

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 11 May 1983

The **SPEAKER (Hon. T.M. McRae)** took the Chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

PETITIONS: CASINO

Petitions signed by 137 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject the proposal to establish a casino in South Australia were presented by Messrs Lewis, Mathwin, and Peterson.

Petitions received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: RIVERSIDE PROPRIETORS

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: Yesterday, during Question Time, the member for Alexandra alleged that Riverside Proprietors, a family company in which the former Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. Brian Chatterton, has an interest, had received assistance under the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act. He further alleged that there may have been irregularities in the manner in which the application for assistance was made by Riverside Proprietors. These allegations were taken up in subsequent questions by the member for Torrens and the member for Davenport.

As the Hon. Mr Chatterton made clear in his public statements on this matter yesterday, the allegations are absolutely false. However, as he has pointed out, the company, and more particularly Mr Chatterton's brother who manages the property at Lyndoch, has made application for and received assistance under the Commonwealth Fodder Subsidy Scheme.

This scheme was announced by the former Minister for Primary Industry, Mr Nixon, on 31 August 1982. It was formulated at a time when the rapidly deteriorating drought situation meant that primary producers were being forced to slaughter sheep and cattle, particularly breeding stock. The object of the scheme is to enable primary producers to retain their stock until better conditions return. The Fodder Subsidy Scheme is wholly funded by the Commonwealth and administered by the States as agents for the Commonwealth. It is a special measure, which was brought in to cope with the recent drought.

The guidelines under which assistance is given are set out in an Act of Commonwealth Parliament, they are quite strict, and in no way does the State Government have any discretion to alter those guidelines. The State's only role in the scheme is to receive applications and arrange for payment where the application meets requirements set down by the Commonwealth. Riverside Proprietors applied for assistance under the scheme in December 1982 and, as the Barossa Valley was drought affected and the other criteria were met, assistance was given.

I would stress that, as this is a Commonwealth scheme, the State Minister of Agriculture plays no part in the process of approving applications, nor is it a matter in which State Cabinet is concerned. The member for Davenport requested that documents related to this application be tabled. As the honourable member should know, primary producers are required to provide detailed financial information to the State Government to support applications for assistance.

That information is supplied on a confidential basis, and the Government will honour that confidentiality.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MINERAL EXPLORATION

The **Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. R.G. PAYNE**: Cabinet has given approval for the Department of Mines and Energy to conduct limited exploration activities along a strip generally about 500 metres wide on the western face of the Heysen Range at the inside edge of the Flinders Range National Park. The Government has taken this decision after careful consideration of all its implications. This action demands the fullest public disclosure so that it cannot be construed as a departure from the Government's policy commitment to protect the environment and maintain the integrity of the State's national parks.

The reason for proceeding to this decision is simple. Reserves of lead-zinc sulphides at Broken Hill are expected to be depleted by about the year 2 000. Without a new source of lead-zinc feedstock, preferably from within South Australia, the smelters at Port Pirie will close, with disastrous consequence not only for that city but also for the State.

A prospective zone for occurrence of lead and zinc was identified in an area extending 45 km along the western flank of the Flinders Ranges National Park as early as 1960. When Oraparinna National Park was proclaimed in October 1970, it was brought under the Mining Act, 1930-1962. Subsequently, the Flinders Ranges Planning Area Development Plan, which was authorised in February 1973, designated this western face of the Heysen Range as a locality in a Class A environmental area 'where mineral deposits are of paramount significance and their exploitation is in the State or national interest.'

When the park was enlarged in 1976, much of the prospective zone was added to the renamed Flinders Ranges National Park, but, without any reference to the Department of Mines and Energy, the application of the Mining Act to the area was omitted. However, it is still possible within the provisions of the National Parks and Wildlife Act for the Department of Mines and Energy to carry out the exploration. In this way the Government can be sure that the work will be carried out with proper care.

In September 1980, B.H.P. Minerals Limited recognised that lower cambrian rocks in the Flinders Ranges were similar to the Mississippi Valley lead-zinc deposits in the U.S.A. and it applied for and was granted five exploration licences over Wirrealpa, Mount Chambers, Reaphook Hill, Wilkawillina, and in the Heysen Range covering an area adjacent to the Flinders Ranges National Park, all of which are considered to have potential for base metal occurrence. Exploration of these areas is interrelated, and the complete geological understanding of the mineralisation in the areas outside the park may depend on exploration of the prospective zone inside the park. The lower cambrian rocks which outcrop on the western side of the Heysen Range dip away at about a 45° angle toward Lake Torrens. Other work further away from the ranges has indicated that this lower cambrian sequence flattens out. It is these areas away from the park that are B.H.P.'s prospects.

To obtain the information it needs, B.H.P. has approached the Department of Mines and Energy to undertake exploration within the park, and is prepared to give financial support to cover operating costs and petrographic and analytical services. The advantage of the Government, rather than the company, exploring the area within the park is that

there is not necessarily any expectation that if an ore body is located within the park it will be mined as would be the case if the company made a discovery.

The possibility, no matter how remote, of finding an ore body within the park cannot be completely discounted. The potential for mining within the park could cause unnecessary alarm. However, it should be remembered that, while exploration is a necessary precondition for mining, it is the presence of an ore body which creates that potential. This Government has already established a track record where matters of principle conflict with development. Without wishing to delve into hypothetical questions, I believe that it is necessary to give a public assurance at this stage that mining, even subject to the most stringent environmental controls, would not be contemplated within the Flinders Ranges National Park unless issues of State or national interest were paramount; for example, as the last resort to maintain the livelihoods of the people of Port Pirie.

The Government has sought not to create a situation where economic and environmental values are seen as competing, and has already notified and begun consultations on this matter with the Conservation Council of South Australia. On Monday evening members of the executive of the Conservation Council met with the Minister of Environment and Planning and me, and were briefed by a senior officer of my department. While those members of the Conservation Council who were present gave some initial response, it would not be reasonable to have expected the council to adopt any particular position on so complex a matter at short notice.

It would be reasonable to expect the council to be less than enthusiastic about any proposal which involves mineral exploration, no matter how limited, in a national park, but I hope that the Government's initial approach will lead to some co-operation being developed which will set a precedent for the manner with which other environmentally sensitive matters can be handled. I have indicated to the Conservation Council that the Government would be prepared to consider arrangements for an observer nominated by it to visit the area and monitor the progress of the work in order to satisfy the council that all possible care is taken.

Cabinet has approved a two-stage programme, each stage to take about three months to complete. The first stage is geological mapping, involving taking 0.5 kg soil samples using a 7.5 cm hand auger, and rock chip sampling, taking fist sized samples from rock outcrops for assay and petrological identification. These activities will have no significant environmental impact, and there will be no need for vehicles to enter the park as the area in question is generally within 500 metres of the boundary.

Stage 2 is detailed geological mapping and geochemical sampling. This phase would involve the study of ground geophysics, possibly using induced polarisation, where a weak current is passed into the ground and recorded at points across the surface. Electrode holes 20 cm by 30 cm and 5 cm deep are the only signs of surface disturbance. One and possibly two light vehicles might be required to enter the park. It is not certain, but likely that the department will consider it worth while proceeding to this second stage on the results of the first stage.

The only further work that has been envisaged at this time is a diamond drilling programme. Each drill site would be about 10 m by 10 m. Tracks would have to be constructed, but the equipment could conceivably be brought in by helicopter. I have given an undertaking that work will not proceed on this latter diamond drilling stage without the Conservation Council being properly consulted prior to my taking any such proposal to Cabinet.

QUESTION TIME

MR DAVID COMBE

Mr OLSEN: Has the Premier instructed all his Ministers and Government departments to dissociate themselves from any lobbying activity by Mr David Combe and, if not—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: —will he immediately do so? With your leave, and the concurrence of the House—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I must establish order from the very beginning of this matter. There are several emotive issues today, and I ask members of the Government and the Opposition to maintain Standing Orders, or I will see that they are maintained.

Mr OLSEN: In Federal Parliament yesterday, the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, revealed that all members of his Government had agreed that they would have no association with the lobbying activities of Mr Combe. He was a member of the South Australian Public Service between 1965 and 1968. He worked in the Attorney-General's Department and then the Premier's Department. Between 1968 and 1973 he was Assistant State Secretary and then State Secretary of the South Australian Branch of the Labor Party.

In 1970 Mr Combe was particularly active in the Vietnam moratorium campaign. With the Premier, he was a member of the co-ordinating committee of the Vietnam moratorium campaign which organised the September 1970 moratorium. In view of Mr Combe's strong links with South Australia, and because his lobbying activities have been Australia wide, it is possible that, if he has not already done so, he may at some time in the future seek contact with the State Government or Government departments. Because of the statement yesterday by the Prime Minister, will the Premier give a similar instruction to members of his Government and State Government departments?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, I have not given any instructions about Mr Combe or anyone else in relation to this matter. It is quite an extraordinary question, indicating some paucity of issues to be raised.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I can visualise the Leader of the Opposition sitting down, studying the paper, and thinking, 'What can I ask today?' Yesterday, it was about the Federal Attorney-General's proposal on business—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I can then imagine his saying, 'Look, here is a good story about Mr Combe.' Then there was probably a ring-around, with names such as Mr Greiner, Mr Kennett, Mr Peacock or any of those names—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The idea might have been to launch a concerted attack on the Parliaments of the nation: all those Opposition Leaders between them have an average of about six months experience on the job, and they will all have much more. I wish that we could have a few more constructive questions during Question Time, rather than having this sort of nonsense.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If members continue to defy the Chair, I will vacate it.

COMPUTERISATION

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister representing the Attorney-General say whether the Government has considered introducing legislation to protect members of the general public from an invasion of privacy because of the introduction of new technology? The introduction of computerisation in nearly every aspect of the Australian way of life has meant that information about members of the public is now more readily available than ever before. Credit ratings are established in computer banks, finance companies, credit unions, building societies, banks, and lending institutions, and, generally speaking, information is exchanged between these institutions. Information on job applicants is installed in computer memory banks in various institutions and is generally available to those who seek information.

The input of labour into computer systems is also now automatically recorded. For example, the person recording this question is also inputting information about his own work production. It is possible that in 10 years from now one could recall from the memory banks of computers the production rate in key strokes for any person, any second, any minute, or any hour, for any day of the year.

The onset of computer technology has enabled information to be gathered about each one of us on a massive scale, and that information can be brought together. It is readily available and has really brought the problem of privacy of individuals to the fore. Unfortunately, because of the very pressure to which I have referred, people who input information can input the wrong information by one wrong key stroke. Members of the public should have the right to correct and delete any misinformation.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now debating the question.

Mr FERGUSON: It has been put to me that members of the public should have the right to correct and delete any misinformation that has been recorded on data banks. If the Attorney-General's Department has not considered this problem, would it be prepared to do so?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question, which I am sure all members will find interesting. This is a very concerning area across the whole nation, indeed in the Western world. There is a history of privacy and the right to privacy legislation in this Parliament, and it met a very stormy protest from the conservative forces in this Parliament in the early 1970s. However, I understand that the Attorney-General is reviewing this matter, and I will be pleased to refer the honourable member's question to him.

I point out that legislation already exists to provide for fair credit reporting and that the information that is held in data banks, information systems, and computers by a credit reporting service is available to consumers for scrutiny and checking. There are remedies at law for organisations that fail to provide that opportunity. However, I understand that the thrust of the honourable member's question is much broader than that, and I would be pleased to refer his question to the Attorney-General.

FORMER LABOR OFFICIAL

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Has the Premier sought information from the Prime Minister following allegations that a former senior official of the Australian Labor Party has had contact with the expelled Soviet diplomat, Valeriy Ivanov, and, if not, will he do so? There have been widespread media reports during the last 24 hours that a former senior A.L.P. official has been named by the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation as having been linked with Mr Ivanov.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know. If the Premier knows—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader will proceed with his explanation.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: In Federal Parliament yesterday the Prime Minister would neither confirm nor deny these reports, although they appear to be of importance to the Federal Parliament and the nation. I hope the Premier treats this question with a bit more seriousness than he did the question asked by the Leader.

The SPEAKER: I hope that that is the last speech we are going to hear during the explanation.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, it has touched a raw nerve.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that remark was not directed at me.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: No, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am very glad that that is the case.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: No, Sir. I was referring unmistakably, I thought, to the Premier and his reaction to the question. However, he did reveal that the matter had been discussed in Federal Caucus and that Caucus had been informed that the person involved is not a member of the Federal Government. As this matter stands at present, there are a number of significant but unanswered questions. The Opposition believes that the people of South Australia require an assurance that this matter does not involve any improper or illegal conduct in this State or by a South Australian citizen.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: A South Australian citizen?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I therefore ask the Premier whether there are State implications and, if he has not already done so, will he contact the Prime Minister with a view to being able to assure himself, this Parliament and the people of South Australia that these reports do not involve any improper or illegal activity in this State.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not intend to contact the Prime Minister. This is a matter on the national level and, if the Prime Minister believes that there is some South Australian implication, no doubt he will contact me. This question and the one before it are rather like those newspaper reports that fortunately we are seeing less of: they say, 'Air crash disaster: Adelaide connection'. One finds that 200 people died somewhere and the Adelaide connection was that somebody from Adelaide was booked on the plane but had not actually caught the flight, or some other obscure inference of that kind.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If the Deputy Leader thinks that this is a matter of great moment for our State Parliament here, I just cannot see what the evidence for that is. I would have thought that there were matters within the purview and the responsibility of the State Parliament for which Parliament should be concerned. Perhaps he ought to be sending off his question to give assistance to Mr Peacock and his friends federally.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the Deputy Leader to order.

OAKLANDS TRAIN CROSSING

Mrs APPLEBY: Can the Minister of Transport indicate whether sequence timing relating to railway crossings is being or will be upgraded to cater for changing traffic flows? The recent completion of the Warradale crossing upgrading

to five lanes, three south and two north, has provided a safer and better traffic flow. The Minister will recall that I recently raised with him matters relating to traffic delays at this crossing.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader to order.

Mrs APPLEBY: My constituents are questioning whether the signals are triggered when the trains arrive at the Oaklands station, some 300 metres away. This creates extended delays at the Warradale crossing. Even allowing for safety, many motorists feel that this is an unnecessary hold-up.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Following our previous discussions on this matter, I now have some information for the member for Brighton. The train signalling system at the Oaklands crossing is set to cater for the fastest train using the crossing. On the down-track from Adelaide, the triggering device is located before the Oaklands station. If an express train moves through, there is a minimum delay of 30 seconds at the crossing, allowing time for the signals to operate, stopping traffic, and the train to pass through. If a train stops at Oaklands, the delay is increased to maybe 50 seconds or a minute. On the up-track toward Adelaide, the problem does not occur as the signal triggering device is located after the Warradale station. Additional delays can occur when, especially during off peak hours, two trains cross at Oaklands. The signals can then be activated twice in succession, causing delays of approximately 1½ minutes. To alter this system would involve moving Oaklands station, which would reduce other facilities and be extremely expensive.

At Emerson crossing, some advanced equipment is used to differentiate between stopping and express trains. The equipment detects the train at Clarence Park station, and decides its status because all trains stopping at Emerson also stop at Clarence Park. Unfortunately, similar situations do not apply at the Oaklands Crossing. Hopefully, traffic flows will be improved by the recent road widening, but further improvements will have to wait until the feasibility of building over-passes at that crossing is investigated.

SCHOOL FUNDING

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Will the Minister of Education say whether the Government intends to alter the basis of recurrent funding in 1984 whereby schools will receive 50 per cent of their grants at the beginning of the school year and then be required to justify any further allocation of moneys? It has been put to me that the Minister is currently investigating whether the present system of school grant funding will be changed.

The present system provides that 50 per cent of the moneys are allocated at the beginning of the school year and the remaining 50 per cent is received by a school in regular increments throughout the year. I have also been told that the Minister intends to alter this system (I recall that there was some reference to this in the Labor Party policy) whereby 50 per cent will be paid to all schools at the beginning of the year and then each school will have to justify whether it receives part or all of the remaining 50 per cent.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: When the member for Torrens on an earlier occasion raised a matter about Labor Party policy before the election, I was concerned that he had entirely misinterpreted that aspect of the policy. I thought that this was perhaps understandable because he did not have a copy of the policy. I therefore dutifully arranged for a copy of the Labor Party's policy to be sent to him, rather hoping that any future misunderstandings about the policy would be cleared away. The reality is, apparently, that the member has not yet read that policy. What is presently

being considered by the Government is in full line with the printed policy put to the electorate before the last election.

I will now spell out that policy. The Labor Party responded to the proposition being put by the previous Government that there should be full indexation of grants to schools for all schools. We took the proposition that the global figure allocated to all schools in South Australia should be indexed but that the increase (the amount given, compensating for the inflation factor over the previous 12 months) should be distributed in a positive discrimination manner. In other words, the basic grant would remain the same, so that all schools would receive what they received the previous year. Therefore, it is not 50 per cent of the total figure; they would receive the full figure that they received last year. However, the extra amount on top of that (that which was put in the Budget to compensate for the inflationary increase during the previous 12 months) would be discriminatorily applied to schools on a basis of need.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: That's not what—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: That means that we will have some understanding of needs based funding principles, talk to schools about how we can do that, and then guarantee that that increased portion, compensating for increases in the cost of living, will be allocated according to the following formula: half of that money will automatically be given to every school on a pro rata basis. In other words, they will receive 50 per cent of the increased figure, and the remaining 50 per cent will be allocated on the basis of needs based funding principles.

In summary, every school will be guaranteed the figure they received last year plus half the c.p.i. indexation figure. The remaining 50 per cent will be allocated according to needs of individual schools. This means that some schools will receive in excess of the c.p.i. indexation in relation to the grant they received last year, while other schools will receive only 50 per cent of the c.p.i. indexation of the grants that they received in the previous year. That point should be made quite clear. Schools will not be receiving 50 per cent of last year's grant; that is a misinterpretation of the Government's policy.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Well, you'd better get out there and tell them.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Torrens to order.

The Hon. J.D. Wright interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Premier to order. The list is growing at an alarming rate.

SENIOR SECONDARY ASSESSMENT BOARD

Mr TRAINER: Will the Minister of Education advise the House when the Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia will come into operation?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: We now have legislation for the board to come into effect. It is my hope that the legislation will be proclaimed at the earliest opportunity, and we can then set in train the mechanics of establishing that authority. I take this opportunity to advise the House that, partly as a result of points made by, amongst others, the South Australian College of Advanced Education and the present shadow Minister of Education, we have reconsidered the structure of the staffing of that authority.

I had indicated to the House that there may be some occasion when a full-time Chairman and a full-time Executive Officer might be necessary. I accept the propositions put to me as Minister that a more appropriate approach would be a full-time Executive Officer with an elected Chairman of the authority. That means that the early action

that we will have to undertake is the appointment of an Executive Officer to get the whole thing rolling. We want to proceed with that as quickly as possible and will do so.

The members of the authority must be appointed once the legislation is proclaimed. As soon as it is proclaimed, I will make approaches to the various groups entitled to representation on the authority with regard to their nominating representatives. That will include the Director-General of Education nominating his representatives on that authority. Previously, the PEASA legislation introduced by the former Minister would have become operative had it gone through the Parliament by March of this year. An intervening election has resulted in some delays. It is still my hope that by September of this year we will have operational times for that authority. That would mean a six-month delay on previous plans. We still believe that we will be able to have as much in place as possible for 1984-86.

UNIONISM

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Premier say why the Government has further extended its instruction to permanent heads of departments to provide to trade unions on a quarterly basis information about public servants who are non-unionists, and what other extensions are planned? In this House on 20 April the Leader revealed that, following a Cabinet instruction, all departmental heads are now required to provide trade union officials with the names, classifications and locations of employees who are non-unionists. The Opposition has now been informed that this instruction has been extended to require the boards of all recognised hospitals in South Australia to provide similar information. Some recognised hospitals have already indicated their objection to this requirement. This is particularly the case in country hospitals.

I am advised that the hospital boards consider that the request for this type of information is an invasion of privacy in regard to the records of their employees, especially because pay-roll information has traditionally been treated by them as confidential. As this now appears to be a significant extension of the circular to permanent heads, will the Premier say how much further this instruction will be extended? For example, will it go to all organisations and bodies in receipt of Government funds or grants for community welfare or recreation and sport purposes?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The policy adopted by Cabinet has been transmitted to those bodies which are Public Service organisations.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Hospitals are not in the Public Service.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is correct, and this policy has been transmitted to them. What action they take depends on what authority it has by way of instruction as opposed to an expression of opinion. I believe that in some areas it is not regarded as appropriate to provide that information in which case it has not been provided. As to extending this to bodies which are in receipt of Government grants, and so on, that is not the case. Let me reaffirm my strong commitment and that of the Government to the policy of preference to unionists. Let me also remind the House, as constantly seems to be forgotten, that this so-called controversial, new—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: With you unionism is synonymous with compulsion.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think I have said enough, Mr Speaker.

VALUE ADDED TAX

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister of Tourism request his Federal colleague, the Minister for Immigration and Customs, to provide British v.a.t. details in Australian immigration and customs booklets? I am advised that tourists to the United Kingdom are entitled to refunds of v.a.t., which currently runs at 15 per cent for goods purchased for use outside the United Kingdom. Most large stores participate in the refund scheme. The customer, on purchase, requests a form on which is entered details of goods and costs. The full price is paid for the goods on purchase.

On leaving the United Kingdom, the document is lodged with officers of the Department of Customs and Excise at the departure point. The goods must be shown at the same time. When correlation between the two has been checked, the form is stamped, and tourists receive a refund by cheque in their home country within two or three weeks.

I sought information from British Airways yesterday relating to the number of persons who arrived in Adelaide from London between November and the end of April this year and was informed that 3 753 passengers have disembarked in Adelaide. It has been put to me that if each of these persons spent U.K. £100 in the United Kingdom on purchases and did not claim the refund of v.a.t., Australia, and particularly South Australia, would be missing out on those refunds.

Since returning from the U.K. I have spoken to many people who have visited there in recent years. Some of those people were aware that they were entitled to v.a.t. refunds and some were not. Will the Minister raise this matter with his Federal colleague to ensure that this information is provided in customs and immigration booklets supplied to Australians leaving for the United Kingdom?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I will raise the matter with my Federal colleague and bring down a report for the honourable member.

JOB LOSSES

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Does the Premier agree with the statement made yesterday by the Australian Federation of Construction Contractors that the Government's decision announced last week to defer a number of major capital works projects will result in a loss of at least 2 000 jobs? Yesterday the federation released a major report of employment opportunities in the construction industry. In that report the federation stated that the deferral of major capital works programmes announced last week by the Premier would result in the loss of at least 2 000 jobs.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, I do not agree with that statement. I read it in the newspapers but have not seen set out all the calculations behind it. I think that that statement is based on a misunderstanding of what is going on in the capital works area. It is true that certain projects have either been cancelled or deferred in terms of a rearrangement of priorities. However, that is aimed not so much at providing a general and widespread cutback in public works as it is at ensuring that those public works which go ahead will be financially feasible and will not involve us in massive or continuing recurrent expenditure which we will not be able to afford.

This is interesting, because only this week I had a meeting with the South Australian Division of the Australian Federation of Construction Contractors, and we certainly explored the future of construction work in relation to the public works programme. Although we covered a number of matters that were of concern to them, this particular point was not raised. We are well aware, as is every Gov-

ernment in Australia, of the important employment generating aspects of capital works and housing construction. We have, in fact, employment for which we are directly responsible as a Government in those areas.

Therefore, we need projects just purely on that level to prevent further high unemployment. Incidentally, the Federation of Construction Contractors has in the past been very critical indeed about the role of Government and the public sector, and in the past has strongly supported the Fraser Government's policy of small government and the idea of cutting back on the public sector, thus allowing the private sector to develop.

It is very interesting that lately it has changed its attack quite considerably and has illustrated, I think, the very heavy dependence of the private construction contracting sector on Government and public sector activities. The federation cannot have that both ways. I believe that there is enough realism in that organisation to accept that. The productive partnership between the public and private sectors is very much exemplified in that area of civil construction, and we certainly intend to work in closely with them to do it.

We are aware of the employment generating effects and, as far as our financial constraints will allow us, we intend to pump a lot of business and activity in their direction. Of course, I think it is scandalous that there was a period when well over \$100 000 000 capital works money was put into funding recurrent expenditure. I would like to know how many jobs that cost in the private construction contracting sector. Perhaps if I am asked to respond formally to those figures by the construction contractors, I will try to get some details of that from them as well.

PUBLIC RENTAL ACCOMMODATION

Mr GREGORY: Will the Minister of Housing advise the House of the position in regard to the availability of public rental accommodation for South Australians? In my electorate, I have received numerous inquiries from constituents seeking rental accommodation from the South Australian Housing Trust. Inquiries I have made have indicated to me that within the past two years the availability of rental stock for the Housing Trust has blown out to a four-year waiting list. In some cases in the Northfield, Clearview and Enfield areas of my electorate it had previously been two years. It is now up to four years, and this lack of housing rental accommodation is causing considerable hardship.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the member for Florey for his question. I think that it is well known that this Government is concerned about the growing demand for accommodation in the Housing Trust area. The high interest rates of the past five years and the increasing costs of home ownership have increased the demand for rental accommodation. In addition, private rents have increased substantially over the past two years, and the vacancy rate of rental dwellings dropped to about 1 per cent during 1982 compared with about 4 per cent in 1978-79. I might say that the increase in need for rental accommodation is, unfortunately, concentrated upon the most vulnerable groups in our community. The majority of applications for public housing is now from non-working households on very low incomes.

Consequently, as Housing Minister, I am looking to the number of contracts let for the building of Housing Trust dwellings to increase from 1 687 last financial year to about 2 500 dwellings by the end of this financial year. However, rapidly increasing applications, combined with inadequate Commonwealth funding, have produced a situation where the trust cannot keep up with needs. There is no doubt that,

with applications for rental housing growing by about 12 to 14 per cent a year, waiting lists will grow. However, I would like to see the waiting list remain constant or decrease. In this regard, I hope to return from this week's Commonwealth State Housing Ministers' Conference with news that South Australia has received a substantial increase in Commonwealth funds for public rental accommodation.

FORMER MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: I wish to take up the Premier's invitation to ask a constructive question of him. Will the Premier now give an instruction to his Ministers, that is, all of his Ministers, to ensure that there is no repetition of the circumstances in which the former Minister of Agriculture and/or his immediate family received Government financial assistance without first raising the matter with the Premier and Cabinet and having the implications of the proposals investigated thoroughly and approved before, as in this case, going to the Minister's own department and administration for processing and, apparently, approval?

From my understanding it has been a long-standing precedent that, where a Minister especially, and possibly any member, seeks financial assistance of a public kind from a Government department or instrumentality, that matter should be raised first at least with the Leader of the Government and, in a case involving a Minister, at least with his colleagues and the full Cabinet. I recognise the importance of that precedent being upheld. It is against that background and history of practice that we call on the Premier in this instance to insist that that procedure be adopted, and adopted rigidly.

This morning the Premier further prompted the call for the need from this side of the House to raise this important issue when he referred in his Ministerial statement to a series of allegations lodged yesterday against the action taken by his former Minister. For example, in that statement he went on to say:

The former Minister claimed that the allegations were absolutely false.

In fact, that is garbage. Indeed, what the former Minister did, in his own protection, I appreciate—

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no need for a point of order. Clearly, the honourable member is now debating the issue. The honourable member for Alexandra.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: I apologise, Mr Speaker, as I recognise how sensitive the subject is. Simply for the purpose of explaining the question and the reason for it, I consider that the matters of fact surrounding this recent incident are important. In that context, and in that context alone, I seek your leave to proceed briefly. The allegations that were made surrounding this specific incident have been and can be upheld.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The point of order is that the honourable member is now debating the issue and not explaining the factual situation.

The SPEAKER: I have had some difficulties at the table and have been trying to handle about three matters at once. I cannot either uphold the point of order or reject it, but I will be listening to the continuing remarks of the member for Alexandra.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: The Premier by his own admission yesterday declared to the House that the matter before the House yesterday and again today was not referred to him or his Cabinet. Initially, that prompted great concern within the ranks of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order! This is where the problem is arising. I have said before that I will protect the right of every member to give a proper explanation by setting forth the facts, but comments are out of order. The honourable member for Alexandra.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Leaving that side of it, in accordance with your instruction, Mr Speaker, the former Minister of Agriculture (Hon. B.A. Chatterton) by his own admission—indeed, in the context of a matter of fact—did apply for and receive moneys. He did this without discussing the subject or its implications with his colleagues in Cabinet and/or the Premier.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: What you said last night—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Having, through his brother Roland Chatterton or some other source (it is irrelevant), lodged an application and having received assistance to the family without any discussion with the Premier constitutes a breach of practice.

The SPEAKER: Order! I withdraw leave. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I reject any aspect of that explanation, to the extent it was in order, which wants to go over the ground and raise allegations and doubt on a particular issue on which I have made a Ministerial statement which should have disposed of the matter. In terms of the specific question, yes, I would agree that it is wise for such matters to be drawn to the attention of the Premier and Cabinet, and I would expect that to be done.

There is no point in going back over a past event on which I am quite satisfied now that the facts have been set out, but certainly the fact that that issue has been raised obviously indicates that in future I would expect such matters to be raised specifically.

WALKING TRAILS

Ms LENEHAN: Could the Minister of Recreation and Sport state what action his department has taken to repair damage to walking trails caused by the Ash Wednesday bush fires? Has restoration of these trails been completed, and are they safe for hikers now that the bush-walking season has started?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am pleased to inform the member that the walking trails developed by the Department of Recreation and Sport in the Mount Lofty Range have been fully restored and declared safe for bush walkers. The trails were closed after the Ash Wednesday bush fires caused extensive damage to waymarkers, stiles and warning signs. All trails have been carefully examined and repaired to offer maximum safety for the public. Minor detours have been created in some areas where logging is taking place in fire-damaged timber forests.

Restoration work was required along walking trails in Kuitpo forest, Cleland, Kyeema, Mount Magnificent and Finnis Conservations Parks and those in Castambul, Cudlee Creek, Hollands Creek and Horsnell Gully. South Australia leads the way in the provision of walking trails and the supplying of information to the public in regard to those trails. I think that great credit must go to the officers of the Department of Recreation and Sport, and in particular to Mr Terry Lavender, whose knowledge and expertise is well known in this particular area. I am pleased to advise the public that all the walking trails that were destroyed in the Ash Wednesday bush fires are now open and safe for use.

CROWN LANDS

Mr GUNN: Has the Minister of Lands examined a Crown Law opinion headed 'Crown Lands Act, 1929-1980; Pastoral Act, 1936-1980; Access to Pastoral Lands; Land Use Conflicts; Minutes to Director dated 14 February 1983'? If the Minister has examined this matter what action does he intend to take to advise pastoralists and others of the advice contained in this opinion? This document has been brought to my attention. I have studied it quite closely and it appears to clarify the confusion which has existed in the minds of certain people about the rights of pastoralists and other people in relation to pastoral land in this State. I therefore would be pleased if the Minister could state what action he intends to take on this opinion.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The document to which the honourable member refers is, of course, a Crown Law opinion. It has been given to me and the matter is currently under review.

GOODWOOD HIGH SCHOOL

Mr MAYES: Is the Minister of Education aware that the Goodwood High School classes start at 7.30 a.m. and, if so, is he satisfied that such early hours are essential to programmes being run at that high school?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, I am satisfied that what is happening at Goodwood High School is an important part of the programme being offered by that school. Some students start at 7.15 a.m. and finish at 12.30 p.m., and there are two reasons for that: first, it enables expensive specialised equipment that exists at that school, and the space at the school, to be used much more efficiently; secondly, the early start has enabled some students to take up part-time work in conjunction with their studies, so that they are able to carry on with their education without being financially constrained by that.

The programmes being offered at Goodwood High School are very exciting. It is one of the vocational awareness schools that run courses in the vocational awareness programme, and the House would be well informed if it were to hear something about that. In year 11 all students at the school do English, mathematics, physical science and social science courses, which have been especially prepared for students who wish to obtain apprenticeships. Approximately half of all the time is taken in technical studies, in which the aim is to develop knowledge and skills in the widest possible range of activities, which include metal, wood, motor, bricklaying and plastering. There is an emphasis away from students specialising in any one of those, so that they can keep their employment options as wide as possible. At year 12, students undertake the Secondary School Certificate courses in English, mathematics, physical science and social science, and do the same technical studies courses, as applied at year 11.

Goodwood High School has been experimenting with a number of initiatives in this area for some years, and I believe that that is showing through in its enrolment pattern. In 1978 there were 165 students at that high school, and there was some concern in the community that the school was on a downhill trend with regard to enrolments. The figure this year is 405 students, with 192 of those in years 11 and 12.

