are quite true. I have no doubt that many of the resentments that are held by some of my colleagues are validly held. I have no doubt, on the other hand, that hatred and resentments are held because of things done during our period in office. The tactics of the two Parties are no better. The end justifies the means: 'get in there and kill it'. Let us be clear about that. The committee I was on was a clean committee. All members on it were clean and worked hard. The Chairman worked hard and he was an honest Chairman. I do not believe he had anything to do with the nonsense printed in the *News*. I am very sad that all the hard work we did, all of the negotiations that were carried out last night in good faith, have had to end up in this fiasco. I am very sad that the South Australian community has to end up in a vote which is a fiasco vote.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (16)—Messrs Allison, Ashenden, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Chapman, Duncan, Eastick, Glazbrook, Keneally,

McRae, Oswald, Peterson, Rodda, Tonkin, Wilson (teller), and Wright.

Noes (27)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Adamson, Messrs L. M. F. Arnold, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Corcoran, Crafter, Evans, Goldsworthy, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Langley, Lewis, Mathwin (teller), Payne, Plunkett, Randall, Russack, Schmidt, and Slater, Mrs Southcott, Messrs Trainer, Whitten, and Wotton.

Majority of 11 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I suggest that, in view of the fact that most members have had their say on this matter, although the last thing I want to do is to prevent from speaking any member who has any more points to make, it would be appropriate to put the matter to the test as soon as possible.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (12)—Messrs Allison, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Glazbrook, McRae, Peterson, Rodda, Slater, Tonkin, and Wilson (teller).

Noes (31)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Adamson, Messrs L. M. F. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Evans, Goldsworthy, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, Lewis, Mathwin (teller), Oswald, Payne, Plunkett, Randall,

Russack, and Schmidt, Mrs Southcott, Messrs Trainer, Whitten, Wotton, and Wright.

Majority of 19 for the Noes.

Clause thus negatived.

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: With the Committee's permission, I suggest that we deal with the remaining clauses *en bloc*. The Bill is now inoperable because of the deletion of clause 21. I suggest that the remaining clauses be dealt with on the voices.

Remaining clauses (2 to 20 and 22 to 29) and title negatived.

Third reading negatived.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.11 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 24 August at 2 p.m.