One of the aspects that will be looked at by the 4-S project, which I have spoken about on other occasions, will be flexible means of structuring within the school, such as time-tabling—when the school will start its day. So I commend the work that is going on at Goodwood High School. I believe that it is being supported by staff, students and

parents. I might quote briefly from a letter that I received from a parent whose child attends that school. She says that her son attended another school last year, and then she heard of the excellent work being done at Goodwood High School, and believes that it is to be fully supported. She says:

The headmaster and his staff show concern and care for each student and this shows in the attitudes of the students to their work . . . The pupil is trained from the very first day in what to expect in the work force and a record is kept of each week's work and progress, and put into a book for inspection by a prospective employer. Students start school at 7.30 a.m. several days a week and finish at 12 noon. This enables them to get used to early work starts and gives them the opportunity to search for employment in the afternoons. Work experience is encouraged and proves of great benefit.

The parent concludes:

I cannot speak too highly of the work done at this school and hope that you [that is me, as Minister] will endeavour to promote and increase this type of schooling for the pupil wishing to undertake a trade.

It was that kind of initiative, along with many others that are taking place in other schools in South Australia, that was at the heart of the decision to establish the 4-S project in South Australia.

ROAD FUNDS

Mr BLACKER: Will the Minister of Transport undertake a review of the method of allocation of road funds to councils to ensure that at least a portion of the funding is allocated on a needs basis? The House will be aware that road funding to councils is allocated on a formula basis. Measures that are taken into consideration are road length, population, area of council, council monetary input, and I think that there are one or two other criteria. I am advised that this formula base would be ideal if all councils commenced this means of funding on an equal basis. As some councils have only 2 per cent of roads sealed and others have 20 per cent or more, an inequality exists. It has been suggested to me that if 80 per cent of funds was allocated on a formula basis and, say, 20 per cent was allocated on a needs basis, some provision for a catch-up allocation could be made.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: It was agreed between the Federal Minister and me that the allocation of local road grants to South Australian local government bodies would be made on a basis similar to that existing under the Roads Grants Act. In a press statement I indicated that the principles for distributing funds were the same as those applying in South Australia to local roads under the Roads Grants Act, and that under those principles \$1 260 000 of the A.B.R.D. local roads allocation would be distributed to councils for expenditure on roads under their control. The balance of the grant would be allocated to the Highways Department in connection with roads under its control in both the incorporated and unincorporated areas throughout the State.

Discussions are continuing in regard to finalising the distribution of funds for 1983-84 and the distribution of funds to the end of the A.B.R.D. programme in December 1988. Hopefully, more funds will be able to be allocated by this means to local councils. The Government believes that the principle used for distributing funds is the fairest one available to it.

CONSUMER PRICE INDEX

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: My question is directed to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place. Will the Minister

say what action the Government is taking to curb the continuing unsatisfactory increase in the c.p.i. in South Australia which I recall was 2.4 per cent for the last quarter? The most recent c.p.i. period was from January to March and was entirely contained in the period covered by the so-called wages pause. It has been put to me that during that period supermarket prices continued to rise at a quite alarming rate. It has also been reported to me that during that period many purchasing officers in manufacturing plants around Adelaide noted that wholesale sector prices were also rising quite dramatically during that period. The comment has been made to me that this gives the lie entirely to the hoary old argument that inflation is caused by wages, and in view of this situation we may now hear no more of that argument.

Mr Gunn: You don't think that you're commenting?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I said that it was reported to me that people had made that comment. In light of this situation, which I understand from reports that I have received is causing grave concern to housewives throughout South Australia, can the Minister tell me what action the Government might be able to take to curb these price increases during this time of a wages freeze if the situation is seen to continue after the department has considered the results of its monitoring of prices in South Australia?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question, which raises matters of great importance to the South Australian community. I will obtain a report on this matter from my colleague in another place. I might point out to the honourable member that many of the clients of the Department for Community Welfare are people who suffer considerably because of rapidly rising c.p.i. figures; for the most recent quarter the figure was in excess of the figures applying to the majority of other States. People on fixed incomes in particular are very adversely affected by rapidly increasing supermarket prices, for example, to which the honourable member referred.

The price control unit of the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs was drastically reduced in manpower and effectiveness under the previous Government. Therefore, the monitoring apparatus and the effectiveness of that unit were greatly diminished as a direct result of Government policy in that area. It is the consumers and, as I stated, those who are most in need in our community who will suffer as a result. However, I shall be pleased to obtain a report on this matter from my colleague.

ADVERTISEMENT

Mr BECKER: Will the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place, investigate whether an advertisement that was placed in the *Sunday Mail* on 8 May by the Darlington Collection offices contravenes the Prices Act or consumer legislation? A full-page advertisement was placed in the *Sunday Mail* of 8 May by the Darlington Collection offices, Darlington House, 89 Pirie Street, Adelaide, under the heading 'One million dollars(\$) worth of solid gold imported 9 carat chain to be sold for as low as \$18 per chain in a mammoth publicity drive', and stating:

The company now wishes to dispose of this chain at prices as much as half normal retail pricing in order to publicise the other services of the company. The only way a consumer can obtain chain at this price (no trade or dealers please) is to come to the company office (address below) before 6 p.m. Wednesday 11 May . . . There is a limit of two chains per customer at this price and no phone or mail reservations will be accepted. To purchase one of these chains you must bring this advertisement with you and attach your name and address. There are 10 000 chains available in a variety of sizes, weights and styles.

The advertisement sets out prices per length of chain. It has been pointed out to me that the advertisement refers to a limit, that is, a limit of two chains per customer, and no phone or mail orders will be accepted. I believe that that provision could contravene the Prices Act.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot hear the honourable member.

Mr BECKER: I understand that State legislation provides that supermarkets or retailers in general cannot limit the number of special items for sale: that is, an advertised special cannot be limited to, say, two items per customer. I am also concerned that the company may be using this so-called mammoth publicity drive to obtain the names and addresses of people in order to harass them in connection with other services of the company, to encourage them to buy gold at inflated prices, and so on. I also believe that the Trading Stamp Act may be involved, because a customer must take with him the advertisement, on which his name and address must be provided. I should be grateful if the Minister would ask his officers to investigate the legality of the advertisement and advise the House.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for raising this matter publicly, and I shall be pleased to obtain a report from my colleague. I point out that at first glance it seems to me that there is a question whether the advertisement contravenes the Trade Practices Act, which is Commonwealth legislation. Also, as I previously pointed out to the member for Elizabeth, the effectiveness of the Trading Stamp Act was greatly diminished by amendments of the previous Government, and legislation that brought about a great deal of consumer protection in this area has now been lost to consumers in this State. However, I will obtain a report from my colleague in another place.

FODDER SUBSIDY SCHEME

Mr LEWIS: I thought I would not be called: I am astonished.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You often are.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Elizabeth to order, which now makes seven persons if we want the tally maintained.

Mr LEWIS: Will the Premier agree that, whilst he was Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. Mr Brian Chatterton had direct responsibility for the administration of the drought fodder subsidy scheme in South Australia? In his Ministerial statement this morning, the Premier said that the Commonwealth Fodder Subsidy Scheme is administered by the States. In this respect, it is the same as all other drought relief funds provided by the Commonwealth which are paid into the Farmers Assistance Fund administered under the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act. The Minister of Agriculture has direct responsibility for allocating these funds in South Australia, as an agent of the Commonwealth. When the Commonwealth announced the fodder subsidy, it made special reference to the need for careful administration of the scheme to ensure that there were no abuses. In the House of Representatives on 9 September last year the former Federal Minister for Primary Industry said:

Measures are being put in place under the arrangement with the States to prevent abuse. One simple measure is that farmers will be paid the subsidy on the fodder one month at a time. If anybody thinks that he is going to rip into the market by buying 10 times as much as he needs and reselling it, he will be due for a shock because he will not be able to abuse the system in that way.

In a press statement on 10 December 1982, the former Commonwealth Minister said that he would be contacting State Ministers responsible (hopefully) for the administration

of the scheme with a view to having the administrative arrangements amended. In this instance Mr Hunt was indicating the Commonwealth's view that State Ministers have direct responsibility for administering the scheme. This is in clear conflict with the statement by the Premier this morning when he said:

The State Minister of Agriculture plays no part in the process of approving applications nor is it a matter in which State Cabinet is concerned.

It is for that reason that I ask the Premier whether he will agree that, while Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. Brian Chatterton had direct responsibility for administering the Drought Fodder Subsidy Scheme in South Australia.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I would have thought that the statements quoted of the then Federal Minister, Mr Hunt, reinforced the point I was making that the schemes are being administered under very strict guidelines which are laid down by the Federal Government and that the States' role is to receive applications and arrange for payments, but they can only be processed under those guidelines that have been laid down by the Federal Government, by its Act, and of course by the Ministerial directives quoted.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: RIVERSIDE PROPRIETORS

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: The need to make this personal explanation arises from the very matter that has dominated the latter part of Question Time today.

Members interjecting.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Are you surprised?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable gentleman has been given leave. Will he please proceed with his personal explanation.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: This morning, in his Ministerial statement, the Premier reflected on members of this side of the House, including me. It is in that respect that I wish to explain the matter, clarify it and indeed clear my own good name on this subject.

The Hon. Peter Duncan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Elizabeth.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: The Premier said that the member for Alexandra 'alleged that Riverside Proprietors, a family company in which the former Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Brian Chatterton) has an interest, had received assistance under the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act'. Taking that point in isolation, in my explanation yesterday, I said:

It has been reported to the Opposition that Riverside Proprietors applied for and have received rural industries assistance or drought relief payable under the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act.

That statement, made yesterday in explaining a question, was perfectly true. We did receive a report, and subsequent events yesterday, last evening and again this morning confirm that, in fact, the former Minister of Agriculture received public financial assistance for drought relief apparently applicable to his property. There is no argument about that. The technical situation has been exploited by the Premier today—

The SPEAKER: Order! That is clearly comment. I ask the honourable member to get back to the point.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN:—and reflects on me: in the second paragraph of his Ministerial statement, he said: The allegations are absolutely false.

This is the only opportunity that members on this side have to defend our situation in such circumstances. The Premier is getting up, and in fairness—

The SPEAKER: Order! No-one is denying the honourable member that right. The honourable member must not comment, and I ask him to come to the point of his personal explanation.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: The point is that the allegations that were made yesterday and uttered by several Opposition members, including me, were true. The technicalities of how the money comes to South Australia, whether it is via a Federal Act for the purposes—

The SPEAKER: Order! I withdraw the honourable member's leave.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): I move:

That Government business have precedence over other business after 3.30 p.m.

Motion carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a short statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I indicate to members that, as the business of the House will go beyond what was originally expected, there will be a break of a fortnight at the conclusion of business this week, and the House will return on 31 May and 1 and 2 of June. I have informed members of that fact previously, and I indicate that today will be the last day of private members business. I inform members that any private members business that they want concluded and voted on should be brought on today.

Mr EVANS: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order, and seek your guidance. I am disappointed that the Deputy Premier has made that statement after moving his motion. Is there any action that Opposition members can take in relation to the fact that the Deputy Premier has informed the House that he has gagged private members business and, immediately afterwards, he said that there will be no private members business after today.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. However, I remind the member for Fisher and all honourable members of the difficulties that members have had from time, to time in that backbench members are restricted as to what they can say in explanation: Ministers are not so restricted. Depending on where honourable members sit from time to time, their opinion on that matter tends to change somewhat. As Speaker, I cannot be a prophet and, therefore, I cannot know in advance what a Minister will say; secondly, even if I could do that, there is no way that I could control it as that is up to the House.

MARCHING GIRLS

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, the South Australian Girls' Marching Association Incorporated be acknowledged as a recognised sport within the meaning of guidelines pertaining to the Recreation and Sport Department.

Over the past four years I have tried to have the South Australian Girls' Marching Association Incorporated recognised by the Minister or Ministers of Recreation and Sport.

That effort goes back to a Labor Government, a Liberal Government, and now to a Labor Government in South Australia. It is frustrating indeed, when one takes a deputation to a Minister and puts a case on behalf of that organisation in order to obtain support and seek recognition for it and one is promised recognition and financial assistance, yet, within a matter of weeks an election is held, a change in Government occurs, and nobody remembers anything about it.

Ironically, before the November 1982 elections, I went to the Minister of Recreation and Sport, the member for Torrens, and again put the case, along with representatives of the South Australian Girls' Marching Association Incorporated. Again we were promised that the organisation would be recognised and given some financial assistance, but an election was held within weeks. The Government changed, and nobody seems to know what really happened.

We are in an awful dilemma in regard to the recognising of a sport and also in regard to obtaining financial assistance for it as the organisation is a victim of the political process of the State. It is also a victim of what I can only describe as clumsy bureaucratic management. I am as critical of my own Party when in Government as I am of the Labor Party for not ensuring that, when a member takes a deputation to a Minister, minutes of the interview should be recorded and filed somewhere so that an incoming Minister has a chance to peruse the file. I am sorry for the present Minister, because he has been put in a position where a promise has been made to the South Australian Girls' Marching Association Incorporated, but his predecessor was in the same position. The Hon. Tom Casey, when Minister, was sincere and said that the organisation deserved recognition and financial support.

Mr Slater: They will get a fair go from me.

Mr BECKER: When the election came and the Liberal Government fell, there was no record on which the incoming Minister could uphold the promises. I acknowledge that the Minister said that he would give them a fair go, and I am grateful for that statement. However, the whole point is that the South Australian Girls' Marching Association Incorporated has not been able to benefit from the financial assistance that I believe it richly deserves. For several decades there have been marching girls organisations in South Australia.

Several marching girls teams are centred in the western suburbs, and probably one of the most successful clubs is at the Western Youth Centre on Marion Road, Cowandilla, the West Point Girls. This team has won prizes throughout Australia and New Zealand, and also Australasian championships. It consists of 18 or so dedicated women and girls supported by parents, relatives, friends, and the community at large.

Mr Mathwin: What about Mr McCulloch, their instructor?

Mr BECKER: Mr McCulloch is recognised throughout Australia and New Zealand as one of the best marching instructors, and is an Australian judge. He deserves full credit for maintaining over the years an extremely high standard of marching in this State.

Mr Mathwin: He's a good sportsman.

Mr BECKER: Yes, he is an excellent sporting personality. West Point is typical of the marching girls' clubs in South Australia and throughout the country. I believe that this activity comes within the guidelines of the Department of Recreation and Sport, and should be recognised as a sport because it has that element required in all sports, the involvement of thousands of people in an amateur sport. This sport has been able to stand financially on its own feet in this State, and to obtain limited sponsorship. However, the real cost of participating in this activity has to be borne by the participants, and girls have had to pay as much as

\$1 000 a year for uniforms, maintenance, and air travel expenses to compete in this State and throughout Australia. Two years ago the Australian championships were held in Darwin, and have been held in Brisbane.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: They were held in Adelaide this year: I opened them.

Mr BECKER: Earlier this year the Australasian championships were held in New Zealand, and the air fare to New Zealand is about \$500 a person. Also, the team must pay for a chaperone, manager, and coach, and is required to take a judge with it. Therefore, it is an expensive sport, but all sports are expensive. The Minister and I agree about how the Federal Government could assist sporting organisations in this country. The Australian marching girls championships were held at Glenelg at the Easter weekend, and the Minister of Recreation and Sport had the honour and pleasure of opening those championships. I was involved during the early stages in trying to assist the association with matters of protocol, such as whether it should have the Governor, the Premier, or the Minister to open the event. The venue was excellent, and there was a good attendance to see a record number of about 162 teams competing, involving a total of about 2 500 persons. The event was well confined and contained on the Glenelg oval.

As the Minister said, he was able to open the Australian championships and I had the opportunity of being the guest on the final day of the championships, as was the member for Brighton, representing the Premier. So, I think that the two of us agree that the devotion and dedication of the participants in this sport deserve the highest praise that can possibly be given to them in recognition of what they are doing for the young people in this State.

Therefore, without going into a lot of detail as to the total involvement of this sport in South Australia, I simply ask that all members are fully aware of this: we want them to be recognised within the guidelines of the Department of Recreation and Sport and that, in so doing, they receive all the entitlements that any other sport does, with financial assistance to compete in Australian championships, wherever they may be.

Of course, in that way, the recognition by the department and the Government helps them to get some sponsorship. It gives them that little bit of leeway that helps them to be far more viable. It also helps them to be in the position (which I hope they can in the next few months) to be given assistance to provide a full-time or, at least, a part-time administrator—someone who can be assisted to promote the sport throughout the State.

By doing that, we contribute to employment and many other areas because, as the Minister would be aware, the clothing and transporting of the teams, the back-up support, the provision of ovals, the premises and so forth, all go to providing activity within the community. It all goes to providing business opportunities. It all goes to providing employment, and that is what it is really all about today.

I believe that opportunities for employment are in many areas where they can be labour intensive, and sport is one of those areas at which we now have to look very, very closely to make the best use of all our sporting facilities. I think that it is an absolute tragedy that Football Park is used for only six months of the year and not used two or three days a week. One only has to look at most of our recreation areas, such as park lands, Marineland park or West Beach, where there are many acres of valuable land which is used for sporting facilities on a weekend but not during the week. I would like to see the Girls Marching Association re-establish its headquarters at West Beach, where there is plenty of land which could now be brought up to a sufficient standard. The Department of Air Transport does not need the area that was reserved for a runway and,

certainly, that provides an opportunity for the Girls Marching Association to participate there. Therefore, all in all, I see the support of members as recognition of the sport and the organisation. In doing so, they give these people the encouragement they so richly deserve. Therefore, I commend the motion to members.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I wish to support the motion of the member for Hanson, because there are many areas in the recreation and sport field where groups have been ignored over the years and have not been recognised as being authentic as far as the department is concerned and not regarded as being sporting, or recreational organisations which are entitled to some Government help.

Unfortunately, in the case of the Girls Marching Association and others, the problem they suffer is that they do not have as many spectators following them or as much public image as far as the press is concerned. Therefore, there is not as much pressure put on Governments to recognise the benefits that these groups have for society in catering for a significant number of people. Of course, in that process where they do not also have recognition from the news media and Government departments, not much interest is created in the community, particularly for young women to become interested in that activity.

There is no doubt that the South Australian Marching Girls Association has carried out over the years a great community service in providing an opportunity for these young women to learn to work as a marching team, to learn the co-ordination of their body through marching, and to learn about team spirit in marching and working together, whether it be in fund raising or just practising for their competitions.

It also teaches them self-discipline in looking after themselves so that they can keep competing and to win where possible. I am not talking just about their physical condition but also about the type of uniforms they wear. Such uniforms are a credit to them, because they are kept neat and tidy. They are truly a great asset to our State and society as a whole. The problem is that when groups like this are ignored by Governments—whether it be the previous Government, the present Government or the Governments of the 1970s—in regard to finance, it is those families on the lower income levels who find that their daughters (in regard to marching girls) are unable to compete. They are the ones who are placed at a disadvantage. When Governments are elected after claiming that they will seek to help the disadvantaged in society, they really go against their promises if they do not help groups such as the South Australian marching girls.

Another similar group is the dance association, which also is not recognised. Dance is not recognised as a sport here, yet elsewhere it is a world-wide sport. In European countries it is a top sport with a great following. Although there are many other areas to which I could refer, I just give that one example that the Minister might consider. Once a sport expands and is picked up by the news media, interest in the sport grows but it ignores other sports that may be just as healthy and beneficial to the individual as any of those other sports being publicised. If one refers to the newspapers of a century ago one will see that under the 'sporting' heading only horse racing was dealt with. Under the heading 'tennis' only tennis was dealt with and the same situation applied to cricket and football.

The other matter that amazed me from reading century-old papers was that papers gave more recognition to lacrosse than to most other sports, although they gave much attention to horse racing, and sports involving gambling. I make the point that in the last century only a few sports have received a great deal of promotion. One that was greatly promoted but which has fallen by the wayside now is lacrosse. It used

to get more publicity than cricket and football, but apparently it failed to capture readers. That is what the media are all about: they seek sports that generate the greatest amount of public support.

Such sports generate the greatest number of people interested in reading the articles and through that process there is an increased public interest in those sports, and those with lesser publicity fall further by the wayside. That is what has been happening to the South Australian marching girls and other groups. If the media and others who give publicity to such areas—they are the only ones who can do it in our society—follow only one or two traditional trends, there is only one group left to pick up the leeway and help minority spectator-oriented sports or recreations—that is government, whether it be local, State or Federal. Government is the only group which can pick up the tab.

I congratulate the member for Hanson on moving this motion. He is making the point that the South Australian marching girls have competed around Australia with much success and yet we as a Parliament have not recognised that success. I know that when we talk about it we get a twinge of conscience but when it comes to the real crunch we are reluctant to pick up another tab and commit ourselves to supporting another association because to do so we would have to cut back on our traditional commitments to other sports or make a greater contribution from Treasury or we would have to find another area of taxation in order to help that particular association.

There is no doubt about the benefits accruing to the community from any disciplined activity. I believe that young people in countries that have a form of conscription which allows them to be trained and disciplined to work together (not in the carrying of guns) receive a grounding which helps them later in life. Similar training in discipline is received by girls involved in marching groups and callisthenics but that training is done voluntarily. The young girls and their officials volunteer because they are keen and enthusiastic to learn a particular activity. They want to achieve perfection in their chosen sport and to do their best for their team, the State and those who help them.

I hope that the Minister is prepared to make a commitment toward the South Australian Girls Marching Association and other similar groups that have been ignored by previous Governments. I know that the Minister will ask where he is to find the money and from which other group it should be taken but that is a decision that any Government has to make. The Government of the day receives the demands and applications for money and all the pressures associated with such demands and an Opposition can never, nor can an individual, put its hands on all the money required, as can a Minister, or offer a suggestion of where a cut should be made or where an increase should be made to try to find the few dollars that would help. At least some initial recognition is a beginning towards the end goal of greater recognition.

During recent years, particularly under the previous Government (and I believe this is continuing under the present Government) substantial sums have been made available to sport and recreation groups for administration. That is one area alone which would be of benefit to the marching girls; there is no doubt about that. I want the Minister to recognise, if he has not already done so, that those persons on the low socio-economic scale who have to contribute towards the cost of dresses, uniforms for marching, footwear and whatever—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: And socks.

Mr EVANS:—and socks, as the Minister of Local Government says, are the ones who also have to raise money for interstate trips or for entering competitions. Yet, those people are the least able to make a financial contribution.

They can do the work at fund-raising activities but when it comes to a financial commitment they are embarrassed because they cannot compete in the fund-raising activities on the same basis as some families are able to do.

I make the point to the Minister that there is a need to help groups like the South Australian Girls Marching Association Incorporated and I support strongly the motion and I hope that the Minister recognises the need.

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the motion moved by my colleague, neighbour and friend, Mr Becker (the member for Hanson), that in the opinion of this House the South Australian Marching Girls Association Incorporated be acknowledged as a recognised sport within the meaning of guidelines pertaining to the Department of Recreation and Sport. I commend the honourable member for doing that. He has made a very wise step.

The honourable member mentioned in his remarks that he was at the recent Australian championships at Glenelg which, unfortunately, I was not able to attend because I was away. I normally would have been there because I have a great interest in the Marching Girls Association. I understand that he met there the new member for Brighton, Mrs Appleby, who is also very sympathetic with these young people and this organisation. I have since talked with some of the officials of the Marching Girls Association, who related to me the sympathetic consideration given not only by the member for Hanson but also by Mrs Appleby (the member for Brighton). Therefore, it would appear that a number of people on the other side of the House would support this motion of my friend and colleague the member for Hanson.

My interest, of course, goes back a number of years because my eldest daughter was involved in marching girls. She was there as a midget; in those days they had the midgets, juniors and seniors. She was in a team that was set up in Seacliff, where I lived and am still living. From there, she developed through the midget stage into the juniors. Then she went to one of the main teams down at the Bay (as it used to be in those days). There were a number of teams—Dolphins, Bay Royals, Glengowries—to name just three in the Glenelg area itself. My daughter went to the Glengowries, which had a fine Sturt tartan, a beautiful costume and a very costly costume, too; that is why it is very important that this matter goes through the House and is supported by all members.

The uniform is a costly business; it involves not only the original outlay for the uniform, but also the replacement of it. The boots are very expensive and must be maintained and kept in spotless condition. This is done not only by the children themselves but also by the people who help to dress them and look after the uniforms. Each club is set up by the organisers, the administration people and the chaperones; they are the people who iron all the clothes. When one gets kilts—and a number of the different teams wear kilts—a colossal job is involved.

My late wife used to help sometimes with the cleaning and whitening of the gloves, and that in itself is a costly job. The boots must be cleaned, just as in some military situations, and the heels even have to be polished to get the points in order to win medals to become champions of the State or Australia. We were more than delighted that one of our children was connected with this organisation, because it taught her a lot of things—deportment, how to march, how to receive discipline, and how to provide and equip herself with self-discipline, which is a necessity for all people in all walks of life, no matter how young or old they are. We must all have that built within us; otherwise we are in dire straits.

Therefore, it is a great area for teaching young people. The involvement of so many people in this organisation is considerable—many thousands of people. As I said earlier, one has the chaperones, the people who organise it, the organising of these championships, of which, I have no doubt, the Minister is well aware. It is no easy matter.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: I have never competed, but I have had an interest over the years.

Mr MATHWIN: I would agree that the Minister would not have competed. I just cannot visualise the Minister in a short mini kilt, although perhaps I can, which is why I do not think he would enter such a competition. Of course, neither would I, for the same reason.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: Yes, indeed; I must admit that there are other parts that would look a little different as well. The people involved are dedicated in doing what they can to help not only the young members of their families but also the teams and the organisation of the sport. I stress that it is a sport, and I am glad that that fact is mentioned in the Bill, because it must be recognised as such. That is fairly obvious because of the number of people involved and the benefits that it provides for young people.

As I have said, the uniforms and the upkeep of those uniforms is expensive. Further, travelling to various States is involved, as the member for Fisher pointed out. Each Australian championship is held in a different State each year. My daughter was in the Glengowries: she went to Brisbane one year, to Perth another year, and then to Tasmania and to Sydney. Therefore, travelling involves a lot of expense and, although people receive assistance from the clubs which run different shows for raising money for the young people, of course, clubs are never able to cover the full cost, which is colossal. Travelling is usually undertaken by air, and the costs must be met by willing parents, which in some cases is hard for them to do, and it is a shame if children are handicapped because parents are unable to provide money for such a great sport.

Thousands of people participate in this sport. Indeed, it involves families because, when the marching demonstrations are being held, the entire family goes to the ground and makes a day of it in a full family situation. Not only that, it is a great sight to see the mass marching of the teams and the teams doing their demonstrations and different set marches. All teams must do a set programme, and they are then involved with a demonstration of their own choice during which they are able to display the different movements within whatever routine they are presenting, which can, of course, earn them points for initiative and the like. It is a marvellous sight—a very colourful and moving sight—as I have found on a number of occasions while watching these competitions. As I have said, this sport involves families and behind-the-scene helpers—those who work on the uniforms, those who help to get the sport going, and so on.

My colleague mentioned the top team which, of course, is trained by Paul McCulloch whom I have known personally over the years because of my involvement with marching girls. He is a very efficient chap and is probably the best marching instructor that I have ever seen, apart from in the Army, of course. Then, of course, I have other friends, such as Don Hicks, who is now the State President. At one time he was on the Brighton council with me as a member of the south ward, and, although I have not seen him for some time, he is a personal friend of mine. The association is certainly in good hands. From what I have gleaned, I understand that the other States provide assistance for their marching girl associations. I think that it would be only right that the Government recognises it as a worthy sport.

It would appear that the Minister is very sympathetic to this matter, and it would be most encouraging if he would

say today whether he will assist the marching girls, as this is the last day on which private members' business will be considered. The Minister, by interjection, stated—

The Hon. J.W. Slater: I will give them a fair go.

Mr MATHWIN: There is nothing better than the old Australian term 'giving a person a fair go', and, by the Minister's indication that he will give this organisation a fair go, I believe that he is sympathetic and understanding in this regard, is genuinely interested in this organisation, and realises the potential and the worth of the organisation.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I will speak briefly in this debate and then seek leave to continue my remarks later. I believe that marching girls organisations should receive some recognition. However, there are two different organisations in South Australia, the South Australian Marching Girls Association (to which the member for Hanson referred) and the South Australian Bands Marching Girls Association. We must consider the recognition of both those organisations if we are to consider the recognition of one of them.

I have not had the opportunity to research this matter, and thus I cannot give a definite opinion or an expression of intention, but I do not disagree with the comments made by members opposite. I believe that this activity provides the girls with certain opportunities and benefits them socially and personally. I am sympathetic to the intentions of the organisation, and I believe that the activity should be nurtured and promoted as much as possible. However, I am intrigued that the comments made by members opposite could have been made when they were in Government.

Mr Mathwin: We always have a go at the Minister.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Members opposite did not make similar comments publicly or in this House. I assure members opposite that I will seriously consider the points raised. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

WEST COAST WATER SUPPLY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Gunn:

That, in the opinion of the House, the Minister of Water Resources and the E. & W.S. Department immediately take steps to provide reticulated water schemes west of Ceduna to all the communities that are without reticulated service and that such a scheme be phased in over the next three financial years.

(Continued from 4 May. Page 1157.)

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Water Resources): I move:

Leave out all words after 'Department' and insert 'consider the provision of reticulated water supply scheme west of Ceduna and that such a scheme be considered in conjunction with other schemes throughout the State and in the light of prevailing economic circumstances'.

The SPEAKER: Is the amendment seconded?

Mr GROOM: Yes, Sir.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: In moving that amendment, I am certainly sympathetic to the matter raised by the member for Eyre. I remember, as he would, the deputation that came to me, as Minister, from people involved in that part of Eyre Peninsula. To be fair and reasonable, this matter must be considered in conjunction with many other areas of the State that also require a reticulated water service. Since I have been Minister, I have had a number of deputations from various parts of South Australia and from various members on the other side, and I think that we should consider them together, rather than being committed,

if this motion is carried, to provide a reticulated water service west of Ceduna within the next three years.

As the member for Eyre is probably aware, 32 areas are requiring assistance in this way. At present-day values, the work involved would cost approximately \$51 000 000. The honourable member has given quite an extensive history of the matter, but I will briefly cover some aspects of it. In 1964 a scheme was tentatively proposed to supply water to several conservation tanks west of Ceduna. The scheme was small in scale and was intended only as a drought relief supply. A preliminary cost estimate of such a project would be a figure close to \$1 000 000, with an estimated return of \$2 400 (this represents a return on capital outlay of 0.24 per cent, which is clearly uneconomic). I do not think that that scheme needs to be considered. It was a small scheme and certainly would not serve the purposes of the member for Eyre.

In 1971 a report completed by the E. and W.S. Department detailed works required to replace and enlarge the Tod trunk main (which has since been completed), which would harness the Kappanwanta Basin, and extensions to the area west of Ceduna, extending to Penong. This would require augmentation of other sections of the Tod trunk main system downstream from Lock. The cost of providing this additional demand would be in the vicinity of \$40 000 000.

A reduced scheme now being considered by the E. and W.S. Department involves the construction of a trunk water main along the Eyre Highway, with farmers and other consumers laying their own distribution mains. This matter first arose out of the following Question on Notice by the member for Eyre (pages 819 and 820 of *Hansard*): what was the total cost to supply water to Eyre Peninsula in 1981-1982, including management operation costs, interest and depreciation?

The cost was \$9 900 000, and the total revenue received by the E. & W.S. Department for 1981-82 was \$3 014 000. As one can see, supplying water to Eyre Peninsula is an expensive problem. Not only do we need to consider the capital cost of the work involved, but the on-going cost to the State in relation to that area. That problem applies to all country areas in relation to cost as against return. In fact, in 1981-82 I think the department charged 32c a kilolitre; if we charged the real cost to the department it would be about \$1.80 per kilolitre.

We have a financial problem, not only in relation to the area referred to by the member for Eyre but in about 32 other areas of the State at a total cost, based on current figures, of \$51 000 000. The scheme to provide reticulated water to areas west of Ceduna will involve capital expenditure of such a magnitude that the State Government cannot finance it without assistance from the Federal Government.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order and ask which remarks *Hansard* is reporting: the conversation from the front bench or the remarks of the Minister of Water Resources.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member would know that private conversations or interjections are quite out of order, and I ask for them to cease.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: In the past it was possible for some uneconomic water supply schemes to be financed under the National Water Resources Financial Assistance Act. Under the recent criteria for eligibility some projects no longer qualify for assistance under that Act. During his Address-In-Reply speech, the member for Eyre mentioned correspondence between myself and him in regard to this matter. I point out that the previous Federal Government announced a scheme whereby South Australia would receive \$150 000 000 under the National Water Resources Act. That money was to be used for water filtration, salinity control

in the Murray River, flood mitigation and water resources assessment programmes.

It is important to this State to obtain Federal assistance to provide a reticulated service to as many areas of the State as possible that are not already serviced. This has been particularly emphasised in the past year because of the drought conditions. I am not unsympathetic to the demands made on me as Minister by the member for Eyre or by any other member in relation to servicing constituents with a reticulated water supply. The problem is simply one of economics. I mention in passing that these problems have not just occurred; they have been around for some considerable length of time.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Do you have a list of all the programmes?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I have a list of some 32 programmes which vary in regard to economic cost. I do not remember the individual amount involved in each programme, and I do not have that information with me at the moment, but the total amount on current-day value is \$51 000 000.

That is a significant amount and one which the State could not bear at the present time. I have moved my amendment to assure the member for Eyre that the matter will not be forgotten. However, it has to be taken in conjunction with other areas of the State, including the 32 on the list, some of them quite close to Adelaide (such as areas in the Adelaide hills), which have been waiting for a service of this nature for some time. Before a firm commitment can be made, we must assess the practicability of all the schemes. It is necessary to complete certain investigations, and I have asked the department to provide full details of a number of schemes following deputations over the past few months. I have moved the amendment in sympathy with the problem on Eyre Peninsula and elsewhere in the State.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I support the motion moved by the member for Eyre in his attempt to draw the attention of the House and the people of South Australia to having the E. & W.S. Department provide a reticulated water supply to communities and people west of Ceduna. I support it for the simple reason that it puts into perspective, through the specific case, the general case. I oppose the amendment moved by the Minister for no reason other than it is a cop out, especially when we look at the last phrase, 'in light of prevailing economic circumstances'. That is always the baloney given to back-benchers and members of the public by Ministers in Governments which do not have the intestinal fortitude to arrange their priorities in a way that is realistic in regard to the needs of people rather than in the ways realistic to their needs for votes. In this instance, if we look at the specific case as it illustrates the general case, we see from the remarks of the member for Eyre in proposing the motion that it causes a great deal of hardship and puts people living in those communities at risk in terms of their public health, particularly during dry periods. It puts members of those communities, their properties and families at risk because there is an inadequate or inappropriately pressured water supply available for the purposes of fire fighting and, overall, it detracts from the general standard and quality of life which they can enjoy.

I hear coming from all quarters the cry that it is their choice to live there. If that is so, given the disadvantages from which they suffer, I believe that they should not be required to pay the same level of taxation. They do not enjoy the same measure of services provided at public cost from public revenue disproportionately higher to the contribution that they are making. They do not have any water, let alone filtered water. They do not have access to other

publicly funded facilities and services which are said to contribute to an improvement in the quality of life, such things as the Festival Theatre and the productions which are put on in that venue at a subsidised cost.

These people do not have ready access to the wide range of public and private schools. Their children cannot take work outside the family business and live at home—they have to leave home. Their children cannot obtain further education in that locality but have to leave home to do so, thereby increasing family costs. They suffer in all these ways, and more, that I have referred to because they are living in these isolated circumstances. The suffering to which I refer is the way in which their quality of life, or capacity to enjoy it, is restricted as against where that quality of life is established at public expense.

Some of the other ways in which these people suffer as a direct result of their geographical location for which they are not compensated in any way by the taxpayer is in the provision, at the same cost, of essential food and other supplies for households and businesses—they have a freight disadvantage. These people do not have as much money per kilometre spent on their roads as do people in the metropolitan area where votes are more important than compassionate regard for people's welfare. There is not as much money spent on public transport in these areas. Indeed, many of them do not have public transport. Regrettably, because they do not have a reticulated water supply, if they decide to slake their thirst in dry years when they run out of rainwater by going to the local hotel there are no taxis that they can catch home, so they are knocked off by the local breathalyser unit if they do anything other than walk. Again, these people suffer from these sorts of disadvantages.

It is all very well for members of this Chamber to sit here and make pronouncements about the unfairness or inability of the economy to provide the money necessary to extend these fundamental and essential services to enable civilised life to be undertaken by people living in isolated circumstances. It is all very well to sit here and say that economic circumstances do not permit this to happen, but that is a value-judgment because prevailing economic circumstances do not permit any of the other things that I have just referred to that most members in this Chamber, especially members opposite, all have ready access to, which are subsidised at taxpayers' expense and which contribute substantially to the improved quality of life that they enjoy.

However, the people I mentioned are not asking for festival centres or an extension of the State Transport Authority system at a subsidised cost. They are not asking for a university to be built at Ceduna, or for any of these sorts of facilities. They are merely asking for an essential life-support system, a reticulated water supply. Can they get it? No! Why can they not get it? Because Governments will not make funds available from public revenue for that purpose. Why not? Because their value-judgments are based more on where they would get their votes than on human need and comparative concern. I can illustrate this quite clearly as it relates not only to this particular instance of people at Ceduna and Westwood but as it relates to the 32 programmes costing \$51 000 000 in a Budget of over \$2 000 000 000.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: And a recurrent loss.

Mr LEWIS: Not to mention the recurrent loss in the State Transport Authority. What is that? It would be interesting to see just how much per capita travellers on public transport enjoyed benefits on an annual basis and how many trips are made each year.

Mr Evans: Multiplied by 70 cents.

Mr LEWIS: As I am informed and reminded by the member for Fisher, one multiplies that by 70 cents a head a trip. How many million trips are made, particularly by the people in or near the metropolitan area of Adelaide, at

that cost? It would be millions. At 70 cents a trip, that is more than it would cost to put the water in. As I see it, the people in Ceduna do not have public transport if they have one too many at the local. The breathalyser is in: they have to walk.

If one does not have decent rainwater to drink in a drought, what does one drink? Where does one go to get it? No: Governments are more concerned to ensure that their vote is shored up by popular programmes in those seats which they regard they must win to retain office. That is regrettable, because what it effectively does is not only discriminate against people's real human needs (such as those to whom we are referring not only in the community in and around Ceduna in this instance but all the communities in which those 32 schemes could be installed) and the justice of their cause, but it discriminates against their capacity as human beings to contribute a greater amount to the gross national product for the same amount of effort, dedication and capital outlay already existing on their farms, save for a few dollars to install water troughs.

Whenever a dry year comes they must destock at whatever price is being offered. As a consequence, those farms never reach anything like the carrying capacity they could reach. The farmers know that there is far too much risk in doing that. If a dry spell overtakes them and they do not have water, they must sell as price takers. They have no way of influencing the price they can get in those circumstances.

In consequence, the amount of benefit they can derive personally and then contribute to the gross national product is seriously reduced, and that is across a substantial area of farmland. At Ceduna it would be somewhere in the order of about half the area of arable Yorke Peninsula which has a reticulated water supply. The intensity with which the land can be farmed would enable a greater number of people to be employed there. Therefore, by this simple decision we reduce the number of job opportunities that would be created economically in that nobody would employ or nobody would subdivide their farm knowing that it was possible to do so, unless they could do so at a profit and thereby make a contribution to the common welfare, the gross national product of this State and this nation.

Of course, aside from that, the Government's decision year in year out to say, 'We cannot do it in light of the prevailing economic circumstances' (because that is what the amendment moved by the Minister really means), and in the event that some hazard arises (and I am particularly referring to fires), these people are left starkers when it comes to a capacity to defend themselves against that risk. If it is a dry year their water supply is already depleted and they probably have insufficient or just sufficient for a week's needs. That would not go anywhere in combating a fire that might break out in their fodder reserves which would be extremely valuable to them in the circumstances or, worse still, in their home.

Of course, no-one enjoys complicating the kind of disaster that happened on Ash Wednesday which most of the people in the metropolitan area and elsewhere in South Australia had brought home to them with considerable force. If that were to happen in a community like Ceduna, in similar climatic circumstances and at the same time of year, a farmer would just not have a hope. It would be hell, and he would be in hell. He would be cooked, and so would everything he owned and cared for. That is tragic. The Minister does not want to be reminded, nor does any other member, of how they are contributing by allowing this condition to continue the likelihood of that event, not only in Ceduna but also in any one or more of the 32 programmed areas to which it is said that we cannot reticulate a water supply because it will cost too much.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: There are other factors involved as well—not only economic costs. You don't understand it all.

Mr LEWIS: I think that I do understand. I regret that the Minister does not perceive an identical case being made out by me regarding the expenditure of public money supporting the supply and subsidising public transport for people living in the metropolitan area and, in this instance, subsidising the supply of water to people in country areas. In many instances, communities themselves are willing to go a long way towards meeting the capital costs in order to get a water supply, because they know the grave risk at which they place their homes, properties and families. There is not only risk of fire but also risk to their health and to livestock. Putrid water can be just as devastating to livestock as to people.

Whilst I care more about people, I am not uncaring about the consequences for livestock, which die if they have to drink putrid water. I point out to the Minister that we are spending more money here in the metropolitan area taking dirt from the water, suspended colloidal material and other semi-suspended material larger in dimension than colloidal material. We are making a value judgment about that and putting that programme higher on the list of priorities than a programme of providing a more essential and a basic service to people in outlying areas. We are spending far more money in the next three years on the scheme I have outlined than it would cost in capital terms to reticulate water to people in all those 32 programmed areas extending across the State. None are within the metropolitan area, by definition, but many are within my district. I know what it is like to live in a situation where reticulated water is not available. I know of the hazards that can accrue as a consequence. I believe that it is immoral to filter the water: it does not improve the general standard in regard to the risk at which the health of people is put; it does not improve that one iota by filtering. In fact, it merely makes people think that the water is safer, yet contained within it are still the dissolved salts that may be damaging to people's health if they exceed 830 electro-conductivity units in each sample.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]

Mr LEWIS: Prior to the luncheon adjournment I was explaining how I thought that the way in which money was taken from public revenue from whatever source is of no great consequence in this context and applied to the purpose of providing subsidised cost for services enjoyed by people in this State where those services related to the supply of water and how I believe the amount of money so spent was not in fact applied in a way which took account of the real needs of people but was rather more cynically applied in a way which took account only of the opportunism of Governments seeking to retain or obtain majorities.

The people of Ceduna and in areas around that locality and westward, like people in other parts of South Australia do not have the same access to these subsidised public services, but they do pay their taxes. Part of that tax revenue comes back to the State from the Commonwealth Government in the form of the funds made available for the provision of water reticulation. The \$150 000 000 at present is being allocated not really for the purpose of reticulating water to people but in fact is applied in great quantities to the cost of filtering water supplies which already exist. I think that is a travesty of the original intention of the provision of the funds. Sure, recently we have had argument raised in Canberra about the necessity for sufficient funds to allow the continuation of the filtering of Adelaide's water supply. However, I do not see this subject in that light. I believe that the first priority the Government and this Parliament should have is to supply water to all people who

need it, especially where it can be demonstrated that it will improve their quality of life and make that quality of life more equitable for all citizens of South Australia; and this is most important where the supply of reticulated water will enhance the productive capacity of the communities and areas to which it is applied.

Of course in my district the areas that need that kind of help are in the regions of Bow Hill, Perponda, through to Karoonda. The Karoonda supply is already grossly inadequate, especially during hot dry spells. Other areas needing a better water supply are adjacent to the Strathalbyn township which does have a reticulated supply but it is in a dilapidated state and is patched up so much that it is almost impossible to find the original system. It cannot cope with the demands made upon it by the increased population in that locality. People to the east and north-east of Strathalbyn do not have any reticulated water at all and neither do people living in towns on the Dukes Highway and in Meningie who suffer from the same problem, as do the communities along the South Coast and the fishing ports, particularly Southend. They all suffer from the same risks as I have mentioned from which people in Ceduna suffer.

There needs to be a rearrangement of the priorities the Government has, and for a Minister to say that in view of prevailing economic circumstances such decisions need to be made is to indulge in a cop out and engage in a double speak. It is an argument that might always be used and an argument that is very subjective and in no way objective in its analysis and application.

I believe we should stop the continuing capital expenditure on the filtration of Adelaide's water supply until we have provided reticulated water to those communities such as the one to which the member for Eyre has referred in his motion, west of Ceduna. If we do not do that we deserve the contempt that people in those circumstances do have for us and will continue to have for us. I see no reason for, nor can I understand the morality of, continuing to filter Adelaide's water supply while we ignore the needs of people in these communities. It is quite wrong. I was explaining and had not concluded the argument that the filtration of a water supply does not improve its capacity to be salubrious; it does not in any way improve public health, it merely improves appearance and, on occasion, odour.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: That's not true.

Mr LEWIS: Well, in the main, I have yet to see any evidence of where an unfiltered water supply has infected someone or caused some bodily injury that a filtered water supply will not cause.

An honourable member: I think the honourable member said it was a waste of money.

Mr LEWIS: By comparison it is a waste of money. Everything to that extent is capable of being ranked in priority. I did not say that it was an outright waste of money but that by comparison we are not addressing the right priorities, we are not addressing the real needs, we are not being reasonable in our treatment of our fellow citizens in South Australia when we decide to persist with filtration schemes in some communities for their benefit and ignore the basic need of a reticulated water supply elsewhere.

For those reasons I have to give my unqualified support not only to the member for Eyre who moved this motion but to his constituents, to my constituents and all other people throughout South Australia who suffer from this indifference which is the result of the way in which the priorities are ranked. I believe that this House should reject the proposition put forward as an amendment by the Minister. I dare say that had the member for Eyre not decided to place this matter before the House in the form he has, we would not ever have had the opportunity of debating it

or hearing the Minister's view of the priorities as they relate to real human need.

I will conclude by simply saying that I cannot see how in all conscience members of this Chamber can oppose this motion, nor can I see how in all conscience they could honestly support the amendment. I believe I have given a reasonable and cogent argument in support of the case I have made out for that.

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

ELECTRICITY CHARGES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Gunn:

That, in the opinion of the House, all citizens of South Australia who are connected to the Electricity Trust grid system, electricity undertakings managed by district councils or corporations and those undertakings operated by the Outback Areas Development Trust be charged on the same basis and that the 10 per cent surcharge which applies in certain areas be abolished and those undertakings operated by the Outback Areas Development Trust which charge at a greater rate than other country areas be placed on the same charging schedule as metropolitan Adelaide.

(Continued from 4 May. Page 1161.)

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy): I suppose that, especially on private members' day, members have over the years seen motions on which it would be easy to take a firm and instantaneous view of one's opinion of the content of such motions. In this case, the member for Eyre asks the House, in effect, to agree with the proposition that all citizens of South Australia who are connected to the Electricity Trust grid system, electricity undertakings managed by district councils or corporations and those undertakings operated by the Outback Areas Development Trust be charged on the same basis, and there is a series of qualifying words in the motion. I believe that that is the essence of the motion moved by the honourable member on behalf of his constituents who have certain feelings about the charge they should be called upon to pay for the supply of electricity that they may enjoy in the circumstances described in the motion.

I assure the honourable member that, as Minister and as a member of the Government, I am not unmindful of the concern shown by the honourable member on behalf of his constituents. However, I think it would benefit all members, including the more recently elected members who have not heard a discussion on a matter such as the provision of services on an equity basis throughout the State and who are therefore not aware of the circumstances relating to such matters, if I detailed to the House on a historical and chronological basis the genesis of the problem that has caused the honourable member to move his motion.

Electricity for the Mid and Far West Coast of Eyre Peninsula used to be generated locally in a number of small diesel power stations. Several years ago these were shut down when ETSA's transmission system was extended into the area. Electricity supplied to these communities is still the responsibility of the district councils and, in one case, a private company holding a franchise from a council, which owns and operates its own distribution system, but bulk supplies are now obtained from the trust. That is the first category of person the honourable member has put before the House in relation to his motion.

The change from local diesel generation reduced costs substantially, but the long transmission distances and the relatively small volume of power required mean that the operators could not charge tariffs equal to or even approaching metropolitan rates without incurring substantial losses.

At present, the charge made to these consumers is the metropolitan rate plus a 10 per cent surcharge. Earlier this afternoon we heard the member for Mallee, when speaking on another matter, put the view that the continuation of a 10 per cent surcharge on inflated and escalating overall accounts was inequitable, and he purported to support that view with information which he gave the House.

A more than cursory examination of the premises used by the honourable member to support that case would show that other factors should be taken into account before one arrived at the conclusion he suggested the House should arrive at on that matter. How is it that operators in these circumstances described by me are able to make a charge plus a 10 per cent surcharge and survive? They can only do so because they receive considerable subsidies from the State Government. Some of the more isolated communities that are not in the group to which I have referred continue to rely on diesel based undertakings. The Outback Areas Community Development Trust is responsible for this at Coober Pedy, Marla Bore, Glendambo, Penong, Kingoonya and Marree. The schemes at Andamooka, Oodnadatta and Yunta are owned and operated by private interest under franchise arrangements. The Government pays much higher subsidies to support these undertakings than it does to support those that are attached to the grid.

Even so the subsidies are only sufficient to allow domestic consumers to receive their first 1 300 kWh per quarter at rates equal to standard ETSA rates plus 10 per cent. The 1 300 kWh is intended to provide sufficient supply for normal domestic purposes. For high consumption the rates increase to reflect the rates of fuel. Tariffs for general purpose and industrial consumers are similarly arranged. So, the rates are increased to reflect the cost of fuel. Often in the past we have received submissions from the member for Eyre and from other country members who, perhaps quite rightly, have drawn to the attention of the House the inevitable costs of living in areas where one is more dependent on liquid fuel, whether for domestic purposes or for transport, than are those people who live in the metropolitan area and who travel relatively shorter distances. I would therefore expect a degree of understanding from those members when I argue that at least it is not unreasonable to take into account that, in supplying electricity, the cost of the liquid fuel involved needs to be considered.

One reason for some concern being expressed by people in the Mid North and in the Far North is that there are two sets of tariffs operating in respect of power in excess of the subsidised block: the Coober Pedy rate and the rate for other diesel undertakings. The reason for this apparent discrimination is actually based on a careful analysis of costs. The Coober Pedy undertaking is more fuel-efficient than the other undertakings because demand there is sufficient to allow its generating capacity to be run closer to optimum efficiency.

The member for Eyre might argue that, although that describes the technicalities of providing supply, it need not be the concern of the individual consumer. However, in speaking to this motion, I could give members a greater understanding of what is involved in providing electricity throughout the State and show whether or not an equitable basis of cost is possible. In moving the motion, the member for Eyre compared the absolute level of subsidy paid by the Government to support these remote area electricity operations with the subsidies paid to operate the metropolitan public transport system. In the debate on the previous motion, to which I intend to make a passing reference, the member for Mallee also dealt with that point.

I would suggest that simply to equate the cost of subsidising public transport in the metropolitan sector with the cost of subsidising electricity to those people living in the circum-

stances we are considering, whilst it is an attractive proposition if one wishes to put forward a particular line of argument, is not really a fair comparison.

Mr Gunn: I think it is very relevant.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The honourable member is entitled to argue it has relevancy and I am attempting to show him that, if it does have relevancy, then there is a need to take into account a very large number of other considerations, none of which he made reference to in drawing the comparison he put before the House. I do not believe the time of the House would be profitably taken up today to tangent off, as it were, into that area which is almost philosophic in nature, and to point out that the State may well have a need to subsidise public transport to ensure that a certain level of industry prevails in this State, that a certain level of business prevails in the State, and thus the net gain (and I am leaving out a lot of other links in the chain) to the State is more than counter-balanced when one takes into account the subsidy amount employed, even though it is of the order of some tens of millions of dollars which was mentioned by the honourable member.

It is not my purpose today to engage, as we sometimes do, in a semantic exchange across the floor of the House seeing who can theoretically score the most points. I am trying to indicate to the honourable member who moved the motion that I see, first of all, that he is being very responsible in this matter in bringing forward the views of those who make up a considerable part of the large area in South Australia which comprises his electorate. Secondly, I am not questioning that those electors themselves in his electorate ought not to have a view which has led to the bringing forward of the motion. What I am trying to show is that there are a very considerable number of factors involved which need careful analysis and study and that I am indicating to him that I can see that there may well be some validity in the arguments that he is putting forward. I propose to give some examination to those factors and, bearing in mind the proposition put forward in relation to the earlier motion, one has to take into account the state of the finances in South Australia, the economic climate and so forth, and there may need to be great consideration given to whether any change can be made in this area.

I think it fair at this stage to point out to the honourable member that he is a member of a Party and was a member of the Party which was previously in Government for a three-year period, which lapsed late last year, and that in essence the same situation applied throughout his electorate that he is now drawing to the attention of the House. His response to me might well be that yes, that is so and that having made representation to the Government of the day, of which he was a member (in the sense that he is a member of the same Party) he then drew to the attention of the House before the ending of the previous Parliament, this very same matter, and I think that would be a fair response from him. I simply want to remind him, in no uncharitable way, that he made very little progress in this area in the previous three years, and that if I indicate to him that I am looking for a little more time to study this area then I think he would be receptive, I trust he would be, to the approach that I am putting before members of the House.

I return now to the point I mentioned earlier relating to the 1 300 kilowatt hour first step block of power in the tariff and I mentioned in the detail I gave to the House earlier that this was stated to be an average amount which related to what we might describe as optimum domestic needs in a household situated throughout those areas of the State we are concerned with. It seems to me at this stage that there is room for examination of that figure, so I am holding out to the honourable member at least a small hope of progress in respect of that particular part of his propo-

sition. I do not want to say to him that I propose any more than that. I can see that all members in a perfect society would like to see the premises contained in his motion acceptable and agreed to by all members of the Parliament. I understand that and I think there would be considerable support for such an approach if that is all we have to consider and that was the only consideration.

Secondly, I am indicating to the mover that I do see an area where there may have, over a period of time, been less attention given to the minimum needs of a family living in that circumstance with respect to the power that they must consume in order to remain operating as a family group. I will give some attention to that area. I seek to take no more time of the House at this stage, and I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

FEDERAL MINISTER FOR TOURISM

Adjourned debate on motion of the Hon. Jennifer Adamson:

That this House condemns the Federal Minister for Tourism, Mr Brown, for his statement denigrating Adelaide as an international gateway; calls on the Premier to seek immediately an explanation from the Prime Minister as to whether Mr Brown was expressing the view of the Federal Government; and further, urges the Premier to ensure that Mr Brown retracts his statement and that he takes active steps to promote South Australia in order to compensate for his statements.

(Continued from 4 May. Page 1166.)

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Tourism): Last week this motion was widely canvassed by the honourable member for Coles who was the mover of that motion and myself, as the spokesman on the Government side in the area of tourism. We were discussing the effect that the comments of Mr Brown, the Federal Minister for Tourism, had on the South Australian tourist industry. I might say as an indicator of what I am going to say today that had the honourable member for Glenelg taken the opportunity available to him during Notices of Motion, Other Business, to move Notice of Motion No. 1, it was my intention to support that motion. Last week I gave an undertaking to this House based on information given to me by my Federal colleague that I would listen to a tape of his famous speech—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: The infamous speech.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:—the infamous speech, as the honourable member for Coles said, and report to the House whether or not I accepted his argument that he had been misquoted. In any event that tape has not arrived and because it has not arrived it suggests to me that the criticism of the Federal Minister for Tourism, about his comments in relation to South Australia, was correct and I have to accept it as such, because as the spokesman in this House for tourism in South Australia, my responsibility rests with the industry here and whilst it might be somewhat unusual for a State Minister to dissociate himself completely from his Federal colleague about comments that his Federal colleague has made, nevertheless, I do so today.

It is my intention therefore to support (with a small amendment) the motion moved by the honourable member for Coles. I do not think it necessary to cover the ground that was covered last week because I did say that had Mr Brown actually used the words that he was alleged to have used, they were outrageous, and warranted condemnation. I move to amend the motion, as follows:

That all words after 'international gateway' be deleted and replaced with the following words: ; and commends the Premier for his prompt action in contacting the Prime Minister and protesting about Mr Brown's statement, seeking withdrawal; and

further supports the Premier in his strenuous efforts to protect South Australia's good name as a tourist destination.

The motion of the member for Coles would thus be as follows:

That this House condemns the Federal Minister for Tourism, Mr Brown, for his statement denigrating Adelaide as an international gateway; and commends the Premier for his prompt action in contacting the Prime Minister and protesting about Mr Brown's statement, seeking withdrawal; and further supports the Premier in his strenuous efforts to protect South Australia's good name as a tourist destination.

I have amended the latter part of the honourable member's motion because circumstances have changed since the motion was moved. Prompt action was taken by the Premier of South Australia and also by me as Minister to contact Mr Brown and draw to his attention the severe criticism that quite rightly came from the South Australian community, particularly from the tourist industry. I would have thought that by now the Federal Minister would have explained himself quite adequately following his claim to have been misreported. He has had the opportunity to tell the people of South Australia that he was misreported. His failure to do so indicates to me that perhaps either he or his speech writer has been reported correctly, and for that reason we will support the motion as amended.

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): I want to speak on this matter because, as the Minister has said, I intended to put forward a motion today before being persuaded by the Speaker and one of the members from his side of the House that it would be better if I spoke to this motion and left mine until next time, never anticipating that I would get a kick in the back for doing so by the Minister of Tourism.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I didn't kick you; you supported it.

Mr MATHWIN: It was an open-ended job: the Minister took the view that as I had not put on my motion it would be left at that. However, the whole business is bad enough without my getting on to bad terms with the Minister: the fact is that he has adopted most of my motion as a Government motion, anyway. I was worried and upset about this shocking situation, which arose from statements made by a person who I would term as being a very pompous and bigotted person in regard to his remarks about the wildlife of South Australia and his remarks relating to Adelaide, in particular. His outburst has upset many people who admire the koala bear.

As a Minister of Tourism he was wrong and out of his depth in the way that he downgraded Adelaide and its tourist potential. Whether the Federal Minister for Tourism (Mr Brown) likes it or not, every country in the world has its wildlife attractions. Perhaps he does not realise the importance of various types of tourist attractions. Indeed, we read in his outrageous statements that he considered that these attractions had little advantage to tourism.

I wonder whether the Federal Minister has ever been to America or Canada, or whether he has read about those places. If he had done so, he would realise that the great attraction in those places is bears. Bears in Canada and America attract tourists and people go there wanting to see the wildlife. Indeed, many people go to Africa with the specific purpose of going to the open zoos and observing the beautiful surroundings and natural wildlife. Of course, amongst other things tourists are attracted to England to see the birdlife (I mean the feathered variety, of course), as well as the attractions of the Palace guard and the horse guard. Incidentally, the Government here is intending to do away with the police greys, which are a tourist attraction.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: That was a decision made during the time of the previous Government, 12 months ago.

Mr MATHWIN: The Minister might be upset about this, but nevertheless, it looks as though the Police Force greys might go because of a decision made by the Government.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: That's rubbish!

Mr MATHWIN: It is a fact. The Minister knows darn well that the greys are going out.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: They are not going out.

Mr MATHWIN: The Minister knows that no further breeding is to be done in this State, and that they are not taking any more in at all.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Lenehan): Order! Will the honourable member please keep his remarks relevant to the topic that is being debated.

Mr MATHWIN: I thank you for your guidance, Madam. Indeed, I was speaking about a few of the grey horses—there are a few about even in this place, although I am not suggesting, Madam, that your pretty head is grey. People travel many thousands of miles to tourist destinations such as Switzerland, which is probably one of the oldest tourist orientated countries in the world, and Italy, in order not only to see the Alps and so-on but to see other forms of wildlife, and I refer to the St Bernard dog, and the like.

I do not know why I should have to give the Minister of Tourism and the member for Hartley a lesson in tourism, but I simply point out that several countries rely on their species of wildlife to attract people as tourists. I refer to the reaction of Cleland Conservation Park koala attendant, Bob Robins, who is 80 years old. The report in the *Advertiser* stated:

Cleland Conservation Park koala attendant Bob Robins, 80, is hopping mad at the slur cast upon his beloved koalas by the Minister for Sport, Recreation and Tourism, Mr Brown.

Mr Brown said koalas were 'rotten little things which are flea-ridden, stink, piddle on you and scratch'.

Mr Robins said: 'There is absolutely no truth in his comments whatsoever. I challenge Mr Brown to come and see our koalas at Cleland—they certainly won't piddle on him and disgrace themselves like he has.'

Of course, a number of other papers reported this matter: the *Advertiser*, the *News* and even the national paper, the *Australian*, lodged their objection. I support those views as I think that the situation was rather disgraceful.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: It was probably reported in the *Times*, if the truth be known.

Mr MATHWIN: It might have been: I shall have to look at the edition in the library. I now refer to what the Federal Minister for Tourism said about the Adelaide International Airport. We know how important the airport is to the member for Albert Park: he stated that, because people in his district were starving, he would not go to a Parliamentary dinner, but he would not refuse an overseas trip to study airports in other countries to see how important they were. He would know how important the airport is in relation to international tourism. The *Advertiser* report states:

Cods wallop, Mr Brown!

One must really wonder whether the Federal Minister for Sport, Recreation and Tourism, Mr Brown, is just trying to make a name for himself or whether, to put it plainly, his new-found power has made him lose his marbles.

That is a drastic situation. The article continues:

While he must make every effort to put Australia on the tourist map overseas, he won't do it by indulging in his own silly fantasies about what constitutes an acceptable Australian 'image'.

The article states that most people in Adelaide are upset about how his remarks applied to Australia, and more especially to Adelaide. He ought to know, as a Minister with some responsibility and an Australian, that Australia is a large country, and it would be ridiculous to have just two international airports in it. The cities are far away from each other, and the cost of travel is considerable—a situation that adds to the cost for the tourists who visit Australia.

Does he suggest that the facilities available at smaller airports (like those that have been built around Australia) are similar to those at international airports in many States in America, and in Rome, Frankfurt, Paris and Geneva? Those overseas airports are all of the same standard. The need is here, and for Mr Brown to say that we have no need for our international airport and then to say, 'Who would want to come to Adelaide?' is an absolute disgrace.

Mr Brown is the Federal Minister for Tourism and Sport and Recreation, and he should educate himself first. He should give credit to Adelaide: Adelaide is a great city and it has so much to offer. It does not have fast living, but it is a great place. I have travelled the earth pretty well, and I have lived in several different places, and to me Australia is the best country in the world and Adelaide is the best city in Australia. I would not wish to live anywhere else in the world. A Federal Minister of Tourism must be off his rocker to make such a ridiculous statement.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): Madam Acting Speaker, I cannot recall having had the pleasure of addressing the Chair that is so well graced by someone so attractive. I am equally eloquent (if that is eloquence in itself) in my remarks about the city named after the fair Queen Adelaide, our own capital, and in my defence of the way in which that city and its State (our State) were attacked unreasonably, unjustly, unnecessarily, and ill advisedly by the Federal Minister, Mr Brown.

Before today, all members in this Chamber, and indeed all people in this country, would have thought that a 'brown out' simply meant that there was insufficient power. Now we know that that is a fact. This is a 'brown out': not quite a 'black out', but things are pretty grim when a Federal Minister has to stoop to such levels to get publicity for himself, or alternatively make such awful miscalculations in his assessment of a circumstance as to denigrate the efforts that had been made in a bipartisan way and with considerable thought in advance by an entire population of the State to enhance the understanding of the appealing features it has to the rest of the world. Those appealing features are probably unique in the world, and have certainly been described as such by many people.

My colleague, the former Minister of Tourism, and our spokesman on such matters, has referred to the quote in the *New Yorker*, during the course of her remarks in moving this motion, that Adelaide is possibly the last well planned, well governed and moderately contented metropolis on earth. As she pointed out immediately following that remark, that is clearly not the case now. There would not be one person in this city who would not willingly join in the spirit of her motion and in the spirit of the early part of the amendment by the Minister to that motion in condemning the Federal Minister for his remarks.

What Mr Brown needs to do when he condemns Adelaide as an international gateway and suggests that we ought never to have built an international air terminal here is to recall the total number of passengers who passed through the first and second international terminals in Australia immediately after they were established. He could work out how many years (I will go further than that, how many decades) it took for those facilities to develop a daily throughput figure that equals what we have had here in Adelaide since we opened the facility at West Beach. Whether that facility is at West Beach or anywhere else does not alter the fact that the same level of patronage could be expected from the travelling public, whether they are members of the South Australian community or visitors to South Australia.

If it was good enough for taxpayers' money to be used in the way that it was to establish international air terminals in other capital cities (and which in the first instance after

they were opened had nowhere near the same level of traffic throughput as has our international airport), then why is it not good enough, Mr Brown, for Adelaide to have and continue to have an international gateway for air travellers? We have been dealt enough body blows over the past decade against which we have stood and recovered and shown our capacity to bounce back in spite of adversity. We did not need yet another, especially coming from a man who purports to have an insight and an understanding of what is really required and needed for tourism development.

If he does not already know and if he has not already been told, then would that man who made this statement, Mr Brown, please seek information (or will our Minister please give Mr Brown that information) about Adelaide and all South Australian regions that make it such an attractive place and an attractive destination to which visitors can come, relax, and enjoy themselves in surroundings as described by the *New Yorker*.

My colleague, the member for Coles, pointed out quite capably and accurately that the remarks made by Mr Brown (which were as equally insulting to koalas as they are to South Australians) were very irresponsible remarks. They have angered us, and they have particularly angered those people who have done years of hard work. Many of those hours have been put in by thousands of people in the development of their tourism services and facilities in communities by people working in an honorary capacity. They have been trying to build up this State's tourist image, knowing that it has the natural assets to support those claims and projections, only to find that a man whom I have heard described constantly outside this place by dozens of people as an idiot, has denigrated their efforts.

If the House has not now had sufficient information laid before it either by me, my colleague, or the Minister, through the media since those ill-advised remarks (which, I might add, take the heat off the ineptitude of the Labor contingent at the Constitutional Convention, and that might have been at the back of it all), then I leave it to my colleague to sum up the position as she sees it in relation to this question, and urge all honourable members to support the proposition.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): It was with much concern that I read the remarks of the Federal Minister for Tourism in relation to tourism in South Australia. The Minister in this House has adequately explained his amendments to the motion, and I have realised the value (as I know all members in this House have) of an international airport for South Australia. I am still of the strong conviction that it was a political gimmick leading to the opening of the airport (and the previous Minister of Tourism shakes her head): I believe that it was a political gimmick, given the lack of furnishings in that airport at the time. I am well aware that the previous Premier wanted to get that airport opened in time to be perceived as one of those things that was doing much for South Australia.

Having said that and having seen and taken particular note (I go regularly and look at the international airport to see whether it has been upgraded: it has not been completed yet, to my knowledge), I am concerned that a Federal Minister (and a Labor Minister, indeed) has not come to South Australia and been man enough (and it does not give me any pleasure to say this) to speak to the people of South Australia and apologise for his remarks. Indeed, if I had been in that position, I would have come here, faced the music, and had discussions with people in the tourist industry in South Australia to ascertain their opinions, and to have put mine before them.

However, he has chosen not to do so. It is with much regret that I have to make such comments. I am a great believer in the tourist industry and I believe in the potential

for South Australia and the job creation potential in this State. Finally, I should take to task the member for Glenelg (who, unfortunately, is not in this Chamber) for the grubby remarks made by this grubby little man (and with his grubby little mind) in relation to the remarks—

Mr EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Madam Acting Speaker. I hate to take this action while you are there, but I believe that the comments made by the member for Albert Park in relation to the member for Glenelg are unparliamentary. I refer to the words, 'he is a grubby little man,' and, 'grubby little actions.' I do not believe that that brings about any credit to the establishment, and the member should desist from that comment.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Would the member for Albert Park withdraw the comments?

Mr HAMILTON: No, Madam, I will not. The reason I say that—

Mr GUNN: I rise on a point of order. The member for Fisher asked that the comments made about the member for Glenelg be withdrawn because he believed that they were unparliamentary. I ask you, Madam, that you rule that the member for Albert Park has uttered unparliamentary words in relation to the member for Glenelg, and that he be instructed to withdraw them.

The ACTING SPEAKER: As I am told that the remarks are not unparliamentary, I ask the member for Albert Park to withdraw them out of courtesy, but not because they are unparliamentary.

Mr HAMILTON: It is with much difficulty that I do that. However, Madam, I accept your ruling. I accept that you wish me to do so, and I wish to get on with the business rather than prolong this debate. However, what is said is on record. The reason I raise this issue is to make my position clear in relation to attending functions some time last year for the Governor-General. I could not see the relevance of the remarks of the member for Glenelg in relation to tourism. However, he had to bring that barb in, trying to couple it with my tour overseas recently to the U.K. where I stood in for the Premier.

However, what he failed to point out was that I took it upon myself to study the needs and the potential to improve some things in South Australia in relation to what I saw in the U.K. However, as was his wont, the member for Glenelg, who has to play politics at every opportunity, had to get down in the gutter and use tactics like that. I can say this—

Mr Oswald: You are doing that.

Mr HAMILTON: I like that interjection from the member for Morphett. I would not have raised this issue had that not been thrown at me, and I absolutely refute such an allegation. If the Opposition is not prepared to accept my viewpoint, that is fine. However, I do not believe that I have to refer to such a situation, which has no relevance whatsoever to this debate. Moreover, I would point out to him that every member has the opportunity to use the study tour allowances, and I have done that in accordance with the procedures of this Parliament. I refer to the fact that the member for Glenelg wanted to go on about my objection to attending Parliamentary functions which, I still believe (and have gone on record as saying) is a waste of public money.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I do not wish to get into the same sort of debate, as did the member for Albert Park. I believe that that sort of language does him and the establishment little credit. He made the point that it was recorded: that is all that he was concerned about. It is recorded, but I do not think it helps his colleagues.

I do not oppose the amendment of the Minister of Tourism, and I believe that the general comments from the Labor Party are similar to those of the Liberal Party, expressing

concern about Mr Brown's statement about this State being a place for tourism, referring particularly to some of our native fauna and our international airport. If the man did say that to get publicity for himself he was successful, and on that I suppose we could perhaps congratulate him. A State such as ours does not need those comments; in fact it is the last thing we want. One would hope that the Federal Minister would realise that all States require the same support from a Minister regardless of the size of the State, how close it is to Canberra or how close it is to his home State. I move:

To amend the amendment of the Minister of Tourism by adding the words 'and congratulates the Opposition for its initiative in bringing the matter before the House'.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth): I had not intended to say anything in this debate, but as I was sitting in my office listening to the proceedings I was absolutely amazed to hear the amount of small-town parochial and provincial thinking evident in this debate, and I thought it was necessary to introduce some sort of realism. I, too, share the views in the most general terms that have been expressed by other members. Of course it was a foolish thing to say; of course a Federal Minister should not have said any such thing, and if he had been better advised I am sure he would not have said such ill-considered things. However, the response in South Australia has been entirely over-blown, and I fear that we are sinking back into the sort of insecurity that used to reek throughout the dealings of this State in the 1950s and 1960s.

Unfortunately, the sort of thinking that has been expressed here this afternoon is the sort of thinking one might expect to hear from someone who comes from a small country town. We are not talking like people who are representing the interests of a large modern State: we are starting again to express ourselves in terms that one might expect to hear from people from small country towns. When I go to Tasmania, as I frequently do, I often hear the sorts of view that have been expressed here this afternoon.

I venture to say that, if these comments had been made by the same Minister about Sydney or Melbourne, we would have heard hardly a squeak about them. It is a sad thing that we are becoming so introverted in this State, so small-town in our thinking that people are starting to over-react to the extent that has occurred in this State.

The honourable member who has just sat down started talking about the reflections on South Australian wildlife. My reading of Mr Brown's comments indicate quite clearly that he was reflecting on koalas at large, not South Australian koalas, but what happened, of course, was that the small-minded people immediately said that that was another reflection on us as South Australians. What rubbish! He was not suggesting that koalas in South Australia piddle more or less than koalas anywhere else in the country. He was reflecting generally on koalas. I do not share his reflections on koala bears but I certainly do not see that as being a reflection on South Australia.

I think that the way we should have handled this was to laugh it off and say that we are proud to be South Australians and we will get on with our own job of building South Australia into a more prosperous place than it is at present; we are confident in the future of South Australia; we have a vision; we know where we are going, and we are proud of it. That is the sort of attitude that we should have and not the small-minded backs-to-the-wall sort of approach that has been reflected here by Opposition speakers this afternoon.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): Madam Acting Speaker, may I also express my pleasure at seeing you

in the position of Acting Speaker. This has been an interesting debate in terms of the perspective which various members of both sides of the House have brought to it. At the outset I would like to commend the Minister for his genuine and appropriate response. I know that it is not easy for a politician of any Party to condemn one of his or her followers. The Minister and his colleagues in supporting the substance of the motion are effectively doing that this afternoon. I can say without any doubt whatsoever that the industry in South Australia will appreciate that action on the part of the Government, just as I believe it has appreciated the action on the part of the Opposition in moving the motion.

I should also add that some of the Minister's colleagues, in particular the member for Elizabeth, have done the Minister no service in describing the reaction as being entirely over-blown. I accept that small States, provincial cities and groups of people can, by comparison with large sophisticated cities, be unduly sensitive. However, in terms of justice and equity, the response by South Australians to the remarks of Mr Brown cannot be dismissed as being entirely over-blown. The reality is that Mr Brown's remarks have been extraordinarily damaging to our State. The reality is that people, as has already been said, who have worked for years and years to try to uplift the tourism industry in South Australia have felt that they have been betrayed by a Minister of the Crown who has the constitutional responsibility for serving and advancing their cause. In that regard, I do not believe that anyone could say that the response in South Australia has been entirely over-blown.

Whilst I abhor some aspects of the remarks of the member for Albert Part, I do recognise his sincere and genuine concern for tourism. I do appreciate that he is probably one of those members of this House who feel most intensely the insults that have been hurled at South Australia by Mr Brown, and I also accept that he will put his views extremely forcefully and personally to his Federal colleague. What we have before the House at the moment is a motion that will read:

That this House condemns the Federal Minister for Tourism, Mr Brown, for his statement denigrating Adelaide as an international gateway; and commends the Premier for his prompt action in contacting the Prime Minister and protesting about Mr Brown's statements, seeking withdrawal; and further supports the Premier in his strenuous efforts to protect South Australia's good name as a tourist destination and congratulates the Opposition for its initiative in bringing the matter before this House.

The Opposition accepts the Minister's amendment and I hope and believe that the Minister will accept the Opposition's further amendment. I do point out that in amending the original motion the Minister has omitted a key point, namely, 'that this House calls on the Premier to seek immediately an explanation from the Prime Minister as to whether Mr Brown was expressing the view of the Federal Government'. That aspect of the matter has not been clarified. The Premier (in response to questions from me) and the Minister (in response to questions also from me) have not denied that Mr Brown was expressing the attitude of the Federal Government.

I assume that they have not denied it because they cannot deny it. In other words, one can only assume that the Prime Minister has not told the Premier that Mr Brown was expressing a personal view and one not shared by his Government. It is essential that the Government and the tourism industry in this State obtain an assurance from the Prime Minister that Mr Brown's comments were not a reflection of Federal Government attitude that will ultimately be expressed in policy. If they were, this State would be in for an extremely rough time from the Federal Government in terms of support for its tourist industry, and that would not augur well for the case that I hope this Government will put to the Federal Government to establish a national school

of tourism in South Australia. I believe that we have every justification for the establishment of such a school here and, if the Government acts quickly and puts an effective case to the Federal Government, there is good reason to believe that, because of the advantages of South Australia in terms of its education facilities, central location and accessibility, we could be successful in obtaining such a school. However, if Mr Brown's view is simply a reflection of that of the Federal Government, our chances do not appear to be very good.

I am grateful that, in amending the motion, the Minister has continued to seek, although in different words from those used in the original motion, a withdrawal from the Federal Minister. It is not too late for such a retraction to be made. I hope that the Federal Minister will make that retraction personally when he visits Adelaide. Indeed, I hope that he quickly accepts the invitation which I understand has been extended to him by the South Australian Minister and his colleagues. I, too, join in that invitation. I hope that, when Mr Brown accepts the invitation, any harsh words that must be said and undoubtedly will be said will be said behind closed doors.

I hope that the public welcome to Mr Brown will be as warm and hospitable as South Australians can make it and that we go out of our way to show him, when he arrives, that this State treats its guests as honoured guests and that we do not insult people, especially Ministers of the Crown. Mr Brown should be shown that South Australians are generous and warm-hearted, that we offer not only hospitality but gifts, and we should convince him that this State is the most beautiful in Australia. We should meet Mr Brown with wine and roses, and it is up to members opposite whether the roses have thorns on them. Mr Brown should be offered in Adelaide hospitality such as he has never experienced before, so that he will become an ambassador for our State and an advocate in the Federal Government for our tourism industry. In other words, let us duce Mr Brown in Adelaide and ensure that he has a visit such as he has never had anywhere before and is never likely to have again.

Mr Evans: Will you let him cuddle our koalas?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: If Mr Brown visits the national park at Cleland, he will see a wildlife park that has been described by a leading South Pacific tourist operator as potentially one of the world's great wildlife parks. I imagine that that compliment will come as a surprise to many South Australians because we tend to place a lesser value on much of what we have here than it deserves. However, the reality is that the Cleland Wildlife Park, if it can obtain the proper facilities for allowing nocturnal animals to be viewed by night, could become one of the best and most interesting wildlife parks in the world.

I emphasise that what Mr Brown has done is not only damaging in itself but appears to have established a climate in the Eastern States which has been picked up by the media which is perpetuating the remarks he made.

Mr Lewis: To our embarrassment.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes, much to our embarrassment. I refer especially to the tasteless and rather malicious article written by playwright Mr Alex Buzo and published in the *Sydney Morning Herald* on Saturday 7 May, entitled '101 reasons for disliking Adelaide'. I should be surprised if this article had appeared or even been written had it not been for Mr Brown's statements. I believe that Mr Buzo thought he was on a band waggon and would push it a little further, so he wrote a shabby analysis of Adelaide in which he referred to the homosexual tendencies of its men, the unattractiveness of its women, the unfairness of its cricketers, the lack of humour of its theatre audiences, and many other such subjects. I would like to read into the

record the reply to that article which I sent to the *Sydney Morning Herald*, a copy of which reply will be sent to Mr Brown. My letter details 101 reasons for liking Adelaide. Many of these reasons appear in tourism brochures, but many would not. My letter, which expresses a personal view of what is wonderful about Adelaide, states:

The Editor,
Sydney Morning Herald.
Dear Sir,

What a pity Alex Buzo's opinion of Adelaide seems to be coloured by personal prejudice, more than a touch of malice and not much actual experience of the good things Adelaide has to offer. (S.M.H. 7.5.83). May I, through your columns, commend to him 101 of the multitude of reasons there are for liking Adelaide. No less an authority than that arbiter of international taste *The New Yorker* has described Adelaide as 'possibly the last well planned, well governed and moderately contented metropolis on earth'.

Some of the things I like about it are . . . North Terrace, by any standards a beautiful boulevard housing the city's principal civic and cultural buildings and pervaded by vitality and tranquillity at the same time.

Rundle Mall, the most conveniently concentrated retail shopping area in the country, steeped with style, flowers, music and fun.

Ayers House, elegance personified. Where else could you dine in the home of a 19th century Premier?

Five lovely city squares which, like the parklands, reflect the changing seasons and the changing moods of the city.

The best selection of fresh fruit and vegetables this side of the Equator. If your taste is apricots, grapes, figs, melons, berries, oranges, lemons, persimmons, pomegranates, peaches—come to Adelaide: they grow in profusion.

Australia's only Constitutional Museum, outlining our origins as befits a State that has reason to be proud of its past and confident of its future.

The River Torrens—just a lake, to be sure, but its banks are cared for so beautifully, who can resist it?

The Festival Theatre, a masterpiece of theatre design—practical, aesthetic, stylish.

Bookshops—Mary Martin, Liberty, Standard and more. Where else is bookselling conducted in such a civilised fashion?

Ditters—the ultimate purveyors of glaze fruit and nuts. Second to none and unique to Adelaide.

The friendliness, courtesy, wit, compassion, dignity and humour of Adelaide people.

Glenelg trams and the trip through the city and parklands down to the Bay.

Adelaide's nineteenth century public buildings and our beautiful bluestone domestic architecture.

The best hospitals in the country.

The best education system in the country.

Voluntary workers and generous givers. Ask the National Heart Foundation and Freedom From Hunger which Australian city gives the most per capita to good causes—it's Adelaide.

North Haven, one of the best equipped and most up-to-date marinas in the world.

Miles and miles of golf links—Royal Adelaide, Grange, Glenelg, Mount Osmond, Seaton. I am told Mr John Brown even finds Kooyonga to his taste.

Adelaide Oval, the only cricket ground with a Cathedral end and a River end.

The nicest, politest policemen of them all. Where else does the populace cheer and clap their mounted police every year in November when they herald the arrival of . . .

John Martin's Christmas Pageant, proving that fairy tales do come true and that there is a Santa Claus.

The largest collection of Aboriginal artefacts in the world at the Adelaide Museum. And a dinosaur is coming.

The Botanic Gardens, all three of them—in the heart of the city, Wittunga and Mount Lofty, truly a floral and horticultural feast.

The cleanest streets you'll see anywhere. We even have lawn and trees in the main street and we fly flags when something special happens, which in Adelaide is often.

A vista of city lights unequalled this side of Rio.

Gelati parlours of a superior kind. Flash started it all three decades ago and Al Fresco and the rest have followed deliciously suit.

Cleland Wildlife Park, home of the (dreaded!) koala, kangaroo, wombat and reputed to be potentially one of the most impressive wildlife parks in the world.

Two great universities—one produced scholars like Florey, Mawson, Bragg and Oliphant and the other is breaking research barriers in medicine and science.

A wonderful symphony orchestra.

A great theatre company.

A world renowned Film Corporation.

An Art Gallery with a superlative collection of Australian Impressionist and nineteenth century British art. 'The Breakaway' 'Women in a Landscape' and 'Hilda's Homecoming' lure me back there time and again.

Jetties—if you like a stroll down a jetty, try Brighton, Sealiff, Glenelg, Henley, Grange, Semaphore, Largs. You might even catch a fish.

Whiting, the ultimate seafood experience.

Wine. South Australia is the wine State and Adelaide is, of course, the wine capital. The great wine families of Australia—the Hardy's, the Seppelts, the Gramp's have left their hospitable mark on their home city of Adelaide.

Iron lacework—the Botanic Hotel (all three balconies), the Newmarket, the Elder Park rotunda, the North Adelaide terraces, the suburban verandahs.

Festivals. We never boast in Adelaide, but we are able to state that the Adelaide Festival of Arts was the first of its kind in Australia and is still the best. There is at least one other festival every week of the year.

Climate, especially the Indian summer of March, April and May in Adelaide.

Norwood Parade, a multicultural mix of bread and meat, fruit and veg. and cosmopolitan bustle.

Antiques—quality and value on Unley Road, Unley, Magill Road, Maylands and in the city itself.

Professionals. If you want to meet scholars, gentlemen and gentlewomen, Adelaide is where you will find them. Adelaide still believes in ethics and service.

A sense of history. Adelaide treasures its past both in the word and in the deed. The South Australian History Trust is, so far, unique in Australia.

Yachting. Jim Hardy learnt to sail in the Gulf waters off Adelaide and so do thousands of others every weekend.

Olive groves and vineyards on the hills overlooking the city.

Plumbago hedges, spilling sky blue over walls and fences everywhere.

Capacity for surprise. We sail along sedately and then suddenly . . . sensation! Pink shorts in Parliament, police commissioner sacked, M.P. resigns, Aboriginal Governor, woman judge . . .

Getting things done—a uranium mine despite all odds; an international terminal in six months; an international hotel despite the cynics.

Open-air dining—at Decca's, Moos, Steinways and sundry pubs and pavements.

Steamtrains, in all their power and glory. From time to time you can take a trip from Adelaide, back into the past.

The General Post Office, mellow stone, burgundy timber, elegant cast iron, topped by a lovely clocktower.

The Adelaide Town Hall, its ornate ceiling and its polite attendants.

The playground elephant and the alligator in Rymill Park, bring all the mystery of the jungle to children in Adelaide on sunny weekends.

Chocolates from Haighs, the epitome of constant quality.

Bike tracks galore—safe, well-planned, easy beautiful!

Traffic—not too much, that is the charm of Adelaide. You can visit our family, your friends, your barber, your grocer, your footy match without getting all snarled up.

Racing—at Morphettville, Victoria Park, Cheltenham. And they're racing good horses, too, born and bred in South Australia.

Parks. Not only parklands in generous profusion, but Botanic Park, Belair Park, Morialta Park, Blackhill Park, Thorndon Park. Parks girding the city, parks spilling over the hills, parks along the foreshore, parks tucked away in suburbs.

Cheese, admittedly not made in Adelaide but Yahl and Mil-lel are good enough to put us on the cheese map of the world.

Choirs: The Pembroke Choir, the Corinthian Choir, the Adelaide Harmony Choir and more all sing for pleasure and give their profits to others.

Pie Floaters, the Adelaide gourmet classic.

Chesser Street with its restaurants, its rag trade and good design, all canopied by vines cascading green in summer, and tawny port in autumn.

The Central Market, with all the sights, the sounds, the smells of food retailing elevated to the level of entertainment.

Fountains—the three rivers in Victoria Square, the pretty one in the Mall, the gushing one on North Terrace, the high one in the Torrens.

Ruthven Mansions Arcade and the Renaissance Centre, looking like the feathers in Adelaide's cap.

Churches and their spires, their stained glass windows, their beautiful stone.

Edmund Wright House, the treasure of King William Street, and the persistence that preserved it.

Friends—Adelaide is full of them. You can join the Friends of the Art Gallery, Friends of the Museum, Friends of the Botanic Gardens, Friends of the Grange Vineyards. We're even willing to be friends with Mr John Brown and Mr Alex Buzo.

Beaches, miles of them, for bathing, clad or unclad.

Max Harris. Yes, he actually lives here, from choice. So does Anne Deveson, Don Bradman, John Olsen (the painter, not the leader of the Opposition) and a multitude of eastern States' executives who have been transferred and who, with their families, cannot bear to return to the rattrace. Don Dunstan lived here once, but he had an aberration and moved east.

Flowers. If your taste is wine and roses, come to Adelaide. They grow on bushes and on vines, trailing with wistaria and jasmine, scenting whole streets and parks and lasting for weeks and months on end.

Pillars of the establishment—every city should have them. They hold us up where we belong. We have iconoclasts too, but they tend to knock us, not our interstate neighbours.

There are about 40 or 50 reasons to go. I must have been ahead of myself and time does not permit me to finish. I shall continue my remarks later in another speech, but I urge the House to support the motion as amended.

Mr Evans's amendment carried; the Hon. G.F. Keneally's amendment as amended carried; motion as amended carried.

MARALINGA TJARUTJA LAND RIGHTS BILL

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the vesting of title of certain lands known as the Maralinga lands in the people who are acknowledged as the traditional owners. Read a first time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to vest the area known as the Maralinga lands in the ownership of the traditional Aboriginal people from that area, on a freehold and inalienable basis. This will fulfil a long standing commitment first made by Premier Playford as far back as 1962, when he promised that the land would be returned to the control of the traditional people following cessation of the atomic bomb tests and relinquishment of the land by the Commonwealth as a prohibited area under the Defence Act.

Members may be aware that the Aboriginal people were moved from the lands when the bomb tests were to take place in the 1950s. These people scattered to various parts of the State and some to Western Australia, although the bulk of them remain at Yalata Aboriginal Community. The people have therefore been waiting for over 20 years for the opportunity to return to their land. Initially, they were well aware of the dangers associated with the after-effects of the bomb tests, and were prepared to wait for a time. However, it is understood that it was the intention of the Playford Government that the land would eventually be added to the then North West Aboriginal Reserve, which had been in existence since 1921.

In 1972 the South Australian Government was advised by the Commonwealth that the Maralinga village was no longer required and that the whole test area would be de-restricted, except for section 400 which surrounds the village and the bomb sites and 'cemetery' areas, which has been retained by the Commonwealth under a land grant. In July 1972, the Dunstan Government approved that the whole of the land would be vested in the Aboriginal Lands Trust. The implementation of that decision was delayed while negotiations were completed with the Commonwealth over radiation issues and the issue of the land grant over section 400. The people therefore again had to wait while governments and bureaucracies slowly worked towards resolving the problems.

There was further delay during 1977-79 when the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Working Party undertook its work and presented a report on the attitudes of the people in the area to land rights. Subsequently the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act was passed in March 1981, which vested the previous North West Aboriginal Reserve and some adjacent pastoral properties in the Pitjantjatjara people on a freehold and inalienable basis, with special controls over access and mining operations. Negotiations with the Aboriginal people over that legislation involved Governments of both persuasions. It was hailed by the Tonkin Government as unique and forward-looking legislation which could act as a model for other places dealing with ownership and control of land by indigenous minorities. The legislation when passed had the support of all political Parties in the Parliament.

The former Government had extensive negotiations with the Yalata people during the 18 months prior to the last election. Whilst these negotiations failed to reach a complete agreement, they were taken to an advanced stage and were of no little significance to this whole issue. Throughout 1982 the Aboriginal people had been advised and assisted by the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement. Questions of access and mining controls have always been under close scrutiny, especially in relation to the protection of significant sites on the land. In discussions with Government Ministers and officials, the people have asked for a 'strong' law to protect those sites, and to enable them to protect the land generally. They have had meetings with representatives of the Anangu Pitjantjatjara and have noted the effectiveness and merit of their legislation.

At a meeting with a large number of traditional owners at Ooldea in March this year, it was made abundantly clear that the people wanted distinct and separate title to the land, to be held in the name of the traditional owners, as occurs with the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act, 1981. This legislation seeks to give effect to that wish. Over the past 10 years many of the traditional people have made visits to the area to identify and record significant sites, and more recently there have been moves to establish some homeland camps on the lands. This movement will continue and the granting of the land will contribute in a major way to advancing the dignity of these people and their ability to control their own lives.

The legislation follows the model of the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act, 1981. It establishes an incorporated land holding body, known as Maralinga Tjarutja, consisting of all Aboriginal traditional owners of these lands. There will be a council to act as an executive. The land will be granted fee simple and inalienable. The area to be granted totals approximately 52 120 square kilometres. The existing Unnamed Conservation Park, established in 1970, is unaffected by this measure and a right of access through the lands is maintained. The conservation park has considerable significance to conservationists and the Aboriginal people have an interest in many significant sites there.

The western boundary of the lands under the Bill is along the Western Australian border and then the edge of the conservation park, while the eastern boundary is drawn at 132°E. The southern border is a line drawn eight kilometres above the route of the East-West railway line, and the northern boundary skirts the conservation park and the Pitjantjatjara lands. Section 400 as held will remain in the control of the Commonwealth.

As this Bill deals with entitlement to land, the setting of these boundaries is of prime importance. An issue which remains is the positioning of the eastern boundary, which has presently been set at 132°E. The Government is concerned about the future of those lands between longitude 132°E and 133°E, an area with which the traditional owners also claim affiliation. It is hoped that the select committee

which is to be appointed to report on this Bill will take this matter into consideration.

Some of the land comprised within the schedule to this Bill is between longitude 131°30' and 132°, which is within the Woomera prohibited area. This area is regulated by the Commonwealth, and public access is strictly restricted. The Aboriginal people are aware of these restrictions and have indicated that they wish them to remain until the safety of the areas presently controlled by the Commonwealth is assured. There will be a constant review of this issue.

The mining and access provisions in the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act are reflected in this Bill and the Bill incorporates reforms which are proposed for the Pitjantjatjara Act. The provisions enable the traditional owners to recover reasonable costs from mining companies when dealing with applications for permission to mine and cater for adequate and reasonable compensation on account of mining operations. A review has been conducted into the issue of royalties and unlike the Pitjantjatjara Act as it presently stands, the prescribed limit applying to royalties has been removed. Other relevant provisions from the Pitjantjatjara Act again appear. It is also of importance to note that mining tenements presently exist over part of the Lands. These are preserved in this measure, ensuring that existing rights are unaffected.

The Aboriginal Lands Trust has been fully consulted about the proposed land grant to the traditional owners and concurs with the principles contained in the Bill. As foreshadowed, this Bill is to go to a select committee. The Government is confident that the work of that committee will provide a valuable and comprehensive report, and its appointment will ensure that all issues arising by virtue of this legislation are properly considered. The select committee of this House for the Pitjantjatjara Lands Rights Act, 1981, performed admirably in relation to that measure, and it is hoped that the next committee will do likewise. I commend the Bill to all members and I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure. Clause 3 sets out the arrangement of the Act. Clause 4 contains a number of definitions for the purposes of the Act. The 'lands' to which the Act is to apply are defined by reference to the schedule. Clause 5 establishes a body corporate, to be known as 'Maralinga Tjarutja', and provides that all traditional owners are members of that body. Clause 6 sets out the powers and functions of Maralinga Tjarutja.

Clause 7 provides that Maralinga Tjarutja shall, before carrying out proposals relating to the administration, development or use of any parts of the lands, consult with the traditional owners in order to ensure that they are fully aware of the situation. Clause 8 provides for annual general meetings of the corporate body. Clause 9 establishes an Executive Council of the corporate body. The council will consist of a chairman and six other members, elected at an annual general meeting. Until the first annual general meeting, Yalata Community Incorporated may act as the council.

Clause 10 prescribes the procedure of the council. It must meet at least once in every two months. Decisions are decided by majority vote. Clause 11 requires the council to act in conformity with resolutions of Maralinga Tjarutja, and provides that no act of the council is binding on the corporate body unless in accordance with a resolution. Clause 12 provides for proof of acts of the council. Clause 13 requires that the council keep proper accounts of the financial

affairs of Maralinga Tjarutja. An annual audit must occur and audited lodged with the Corporate Affairs Commission.

Clause 14 provides that proceedings of Maralinga Tjarutja shall be regulated by a constitution approved by the Corporate Affairs Commission. Clause 15 provides that the Governor may issue a land grant in fee simple for the whole, or any part of the lands. A gradual transfer of title may therefore occur. Clause 16 provides that a land grant shall be in both the English language and the Pitjantjatjara language (the common language for the area). Incorrect or imperfect descriptions of the lands may be altered at a later time. Clause 17 provides that vested land is to be inalienable and may not be compulsorily acquired, resumed or forfeited. Clause 18 provides that the traditional owners are to have unrestricted rights of access to the lands.

Clause 19 relates to control of access to the lands. A person who enters the land without the permission of Maralinga Tjarutja will be guilty of an offence. Permission to enter the lands may be sought by lodging a written application with the council. Conditions may be imposed in relation to restricted access to the lands, and contravention of such conditions will be an offence. The section does not apply to police officers or other statutory officers acting in the course of their duties, a person acting on the written authority of the Minister, a member of Parliament or a candidate, entry in cases of emergency, and entry in relation to existing mining tenements, or for road works.

Clause 20 provides that any person who carries on mining operations on the land without appropriate permission shall be guilty of an offence. Provision is made for applications for permission to enter the land for mining purposes. Any dispute may be referred by the Minister of Mines and Energy to an arbitrator. Provision is made for his appointment and powers. Maralinga Tjarutja may recover its reasonable costs. The clause also prescribes the matters which the arbitrator must take into account in order to determine the dispute. A decision is binding on all parties, including the Crown. The Arbitration Act, 1891-1974, does not apply to an arbitration.

Clause 21 relates to the interaction of this Act and the Mining and Petroleum Acts. These Acts are still to apply to persons seeking the grant of a mining tenement, in conjunction with the requirements of this Act. Provision is made to prevent payments in relation to the possible granting of permission to carry out mining operations, other than those expressly authorized by this Act. Clause 22 deals with royalties, which are to be divided into three equal shares and one share each paid to Maralinga Tjarutja, the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, and general revenue.

Clause 23 makes it an offence to give a bribe in connection with applying to carry out mining operations. Clause 24 provides that payments or other consideration given to Maralinga Tjarutja in respect of carrying out mining operations must be reasonably proportioned to the disturbance to the lands, the traditional owners, and their ways of life. The Minister of Mines and Energy is to be notified of any payments under this section.

Clause 25 reserves the right of the Crown to remain in occupation for up to 50 years on the lands, for purposes connected with the health, education or welfare of the traditional owners. Clause 26 provides that the Commissioner of Highways may carry out road works on the lands, with the consent of Maralinga Tjarutja. Consent shall not be withheld in relation to the work on the road referred to in the second schedule. Clause 27 deals with the information which the Commissioner must submit to Maralinga Tjarutja and provides that a dispute may be referred to arbitration. Clause 28 establishes a road reserve along the road referred to in the second schedule.

Clause 29 provides for the consent of Maralinga Tjarutja to the maintenance of the road in the second schedule. Clause 30 deals with the appointment of a tribal assessor. Clause 31 provides that a dispute between a traditional owner and Maralinga Tjarutja, or any of its members, may be referred to the assessor. The section prescribes the procedure to be observed. Clause 32 allows the enforcement of a direction of a tribal assessor by the local court of full jurisdiction.

Clause 33 provides that offences shall be disposed of summarily. Clause 34 provides that a court may award compensation for damage suffered by Maralinga Tjarutja as a result of the commission of offences. Clause 35 exempts the lands from land taxes. Clause 36 is a financial provision. Clause 37 provides that the Outback Areas Community Development Trust Act, 1978, does not apply. Clause 38 provides that in the application of other Acts, the lands may be regarded as public places. Clause 39 is a regulation-making power.

The Hon. H. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

PITJANTJATJARA LAND RIGHTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act, 1981. Read a first time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

When the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act was passed in 1981 it was regarded as a unique piece of legislation. It introduced new concepts of land holding and control for the benefit of traditional Aboriginal people, and followed intensive negotiations with the Aboriginal people and other interested parties. Nevertheless, as might be anticipated, there have been some difficulties in the administration of certain parts of the Act, both from the point of view of Anangu Pitjantjatjara and of other agencies involved with the land. Certain amendments were initiated by the former Government, and have been agreed to by Anangu Pitjantjatjara.

Some of these relate to the freehold nature of the land, and the need to deal with certain evidentiary requirements and onus of proof, and the status of the land as a public place for the purposes of other Acts. In relation to the issue of 'public place', this has been investigated by the Government. The Crown Solicitor has advised that the access provisions found in sections 19 and 20 of the Act probably mean that roads and other public places are not 'roads' or 'public places' as those terms are used in the Road Traffic Act, the Motor Vehicles Act or the Police Offences Act. The consequences of this are both substantial and undesirable, especially where the use of motor vehicles is concerned. For example, it is not necessary for a driver on the lands to hold a driving licence, obey any speed limits or other traffic laws, or drive a vehicle with respect to which a third party insurance policy applies. A new section 42a (2) therefore provides that the Motor Vehicles Act and the Road Traffic Act are applicable to the lands.

In addition, Anangu Pitjantjatjara have put forward several amendments to the mining provisions in the Act, with which this Government has concurred. These refer to the right of Anangu Pitjantjatjara to seek reimbursement of costs from mining companies where Anangu Pitjantjatjara is required to negotiate on mining applications and for a change to the provisions regarding royalty payments. The result of both amendments, in the long run, will be to place

Anangu Pitjantjatjara in a more independent financial position, and enable them to be less dependent on Government grants. In particular, it has been requested that the costs of negotiations with mining companies be paid by those mining companies. This is considered to be a reasonable requirement so long as the legislation prevents claims for costs or expenses which have been incurred unnecessarily or which are exorbitant. Anangu Pitjantjatjara should have the ability when negotiating with mining companies to obtain advice from solicitors, anthropologists and other advisers. As the negotiations are undertaken at the request of the applicant companies, it is considered appropriate that they meet the costs. These costs will be set off against any further compensation that the applicant pays under the Act.

In relation to the issue of royalties, the existing provision prevents Anangu Pitjantjatjara from obtaining maximum benefit from mining operations on their land and consequently limits their opportunity to develop full financial independence. The prescribed limit is therefore to be deleted. Anangu Pitjantjatjara have also requested that the word 'Pitjantjatjaraku' throughout the Act be changed to 'Pitjantjatjara'. The letters 'ku' at the end of the word symbolize 'possession'. The definition 'Pitjantjatjara' in the Act in section 4 refers to 'a member of the Pitjantjatjara, Yungkatjara or Ngaanajara people' and the use of the possessive 'ku' after 'Pitjantjatjara' is inappropriate therefore. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the Bill inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Mr Lewis: No.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 deals with the change of the name from 'Pitjantjatjaraku' to 'Pitjantjatjara' whenever it appears through the Act. Clause 3 amends existing section 19 in relation to unauthorized entry on to the lands. The present provisions of section 19 of the Act makes it an offence for a person to enter the lands without the consent of Anangu, but do not cover the situation of a person who enters the lands legally but who fails to comply with a condition of entry; for example, remains after the period for which consent was granted. The amendment creates an offence under these circumstances. Clause 4 amends section 20 to provide for Anangu Pitjantjatjara to obtain reimbursement for costs incurred in negotiations with mining companies. Clause 5 amends section 21, which deals with illegal payments which may be made to Anangu Pitjantjatjara in relation to permission to mine or to carry out mining operations. The existing subsections (4) (5) and (6) are repealed and the existing provisions brought together into one new subsection (4), while also taking account of the right of Anangu Pitjantjatjara to receive certain payments under this Act, (the costs of mining negotiations mentioned earlier). Clause 6 amends section 22 regarding royalty payments. The amendment removes the provision for a prescribed limit to the amount of royalty. Clause 7 amends section 23 of the principal Act. Mention is to be made of payments or consideration in discharge or partial discharge of liabilities under the Act.

Clause 8 is a consequential amendment to section 24, for the purpose of maintaining consistency. Clause 9 introduces new provisions of a procedural and evidentiary nature, which were raised by the Police Department. In order to obtain a conviction for an offence against the provisions of the Act it is necessary to prove certain facts which will, in many cases, be extremely difficult to prove; for example, that a person was a Pitjantjatjara or was on the lands. The amendment assists to alleviate these problems. Clause 10 deals with the interaction of this Act with other Acts. Subsection (1) confers the status of 'public place' upon the land, for the purposes of other Acts and subsection (2) relates to roads.

The Hon. H. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the adjourned debate on the second reading of the Casino Bill to be taken into consideration forthwith.

I take that action for several reasons: first, I want to remind the House that last week I gave notice to the House that this in fact would be the position.

Mr Ashenden: Not at 3.30 in the afternoon.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to refrain from answering any interjections.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I gave notice to the House, to the Opposition, to the State, to the public and to the newspapers that this Bill would be debated today.

Mr Ashenden: You deceived us all along.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: There has been no deception whatsoever. Anyone who has had any experience in this place at all would know that private members' business would not extend to 6 o'clock today, otherwise we would not have sat earlier. There was no deception. There might have been foolhardiness on the side of the Opposition but there was no deception on my part. It must be obvious for the members opposite that by procedural matters if the Government had not taken the action that it has taken in this aspect, then this Bill would not have been debated in this session of Parliament.

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: There was clearly no opportunity for the Bill to be discussed today because the person who would have been responsible on the Opposition side for taking the adjournment happens to be the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (as is stated on the Notice Paper) who could have spoken and had the matter adjourned; therefore, there would have been no debate on this matter today and it could have been concluded. I do not think the Opposition has much recourse for complaint as they had been notified on this matter for a week. It is a week since I notified the House of this and it is a week since this press first published it and I do not think that anyone can complain about it in those circumstances.

The second important reason why I believe this matter ought to be debated in this session of Parliament so that it can be concluded (and it must be recognised by members of the Opposition that this session was to have finished this week but because of the excessive amount of business and debating, and I am not blaming any side for that, but the session has to be concluded in two weeks when the House will resume again) is that this is the first time this House has been faced with the situation where it must deal with a Casino Bill that has been passed by another House. On each occasion that I have been in this House (a total of three occasions), the Bill has always been introduced in the Lower House, debated in the Lower House and has always been defeated by the Lower House.

On this occasion, there is a tremendous difference in the situation because the Legislative Council, whose members represent the whole of the State, have examined this matter in detail (the Hon. Mr Blevins gave notice of the Bill some months ago in that House). No doubt members of that House were lobbied by people from all over the State. The Legislative Council in its wisdom decided to pass this legislation and I understand it was passed by 15 votes to 4, which is a fairly healthy majority in that House. The third

reason why the Government is facilitating this legislation, and that is all that it is doing at this moment, facilitating debate on this legislation—

Mr Ashenden: Why?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I have given members opposite two reasons and I can give them a third reason. The third reason is that I believe that there is a great public demand and perception in the community at the moment to have this matter settled.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable gentleman to order and remind him that at the moment the merits or otherwise of the Bill are not before the House, but strictly the terms of the motion.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I think that I am in order in suggesting that there is a demand out in the public to have this matter decided and that is one of the three major reasons why the Government has decided that in the circumstances it ought to facilitate the procedures of this House so that Bill can be debated. I do not know that the Bill will take a lot of debating in this house; it may or it may not.

However, the Government is certainly giving facilitative measures in the House to allow members to have that opportunity and I imagine we should be on that piece of legislation by about 4 p.m. There was a very full and lengthy debate back in October last year when this House decided against the casino legislation. I believe that it is essential that, before this session of Parliament concludes, in the light of the facts that I quoted previously, there ought to be a decision. That decision is no concern of mine.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is only one speaker to follow and, therefore, I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, in view of his seniority.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition vehemently opposes the motion moved by the Deputy Premier for what I believe are very good reasons. We saw a travesty of the Standing Orders last week when, in the normal course of events, a private member's Bill would have come from the Upper House. Notice would have been given and it would have been introduced today and thereafter adjourned, which meant (as the Deputy Premier has rightly indicated to the House) that it would have dropped off the Notice Paper.

He talks about the House making a decision. The fact that this very measure was before this House last year (which, in Parliamentary terms, is in very recent days) and was soundly defeated by a vote in this House, is a very compelling reason why in my view this Bill should not have priority in Government thinking. How has it got priority?

The fact is that the Government had been tinkering with the normal practice in relation to private members' business, simply to get this Bill on, when it has set this House an impossible Parliamentary programme. I said that last week to the Deputy Premier. I said it again this week. We were handed a week's programme with no fewer than 17 Bills to be dealt with yesterday. Some of them were major Bills affecting the economy of this State. We got through three. The whole of today's proceedings were given over to private members' business and, the major part of that, to this one question which was debated in this House in very recent Parliamentary times. So much for this clamour for a decision of the House.

No decision has been made in relation to the Natural Death Bill, which was raised three times nine months ago. That is a private member's Bill. There are 29 items on the Government Orders of the Day before the House; 17 were listed for yesterday and three were dealt with; an impossible programme with some important Bills has been set for

Friday. There is enough for two days work, and here we are giving away the whole of the Parliamentary day, the Deputy Premier at last realising that we have to have an extra weeks sitting to accommodate his impossible programme (with some confusion for Government members and others). We are giving away a whole day by tinkering with the Standing Orders when there is a whole list of other matters on the Notice Paper for consideration, simply so that the Government can deal with this measure. It has not got the guts to put it on as Government business. In effect, that is what it is: it is taking precedence over every other item of Government business that has been before the House in this sitting. It will not put it on as Government business.

Mr Evans interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Fisher to come to order.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Deputy Premier talks about excessive debate. The debate in this place is governed by Standing Orders. Who is he to say what is excessive debate? The fact is that members of the Opposition have not availed themselves of every opportunity available to them in the last fortnight. Had we behaved as the present Government is behaving we could have spent many more hours during the Appropriation Bill. However, we chose not to. We said what we wanted to say. The Government put up about five speakers in relation to the Workers Compensation Bill. Does that indicate a Government that is in a hurry to get its legislation through? That is one of the disciplines one has to accept in Parliamentary life: it is the right of the Opposition to speak, so if the time is available, it is the right of the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I make this very clear right from the very beginning: in relation to this Bill, yet another emotive Bill (in fact the fourth one in six days of sitting), Standing Orders will be upheld by everybody and I will ensure that that is the case. When I call a member to order he should realise that that is the first step along the line to being excluded from the House, not because I wish it, but because his or her own conduct may call for that.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is not the prerogative of the Deputy Premier to suggest that there is excessive debate, which is the term he used.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: However, the Government is incapable of disciplining its own members. In fact the discipline is on the Government. If the Government wants to get the legislation through, it has to discipline its own members. The opportunity for back-benchers speaking in Government is limited for that reason. However, the manager of the Government is incapable of disciplining his own members. What do we have? Today we have under the guise of private members' legislation what the Government does not have the courage to accept is obviously a stigma to them and take this Bill as its own, extending private members' business in an unprecedented way (in my 13 years in Parliament) just to get this problem off its plate. What is this hoo-hah about 'the public demands it'? There was a vote in this House which soundly defeated the same Bill only months ago and, in Parliamentary terms, that is in very recent days.

The Government does not have the courage to take it over. This is when members of the Government voted so soundly against it. Members of the former Liberal Government said, 'Yes, it is hanging around. Let's get it in and get rid of this question.' Once and for all we got it in and it was defeated, and the Government made no bones about it: it was a conscience vote. However, the Government took

the decision to bring it in. Government members did not support it. I did not, for one: however, at least we had the courage to put it before the Parliament. Here we are mucking about with the Standing Orders in private members' time just so that the Government can get this thing dealt with when it has run out of time. It will be cold comfort for the members of this House when this week is done, after we have sat all hours of the day and night and come back for an extra weeks sitting after the school holidays (which the Government had to arrange) and we find that we still have about 17 items on the Notice Paper, because I predict that that is what will happen.

An honourable member: Their priorities are all wrong.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: We oppose the suspension of Standing Orders for what it is: it is a complete farce and a travesty of the operation of this Parliament as, indeed, have been the sittings of the last fortnight.

The House divided on the motion:

While the division was being held:

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind honourable members of the ruling I gave at the beginning of this debate.

Ayes—(23)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs Bannon, M.J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright (teller).

Noes—(16)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Blacker, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Oswald, Rodda, and Wilson.

Pair—Aye—Mr L.M.F. Arnold. No—Mr Olsen.

Majority of 7 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

CASINO BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 May. Page 1237.)

The SPEAKER: I have perused the list of speakers before me, and I propose to call to notice the member for Glenelg first and then the member for Torrens. Since this is shown as a private member's Bill on the normal informal call sheet we have, I am happy to assist but I want to be reassured by the Whips that that in fact represents the consensus of members.

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): First, let me state that this Bill was not brought in as a Government Bill but was brought in in an underhanded way by the backdoor method by the Government in an attempt to make a surprise attack on people who were unaware that this Bill was to come into the House, on some pretence that it was necessary in view of the complete change of opinion that had occurred in South Australia in a few short months. It must be asked why; what was the reason; what was the deal; who promised what; is any money involved in relation to the Government; and who has forced the hand of the Government?

We will not be able to deal with this Bill as a private member's Bill because the Government in essence has taken it over but it is too scared and upset to say so and the Deputy Leader said that a little earlier. The Deputy Premier said that it needs prominence, it needs to be brought out. What about all the other business on the Notice Paper. What about all the private members' business on the Notice Paper that will now lapse? As it was a private member's Bill in the other place it was decided by the Government

that the only way to bring it into this place was to give the second reading in Government time and then to bring it in today after private members' time to force a vote on it whether anyone wishes to speak to it or not. They were the Government's tactics.

As mentioned by the Deputy Leader, the Notice Paper is loaded; in fact, we were supposed to deal yesterday with 17 Bills. This must be urgent, and that is why I ask these questions of the Government. There must be something in it and there must be a darned good reason why the Government is forcing Parliament to vote on it as soon as possible. The Deputy Premier says that the public has demanded that this casino issue be debated. If we are now to debate Bills that have been delayed for years, what about the lights at Football Park? Demands have been made for years to have those lights erected. Why has the member for Albert Park not lobbied his Government about it? This problem has been around for years, and yet it is not urgent enough to be brought on today. However, the Casino Bill, which was debated fully last August, is brought in again today.

I oppose this Bill, and I oppose the manner in which it has been brought into this House. If one is honest about it, one will admit that it is a Government Bill. It is supposed to be a conscience vote, and it will be interesting to see what has happened to the consciences of members since they voted last August. It must not be forgotten that the vote was taken on this Bill on 18 August 1982. During that debate the member for Albert Park said—the honourable member is laughing; he will not think it is funny when he rereads his speech. He said:

What mainly concerns me is the social and welfare consequences of gambling. I am not a hypocrite. I have gambled and probably as much as any other member of this House, but when you are dealing with people's social welfare I think that is another issue.

The member for Albert Park also said:

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

He went on to say:

I am not prepared to support a casino in South Australia because I believe it will make the problem even worse.

The member for Gilles at that stage, now the Minister of Recreation and Sport, interjected and asked, 'What problem?'. The member for Albert Park said, 'The problem of gambling itself.' That is what the member for Albert Park said during his conscience speech last August. In his conscience speech then the Deputy Premier said:

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

Later, the Hon. J.D. Wright said:

I am not completely satisfied either in my own mind that a casino will to any great extent bring many people into South Australia.

There was a 'Hear, hear' from the member for Coles to that. The Hon. J.D. Wright continued:

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

So said the conscience of the Deputy Premier not long ago, indeed in August last year. The honourable member was no

doubt carried away by his conscience because he voted against the Bill. The member for Norwood (now Minister of Community Welfare), who has cause to worry about such a Bill as this because any problems that result from it will drop squarely into his lap as Minister, last year said:

I am pleased to support the noting of this report, but I do so with much reservation. I want to point out to the House at the outset that I do not propose to support the establishment of a casino on the basis of the Bill that is before the House this evening or the amendments that I understand are to follow.

So said the member for Norwood, now Minister of Community Welfare, who must deal with the problems that will result from this Bill if, heaven help us, it is passed. On 19 August it was decided to vote on an amendment to clause 21, which was the basis of the Bill. On that amendment the division resulted in 16 Ayes and 27 Noes, so the amendment was negated. Then the Committee divided on clause 21, and the result was 12 Ayes and 31 Noes. So a few more members came over to the side of the Noes: people whose conscience told them that the legislation was not right for South Australia.

Maybe it would be only right for me to read out who voted against the Bill on that occasion: Mr Abbott, Mrs Adamson, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Evans, Goldsworthy, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hoggood, Keneally, Langley, Lewis, Mathwin, Oswald, Payne, Plunkett, Randall, Russack, and Schmidt, Mrs Southcott, Messrs Trainer, Whitten, Wotton and Wright.

There was a majority of 19 for the Noes, yet on this occasion the Deputy Premier has the audacity to stand up here and say that Parliament wants an indication from the people on the establishment of a casino when only a few months ago the House voted by a 19-vote majority against the casino. I am sorry for the Deputy Premier, because it was up to him to make everything a little legal and explain why Standing Orders should be suspended so that a private member's Bill could be introduced in Government time. The message was given in last year's debate that the people of South Australia did not want a casino. Because of the problems related to this Bill, the Government of the day, of which I was a member, decided last year that the best thing to do was refer the Bill to a select committee so that it could gather information that could later be placed before members of Parliament.

It was open to the select committee to make a recommendation if it wished to do so, but in this case the select committee on the Casino Bill made no recommendation: it merely placed the evidence before members of Parliament. Indeed, the committee collected five volumes of evidence and you, Mr Speaker, will remember well the deliberations of that committee, because you played an important part in them. Indeed, because of your legal knowledge you were a great asset to the committee, and I admired your efforts in helping me and other members of it.

The select committee comprised the Hon. Michael Wilson (then Minister of Recreation and Sport) as Chairman, and Messrs Rodda, Mathwin, Glazbrook, Slater, McRae, and Peterson. The resolution agreed to by the House of Assembly, when appointing the select committee, stated that the select committee should be immediately appointed to inquire into and report to the House on the Casino Bill. In addition, the Minister undertook to report on the social, economic and welfare effects of gambling in a casino on the individual, the family and the community; the relationship, if any, between the operations of a casino and organised crime; and the effects of the operations of the casino on other forms of gambling.

Those additional matters to be reported on are important and must not be lost sight of when, in the hurly-burly and the pressure of the session, we are told that this Bill is so urgent that it must be given priority over Government Bills on the Notice Paper. The committee last year held 34 meetings and took evidence from 55 organisations and individuals, whose names are given in Appendix 1. The committee also visited Tasmania, the Northern Territory and New South Wales, and took evidence from witnesses from Victoria. The usual advertisements were inserted in the various newspapers. At page 2, the report states:

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

The report continues:

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

That happened; when the report was presented to Parliament, we had a debate on the report before we had a debate on the Bill, and several members spoke on this report. I think the member for Albert Park as well as the honourable member for Price and others, from memory, spoke on this report. I will relieve members by not quoting from the reports of the many who spoke on the ability of the committee and of the good job it had done in collecting this evidence so that people who were interested and concerned, and who had to make some decisions, would consider this report. If they wanted to search further for direct information they could read the evidence tabled. It is common public property, and if they so desired they could go through the whole five volumes and then assess the situation. The report, at page 3, states:

Many of the witnesses who appeared before the select committee made reference to the wellknown casinos of the world which exist in such places as Las Vegas, London, and Monte Carlo. It is as well to point out that casinos are not limited to those areas. In fact, legal casinos exist in most parts of the world, and their numbers are gradually increasing. At present they exist in Europe in the United Kingdom, the Isle of Man, France, Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Italy, Yugoslavia, Portugal, Belgium, Holland, Greece, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Malta, Monaco, and Sweden.

Are casinos situated in these places to attract tourists? That seems to be part of the thinking of people who introduced this Bill, but that is not the case. Who would suggest that people would go to the United Kingdom to play the tables? First of all you are supposed to be a member of a club and put your name down, and you have to go back a week later. That does not give much chance for a tourist, and secondly, there are far more nicer things to look at in the United Kingdom than to go into a casino. One could look at the Household Cavalry and see the beautiful greys in London that we are going to lose in South Australia from our Police Force. They are certainly an attraction. In North America, in Nevada and New Jersey, are casinos and also in Africa, Egypt, Morocco, Zambia, Swaziland, Sierra Leone, Tunisia, Ghana and Lesotho, in Asia they are in Lebanon, Iraq, Jordan, Macao, South Korea, Malaysia, Thailand, Indonesia, and the Philippines. In Australia at the time of this report, casinos had been established in Tasmania and the North Territory. Since the committee published this report, a new casino has opened at Darwin at the cost of about \$30 000 000. I understand that the casinos in Darwin, Alice Springs, and Tasmania are supported by local money. A small amount comes from tourists, but the local people provide most of the money. When one is trying to assess this situation and

testing one's conscience on this, it is one area where the conscience has to play its part. The report at page 14, referring to other investigations, states:

The committee is not the first to embark on an examination of casino gambling. During the course of proceedings, the committee was referred to several reports from varying committees, as follows:

Royal Commission into Gambling (Western Australia), 1974.
The Commission on The Review of the National Policy Towards Gambling (United States), (Morin Commission), 1976.

I will refer to that in more detail later. Mr Speaker, you will agree (I know that member for Semaphore will) that that is the greatest and best report ever done on gambling generally in the world, and probably the only report one could refer to on the wide field of all aspects of gambling, that is, the Morin Commission. The report continues:

Report on the Inquiry into the Legalising of Gambling Casinos in New South Wales (Lusher Report), 1977,

Standing Committee on Tourism and Recreation Report No. 1 (A.C.T.), 1977,

Royal Commission on Gambling (Great Britain) (Rothschild Report) Final Report, 1978,

Report of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Gambling (Tasmania), 1978,

Select Committee on the Establishment of a Casino in the A.C.T., 1981,

Report on the Legalising of Gambling in New South Wales (Booth Report), 1981

In addition, the committee has had the opportunity to refer to: Report on the Impact of Wrest Point Hotel-Casino on the Tasmanian Community, 1981,

Report of Mr S.G. Evans, Esq., M.P., (member for Fisher) on operations of overseas casinos, 1976,

Confidential report to Queensland Liberal Party on Casino Developments in Queensland, 1982.

The extent and length to which some of those investigations went in the endeavour to cover all aspects of gaming make it impossible to retrace the full details of these reports in this particular report.

They are available and I suggest that, if members have been studying the situation with great concern, some of them would have considered some of these reports, not all of them, to try and help them with decisions which they are about to make and which they did make some time ago. The report continues at page 25, with a recommendation in relation to part of one of the reports relating to the Capital Territory House of Assembly. This is an important factor that all members should take some notice of; it should happen, it should have happened before this, and it should happen as soon as possible, and all States of the Commonwealth should act on this recommendation:

That the Australian Bureau of Statistics be requested to conduct a survey on gambling participation, expenditure on gambling, its taxation and the extent of compulsive gambling within the community; that the Government consider approaching other State Governments and the Australian Government with a view to having the survey made on a national basis in order that the appropriate information could be put at the disposal of each Government. If this proposal is adopted, it could be suggested that a commission on the review of the national policy towards gambling could be established similar to the Morin Commission in America.

That is the report to which I have referred, and which I will give more detail about later. The report continues:

That the Government establish a committee to measure the social and economic aspects of gambling in this State.

That is, of course, the Northern Territory. The report then states:

To be effective, the committee will require the information obtained by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. The committee should have appropriate expertise and access to social and economic research facilities.

Every member, irrespective of how he intends to vote on this Bill, ought to support that proposition. We should all

ensure that it happens as soon as possible, because it is important to realise that the statistics which are available indicate that compulsive gamblers to a certain extent have been left on the outer. I think it behoves us all to see that something is done about the matter. Without statistics on a particular matter we are working in the dark, and one does not know whether or not one is working along the right lines. In regard to the background of the development of the casino in Tasmania, the report states:

Federal Hotels Ltd purchased the old Wrest Point hotel at Sandy Bay, Hobart, in 1956. In 1967, the company approached the Tasmanian Government with a proposal to build a multi-million dollar international hotel-casino complex on the site. Subsequently, the Government passed the Wrest Point Casino Licence and Development Referendum Act, which authorised the taking of a poll of electors on the question of the establishment of a casino at Wrest Point Hotel, on 22 November 1968. Following the result of the referendum, which favoured the establishment of a casino in the South of Tasmania, an Act was passed called the Wrest Point Casino Licence and Development Act, to provide for the development of Wrest Point with a tourist hotel of international standard, including the issue of a casino licence, to ratify an agreement for that purpose and to provide for the carrying out of that agreement, on 24 December 1968. Under the terms of that agreement, the licence was renewable annually subject to compliance with the legislative and regulatory requirements. So long as that agreement remained in force, no other licence could be granted in the southern part of Tasmania. The operating company at that time was Australian National Hotels Ltd, a subsidiary of Federal Hotels Ltd.

The report further states:

Prior to 1973, evidence suggests that the tourism industry in Tasmania was in a period of stagnation. However, with the opening of the casino there have been major increases in tourism with associated employment and income opportunities. In fact, according to available figures, the Tasmanian tourist industry in 1981 was worth \$150 000 000 per annum, compared to \$110 000 000 per annum two years previously.

In regard to the suggestion that a great increase in tourism occurred as a result of the facility in Tasmania, I suggest that all countries in the world, no matter where they are, have found that there has been a vast increase in tourism over the last 10 or 12 years. People are now travelling wider and further afield. Indeed, Australians are not only now travelling around Australia but to New Zealand and around the world. Over the last 10 or 12 years tourism in countries such as Switzerland, Italy, the United Kingdom, America, and so on, has increased vastly. People have more time in which to travel, and, indeed, more money to enable them to do so. Therefore, it is not correct to say that the facility in Tasmania has been totally responsible for boosting tourism in Tasmania.

I do not contend that the casino facility did not boost tourism to some extent, because it should be remembered that originally Tasmania was the only State that had a casino. However, now there are also two casinos in the Northern Territory and two proposed in Queensland, and there are proposals for a casino in Victoria and in New South Wales. To contend that a further casino in South Australia would be a tourist attraction is just plain rubbish—absolute piffle. In regard to the tourist attraction aspect, if there were only one casino within a certain region, that argument could apply, but it no longer applies to Australia. Again, referring to the report, in regard to the Northern Territory, the comment was made:

Tourism was again a prime motive behind the decision taken by the Northern Territory Government to legalise casinos, in that the Government saw the establishment of two hotel-casino complexes of international standard serving as major tourist drawcards.

When the South Australian select committee was in Darwin we were told that a couple of junkets from Japan had flown there solely for the purpose of gambling. They had come to Darwin to spend a couple of days on the tables with the

intention of then flying to Tasmania. According to the information contained in the massive documents that I have here, a considerable sum of money was spent, but that does not occur regularly: I think there have been only two such occasions when the Japanese have spent a lot of money. It certainly was not the great thing that it has been ballooned up to be, namely, that there are groups of people with the potential of boosting tourism through casinos. The report further states at page 31:

The Casino Development Act 1978 was passed and that provided that the relevant Minister could negotiate and enter into agreement with any person with respect to the establishment and licensing of a casino within 30 km of the post office of Darwin and a casino within 30 km of the post office of Alice Springs.

The South Australian committee also visited Alice Springs. We all realised that local money was involved there. They were in a bit of trouble there in relation to local people who were attending the casino, the people who were really keeping it in business. In regard to the Western Australian situation, the report states:

The Western Australian Government examined the issue of legalisation of casinos as long ago as 1974 when the royal commission reported to it that a casino should be established at Exmouth on the Western Australian coast.

That is a fairly long way from Perth, although I suppose it could mean some development for Exmouth. However, it seems to be a long way from civilisation—perhaps that is the best place to have a casino. In regard to New South Wales and Victoria, the report states:

Both these States are currently examining the question of legalisation of casinos. In May 1982 the Treasurer, the Honourable Mr K. Booth, reported to the N.S.W. Government. The Victorian Government has appointed the Honourable F.X. Connor Q.C. to head a Board of Inquiry to examine the question.

I believe that the report of that board has been brought down, although unfortunately I have not had time to peruse it. However, I will read the report, because it is important to know about this. I could read out further excerpts from the South Australian committee's report, although I know that a number of members of the House have read the report and have taken notice of many of the submissions contained therein. As I have said, the report is not a recommendation but a collection of evidence for members to peruse, in an endeavour to glean information in deciding when making a conscience vote what the situation ought to be here in South Australia.

Oral submissions were given by a number of people and groups, and I believe that this Parliament ought to know who they are: Mr Aboud; Mr Bimson; Mr R.G. Bottom (who is an authority on such matters as organised crime); the Community Welfare Department (Mr C.E.M. Harris); Confederation of Industries, N.T. (J.S. Cameron); Mr J.E.W. Curtis-Hayward; Darwin City Council; Darwin City Council, Social Welfare; Mr D.M. Davey; Dr Dickerson; Mr J.P. Errington; Federal Pacific Hotel (Alice Springs); Dr M.C. Fereday (and I will read some of her evidence later); Festival of Light (S.J. Stevens); Festival of Light and Community Standards Organisation; Gamblers Anonymous (Tasmania); Government Casino Controller (Tasmania); Mr J.M. Haddad; Mr Eric Isaachson; Launceston Federal; Licenced Clubs Association (Mr Vibert, a very interesting person, and I would like to read some segments of his evidence a little later); Licenced Clubs Association (Mr Beck); Dr A. Livingstone; Mrs B. Luks; Dr A.W. McCoy (an expert in criminology); Reverend H.H. Morrow; National Council of Women (six people representing that council gave evidence); the Northern Territory Police Department in Darwin; the Northern Territory Police Department in Alice Springs; the Northern Territory Tourist Commission; New South Wales Police Department; Mr Ottoson; Mr Philbey; Mr Priest;

Public and Consumer Affairs Department (Mr P.F. Young); Mrs A. Ridge; Reverend R.C. Simpson; South Australian Greyhound Racing Control Board (Mr Dunsford); South Australian Jockey Club; South Australian Police Department (Mr D.A. Hunt and Mr N. McKenzie); South Australian Police Department (Mr Mildren); State Lotteries Commission (Mr Minchin); South Australian Totalizator Agency Board (Mr Powell, Mr Knight); Mr G.B. Stevens; Tasmanian Police Department (Mr Robinson); Tasmanian Racing and Gaming Commission; Department of Tourism, South Australia, (Mr Inns); Department of Tourism, Tasmania; Trotting Control Board (Mr Byrne and Mr Porter); Uniting Church in Australia (South Australian Division); Woman's Christian Temperance Union; Women's Electoral Lobby; Wrest Point, Tasmania; and Mr B.J.M. Wright. Those people gave oral evidence to the committee. That evidence is recorded in the volumes that are available to all members if they so desire.

Many people (listed on three foolscap pages) made written submissions to the committee, and were generally against the establishment of a casino. If members wish to have proof of the feelings of people in relation to the establishment of a casino, then they had better study the written statements which are available to them. I have no doubt that members would have received written submissions against the establishment of a casino in South Australia.

While the committee was collecting its evidence and undertaking its inspections at the different establishments, not only did the committee receive many telephone calls and letters against the casino, but I am sure that all members did as well. I did. Not one member has ever said to me, 'I have had 40 letters that say that a casino should be established' or, 'I had 10 or 20 people ring me to say that they wanted a casino.' Not one member has said that. I suggest, with due respect to the people who have contacted members, that with few exceptions nearly all of them would be against the establishment of a casino.

The way in which this legislation has been introduced into the House with its undue haste is rude indeed, especially after the efforts and great strain that the committee made and was under to get this report to Parliament in time for it to be debated last session (which was only August), and did not give the people who had already contacted their members previously an opportunity to put forward their view and make their feelings clear.

If this is a conscience matter, then there have been lodged in Parliament House the last time this Bill was before Parliament a number of petitions. There were 12 673 people who signed petitions against the establishment of a casino. These signatures came in 89 separate petitions, and were presented by all members of the House. That is many people, and I believe that there is a fair indication of what the people in South Australia really feel about this issue.

A total of 151 written submissions was received by the committee. Some people may wonder what is the value of people writing in about an issue and what is the value of people signing petitions. I believe that, if people are willing to draw up and sign a petition, then there is something in it and that notice must be taken of it. The fact that Parliament has received 12 673 signatures against the establishment of a casino in South Australia must prick the conscience of members.

I said earlier that I could quote from parts of the Morin Report, which is probably the greatest report ever written on gambling. I will not deal with gambling in general, but what is written about casinos. This report was presented in 1976 to the Hon. Gerald R. Ford, President of the United States and to one of his Senators, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. This was an important and costly operation.

It went on over a long period. The commissioned membership of the board was as follows:

Charles H. Morin, Chairman Attorney, Washington, D.C.	Senator John L. McClellan Democrat, Arkansas
Ethel D. Allen, M.D. City Councilwoman, Philadelphia	Senator Howard W. Cannon Democrat, Nevada
Philip Cohen Executive Director National Legal Data Center	Senator Hugh Scott Republican, Pennsylvania
James M. Coleman, Jr. Prosecutor, Monmouth County, N.J.	Senator Robert Taft, Jr. Republican, Ohio
Joseph A. Gimma Stockbroker, New York	Representative James M. Hanley Democrat, New York
Robert Frank List Attorney General of Nevada	Representative Charles E. Wiggins Republican, California
Charles F. Phillips, Jr. Professor of Economics Washington and Lee University	Representative Sam Steiger Republican, Arizona
	Representative Gladys Noon Spellman Democrat, Maryland
James E. Ritchie Executive Director	
Marilu Marshall Deputy Director	

The officials were as follows:

James E. Ritchie: Executive Director
Marilu Marshall: Deputy Director
Stephen B. Bull: Director, Communications and Research
Thomas Farrell: Associate Counsel
David Drelich: Assistant Counsel
Rita Hallaren: Administrative Officer

Staff members were as follows:

Bruce A. Butcher
Carol D. Cragg
Robert E. Creeden
Robinette L. Davis
Norma D. Dosky
Carol H. Duncan
Anne M. Fleming
Stephen C. Fogelman
Kathleen J. Foley
Katharine M. Francone
Nancy S. Hendee
Kathleen M. Joyce
Lael L. Kenyon
Roger L. Kreuzer
Patricia A. Owens
Leslie M. Pittler
Peter H. Reuter
Jacqueline A. Sheppard
Joseph D. Van Cleve, III
Betty J. White

There were a number of student assistants included there. However, I will not bore members with that, because they appear to be getting a little edgy. Nina Graybill and DuPre Jones were editors, and Patricia Helsing was the writer. So, it was no ordinary sort of committee. It was a big committee which had about 15 consultants, and I will not read all those names to the Parliament, although I could. In a note to the reader, the report states:

Between April 3, 1974, and September 23, 1976, the National Gambling Commission conducted 37 days of hearings and received testimony from approximately 265 witnesses. Among the witnesses were elected officials; members of the criminal justice community at the Federal, State, and local levels; officials of gambling regulatory agencies in the United States and abroad; representatives of the various gambling industries, both legal and illegal; members of amateur and professional sports leagues; journalists; and interested citizens. Hearings were held in Washington, D.C., and in nine other cities: Boston, Philadelphia, Detroit, Cleveland, Carson City, Las Vegas, Phoenix, Chicago, and Miami.

This volume contains summaries of the testimony of all principal witnesses, including highlights of the questioning period that followed witnesses' prepared statements. Readers desiring the complete transcripts of these hearings may contact the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Va.

Mr Plunkett: You haven't got much time.

Mr MATHWIN: I am quite happy to excuse the member for Peake.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair is not very happy. Interjections are out of order.

Mr MATHWIN: Thank you for your kind attention, Sir. That was the basis of the Morin Report. I will now quote sections of the report which I believe will be of interest to members. The report states:

More than 60 per cent of all adult Americans gamble—both legally and illegally. In 1974, at least \$24 billion was wagered—and, at a minimum, \$5 billion of that amount was bet with illegal operators. Today, 33 States have some form of legal gambling, and others are considering legalisation.

As legal forms of gambling increase, the States are faced with a number of problems: How can State Treasuries obtain the largest profits possible from the legalised games? How can the crime and corruption often associated with gambling be controlled? What Federal laws now interfere with State gambling policy? Should these laws be changed? How does legalised gambling affect society? What is the impact of legal gambling markets on the illegal games?

Under the heading 'Gambling in the United States', there is a 'profile of American gamblers'. Page 39 of the report states:

Fully 61 per cent of the adult population—about 88 000 000 people—participated in some form of gambling in 1974. Among these people were about 19 000 000 who wagered only with friends in a social setting, leaving about 69 000 000 people—or 48 per cent of the adult population—who patronised some form of legal or illegal commercial gambling. Only 11 per cent of the adult population—about 16 000 000 people—gambled illegally in 1974, and the overwhelming majority of those who wagered illegally also patronised one or more of the legal games.

Of course, one can see that gamblers do not only stay in one place. People who gamble illegally go on and extend themselves to legal gambling. Page 41 of the report states:

Economics of gambling. Approximately \$24 billion was wagered during 1974—\$5 billion of it illegally.

There is a table to illustrate this, although it is not my intention to read it. Under the heading 'Gambling and Morality', the report states on page 43:

Although moral considerations are an important constraint on gambling behaviour, they are not so significant an influence as mere disinterest in play. Forty-eight per cent of the non-gamblers interviewed said they refrained from gambling because they think it is 'wrong' or 'sinful', but even more non-gambling respondents said they were just 'not interested', 'have other things to do', or 'don't know about it'. Monetary concerns also were mentioned more often than moral concerns. Of the major American religious bodies, only the Baptist Church teaches that gambling is inherently sinful. This is one significant reason why gambling participation is so much lower in the South, where the Baptist faith predominates. Other churches merely teach that gambling in excess is wrong or take no position at all.

Most people gamble to have a good time, or for excitement and challenge. Money-oriented inducements for playing were cited less often, and, in general, the less exciting a particular game was rated, the more important the chance to make money became. Of all forms of gambling—legal and illegal—horseracing at the track was rated as the most exciting, followed by cards with friends, casinos, and slot machines. Illegal horse and sports betting with bookies and numbers were rated as the three least exciting games. These findings suggest that excitement is derived from the amount of personal involvement in an activity rather than from the amounts of money likely to be won or lost. Neither track betting nor social cardplaying is a particularly high-stakes game, yet both are considered to be very exciting. As previous surveys have consistently demonstrated, gambling and corruption often are linked in the public mind.

Let me emphasise this:

The survey reinforced these findings. High school sporting events were seen by the public to be the least corrupt type of activity on which gambling takes place, falling midway between 'almost never fixed' and 'never fixed.' Other games perceived as being primarily honest were charitable and State-run gambling, and other sporting events. The games perceived as being the least honest were horseraces and dograces, slot machines, casinos, and—at the bottom of the scale—numbers, which respondents believe are fixed 'pretty often.' A majority of nongamblers felt that legal-

ization would increase the incidence of fixing. Gamblers, on the other hand, thought that some games, such as numbers, could be cleaned up through legalization, while others, such as sports events, would be tarnished. Although 80 per cent of the respondents said they favored legalization of some form of gambling, no form of gambling received majority support for legalization in a State where it was not already legal . . .

Gambling participation increased steadily as the number of legal games available increased. Participation in illegal gambling also was significantly greater in States where at least three types of gambling were legal compared to States where no form of gambling is legal. This finding suggests that, rather than driving illegal gamblers out of business, partial legalization creates a climate favorable to the illegal forms.

The report then dealt with compulsive gambling, about which all members should be worried. On page 43, the Second Interim Report of the Morin Commission stated:

Approximately 0.77 per cent of the adult population—1.1 million people—can be classified as probable compulsive gamblers, and an additional 2.33 per cent—3.3 million—can be considered 'potential' compulsive gamblers.

In Nevada, the incidence of compulsive gambling appears to be significantly higher.

Let me remind members that Nevada is the State where gambling is legal. The report continues:

On the basis of interviews with 296 Nevada residents, it was projected that 2.62 per cent of the Nevada population could be classified as probable compulsive gamblers and an additional 2.35 per cent as potential compulsive gamblers. In Nevada, as in the national sample, the incidence of compulsive gambling among men was much higher than among women. The findings suggest that the widespread legalization of gambling increases the incidence of compulsive gambling. Additional research is needed before the findings on compulsive gambling, both nationwide and in Nevada, can be considered conclusive.

That is the situation in Nevada, of which I hope all members will take notice. The Morin Commission deals with casinos on page 47 of its Second Interim Report as follows:

In the continental United States, casino gambling is legal only in Nevada . . .

In recent years, a number of States have taken an increased interest in Nevada's brand of casino gambling. Some gambling proponents see casinos as the answer to their State's revenue problems, particularly in view of Nevada's fiscal soundness. Others merely see no valid moral, social, or economic reasons why other States should not follow Nevada's example. Opponents of casino gambling point to the alleged ties to the underworld and the higher crime rates in Nevada's principal gambling cities as reason enough to prevent the spread of the casino gambling phenomenon.

Preliminary results of the National Gambling Commission survey of American gambling behavior and attitudes indicate that 27 per cent of the adult population had gambled at a casino sometime in their lives. Ten per cent of those surveyed said they had gambled at a casino in 1974, which translates to a projected figure of 14 million people nationwide who gambled at a casino—legal or illegal—that year. The majority gambled in Nevada; about a third went to casinos outside the United States.

Consequences and recommendations appear on page 48 of the report. The report states:

The commission does not believe that the States should expect legalised casino gambling to ease their financial difficulties significantly.

That point ought to be considered by all members. It is not to be all and end all. It is nice to get a bit of revenue but this report, which is the greatest report ever on gambling, states that it does not produce revenue. The report continues:

Although casinos may generate enough revenue to help the needs of a State of Nevada's population, they are not capable of providing the resources necessary to support the costs of public services in heavily urbanized States. Compared to the costs of government, the contribution which could be made by taxing or operating casinos in such States would be trivial. Casinos are looked upon also as a means of stimulating tourism in resort areas. However, the possible benefits that could accrue to local economies—assuming that the huge capital outlay necessary to construct casinos and attendant facilities that are competitive with Nevada's could be secured and that competition among resort areas would not fragment the available market—might well be offset by social costs to the surrounding communities.

I believe that must worry some members of Parliament. The problem of the social costs to the surrounding com-

munity must worry people in that community. I believe that point must be considered. The report continues:

For these reasons, the Commission recommends that if any further legalization of casino gambling is to take place in this country, it should be restricted by the States to relatively isolated areas where the impact on surrounding populations can be minimized.

This is where the suggestion for a casino to be built at Exmouth comes in. The report continues:

Although the Commission realizes that such a principle might not appeal to State policymakers who wish to stimulate existing resort areas, it nonetheless believes that the likely social effects of legalized gambling might outweigh purely economic considerations.

Another factor to be considered is the possible impact of casino gambling on existing industries—not only on other forms of amusement and recreation, but on those forms of gambling which have been legalized for the purpose of raising State revenues. Would casino gambling reduce the handle at parimutuel racetracks or the sales of State lottery tickets? Or would the climate of further legalization stimulate these activities? Local market conditions play a major part in such developments and merit careful examination.

That was an area which last year's select committee considered and about which it was so concerned in relation to the proposed establishment of a casino in this State. This report continues at some length, and I refer to the following quotation (on page 51):

In sum, for those States presently considering the legalization of casino gambling, the following consequences of such action should be considered:

The revenues generated by casinos will not be sufficient to ease significantly the financial burdens of densely populated States.

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

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

In South Australia we have the gallops, the trots and the greyhounds. We know that the greyhound racing authorities are experiencing difficulties at present, and the trotting authorities are not much better off. The horse-racing authorities, too, are finding the going rough. Yet, despite this, Parliament is asked to provide for another area of gambling which could cause even more difficulties for the various racing authorities and which could result in their having to come to the Government for help. Horse racing is a big industry: it is not just a matter of providing the horses to run. The aspects of stock breeding and the employment of many people must be considered in relation to the proposed establishment of a casino in South Australia. I now quote from the foreword of the final report of the Morin Commission, as follows:

With this report, the Commission on the Review of the National Policy Toward Gambling concludes its three years of research and hearings into the controversial and divisive subject of gambling. Our work is completed. . . . This report and its recommendations will surprise most Americans and may startle some. But those who are surprised or startled should carefully reflect on the significance of the fact that a pastime indulged in by two thirds of the American people, and approved of by perhaps 80 per cent of the population, contributes more than any other single enterprise to police corruption in their cities and towns and to the well-being of the nation's criminals.

That is a very strong statement from Mr Charles Morin, and it should be noted carefully by members. I now quote from page 97 of the final report, as follows:

Regarding the impact of legalised gambling in Nevada, survey results indicate that the widespread availability of legal gambling (particularly casinos) generates measurably higher rates of participation by Nevada residents. Seventy-eight per cent of those questioned in Nevada bet on something in 1974. Compared with 61 per cent of other States . . . the incidence of betting is approximately 10 to 20 per cent higher in Nevada.

That statement merits our serious thought if we are honest in our consideration of this subject. Under the heading

'Conclusions and Recommendations', at page 101, the report states:

Proponents of legalised casino gambling in States other than Nevada generally put forth two major arguments in favour of their position. The first is that casino gambling will provide needed revenues to States; the other is that resort areas will become more popular tourist attractions with the added glamour of casino gambling. The commission questions the validity of these two arguments. The commission does not believe that States should expect revenues from legalised casino gambling to ease their financial difficulties significantly. Casino gambling has not, to date, proved to be a financial panacea. The State of Nevada, which offers an example of successful revenue-raising through legalised gambling, stands only sixth among States in total revenues derived from legal gambling. Although casinos may generate enough revenue to help meet the needs of a State with Nevada's population they are not capable of providing the resources necessary to support the cost of public services in heavily urbanised States. Compared to the cost of Government, to say nothing of the potential social costs, the revenues that could be made by taxing or operating casinos in those States would be trivial. . . . As to the potential increase in tourism, the commission warns against promotion of casino gambling as a tourism stimulant where there is no pre-existing demand for this type of gaming. The legalisation of casinos in Great Britain came about because many illegal casinos were already in operation throughout the country and were being heavily patronised by British subjects—to their financial detriment.

We have the evidence that was presented to last year's select committee by a person who had worked in these casinos and who was then living in the District of Mallee. That person gave strong evidence in relation to casinos in the United Kingdom and the way in which they operate. Surely that is proof enough. Indeed, Parliament should need no further proof that casinos are not the be-all and end-all of tourist attraction.

Mr Groom: How much longer are you going for?

Mr MATHWIN: I hope that the honourable member who is looking after the Bill is listening to my remarks, because they will help him.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Hartley to get back to his seat before he interjects again.

Mr MATHWIN: The report deals also with the membership of clubs, and the following statement is made:

The restriction of public access to casino gambling has been deemed to be desirable in Great Britain. To gamble in a casino there one must become a member of a club. That can be done only by making an application on the premises. Forty-eight hours after this application is accepted the applicant may gamble. Furthermore, after someone has become a member he must give notice of his intention to gamble 48 hours before he is allowed to.

The situation as it exists in the United Kingdom would not do anything for tourism. That is quite obvious because one must give 48 hours notice of his intention to have a wager.

Mr Evans: They are not allowed to advertise gambling, either.

Mr MATHWIN: No. If one is attempting to get into a casino in the United Kingdom one can do so if a friend knows someone on the door, but of course the person would get into trouble if there was a raid, because one would be breaking the law. I have received many submissions and letters about this matter. Indeed, today I received a telegram as well as some letters. The telegram, dated 10 May, from the Board Chairman of the Brighton Church of Christ states:

The members of the Brighton Church of Christ at their annual general meeting on 22 March 1983 were unanimous in their opposition to a casino being formed in South Australia. Our objections are based on:

1. Money lost to gambling which should be put to family needs, for example, food, clothing, services, etc.
2. Less money for home needs will mean even more demands on welfare agencies.
3. A few getting rich at the detriment of the many who are already poor.
4. Experience from other States indicates that employment does not benefit from a casino.

5. The disadvantaged become even more disadvantaged. We therefore implore you to vote against the Casino Bill.

I gather that the Premier has received a similar telegram. Also, I have received a letter about this matter from a doctor from Byron Street, Glenelg, which I notice is addressed to the member for Morphett, so I will pass that on to him. There is a letter from a person living in Jetty Road, Brighton, which states:

I am concerned about the Casino Bill which has been introduced into Parliament. We need Parliamentary leaders who are bold enough to resist the pressures that vested interests make for this type of facility.

The writer goes on to express concern about the situation in relation to gambling generally, the provision of another outlet for the gambling dollar, and the casino itself. I have another letter from a constituent who lives at Pier Street, Glenelg, which states:

As a concerned citizen of this State of South Australia it is my duty to inform you that I am very much against a casino being built here.

I have a further letter from a resident from Pier Street, Glenelg, who couched her letter in a similar way, expressing concern about gambling here, and about the possibility of a casino being built in South Australia. I am referring only to letters I received today. I have many more letters but I did not bring in them all to read out because it would take up too much time. No doubt when members opposite have the opportunity they will read out some of the letters they have received from their constituents to give us some idea of what those in their districts think about this matter.

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: I think the member for Mawson will vote against the Casino Bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MATHWIN: In all the time that I have been receiving letters on this matter (and I have received hundreds) I have not received one letter expressing support for a casino.

The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: That is the good part about the whole thing.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The bad part is that interjections are out of order.

Mr MATHWIN: The members of the committee were hard working and were controlled by a strong and forceful, but very fair, Chairman. The Women's Christian Temperance Union of South Australia wrote to me as follows:

We wish to express our strong disapproval of the establishment of a casino in this State. The following are some of the objections:

1. There is no guarantee that crime will not increase.
2. The glamour of a casino could encourage the less fortunate who can ill afford any cash loss; this in turn imposing a greater burden on social welfare funds.

Of course, the Minister of Community Welfare must have some concern about this situation, because it will be the Minister who will have to find money from his allocation to try to help these people in need. The letter to which I just referred continues as follows:

3. Can the Government please tell us who they expect will patronise a casino?

I also have a letter from the Churches of Christ which is headed 'Statement concerning Casino Bill', which is as follows:

This statement is sent to you as a member of Parliament who shortly will be deciding how you will vote concerning the current Casino Bill.

Four reasons are given as to why it should not be supported, as follows:

1. A casino would do little for the development of tourism in South Australia beyond its immediate locality and, with the opening of casinos in other States, is unlikely to be an influential factor in making people decide to visit South Australia.

That is exactly what I have been saying about the aspect of tourism. The letter continues:

2. The economic advantages of a casino would be off-set by losses to existing tourist facilities and by the increased cost of surveillance and social welfare that would have to be met out of State revenue.

I must agree with that. The letter continues:

3. Casinos in other places have encouraged various forms of criminal and illegal activities.

This is so in other parts of the world, particularly in America. However, so far it does not apply in Australia as far as we know, although in regard to corporate crime one never knows who is behind what; in the buying and selling of shares one does not know who or what is involved. What is more, it is impossible to find out. The letter from the Churches of Christ further states:

4. A casino would introduce instant or impulse gambling (short-term games continuously available) and further exploit the compulsive gambler and the disadvantaged, who cannot afford to gamble, but keep trying to win a fortune that remains elusive for most of them.

The writer goes on to add to that argument. Further, I received a letter from the Uniting Church in Australia which expounds why it is opposed to a casino and which to some extent scolds the new Minister of Agriculture (Hon. F.T. Blevins) in the Upper House for introducing the Bill.

It takes him on a number of matters in relation to his speech, which I believe is quite right. It was suggested that the first benefit would come from the construction phase. However, nowhere in the Bill is it required that a casino will require a construction phase. It is essentially entirely possible that the premises with respect to which the licence might be granted are existing premises. Of course, that is quite true. I should imagine that one of the organisations to throw its hat into the ring would be the Hilton; no doubt another organisation would be the one across the road. The building of a casino does not come into it, because there is no guarantee that that will happen. I will not deal with the other points mentioned. I am sure my colleagues have received similar letters and will refer to them. I understand that my friend and colleague, the member for Morphett, will refer to that letter.

I received another letter from a resident of Brighton who also voiced opposition. The gentleman said that he opposes the casino Bill and that he was glad that I have opposed on the first, second and third times it has been introduced into Parliament. He has asked me to continue that opposition and says that he is very concerned about casinos and their effects on members of the community.

I turn now to some parts of the evidence that was presented to the committee, as it is important to people who have not taken the trouble or who have not had the opportunity of making themselves familiar with it. I will not deal with all the evidence; that would be impossible. At page 89 of the evidence the witness was Dr Margaret Claire Fereday, from Goodwood. Asked whether she would like to make some statement before giving evidence, She said:

While I am here as a child psychiatrist, I am also here as a general psychiatrist in that I have done adult training and worked with adults among whom there have been gamblers. Last night I was reading the latest information from the psychiatric world in a way of a text book that gives the most recent statistics (1980) from the United States. There is vast evidence in there of compulsive gambling and the severity of it. There has been an increase in legalised gambling of 400 per cent in the last decade.

That was the situation in America. She went on to say:

With the increase of legalisation of any sort of gambling, particularly with a casino, I believe that we are going to have many more psychiatric problems on our hands as a result. My particular interest is that while the whole population will be affected by such gambling, the people at the end of the line are the children, and the children not only have the embarrassment of having a parent who gambles socially but they also have the terrible hardship

when there is a compulsive gambler in the house, both from the actual loss of finance and also from the severe constraint it puts on the marital relationships.

I see children in Whyalla now (I go there four days a month) who have mild effects secondary to gambling, so the poorer elements of the population have a flutter. The children then say, 'We could not go to such-and-such because Dad lost at the races' or 'Mum spent a night at the bingo, so we cannot go out on the weekend.' That is a thing that children have to put up with. With compulsive gambling the effects are very dire; I believe with the increase in the legalisation of gambling, especially with a casino, that there will be more hardships for children.

The Chairman asked:

What leads you to the statement that casinos *per se*, as opposed to other forms of gambling and investment, horse racing and the like, are more likely to bring forward a compulsive gambler?

Dr Fereday replied:

I think that casinos and horse racing are similar in as much as there is action. There are things that appeal to a compulsive gambler; it is rather different from having to send money away to a lottery or something like that. That is more for the person who makes a big lot of money easily; that is not what a compulsive gambler goes for. He is seen at the dog races, horse races or casinos and uses one-armed bandits. Anything involving action and quickness appeals to a compulsive gambler.

The committee, when it visited the casinos, noticed that people who indulged in compulsive gambling were there all the time. The atmosphere urged them on—the situation, the smoke, the dull lights, the machines, the beautiful decorations, the lush carpets and the lighting all made them feel that they wanted to gamble. The Chairman asked:

They can see an immediate return or otherwise on their investment?

The witness answered:

Compulsive gambling is not only about making money; it is a way of life. It is something that completely involves one to the exclusion of relationships, and it is hoped that it is a way of making money, but one does not make money in the long run.

The Chairman asked:

Is there a comparison between a compulsive gambler and an alcoholic?

The witness replied:

Again, I refer to the book. Interestingly, it is said that there were few chronic alcoholics who were compulsive gamblers. The people who perhaps drink heavily and gamble heavily may be of some other mould, like an anti-social person rather than a compulsive gambler, who is quite different from those people.

When asked whether it was a form of addiction, Dr Fereday said:

Yes. Several writers have drawn attention to the fact that they see it to be like drug dependency: one continues to do it for its own sake and not just for making money.

I asked Dr Fereday, as I was interested in the family situation in relation to gambling:

In saying that you have seen the effects of compulsive gamblers on families, are you relating to younger children?

She said:

Not compulsive gamblers—these are people who have gambled but who were not compulsive. They would be children of primary school age. This would come out as part of the psychiatric treatment. They may say that they could not go away at Easter because dad had lost at the races or that mum had had a heavy night at bingo and so they had sausages for dinner the next night.

That is a sad story from a professional person who deals with this situation all the time. I asked whether she agreed that legislation should be there to keep out people under 18 years and asked how she would police it. This is a situation that really concerns me: how does one police young people in casinos? One cannot. One cannot tell the difference between a 16-year old, a 17-year-old or even a 20-year-old; they all look about the same age. It is impossible to police it. Indeed, I said, 'How would one police it?' The answer was:

My idea is that we would be better off without a casino and that, if a casino were seen as a must for tourism, perhaps only

interstate or overseas people should be admitted. That is my personal view. Perhaps I am too strict in my ideas.

From memory, I think that the member for Fisher made some statement about that being the case in Austria. The Chairman then asked:

If Parliament passed this Bill, how should this provision be policed? Have you any suggestion?

The doctor replied:

Not really. It is hard to police controls in regard to alcohol and entry to cinemas. Unless adolescents take their birth certificates with them, I do not know how it would be policed.

Of course, it is impossible to police it. Indeed, the only way to police that sort of thing correctly is to have identity cards or drivers licences with photographs on them; otherwise someone could produce anybody's licence and say anything. The only solution is an identity card or a licence with a photograph, and I believe that that should happen.

Mr Evans: They have that in Europe.

Mr MATHWIN: Of course. Identity cards are in use in most countries, and there is nothing wrong with that. I do not mind carrying an identity card.

Mr Evans: It's a membership to your club.

Mr MATHWIN: That is right. If one wants to travel abroad one must have a passport. Who objects to having a passport? If one wants to visit another country, one has to have a passport with a photograph in it. There is nothing wrong with that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is finding some difficulty in linking up the question of passports and the casino. I hope that the honourable member can link the remarks that he is now making with the Bill.

Mr MATHWIN: I was trying to relate that in some casinos abroad one has to produce some identification. I would imagine (and, no doubt, the member for Fisher will point this out when he speaks on this Bill) that one has to have identification to prove that one is a tourist.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MATHWIN: Getting back to the evidence, the member for Gilles said:

Do you agree that gambling can be a release for some people and that it can help some people?

The answer given by Dr Fereday was:

That is a loaded question. You are inviting me to agree with everything you have said. Of course, gambling is a form of enjoyment for many people. In many cases, social gambling is harmless. I do not agree that there would be few compulsive gamblers as a result of more legalised gambling, because the opposite situation has been suggested. With increased gambling there is an increase in the number of compulsive gamblers.

There was nothing half-way about that answer from the doctor. She was quite firm on that point. The Chairman asked:

You said that a compulsive gambler usually identified with another member of his family who is also a compulsive gambler. Does that mean that they will be compulsive gamblers anyway whether or not there is a casino?

Dr Fereday answered:

Perhaps I am saying two different things. One way for a person to become a compulsive gambler is for a child, particularly an adolescent, to identify with his father who is a compulsive gambler. The moment that legalised gambling is increased compulsive gambling becomes more prevalent.

There are no half measures about that. That person deals with this problem all the time, so one must think about that. I remind the House that this is a conscience vote: so members must let their consciences work a bit.

Mr Glazbrook, a member of this committee, was a person who thought that a casino was a good idea; he was steeped in tourism and he had not really learned the lesson. Nevertheless, he was an asset to the committee. He was fair in

his questioning and, indeed, helped me a number of times when I had run out of words.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Did you need help?

Mr MATHWIN: At times I did. Mr Glazbrook asked:

How can you assume that what has happened in the United States can occur in Australia, particularly when different forms of legislation in this country is coming from different legislators to control different forms of gambling?

The answer was:

It has been proven that more legalisation creates more opportunity and results in more strife.

That is what the lady said on page 94 of the evidence. Mr Glazbrook said:

What if there is more control?

The answer was:

It is still providing an opportunity that did not previously exist.

I ask members to think about this, because it is very important that they realise that this is the evidence of a professional person who is dealing with these problems all the time. On page 96, Mr Glazbrook asked:

With the introduction of other forms of entertainment, have any of your associates come across acute cases of compulsion amongst people who buy lottery tickets to the extent of their resources?

The answer was:

Compulsive gambling is not seen in regard to lottery tickets. A little foolishness may be seen but compulsion is associated with quick action such as the noise of the roulette wheel or ringing the bookie and chasing money. It is something vastly different from lotteries. You must plan ahead and put aside \$1 a week.

Therefore, there is no connection between the two in relation to compulsive gambling. A further question was asked:

Have you been to any casinos in the US or Europe?

The answer was:

I have only been to Monte Carlo and my impressions are very small as it was some years ago. I have also been to Alice Springs. I saw a compulsive gambler go through his pay cheque for the week.

The Chairman then asked:

Would you like to describe that for us?

Dr Fereday said:

The man was of Yugoslavian origin. It was Sunday night and he had come in from some place afield. He asked if he could cash his pay cheque. He took \$240 and bought the chips and proceeded to tell the whole table that lady luck was on his side, that he knew where to bet and how to do it. He said that he would win the bank. He went through all the money in 20 minutes. I had visions of a wife and children sitting home waiting for the housekeeping money. He was very sour and very angry when he lost it all. He went away and somebody shouted him a beer. He got through the lot in grandiose style.

That is the situation in relation to these casinos. The question was then put:

What was the amount of the chips?

The answer was:

It was about \$20 and he was using three or four at a time. One sees that at Wrest Point or anywhere else.

I agree with that. At these casinos it is quite a different situation when one is betting on the table, on baccarat, cards and blackjack. It is quite different to put one's money down and see it disappear. Chips do not really mean much. It is like playing with matches until one counts up the points at the end of the night. One puts down \$5 worth of chips; some tables have a minimum of \$5. One throws down the chips, and \$5 is gone as quickly as one can draw breath. The birds fly over the cards very quickly. People do not realise that they are playing for money, and it is only when they tot up that they realise they have lost so much. The member for Gilles asked Dr Fereday:

Of course, there are various forms of gambling. I am interested in your definition of 'gambling', because there are some acceptable forms in society and some not so acceptable. One of those forms which comes to my mind is speculation in business, for example,

the Stock Exchange and so on, which is a form of gambling. Would you regard that as a form of gambling?

The answer was:

I think we all have our own personal mores and conscience on different matters. I do not see this inquiry as really covering that sort of thing. I do not think it is so important what my views are on what I like or dislike, but rather I am more concerned about the establishment of a casino and the legalised gambling in such a casino in South Australia. That is something different from the question of a Stock Exchange. I think one could rationalise that life is a gamble and that everything we do is a gamble.

I refer now to page 192 of the evidence. The Deputy Director of Tourism in Tasmania, Mr P.B. Oldfield, gave evidence to the committee. I asked:

When the casino opened in 1973, it was the only one in Australia.

Mr Oldfield answered, 'Yes', and I asked:

You had a big advantage in relation to relating the casino to tourism. There would possibly be one in most of the other States; that potential as a tourist attraction will be far less than it was in 1973?

The answer was:

True. It is diminishing in importance. Still, it is a landmark of the place.

Thus, the Deputy Director of Tourism in Tasmania admitted that the casino was not the great tourist attraction that it had been when it was first built. The committee took information and evidence in Tasmania, and some of the saddest evidence was given by two members of Gamblers Anonymous, Mr Stone and Garth (that was the only name we were given). Garth told us a sorry story of the problems he faced in his life and how his problem had affected not only him but also his family. The Chairman of the committee introduced Garth to other members and asked whether he would like to make a statement. The Chairman also stated that one of the main reasons for the committee's visiting Tasmania was to talk to Garth. Garth stated:

I am using the name Garth only for the sake of anonymity, because I am acting on behalf of Gamblers Anonymous, of which I am secretary. My involvement with gambling goes back to the Second World War when I was about 18 years old, about 40 years ago. This does not affect me at work, but actually assists me with my work with alcoholics and compulsive gamblers. I have appeared on television anonymously in New Zealand and Queensland to get our message across, which does strain the anonymity a bit.

We are not wowsers, anti-casino, or anti-gambling. We are similar to Alcoholics Anonymous, which does not want to see all the hotels closed. The main aim of our organisation is to assist the compulsive gambler in the community, who has a continuing problem of financial, family and criminal activities. The main thing G.A. is trying to get across to the community is that it recognises...

He went on to say that the oldest member of the organisation had had 127 finance company loans. That is amazing. That person was in dire straits: he had had 127 loans, and five of them were outstanding at one time. Thus, he robbed Peter to pay Paul. Garth referred to an invalid pensioner who was mentally affected. What a situation to be in! It is unreal to us that a person could be running five loans and in his lifetime could have had 127 loans. One can see what can happen if one looks at some of the evidence given by a person who was involved in trying to retrieve money in the United Kingdom. One can see what tactics are used in some areas to retrieve money. At page 195 of the evidence, Garth further stated:

We have more compulsive gamblers coming to us all the time. One who is coming tomorrow is married and has three children. He is under financial stress and is bringing his wife with him. This is fairly common. There have been marital break-ups caused by gambling and financial problems, such as bankruptcy. We are not anti-casino or anti-T.A.B. I have spoken to people in Queensland and there is no doubt that the casino will go ahead. Also, the Alice Springs and Darwin casinos will go ahead. For 98 per cent of people they are no problem, but for about 2 per cent there is a problem and for about 0.8 per cent a continuing problem. The casino was, to me, instant gambling, like instant coffee. I have not gambled now for 2½ years since I joined G.A.

I had had a gambling background of 40 years. My wife worked for over 30 years to bail me out. The children probably suffered somewhat, because they could have had more than they had. One was killed in an accident. I could not get out of this problem until I joined G.A. I had borrowed extensively. I am still paying off debts, and will be until I finish working. At one time, I held three jobs. I was working in a clerical situation during the day and driving a taxi at night until 4 a.m. and I was working as a bookmaker's clerk at the weekend. I never saw any pay. I actually paid him for the privilege of working.

The member for Playford asked:

Instead of him paying you wages, he was deducting what you owed him?

The answer was:

No. If the pay was \$20 for the day, I would say, 'Give me my \$20. I want \$10 on that, or \$20 on that.' When the casino commenced, I gravitated down there, because I had friends who had made computer runs. We had all sorts of systems. It was a terrific game and a challenge. I probably thought that I was smarter than the average. I used to attend the casino in the lunch hour, after work and before I picked up my wife, and if the urge was strong enough, and if I still had money, I would have a row.

The Chairman asked:

Did you find that you gambled more on the casino than you did on the racecourse?

The answer was:

Yes, because the opportunity was there. I have sat down and played black jack for 14 hours straight—from the time the casino opened until it closed. That would not be an uncommon occurrence for many gamblers.

At page 196 of the evidence, the Chairman asked the following question and received the following reply:

With compulsive gambling, one of the points we would like to get to is whether the advent of a casino would increase the number of compulsive gamblers in the community, or do they switch part of their gambling activities from one sphere to another?—From experience, and as a gambler, you know the habits and experiences of other gamblers. The casino is an attraction. I would have liked to see Cleo Laine, but I did not like the risk of going into the casino to get to the entertainment area.

The witness was saying that one must go through the casino to get to the entertainment area. That is bad in principle. The evidence continues:

The CHAIRMAN: The entertainment section of the complex should be entirely separate?—(GARTH) Yes, similar to in the U.K.

As an organisation, you are not anti-casino?—No. Mr Holdgate was intending to fund a sociological report by the T.C.A. and the university into compulsive gambling in Tasmania, but nothing has been done. Your State could look at the effects of gambling. Something should be done to alleviate the problem—something like the John Edis Hospital, to include compulsive gamblers.

As I was saying before the dinner adjournment whether or not this Bill is passed an organisation should be set up to gather statistical evidence relating to gambling in general and compulsive gambling in particular. If possible, it should be set up as a national body. It is imperative that this information be gathered and compiled. If it cannot be done on a national basis because one or more of the States do not agree to it, then South Australia should set up such a body to compile statistics and investigate gambling generally and especially compulsive gambling. The evidence continues:

If a casino come to S.A., the Government should see that certain things occur?—We have no opinion. Our board of trustees would be annoyed if I gave an opinion on certain matters.

You would like to see an investigation into compulsive gambling?—Yes.

Any other things to do with the casino itself?—The need will be seen for assistance to compulsive gamblers. It might assist the T.A.B. It is treated as a medical problem, the same as for alcoholism.

Members should note that this evidence comes from a person who has been a compulsive gambler and a member of Gamblers Anonymous in Tasmania. The evidence continues:

Mr McRAE: You made two practical suggestions to minimise social problems in relation to compulsive gamblers if a casino is introduced into South Australia. Have you any other suggestions?—(GARTH) You have a branch of Gamblers Anonymous in Adelaide which could probably assist with regard to any inquiries that might further assist you in your investigations.

Would you consider that a levy ought to be struck on the casino, or a fund of some sort established, to provide adequate medical or other attention to people who are afflicted by this problem?—Gamblers Anonymous will not accept donations from anyone. I think it is an excellent idea. Perhaps even 0.1 of a per cent could be directed towards not just research, which is not getting at the root of the problem, but to the establishment of a number of in-patient beds at hospitals that deal with alcoholism, or something of that nature because, irrespective of the casino or not, you will have compulsive gamblers. A casino might exacerbate the numbers, but that would be an excellent idea.

Mr McRAE: Is there any other practical measure that we could adopt? Can you think of anything else that we could or should be doing?—(GARTH) I have spoken with casino management. It is difficult to interfere with the private activities of a person, unless he contravenes the casino or racing regulations. They are well aware, because of emotional stress, that people are in trauma. It is similar to areas of welfare—you cannot interfere. Despite the fact that we have 650 employees at the casino, it would be interesting to know how many people are affected by gambling, and whether one thing is offsetting the other, because of problems on the welfare side. The compulsive gambler is entirely different from the social or professional gambler, and can be assisted. He cannot be cured, but his addiction can be arrested.

That is a crucial part of the evidence of this witness. As a member of the committee, I then asked some questions, and the evidence states:

Compulsive gamblers are from any particular salary bracket? . . . No. We have had members who have been submanagers, vitally down to the stage of the labourer. Mostly they are in their 30s. Most of their wives work, because most of them have families, and the husband's earnings have to be supplemented. The wife might also be addicted, but there is no general pattern.

Then a further question was asked, and the evidence is as follows:

Do you think that young people are latched onto gambling? . . . There is the glamour of gambling. Not many young people attend racing in Tasmania. The problem lies mostly with the older person.

The Chairman then asked the following questions of Garth:

We have had evidence from a psychiatrist that compulsive gambling in young people comes from their family background? . . . It may be from a broken background. If there has been a family history of compulsive gambling, it may well follow, but there was none in my family.

Does the advent of a casino alter that situation or not? . . . We have no statistics on that. Our youngest member at present is 21. He attended university for 1½ years, lost his tertiary allowance, and was going to the casino. He has done 1½ years of nursing, and is progressing well.

I then asked a question which, together with the reply, was as follows:

Obviously, the effects of husband and wife gambling must affect the children. They would not get the right food and clothing. Are they the main effects on a young family? . . . Yes. Generally, that occurs in quite a few cases where the wife, in most cases, rebels and there is a family break-up; then, it becomes a welfare problem.

He is saying that it becomes a drain on the State, on the taxpayer, and then it becomes a problem for the particular Minister. In our case in this State it then becomes a problem for the Minister of Community Welfare, who would have to find more finance for this area. I then asked further questions, and the evidence states:

This is a difficult area to police? . . . Yes. Most of our compulsive gamblers started gambling at 13 or 14 years of age, perhaps with T.A.B., by having someone put on a bet.

Your personal opinion is that you do not mind casinos, or would you rather that we did not have them? . . . (GARTH) A casino for me is dynamite.

This was a person who was a compulsive gambler, a person who could not help himself and who was put in a situation where he nearly lost his wife and family through his gambling. His answer (followed by a further question and answer) continued:

I will not be returning to the casino. That is my problem, but for possibly 98 per cent of the people it is no problem. As a non-practising gambler, I would not attend a casino, because of my addiction. It would bring a renewed problem into my life.

You do not care whether there is a casino or not? . . . (GARTH) I have always been involved in welfare work and I feel extremely sorry for people like myself who have problems with gambling, whether the casino, T.A.B. or whatever. It is a most unproductive part of our lifestyle. I would rather plant a patch of lettuces. My comments are not religious ones, but if I had the right to make a decision I would say it would be better not to have a casino. I think the energy diverted into gambling in my life could have been better diverted, and now is being diverted into the pursuit of trying to help other people. I do this in my job eight hours a day and in my spare time.

The Chairman then asked questions of the second witness from Gamblers Anonymous, a Mr Stone, and the evidence is as follows:

Mr Stone, to help the committee it would be good if you could put on record now the statistical basis of gambling in Tasmania as you are aware of it and elsewhere in Australia, if you have those figures, so that members of the committee can use that information in their questioning? . . . (MR STONE) First, I will speak professionally from my job. There are no statistics. The best information you can get on gambling as a whole comes from two reports, the 1975 Morin Commission Report into the national attitude towards gambling in the United States—

as I explained before, that is the best report in the world on gambling—

and the 1978 Royal Commission into Gambling, the Lord Rothschild Commission, in the United Kingdom.

No doubt some members would have read that report. The witness went on to say:

It is interesting to note the number of women going to the casino because it is associated with glamour, women who might otherwise go the T.A.B. They are women from the housing estates, the women with slippers with pom poms on them or their hair in curlers. From my discussions around the State, I think that it was never intended by the Racing and Gambling Commission that this type of clientele would patronise the casino as it has caused a bit of worry in the racing industry.

Mr Stone then added:

The experience of the Morin Commission in America and the Rothschild Commission can be drawn upon. Already the population survey group of the Bureau of Statistics has looked at the possibility of running a nationwide survey. There is no nationwide survey plan because the States of Australia have not got their act together in pressuring the Bureau of Statistics to raise the priority of this matter.

That gives a hint of what we ought to do about this important matter of statistics. He made quite clear that there is no nation-wide survey. The information he provided and also the Morin Report in America make quite clear that it is imperative that statistics be kept. As I said earlier, it is very important for this Parliament, as well as the State, whether or not this Bill is passed, that statistics be compiled.

I now deal with some of the questions asked by one of the other members of the committee, Mr Peterson, who showed a very good understanding of the matter in his questioning. The following includes a question he asked, followed by the reply:

We must consider the individual in our considerations. The establishment of a casino could put only a few more people at risk? . . . In total number, yes. I cannot quantify what they will cost your State in prison facilities and broken marriages, but I suggest that you get enough out of gambling to pay for these things.

That is a very wide statement, because obviously the gentleman does not know that, if someone has to be imprisoned, a prison has to be built, because most prisons are full. An adult prisoner involves a cost of \$60 000 to \$70 000 a year. The evidence continues:

There always were, and always will be, gamblers. The best you can do is to protect them by providing the best rehabilitation. You cannot stop a compulsive gambler from gambling? . . . (GARTH) You can have a programme to assist people who cannot handle themselves. (MR STONE) The Americans said, 'Don't put your casino in a built-up area that is accessible

to the blue-collar workers,' but we have done that. 'Don't put your casino so that it is almost incorporated into the campus of a university.' I hope that you do not put one in the middle of the University of Adelaide—

The Launceston casino is only a matter of yards from the university—

Advertising is done by way of the cabaret, and people go through the gambling room to get to the cabaret. The casino is post-graduate institute for gamblers. It channels gamblers there who have problems; it is a wonderful opportunity to nab them. We asked for a notice to put on the back of toilet doors in the casino, 'If gambling is creating problems in your life, contact Gamblers Anonymous (G.A.) by telephoning Lifeline 345 600.'

I understand that the posting of this notice was refused by the casino management. Mr Peterson then asked whether Gamblers Anonymous existed before the casino was built, to which Garth replied:

Yes. I think that G.A. grew from about the year the casino started. G.A. was in the U.S. in 1967, in Victoria in 1968, and in Hobart in 1974.

Mr Peterson then asked:

I spoke to a member of the Adelaide group. I said, 'What difference would a casino make to compulsive gamblers?' He said, 'It will make no difference. A compulsive gambler will find a way to gamble, no matter what you do.'

Garth replied:

You are widening the range with housewives and young people. We know the problem will exacerbate with any type of gambling. We have a lot of T.A.B. betting at the moment. Everybody is being educated not in the three Rs but in how to gamble on the T.A.B. It is advertised three or four times an hour, almost. I think that with anything we have to look for the anti-venom, we cannot eradicate this snake.

Mr Peterson then asked:

We have currently in Australia lotteries, race horses and poker machines. All of them seem to be in trouble and are advertising?

Garth replied:

Bingo is leading a lot of housewives into the casino.

Of course, the Hobart casino has facilities for a game similar to bingo. Garth added:

Bingo can be seen to be a church or Parents and Friends Association fund-raising thing. However, although people are going along to give money, in the back of their minds, if they are compulsive gamblers, they are going along to win something.

Mr Rodda (member for Victoria) then asked a question which, together with Garth's reply, is as follows:

When you gambled, did you have any goal in sight? . . . I think at times the compulsive gambler hopes to win a certain amount. I did start off winning, say, \$20. I might take \$200, or \$500 with me to win \$20. To any smart mathematician, as I thought I was, the odds were my way. There were various systems being worked out by experts including computer experts. There was no entity that could beat me. It goes on from that point in time. You then do not win that \$20. I had worked up to about \$500 at \$20 a time. I then decided I could increase my winnings to \$30. Then I was losing something like \$50, and I can remember this quite plainly; I got my money back, counted it, found I was down \$20, went back to the table and lost the \$480.

In response to this Mr Rodda asked, 'That was your money?', to which Garth replied:

That was casino money. You think, 'This is my money' and it was in my pocket. The addict or the person lacking intelligence goes to regain that money. So I went more and more and I would borrow money or take it out of the bank, if I had the money in my wife's bank account. Now I get the money and deposit it in the cheque account from which I cannot take it out without her signing for it. My wife has retired in the past couple of years after working for 30 years. Finally, you start to chase, which is the problem with a compulsive gambler. After I had borrowed several thousand dollars I would have been happy to get half square.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MATHWIN: Garth's answer continued:

I borrowed \$500, a \$1 000 or \$2 000 at a time. It is difficult to understand, yet I cannot understand alcoholics.

Mr Rodda further questioned the witnesses about this matter. Mr Slater then asked a number of questions (page 206 of

the evidence). He asked, 'Are there known personality traits associated with all compulsive gamblers?', to which Garth replied:

It is similar to alcoholism. It is regarded now as a medical problem. The investigations into this field show that some people have a weakness for gambling.

Mr Rodda then asked:

Is there likely to be a previous history in the individual of some underlying factor that indicates some emotional insecurity which feeds on the gambling habit?

Mr Stone replied:

They have not come up with a conclusive answer.

Mr Slater's next question and the replies from the witnesses were as follows:

'Compulsion' is difficult to define. There are compulsions in all of us in different ways. Is it likely that compulsive gamblers may also, if not addicted to gambling, have become addicted to some other form of gambling? (STONE) Not necessarily. The problem is to find the underlying factor. (GARTH) One of the things you find is that he is not an alcoholic. He will not spend money on alcohol, because he needs it for gambling.

This is a sorry story, indeed, Mr Speaker, as you well know. Another question was put to Garth as follows:

Did you have a long association with other forms of gambling previously?

He replied:

Yes. In 1939 I was gambling on crown and anchor; that was my commencement.

The SPEAKER: Order! I want to make a very brief comment from the Chair before allowing the honourable gentleman to continue with his remarks: he must not associate me with any selected parts of the report. I anticipate that the view which was jointly expressed by myself and the member for Torrens will be expressed by the member for Torrens, and I will reserve the right to criticise in due course. The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr MATHWIN: It would not be my intention to embarrass the Chair or any member of the committee—that would be the last thing I would want to do. In regard to the evidence, the former member for Brighton (Mr Glazbrook) then asked a question as follows:

Usually with compulsive drinkers there are recognisable traits?

Mr Stone replied:

Physically, no. Their wives, aunts, employers, and workmates know that they are compulsive gamblers.

Further questions were directed to Mr Stone, who is employed by Gamblers Anonymous in Tasmania. A question asked of Mr Stone and his reply are as follows:

You also mentioned, Mr Stone, the connection between alcohol and gambling. You said there was a possibility of these going together. I wondered whether the compulsive gambler's problem was compounded by the effect of alcohol on his social conscience and that if he becomes more relaxed by alcohol his judgment is impaired so that he bets more?—What would happen in my case, and with others I know of, is that the compulsive gambler is generally not an alcoholic. He may have a few drinks before he goes to the casino. The reason for that is that the compulsive gambler will not spend money on alcohol because it represents units of betting.

Therefore, it is pretty obvious that as far as Mr Stone was concerned it was the gamblers who were spending the money on gambling on the tables, and the like, and that they wanted the facility strictly for that purpose. A minister of religion was called to give evidence to the committee (page 209 of the evidence).

He said that he was involved previously in organised crime in the casinos in the United Kingdom. He was the heavy man or the enforcer, the man that got the money that was owed. He came in and gave evidence to the committee and I will select passages of his evidence to portray the situation. We know that the situation in the United Kingdom is different and we are not going to copy that,

but we ought to take some notice of some of the matters that he mentioned. In answer to the Chairman's invitation to make a statement he said:

I am here to share my concern about the possibility of granting a casino licence or licences in South Australia. What I have to share with you is not hearsay, but first-hand experience and knowledge of my past life before I became a Christian and ended up as a minister of religion. My previous life in England was involved in organised crime; that is, safe-breaking, wage snatching, and gang warfare, and especially for this morning's interest, my involvement in gambling casinos, or, as they were known in England in the 1960s, gambling clubs. I am here specifically in that area of my previous life to share with you my experience on a number of points. I will be speaking on four different points: first, the organised crime behind gambling and casinos in England; secondly, the unorganised crime that went along with the casinos; thirdly, spontaneous crime; and fourthly, the social effect.

He goes on to state his case in relation to those matters over a number of pages which I would recommend as compulsory reading for some members because it is a rather shocking and frightening account of what happened to that person. He was talking about the people that got into debt and did not pay and how he and his heavies were used to getting that money.

I asked a question when he was talking about the debts that had to be collected. On page 216 of the evidence I said:

What type of debts are you talking about? Are you talking about large debts?

He said:

I am talking about any debts, whether large or small. Once it has been incurred on the tables it is collected and it is collected according to the amount of muscle one puts on the person. Usually the heavier debts are the ones you have to muscle for because they are harder to find. If a person is owing \$500, that type of money is easy to raise and hand over; however, when you are dealing with \$50 000, that is a lot harder to find and the heavies have to put more muscle on. By the way, I was one of these. It was one of my jobs in the area of collecting.

I then asked:

The people that ran the businesses and who saw that these people were getting into debt and would not ease off, would not they ban them from the clubs?

He answered:

The gambling structure is set up to draw as many people as possible and to obtain as much as possible out of those people. Organised crime will give the patron as many doors as possible through which to lose that money.

That was the statement from this person who had been directly involved in this area of crime.

I now move to a very short explanation in relation to some of the information the committee collected from Mr Graham Inns who, as members well know, is the tourism chief in South Australia. The committee asked for information in relation to trends of visitor arrivals in Tasmania during the 1970s because some members were very interested in the promise of so many visitors to Tasmania as the result of the erection of a casino. To me, that never rang true. I knew in my own mind that it was a fallacy. It was a certain attraction but certainly not in the area or not in the way that they tried to convey to us. We asked to be given statistical information on visitor arrivals and I will now relate those statistics regarding Tasmania. From 1968-1969, and 1969-1970 it increased by 8.5 per cent; in 1970-1971, 9.3 per cent; 1971-1972, 0.9 per cent; 1972-1973, 17 per cent; 1973-1974, 27 per cent; 1974-1975 it fell to minus 1 per cent; 1975-1976, to minus 3 per cent; 1976-1977, to minus 5.3 per cent; 1977-1978 it increased 5.4 per cent; 1978-1979, 3.7 per cent; 1979-1980, 3.3 per cent; 1980-1981, 0.1 per cent. For people to say that those visitors went to Tasmania merely to play the tables I think is a load of cods wallop.

I turn now to the area in which the National Council of Women gave evidence to the committee. On page 279 of the evidence there was an oral submission from the President

of the National Council of Women (Mrs McCarter), Mrs Hartley, Mrs Morrell, Mrs Womersley, Mrs Swift, and Mrs Hyder, who were all members of the executive committee of that organisation. These ladies gave a lot of evidence. On page 280 of the evidence they stated:

We represent the National Council of Women, an organisation made up of affiliated women's groups in the community. We currently represent 76 affiliated organisations and about 220 associate members. They are ladies who joined the council in their own rights. You will gather from those figures that we represent a wide cross-section of women, women's interests in this State. The aims of our organisation are based on the interests of women and the family. From these aims we find it very difficult to see how a casino would benefit women and children. We have already sent letters to all members of Parliament in which we pointed out there were three main points against the casino: the first was that we felt that there were enough gambling facilities in South Australia at present; the second was that we believed that the establishment of a casino would be of no advantage to tourism; and the third was we are sceptical about the policing of the casino—

I certainly share that view, particularly in the area of juveniles. They went on to say:

We have a very poor track record as regards violent crime in this State at present—

Of course our State is not as bad as some of the other States. They continued:

Not nearly enough research has gone into the social impact of a casino. We have written to the Tasmanian and Northern Territory Governments and we have gathered up considerable evidence from these areas on the impacts of the establishment of a casino in those States. Australians are known to be the heaviest gamblers in the world and according to 'Choice' in July 1979, Australians spent \$710 per capita compared with the U.S.A. \$440 per capita and the United Kingdom of \$95.

There is a great deal of difference there. The evidence continues as follows:

Such large-scale gambling diverts resources from productive to non-productive fields. We therefore feel that we need less, not more, gambling in our community. Legal casinos would only aggravate a serious problem, and should be rejected. Casinos, more than any other form of gambling, it seems, encourage the compulsive gambler. We have had difficulty in getting exact figures, but I quote Stewart Cockburn as saying that, in Sydney, there are said to be 50 000 compulsive gamblers, which probably means that there are at least 5 000 in Adelaide, but that is difficult to substantiate.

That was the evidence from these ladies who, as I said earlier, represent a great deal of the women and families within the community. They were very concerned right through the evidence that they gave to the committee (and I will not proceed much further with that) and they make it quite clear that, as an organisation representing people all of whom they had contacted, they are not, indeed, in favour of the building of a casino in South Australia. Mrs Womersley went on to say, in part:

I would like to refer now to on-course betting. From 1977 to 1980, through bookmakers and on-course totalizators, we have seen an investment of nearly \$600 000 000. Nearly \$10 000 000 has been paid to consolidated revenue and \$285 000 has been paid to the Hospitals Fund from unclaimed dividends. No wonder the Government looks to another such money spinner like the casino to bring in more money from gambling. However, we would question whether this is going to be the case. The economic climate has already had an effect on the racing income. So, how much new money will be gained from the casino? We note that Kevin Nagle of the Tasmanian Tourist Council states that, 'The casino in Tasmania depends upon the local population to provide a nightly clientele'—

That is what I said earlier and that is what I now reiterate: indeed, they depend on local clientele. The witness went on to say:

What will be the hidden costs to the Government and to South Australians as a whole?

Of course, we know what the situation will be if it runs into trouble. She goes on to say:

Of course, this is not in the glossy reports that we have received from Federal Hotel Holdings, the present owners of the Tasmanian

casino. I would like to know what the cost of policing the casino regulations will be. I would like to know what will be the extra cost of criminal and petty offences. What is going to be the cost of the extra social services that we might be called upon to provide?

Indeed, that is a reality. She continues:

I would like to know if the profits will mainly go out of the State and if the owners will be from interstate and whether big name entertainers are going to be used.

So, as I said, the evidence gathered and gleaned from these people was quite enlightening as far as we were concerned. We were talking to people who were concerned about women, children and families who get into trouble with this sort of operation.

The actual situation in relation to the explanation of the Bill was pretty well glossed over. However, there are two more passages of evidence that I would like to quote to the Parliament. We talked about the worry of organised crime and we, as committee members, found that there was none of that in the present situation in regard to casinos, as far as we knew it. We also gleaned that it was a difficult area about which to worry. When one gets to corporate crime, the situation of shares and the like, the big take-overs and so on, it is virtually impossible to know what is going on and to know who is who. I believe that there is no way that that can be legislated for and, although the surveillance can be kept, I think it is nearly an impossible task to keep that completely out.

I quote from the evidence given to the committee by the Women's Electoral Lobby, on page 648:

Our first concern was that no community needs study had been undertaken on this question. To this end we circularised all members of both Houses, and the Speaker in the House of Assembly concerning the question of a casino. The need to conduct a community needs study is based on the fact that the South Australian economy includes the allocation of money to many non-Government (or semi-Government) organisations on a funded basis. If in any way these funds were to be re-allocated to other sources and if those organisations were to go without in any way is a major concern of ours.

The Chairman then asked:

Which funds are you talking about?

The answer was:

I am talking about State Government funds of any sort which need to be re-allocated if the cost of a casino was to be laid on the State.

Of course, we know that that will not happen. The answer continues:

We begin our objections by saying we do not take a moral stand or raise objections to the ways which people spend their money. They may gamble on anything at all—that is their business. However, we do take a stand on the matter of the State spending public moneys for a gambling casino when, in fact, women's organisations will possibly be doing without in terms of needs of children, deprived families and deprived single women and the like.

Evidence was given over a period of time and it covered many pages. Finally, in quoting from the evidence gleaned by the committee, I merely point out that the evidence given by Mr Vibert on page 637 was in response to questions from the committee. The following appears on page 637:

I want to begin by making reference to articles which have appeared in the press recently which have linked your name with the alleged payment of money by you to political Parties in Queensland. It has been alleged in the *Australian* newspaper that you had on behalf of some organisation paid to the Australian Labor Party in that State the sum of \$30 000. Did you do that?—(Mr Vibert) Yes.

On whose behalf did you do that?—I made a donation to the Australian Labor Party a year after they made a public commitment at their national conference supporting poker machines. I arranged also for Ainsworth Consolidated to make a payment. It is also a fact that I made a payment to the National Party and to the Liberal Party in Queensland.

What amount did you pay to the Labor Party?—\$30 000.

On whose behalf did you pay that?—Personally, I made a payment of \$15 000 and Ainsworth made a payment of \$15 000.

The SPEAKER: Who asked the questions?

Mr MATHWIN: It was a Mr McRae. The questions and answers continue as follows:

What was your reason for doing that? It was very simple. The Australian Labor Party was the first Labor Party in Australia's political history to hold a full inquiry into the poker-machine issue and to make a public commitment in their election campaign that, if elected to office, they would legalise poker machines and support the club industry.

Are you saying that that \$15 000 came from your own pocket?—Yes.

What was your occupation at that time?—The same as it is now: public relations consultant and a poker-machine analyst, with my own business.

Were you then a shareholder in any poker-machine company?—No.

Were you a shareholder in any other company associated with poker machines or the club industry?—No.

You say that you paid money to the National Country Party in Queensland. What was the sum that you paid?—I am not prepared to release that information.

You have said that you paid money to the Liberal Party in Queensland. What was the sum that you paid?—I am not prepared to release that information.

Did you pay those sums on your own account or for other persons?—On my own account.

Have you made donations to political Parties in New South Wales?—Personally?

Yes?—No.

Have you made donations to political Parties in South Australia?—No.

I have dealt with the evidence that was given to the committee, and I refer now to the second reading explanation. It was stated:

...the history of the proposal shows that attempts were made by the Hon. D. Dunstan, the then Premier, in 1973, Mr Peterson (member for Semaphore) in 1981, and the Hon M.M. Wilson, the then Minister of Recreation and Sport, in 1982.

That related to the number of times casino legislation has been introduced into the Parliament. It was further stated:

I have no doubt that, if this Bill passes the Parliament, a casino licence will be issued and South Australia will have a new facility. The economic impact of this to South Australia will extend from the construction phase to the eventual generation of income, employment and revenue to the State.

We do not know that. It is quite possible, indeed probable, that, if this Bill is passed, an existing building would be used. The explanation continues:

It can be reasonably expected that during the construction phase, hundreds of workers could be employed on-site and many more off-site in supplying materials.

That is just guess work: we do not know that that will happen. Thus, we should take no notice of that. It was further stated:

Because the hospitality and entertainment industry is very labour intensive, it would reasonably be expected that several hundred staff would be employed in a casino complex when operational (Wrest Point, I believe, employs 600 and Alice Springs 200).

We must not forget (as the Minister did not add) that local money keeps a casino going. I understand that there is about 93 per cent local participation in Tasmania. The explanation further stated:

The tourist industry would obviously be the major beneficiary of a casino being established in this State. It has been clearly demonstrated interstate and overseas that a casino complex is an attraction by itself...

I believe that that is quite wrong. A casino is not a major tourist attraction. A casino might have been an attraction in places such as Monte Carlo in years gone by, because only a few casinos existed then, and they might have attracted millionaires. To say that people would go to Tasmania just to play the tables is absolute cuds wallop. It is rubbish. It was further stated:

It is impossible to calculate just how much profit would be generated by a casino for the sole use of the State.

That is a true remark if ever there was one. The Minister wanted to make a further point—he stated:

I want to make only one more point before concluding. There are many people who feel that investment capital spent on establishing a casino could be better spent on something else—building a school, a hospital, or something of that nature.

That could well be done. We are talking about big money. About \$40 000 000 was the cost of the casino at Darwin; the Alice Springs casino cost nearly \$30 000 000; the Hobart casino cost more than \$26 000 000 or \$27 000 000; and the figure for the Launceston casino was similar. That is big money. If one had that sort of money to invest, one would expect a very generous return. The second reading explanation further stated:

... I am sure that the majority of South Australians would agree that the case for a casino carries the most weight.

I wonder where the Minister got that idea. Obviously, he did not do his research or look at the material available, such as the Morin Report or the Rothschild Report. The Minister was well off the track: he was quite wrong. The Minister has no idea: I do not believe he ever intended to try to understand. He has been able to convince the Government that the Bill should be debated in Government time. I believe that this is the first time a private member's Bill has been brought on in Government time, when Government time is so precious.

This is really a Committee Bill, and I expect that the member for Hartley, who will deal with the Bill in this place (but who is not present now), will be able to answer questions. However, I refer now to clause 17, regarding 'Provision as to age,' which states:

No person under the age of 18 years shall be admitted to a licensed casino.

I want to know how that will be policed. Will it be policed in the same way as is the situation regarding young people viewing R-rated shows or drinking in hotels? Kids of 16 or 17 years are involved. How on earth will the provision operate? It is impossible. Perhaps I can give honourable members some idea: the only way in which that provision can be put into operation successfully is by the use of identity cards for all people. I do not mind having an identity card. On the other hand, a photograph of a person could be affixed to his driving licence. That is the only way in which this clause can be effective. What has the member for Hartley in mind in relation to clause 17(1)? Will he have that subclause amended to provide that a person under 18 years of age shall be admitted to a casino if he carries a driving licence with a photograph by which he can be recognised?

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not want to interrupt the honourable member or to cut short his speech, but I hope that he will not canvass a proposed amendment on second reading. I hope that he is dealing with the second reading so that, when amendments are moved in Committee, they can be dealt with in sequence.

Mr MATHWIN: I did not intend to refer to an amendment at this stage, Mr Speaker. I was only passing on the opinion that I believe that clause 17(1) will not work and that something must therefore be done about it. I defy anyone to tell the age of a young person, whether 16, 17 or 18 years of age. The only way to do so is by way of an identity card or a driving licence with an accompanying photograph. The National Council of Women has declared through the local press that it is against the establishment of a casino in this State. By now I suppose that members realise that I oppose the Bill. I will oppose it certainly on second reading and, if it passes second reading, I look forward to taking part in Committee.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens): I assure the House that I shall not try to—

The SPEAKER: Order! I also assure the House that the same warning given at the beginning of this debate still obtains, and the same list of offenders (not including the member for Torrens) is still before the Chair.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I am relieved to hear that, Mr Speaker, because I thought I was on the list.

The SPEAKER: Order! You were not.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I do not intend to emulate the example of the member for Glenelg. Indeed I do not have the time to do so, nor do I have the time to answer all the points he made, although I hope I will have the opportunity to refer to one or two of them later. The House is faced with an extraordinary situation consequent on the introduction of this Bill. On 31 March 1982 a Bill to establish a casino was introduced by me on behalf of the Tonkin Government in an effort to settle this issue once and for all. There was to be a conscience vote for all members. A select committee was set up to provide members of this House with a substantial report covering all aspects of casino gambling. The select committee did that job and eventually brought down its report in August 1982. That select committee had to work under difficult conditions indeed. Its report was regarded (and these are not my views but those of outsiders) as one of the most comprehensive reports ever presented on casino gambling. I congratulated members of the select committee then and I congratulate them again this evening, because I believe it was one of the most comprehensive reports brought down anywhere in the world on casino gambling.

After the report had been tabled we moved into the debate on the Bill and it was obvious during that debate that the Bill would fail. For that reason, on behalf of a majority of members on the committee I introduced an amendment in the latter stages of the debate which was exactly the same as the legislation before us today, except that in clause 16 (2) the word 'shall' has been substituted for 'may'. That amendment was made by the Upper House last week. Otherwise there is no difference between the Bill that was debated in August last year and that before us now.

Last year's Bill was defeated in this House in August by 31 votes to 12 yet, within only 4½ months, the honourable Mr Blevins announced that he would reintroduce the legislation in the Upper House. How could he possibly have thought that his measure would pass after an almost identical measure had been so soundly defeated 4½ months previously? In March this year he introduced this Bill in the Upper House, where it passed by 14 votes to four. So the legislation is now before us again.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The House has changed in the meantime.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Of course it has, but it has not changed enough to pass this Bill if members who were here last August vote this time the same way as they voted then. I am puzzled as to why this measure is before us within nine months of its crushing defeat last year. I cannot understand the rationale behind its introduction. It has been widely promulgated by the media that the Bill will pass, but I do not know how the media know that. Maybe the media have taken a poll of members. If this Bill is to pass, most, if not all, of those members opposite who voted against last year's measure will have to change their vote, for I believe that there is little likelihood of any member on this side changing his or her vote.

Indeed, most of the following members who voted against last year's legislation must change their vote on this occasion if the Bill is to pass: the Minister of Transport, the Minister of Education, the Minister of Community Welfare, the Minister of Local Government, the Minister of Environment

and Planning, the Chief Secretary, the Minister of Mines and Energy, the Deputy Premier, and the members for Elizabeth, Albert Park, Peake and Ascot Park. I find this state of affairs extraordinary. I do not say that members will change their vote because I do not believe in emptying a vote in this House on a conscience issue. However, if this measure is to pass (and it is widely reported that it will pass) that must happen. That disappoints me because I admire people who stick by their principles and are willing despite difficult circumstances to stand up for what they believe and I believe that the member for Glenelg is one such member. Indeed, he demonstrated that throughout the hearings of the select committee.

I now want to refer once more to the vote in August, when I believe that this House did the institution of Parliament harm. I say that because, as I mentioned before, this House set up the select committee to do a job for it and I believe, as most people outside also believe, that the select committee did a very workmanlike and thorough job, yet in the final vote on that particular Bill every clause in the Bill was negatived by this House, including the title of the Bill. I was forced to move the third reading of a Bill that had no title. I regard that as a gross insult to the select committee, which had worked under the most adverse and difficult conditions and which had done its job reasonably well. I thought I would put that on the record not for myself but for the other members of that select committee (including the member for Glenelg) who worked so hard and for such long hours to bring down that voluminous report which covered every aspect of casino gambling.

I now refer to a couple of points made by the member for Glenelg and in doing so I indicate that I will support the second reading of this Bill because it is the same Bill I introduced in this House in August and, indeed, I would have no credibility if I did not support it. I will support it and, provided I am satisfied with the amendments (which I will not now canvass), I will then support the third reading also. If one particular amendment is passed by this House, I will not support the third reading. The Bill we see before us allows the Lotteries Commission to own a casino and, because of an amendment in another place (an amendment with which I agree completely), the Lotteries Commission shall license an operator (the Bill says 'another person') to run a casino. I believe that that is quite correct, because it allows private enterprise, with its expertise in these matters and in marketing, to run the casino and make it successful.

I repeat what I said last year: it is not the casino *per se* that is important in this State, but what it will bring with it. We have already had made public, both by the Government, of which I was privileged to be a member, and by the present Government, the proposed development at the Adelaide Railway Station, a possible \$150 000 000 worth of investment in this State, and part of that complex was to be a convention centre. There was another proposal for a development on the West End Brewery site, the site where the Aquatic Centre was to be located and where I am very much afraid the Government may place the remand centre and therefore ruin that end of Hindley Street and the possibilities for redevelopment, but that is another matter. Nevertheless, an imaginative development was proposed at the West End Brewery site at the western end of Hindley Street which would attract enormous investment. Once again the question of a convention centre was mentioned. There is no doubt that because convention centres must be subsidised by the Government the advent of a casino in such a development would assist in ensuring that the convention centre was used virtually the whole year round, mainly because a casino offers another sphere of entertainment for the delegates and attracts conventions.

I do not believe that we need a casino *per se*, but we need it for what it can bring and we need it for the employment

that it can generate. To me that is the most pressing reason, because I feel very upset at the high rate of unemployment in this State and, indeed, right around Australia. I believe that, if we can bring about a development by imaginative proposals that can bring at least 600 jobs to this State (600 direct employees to this State let alone the flow-on effects), I think that that is something we have to consider very carefully. That is the reason why I supported the establishment of a casino before, and that is the reason why I was pleased to sign the select committee's report. It is also the reason why I will support this measure, because even though the casino will be owned by the Lotteries Commission (and that means by the Government) under this legislation, it will have to be run by private enterprise. I will not have a bar of a casino that is run by the Government. If you have that sort of situation, the Government has to set up a bureaucracy; it has to go out and buy the expertise; it has to bring people from overseas; it has to train the croupiers; it has to go into all the management and promotional aspects of a casino, and I do not believe that that is a job for the Government.

I do not really think many members in this House believe that it is a job for the Government. Enough that the casino is owned by the Lotteries Commission or the Government, which in itself is some sort of safeguard to prevent the creeping in of organised crime, even though I do not believe that organised crime has infiltrated any casino establishment in Australia; certainly the select committee found that to be the case.

Members are very welcome to look at my speeches on the previous Bill last August. I want to take up one particular point that the member for Glenelg mentioned. He quoted at great length from the Morin Commission Report. I am very pleased to say that that report was one of the best reports I have ever read and it was a very valuable tool and resource for the select committee, just as I believe that the South Australian select committee's report has been a very valuable resource for the Victorian Royal Commissioner, who has already given his report to the Victorian Premier on whether there should be a casino in that State. I believe he has relied very heavily on the South Australian select committee report.

The Morin Commission Report, which was a report such as this, contains valuable information, especially as to the percentage of compulsory gamblers in the population, percentages which we could reasonably expect to be transposed to Australia. It was in fact the Morin Commission Report which gave us more information on that particular matter than many others. The Morin Commission Report refers to casino gambling in the U.S., where they have privately run casinos without the legislative safeguards proposed either in the original Bill that was presented on behalf of the select committee or in this Bill. In the United States, casinos connected with the Mafia and the underworld have grown up over the years.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Is this the crime you talk about?

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: The Minister knows very well that he is taking that out of context; he ought to read the report that he signed. It is important to realise that those United States casinos have grown up with very little controlling legislation. Certainly, legislation is being introduced now, some of which was recommended by the Morin Commission, but these casinos were originally founded in a legislative vacuum as far as controls against organised crime is concerned. Therefore, I am simply saying that one cannot transpose all the recommendations of the Morin Commission to the Australian experience. Nor can we compare the casinos operating in Great Britain with those operating in Australia or with those proposed to operate in Australia and in South Australia under this legislation.

There can be no comparison between the type of club casino as it exists in Great Britain, where they levy a table tax, and the type of casino that is envisaged in this Bill. The controls are not there in Great Britain. I did not hear every minute of the member for Glenelg's speech, but I think he referred to a witness who had experience with the United Kingdom casinos. Once again, I point out that one cannot compare the operation of those casinos with what is proposed in this legislation.

I will support the Bill, because I believe that it will do much to generate employment in South Australia and to generate investment in this State which is important. However, I do not support the placement of a casino in an existing institution or construction. I do not believe that that is desirable or what we want. We need massive investment and increased employment. We need a convention centre and increased tourist potential. I believe that all these things will come if a casino is part of a multi-million dollar investment, either on the railway station site, at the West End site or somewhere else in the city area.

I know that it will be a lot easier to raise the tens of millions of dollars required for one of those projects if there is to be a casino present on the site. I have talked to financiers: it is not that they particularly want to run or own a casino, but they have indicated that they believe that an investment in such an establishment would be safer and that they would be surer to get a return on the investment if a casino was part of the complex. I think I mentioned last August that one private developer told the select committee that he did not really care whether the Government owned the casino as long as there was a casino present, because he believed that the only way the Government could subsidise a convention centre (which was the most important of all the areas of development) would be to have a casino on site and that the subsidy would come through that avenue. That is not detracting from other development, such as other multi-storey hotels, trade centres, bus-rail interchanges, which may be contained within such a development, but a convention centre is very important. It seems to me in the present financial climate that the only way a Government could afford to take a first lease on a convention centre would be if it had some avenue of subsidising the running of that very vital institution for this State.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I intend to devote my time to two main areas. I will refer, first, to the total dishonesty of the Government in relation to the Bill before the House and, secondly, to the reasons why I will not be supporting the Bill. The Government has been totally dishonest in the manner in which this Bill has been brought before the House. I do not know why the Government did not have the courage (which the previous Government had) to introduce this Bill as a Government Bill. It has done everything but actually introduce it as a Government Bill.

Mr Plunkett interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: I think that the member for Peake should wait until someone has written his speech for him so that he may then be able to come out with something intelligent. The Bill before us is virtually a Government Bill, yet the Government just does not have the courage to make it such a Bill. It has given priority to private members' business over Government business in order to bring this Bill before the House, even though for the past two weeks the Government has been telling us that it has a tremendously important legislative programme, and that we must sit for four days a week from 10.30 in the morning until all hours at night, purely and simply because there is so much important legislation that this House must consider. However, we have found that from 3.30 this afternoon the Government

has given priority to a private member's Bill over all the matters that apparently cannot be left for two weeks. If that does not make the Government one of hypocrisy, I would like to know what does.

There is no doubt at all that the Government wants this Bill passed for its own reasons: I will dwell on that matter in considerable detail later. The Government wants the Casino Bill passed purely and simply because it knows full well that if that occurs it will be able to say that the Government has been able to attract new investment to this State as a result of a new complex, probably at the Adelaide Railway Station, which complex will probably involve accommodation and will certainly involve conference and casino facilities.

Those responsible for this Bill are virtually the same group of people who but a very short while ago rejected a Bill that was brought in by the Tonkin Government, which if accepted would have provided for exactly the same thing, except that members of the present Government would not have been able to claim the credit for it. That is the only reason why the present Government is giving precedence to this Bill, so that the Premier can stand up in a few weeks time and say, 'Look what the Labor Government has done for South Australia; it has brought in all this investment.'

That is the only reason why the Government wants this Bill passed. I give notice to the member for Hartley that I will be asking a number of questions requiring answers from him or from the Premier. I will certainly be asking questions when the Bill goes into Committee. The Government has kept members here for hours and hours last week and this week. I have no doubt that the Government will want to bring us back again on Friday, and I do not have any idea how long we will sit tonight.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten): Order! I ask the member for Todd to speak to the Bill presently before the House. So far the standard of debate has been very good. The previous two speakers have stuck to the Bill implicitly, and I would ask that the member for Todd do the same.

Mr ASHENDEN: With due deference, my comments do relate to the Bill before the House. I think that these are extremely important aspects to consider. The Bill is only before the House for certain reasons, which I am bringing forward now. I think that this is an integral part of the matter being considered by the 47 members of this House before a vote is taken some time in the not too distant future.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ASHENDEN: I agree that this matter is one of vital importance. The points that I make now I believe have a tremendous bearing on why it is that we as a Parliament are considering private members' business in Government time. I am extremely concerned that as a member of Parliament with constituents to represent I have been caused by this Government to sit in this House quite unnecessarily because if the Government had planned its programme properly instead of sitting for just a few weeks in the first six months, the sittings would have been spread out so that we could have both performed our Parliamentary duties and our duties to our constituents. I am sure that there are members on the other side who are in a situation similar to mine that because of the unreasonable hours that we have been required to sit—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Todd to resume his seat. I have asked him to speak to the Bill and not criticise Government business or business of the day but to specifically speak on matters in this Bill. I ask him to stick to that and we will get on very well, but it will be different if he is going to raise other extraneous matters.

Mr ASHENDEN: With due deference, I believe that this is an integral part of the reason we are considering the matter that is before the House at the moment. In deference to you, Sir, I will not press the issue any further in relation to the earlier sittings of the House but I certainly believe that the sittings that we are going through at the moment and the fact that we are going to be kept here until all hours of the night is because of the Bill which we are presently considering.

The Government has indicated to the people of South Australia that it has got what it believes to be vitally important matters that must be considered by us as a Parliament, and the point I make is that this Bill, which is a private member's Bill, is being given precedence by the Government despite the fact that we have these so-called important issues to consider. That is what concerns me and I believe that we as a Parliament are being pressured to consider this matter much more quickly than should be the case.

The Deputy Premier earlier this afternoon indicated that it is imperative that we as a Parliament make a decision on whether South Australia should have a casino. Since I have been a member of Parliament we have already voted on this issue twice. A Bill was introduced by the member for Semaphore and subsequently a Bill on the casino was introduced by the then Tonkin Government. The Bill that was introduced by the Tonkin Government was amended and that amended Bill was virtually identical to the Bill which we now have before us. That Bill was soundly defeated by the members of this Parliament in the previous session. There have been some changes in the personnel that go to make up this Parliament compared with that of the previous Parliament. However, as the member for Torrens has pointed out, there have not been enough changes in personnel to lead to a change of the decision—unless persons who voted against the previous Bill now decide to vote for this Bill.

How is it that in six or seven months there can be such a major change that will cause that number of members to change their minds and to vote now for a Bill which they previously opposed? I am afraid that I am cynical enough to believe that if that occurs it is purely and simply because members now on the Government benches, for political reasons only (which I have already touched on) will support a Bill to introduce a casino into South Australia. Something more hypocritical than that, or more cynical than that, I cannot imagine. The Bill that is before the House is supposed to be a conscience issue and I hope that members will look closely at their consciences.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: I indicate to the member for Albert Park that I for one will certainly not be changing my vote; a vote which I gave on the previous Bill.

Mr Hamilton: Your colleagues will be doing exactly the same as last time?

Mr ASHENDEN: I do not know; that is for them to decide, but I am sure that the honourable member will find (and I will be most interested to look at the divisions) that the only members who were in the Parliament previously and who change their minds will be from the honourable member's side of the House.

The Bill that is before this House is virtually identical to that amended Bill which was defeated very substantially by the previous Parliament. Therefore, the Deputy Premier's words that this issue is vital and must be considered immediately rings very hollow indeed and only strengthens my belief that he and his Government have supported this matter purely and simply for their own political ends. If that is the case, then the proper thing to do is to be honest and say, 'Right, we will make this a Government Bill; we would like to indicate to the members of the public of South Australia that if this Bill is passed, then it could well

be that a development will be attracted to South Australia; this development will involve this number of people to work in it; this number of dollars in constructing it; and it will be for the good of South Australia.' But, no, they have not been honest. They have not come out and said that there are very real reasons that they want this Bill to be considered for the good of South Australia, because for Party political reasons only and grandstanding they are hoping that in a few weeks time they will be able to come out and say, 'This is what your Labor Government has done for South Australia.' Why is it that members opposite cannot be honest with this Parliament? Why is it that they cannot be honest with the people of South Australia?

There is no doubt that as this matter has come before this Parliament again, serious consideration has to be given to it by the people of South Australia, who had thought six months ago that the matter had been closed. Why is it that such a short period of time is being given for the consideration of this Bill? Why is it that the Government is so determined to force a vote as soon as it possibly can? I can think, for example, of the words which were put forward by the Deputy Premier, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition as he was then, when he stated quite categorically that in his electorate he had no doubt whatsoever that the majority of people were opposed to the introduction of a casino in South Australia. The Deputy Premier as yet has not spoken and I will be listening with extreme interest to what he has to say because if (and I stress the word 'if') he is to change his vote then something has occurred in six months which leads him to believe that his electorate has changed its mind. All I know is that when this previous Bill was put before the House I did a tremendous amount of work in my electorate to determine how the people in the electorate of Todd really felt about this casino. I had press releases placed in the *North East Leader*; I wrote to people; I wrote to organisations; at every meeting that I went to I spoke to the people and at every meeting I went to people would come up to me.

I did not move in small circles; I moved as broadly as I could through my electorate to try and determine whether or not my electorate wanted a casino. Listening to those people, reading the letters that came back to me from the contacts I made with people and organisations throughout my electorate, I felt that the majority of people in Todd, particularly the women, were opposed to a casino in South Australia. Nothing has occurred since then to change my mind. Then again, if my electorate has changed its mind, the rapidity with which this Bill is being forced through this Parliament has not given me time to find out from my electorate if this is the case. I do not know how any other member could say that he has had advice from his electorate in such a short time which would cause him to change his mind.

Mr Hamilton: That would be so easy to do.

Mr ASHENDEN: The honourable member says that that would be easy to do. This has come before the House only very recently and most of the time since it has been before the House we have been sitting in here. Of the phone calls I have received in my office every one of them has been opposed to the casino, but I do not accept that that necessarily reflects everyone's opinion in Todd. I certainly have not had an opportunity to do the depth of research that I was able to do when this Bill was before the House previously.

I know that the Chief Secretary disagrees with the point that I made in the previous Parliament and, that is, that I believe a member of Parliament is here to represent the wishes of the constituents in his electorate and not to push his own barrow. Therefore, what I intend to do on this matter—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ASHENDEN:—is to represent the wishes of the people who live in the electorate of Todd. Nobody else in this Parliament lives in my electorate. Therefore, how can members opposite be so grizzly and come up (as they are now) and try to tell me that my assessment of my electorate is wrong: I just do not know.

I would point out to members opposite that many of them sitting there now have said to me on many occasions in the previous Parliament that I was a 'oncer' and that I would not be here again. I believe that, because I know my electorate, I have represented my electorate and I have got to my electorate, that is the main reason why I am back here. The swing against me was only 3.2 per cent and, when one considers that I beat Mrs Molly Byrne (who was extremely popular) with a swing of 11 per cent, I believe that holding that seat with only a 3.2 per cent swing is indicative and shows to this House that I am in the best position to judge what the people in my electorate feel. Therefore,—

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: The member for Henley Beach is not even in his seat and he is interjecting. He will not be back in his seat after the next election either. The point is that I am here tonight representing the people in my electorate and I do that unashamedly. I know that members opposite think that this is ridiculous because, as the member for Newland knows, he cannot represent his electorate on the O'Bahn situation. If his office has been anything like my office, he would know only too well what the people out there think of what his Government has done in relation to the O'Bahn system, but he has not said one word to this Parliament about it.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The member for Todd will speak to the Bill, not about the O'Bahn system.

Mr ASHENDEN: The point that I make is that I am here tonight representing what I believe are the wishes of the people in the electorate of Todd. If people in the electorates of members opposite have different wishes, then so be it. They can represent either their electorate or themselves as they see fit. However, I stand here tonight indicating that I will be opposing this Bill because, from the research that I was able to do when the previous Bill was introduced, I am in no doubt that the majority of people in my electorate (not a great majority) are opposed to a casino in South Australia.

Perhaps if the Government had been honest and had come out and said, 'Right: if a casino is developed in South Australia, then we will have this huge development. We will have jobs and investment, one never knows: the people in Todd may have changed their minds. However, the Government has not been honest. It is trying to force the Bill through for its own political advantage and it is not even game to bring it out as a Government Bill.

As I have indicated, the dishonesty of the Government about this matter has to be seen to be believed, although, in the short time it has been in Government we have seen that time and time again in many areas. I have already heard members opposite indicating that it is the supposed intention of members on the Opposition benches to speak purely and simply to try and avoid a vote on this issue. Of course, that is totally false. Members on this side of the House are vitally concerned that they represent the wishes of the people whom they are here to represent. I believe that there are some members on the Government benches who will be changing their position. As I said, I look forward to that with a great deal of interest. For example, I wonder whether or not the Minister of Water Resources will speak to this Bill.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: I will.

Mr ASHENDEN: Good. I will be most interested to hear the Minister when he speaks because it has been indicated to me that he is one who will be changing his mind about why he can support this Bill, but, of course was not able to support the Bill brought in by the previous Government because there is absolutely nothing different in this Bill when compared to the amended version of the Bill which was brought in previously.

So that the member for Hartley has time to approach his Premier, I would indicate that there are some questions I will be asking in the Committee stage (if the Bill passes the second reading) because I believe that these are matters which are extremely important and which should be answered. I believe that they will have a vital bearing on the way in which this Bill is considered. I will be asking the member for Hartley whether the Premier has been approached by any company, individual or organisation indicating that a large commercial development will be introduced to South Australia if this Bill is passed. I believe that it is imperative that the member for Hartley answers that question on behalf of the Premier and it is the member for Hartley who will have to answer that question, because he is the one who has been charged with the passage of this Bill through the House. We all know why that is: it is because a number of present Ministers will not be Ministers much longer and the member for Hartley will certainly be taking the place of one of those displaced Ministers.

I have already outlined the first question on which I will be seeking information from the member for Hartley. Secondly, I will be asking whether it is the Premier's intention to fly to South-East Asia, Malaysia or a country nearby within the next month if this Bill is passed, and, if so, why he is going overseas to that area. I think that that will be of some considerable interest to members in this House. I will also be asking whether the Premier is aware of any proposed developments for South Australia contingent upon the passage of this Bill. I would certainly hope that the Government will be honest for a change as far as the people of South Australia and this Government is concerned.

I believe that it is important that I indicate again in summary quite clearly why I will be opposing this Bill. As I have previously indicated, when a virtually identical Bill came before this House I did a tremendous amount of work in my electorate to try and determine the wishes of the people who live there. I have not been given the opportunity to do that this time.

Mr Groom: You have had since December.

Mr ASHENDEN: That is a ridiculous statement to make. At that stage we had no idea whether or not this Bill would be successful in the Upper House. It has come down from the Upper House only in the last few days. That is the whole point: the Government is indicating only too well the cynicism of this exercise. As it indicates, the Bill has been in the Upper House since December, yet the Government wants it through this House virtually in one day. Why is it able to take so long to come forward to this House from the Upper House and, yet, when it reaches here members of this House are not given the same opportunity to consider this matter as their colleagues have had in another place? I think that they have been very much hoist with their own petard.

As I said, from the research I was able to carry out in my electorate at the time the previous Bill was introduced, I believe that the majority (not a great majority but a majority) of the people in Todd were opposed to the development of a casino in South Australia. I firmly believe that it is my duty to represent the people who elected me to represent them in the House of Assembly. I do not intend to let them down on this or any other matter. That is a commitment that I also held firmly when we were in Gov-

ernment. Certainly, if my Government had done to the north-eastern suburbs what the present Government has done, I would have been rather more outspoken than the member for Newland has been. However, some of us represent the people and some of us represent—

The ACTING SPEAKER: The member for Todd will come back to the Bill.

Mr ASHENDEN: As far as this Bill is concerned, it is my intention to represent the interests of my electorate. I have not been given the opportunity to determine whether a change has occurred in the last few months, although I would be staggered if (as Government members are now trying to indicate) there has been a major change of feeling in the last few months. It is interesting to note how every member of the Government has at one time or another in the last 25 minutes indicated quite clearly *en masse* the way in which they regard the Bill before the House.

That is quite interesting, bearing in mind that the matter before the House is supposed to be a conscience issue. It will be interesting to contrast the division that occurred on the previous Bill to the division that will undoubtedly occur when a vote is taken on this Bill in relation to those who were members when the previous Bill was introduced and who are still members. I look forward with a great deal of interest to seeing how those members vote.

I was diverted from the point I was making: I believe it is my duty to represent my electorate. If members opposite believe that their electorates have a different point of view, that is fine. Obviously, members should put that point of view, and I accept that. However, I cannot understand how members opposite could believe that the research I have undertaken in the District of Todd is inaccurate, because some members opposite might also have spent as much time in their electorate getting to the grass roots to try to ascertain the feelings of the people, as I have done. Therefore, it would be silly of me to indicate that the points they made in relation to their electorate were inaccurate.

Frankly, I cannot understand the attitude taken by members opposite to my statement that my research indicates that a slight majority of the people in my electorate, according to my discussions, oppose a casino. The male population of my electorate is probably 50/50 on this issue. There is no doubt that there is a very even division of feeling. However, the majority of women in my electorate are opposed to the development of a casino. The Deputy Premier confirmed my feeling when he stated in this House that his electorate was opposed to the development of a casino in South Australia. Certainly, the District of Todd does not stand alone.

I have not been given any information that would cause me to change my mind. Another factor that must be considered is that, in relation to the District of Todd, there are two quite diverse groups: one group is quite strongly opposed to a casino, and, on the other extreme, the other group is strongly in favour of a casino. In the middle of those two groups is a large group that says, 'We don't mind whether or not there is a casino. We will not use the casino, but if it is there, so what?' One could say that there are three groups—one opposed to a casino, one that does not mind, and one in favour of a casino. Obviously, we must consider the case for and against a casino.

From my research in the District of Todd (which I represent, and which I intend to represent for a long time to come), I must vote according to the wishes that have been indicated to me. Therefore, I will oppose this Bill at the second reading, because it is no different from the Bill on which we voted a short while ago. I have been given no information that would cause me to change my mind. I will certainly listen with interest to any amendments that may come forward in the Committee stage. In conclusion, I

believe that I am following the wishes of my electorate, and I do so unashamedly.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): I move:

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

Motion carried.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Before I indicate which way I intend to vote, I shall refer to a number of issues raised by members opposite and to the attitude of members opposite. As the member for Glenelg rose to his feet to speak in this debate, I said to the member for Peake, 'I bet the member for Glenelg names me first in relation to the way in which members voted on the previous Bill.' Quite predictably, the member for Glenelg commenced his contribution by referring to me. What really concerns me about the level of contribution is the attitude of members opposite. They are smarting because, first, quite clearly they have been defeated and, secondly, because the Government has introduced this Bill. Members opposite have indicated that they intend to prolong the sittings of this House.

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I am sorry: this is a private member's Bill. The honourable member is right. The three-hour contribution from the member for Glenelg was designed to keep us here for a long time, into the early hours of the morning. The honourable member's attitude was quite obvious to us all. Those who have been members in this House for some time know what the honourable member was about. It was a disgraceful performance. If a member cannot put forward his views in one hour, he should not be in this place, given that this type of debate has taken place twice before. Clearly, the honourable member was reading from the select committee report and was citing discussions that took place to fill in time. I do not hear many protestations from him now.

The member for Todd was also smarting about the fact that this Bill was introduced by a private member (to get it right); he was also using delaying tactics, but he stated that the Government is keeping us here longer than is necessary. The honourable member alleged that the Government has not planned its programme properly. However, the honourable member is very short on memory. I can remember quite clearly that, when we were in Opposition, we were here until 4 a.m. or 5 a.m.: I believe that the latest was 6.30 a.m. We heard nothing from the member for Todd about that situation. No, sir! People who live in glass houses should not throw stones.

Quite clearly, the honourable member is hypocritical. He knows what happened when his Party was in Government. Even his Deputy Leader recalls some of the statements made about disciplining back-benchers. The honourable member knows the tactics employed by those in Government. He knows that and I know that, so he should not talk garbage in this place or laugh about this matter. He is not being honest. The honourable member should not talk to me about hypocrisy. He said that some members may or may not be here after the next election, but what relevance has such comment to this debate? It has very little relevance. The honourable member wanted to fill in time so that he could keep us here for as long as he likes. He stated that all Government members, *en masse*, have indicated which way they will vote, and when making that comment he was alluding to those who were present in this House.

Had he wanted to, I believe that the honourable member could have assessed the feelings of his constituents on the Casino Bill. I suggest, however, that he had neither the desire nor the will to obtain that view from his constituents. Even over the last weekend he could have gained an indication of their desires. He is certainly not being truthful to

the House when he says that he could not get an indication of their feelings.

On 18 August 1982, when last year's Casino Bill was before the House, I said that I would oppose it, and my attitude remains the same on this Bill. At page 569 of last year's *Hansard*, I am reported as saying:

In other material I have read there is insufficient statistical information available on gambling in this country. While we can refer to studies conducted in other countries, I believe a study should be carried out not only in South Australia but in Australia as a whole. The report points out Australians are amongst the world's heaviest gamblers. . . . Because of the many social problems in the community today, about which I have very strong convictions, I am not prepared as a member of this Parliament to support a measure that I believe could contribute to increasing social and welfare problems in this State.

I then quoted from page 49 of the select committee's report. In my opening remarks in that speech I said that I was not a hypocrite and that I had gambled, probably as much as any other member. Indeed, I still gamble from time to time. In order to assess the feelings on this matter in my district, I had a brief telephone survey conducted last weekend. The survey covered 144 people.

Mr Lewis: Not a bad sample.

Mr HAMILTON: No. Two questions were asked: 'Do you approve or disapprove of a gambling casino in South Australia?' and 'Do you approve or disapprove of poker machines for South Australia?' A total of 69 people disapproved of a gambling casino. Of these there were 14 males, 43 females, and 12 persons who did not state their gender. Surprisingly, four persons opposing a gambling casino supported poker machines. A total of 75 persons approved of a gambling casino. Of these 40 were males and 34 females, one person not indicating the gender. Of the 75 people approving gambling casinos, 50 approved of and 25 disapproved of poker machines.

I have received 21 roneoed letters signed and posted through the same person, because stamped on the back of each envelope is the following: BSM Labels Pty Ltd, P.O. Box 123, Hindmarsh, South Australia 5007. All 21 letters were signed and were against the Casino Bill. I have received 10 handwritten letters, all signed and against the Bill. Four outside organisations have written to me asking me to vote against the Bill. I have received nine telephone calls against the Bill. I believe that that is a reasonable assessment of what has taken place in my district. It would be easy for me, if I chose, to change my mind and state reasons justifying such action. However, I am a man of social conscience and I therefore oppose the Bill.

Mr KLUNDER (Newland): This Bill has caused me to do a considerable amount of soul searching. I do not see the building of a casino in Adelaide as a clearly defined good or evil but rather as a difficult choice based on value judgments as to its effects. I do not wish to canvass in detail the various pros and cons of a casino. It would require a peculiar kind of conceit for me to pretend that this has not already often been done in great detail on previous occasions when this legislation has surfaced in the House.

Let me instead briefly give my summary of the facts on which I have based my value judgment. There are social costs involved in the building of a casino. To my mind there are two major social costs: first, some money will be taken away from a more worthy method of spending; secondly, it is possible that some people will become psychologically dependent on and addicted to this form of gambling who are not already addicted to other forms of gambling and who would not become so addicted if a casino was not introduced.

Some of the benefits of a casino include developmental benefits with jobs in the short term and tourist income and

jobs in the long term. The difficulty is that each member must take these costs and benefits and try to balance them as best he may. In such a situation each member must also take into account the views of his constituents. I readily allow that I have received telephone calls, correspondence and personal visits from people opposed to the Bill. Indeed, these totalled 48. As well as that, I was asked to present to the House a petition signed by 50 persons opposing a casino. That petition was received in my office yesterday afternoon and needed to be put before the Clerk of the House before 8.30 this morning so that it could be presented today. However, because of the heavy sittings of the House, and because I had to keep appointments with constituents in my office this morning, I was unable to get the petition to the House early enough for it to be presented today.

I make that point so that the House may be aware of that petition in making up its collective mind on the Bill and because I would not wish it to be thought that I had deliberately held back the petition until tomorrow. The letters, telephone calls and visits I have received came in a wide variety of persuasiveness and courtesy. Most of the letters, I am happy to say, clearly and courteously stated the opinions of the writers and asked me to heed their comments in making my decision. I appreciated those letters and comments, and I assure those people that I gave long and hard consideration to their views.

On the other hand, others were less courteous, some being blunt statements instructing me how to vote on threat of organising against me at the next election. These may be regarded as legitimate expressions of anger or fear, but they saddened me because those people obviously believe that threats are the only kind of currency left in our modern society. My problem with the information given me by these people is that my doorknocking has presented me with the opposite picture. A recent survey showed that just over 50 per cent of South Australians favoured a casino and that opposition to a casino increased with the age of the respondent. I am forced to agree with the results of that survey. Indeed, in Newland the average age of the constituents is lower than that in many other districts, and I am certain from my contact with constituents that support for a casino in my district is nearer 60 per cent than 50 per cent.

A major factor that I must give great weight to is something that happens daily in my electorate office. Each day people come to ask for my help because they have become unemployed. I do not need to elaborate on this. Every member has seen marriages crumble, children mistreated, and savings and property, including houses, lost. Every member has also felt the helplessness I have felt and, in giving what little help he could, has wished he could do more.

As I have said, I do not see this Bill as an absolute good or an absolute evil. I see the value judgment that I am taking in this matter as a choice between a social cost due to gambling and a social cost due to unemployment. As I have said, in the final analysis one must make a value judgment on these matters. I can assure the House that I have not made the decision lightly. I support the Bill.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I rise on this occasion to express my opposition to the Bill. I do not think that comes as any great surprise to members, because on three previous occasions when the matter has been before the House I have adopted a like attitude. It is for that reason that I do not intend to waste the time of the House unduly, because my views are clearly known. I think that all that I can do is to refer members to my previous speeches when the matter has been before this Chamber.

However, I would like to make a couple of observations and express my partial amazement, if you like, at the way in which the Bill has come forward. I think it is only fair

to say that in a casual conversation I had with the member for Semaphore on the first day of sitting of this present Parliament, we rather jokingly made some remarks about private members' business. The comment was made by the member for Semaphore as to whether he should introduce a private member's Bill for a casino. I think equally as jokingly I replied, 'You had better be quick, because somebody might beat you to it.' Before we had finished our conversation I think somebody did beat us to it, because the Hon. Mr Blevins in another place had foreshadowed that very day that he intended to introduce a private member's Bill for the establishment of a casino.

That did not come as a great surprise. We had had a measure before this House in August last, and at that time there was considerable debate. In fact, on the evening of the final vote it was expected that the count would be within one or two votes and that it was going to be very close. A last-minute rescue operation by the proposer of the Bill to introduce an amendment in order to placate the one or two members who were opposing the Bill failed, and certain members of the present Government believed that the matter was Party political and so it reverted to Party political lines. On that basis, at that time the measure was soundly defeated. I think we all know that, even though the votes were quite wide in the actual count, the feeling amongst the members at that time was somewhat closer. In fact, the overall vote was either 31 or 29 to 12. Irrespective of the number, we all know it was quite a landslide defeat for the Bill. We now have a measure coming before the House and we find people reverting to the way they were really thinking just prior to that vote being taken. I believe that circumstances may arise on this occasion which will make the vote somewhat closer.

From my own point of view I think it is fair to make the observation that the general community reaction to a casino is not as strongly opposed now as it was some 10 years ago when the Bill was first introduced. In 1973, when the matter came to my notice on the first occasion, I had some 150 letters individually written, and in their own individual styles, where people wrote to me spontaneously in opposition. There was also a number of petitions with many hundreds if not thousands of signatures. They, in turn, were individually styled. People did not come to me for the wording of the petitions; they did not come from this House, but were in fact prepared and collected by residents and organisations in a spontaneous manner.

The next time the matter came before the House the number of letters dropped to 98 and, likewise, the number of petitions also dropped. Last year when the matter was before the House I had 38 letters in opposition. During all this time I have not had one letter in favour of the Bill. Likewise, the number of petitions has also decreased in number. On this occasion I have not even received 20 letters as yet and at this stage not one petition. I think there is a feeling of complacency within the community and a certain attitude where people say, 'We do not really want it, but we think it is going to come anyway, so be that as it may.'

The member for Mallee has made the observation that we have not had sufficient time. In a sense, I think that is a fair comment, but by the same token some considerable time has elapsed since the Hon. Frank Blevins first gave public notice of his intention. I think it is also fair to say that if a community response were to be ascertained as to the suggestion of another casino Bill, then we would have had reasonable time for some community response to have evolved.

As I mentioned, this is the fourth time in 10 years and the second time in the last eight or nine months that we have debated this matter. The matter has been the subject of a number of reports and inquiries. Last time it was the

subject of a select committee report, and it was a very comprehensive report. At the time it was carried out, I think I did offer some criticism as to the speed with which it was carried out, because a matter of such social consequence does require a detailed inquiry by many people over a very long period of time. Be that as it may and even though it was conducted over a relatively short span of time as select committees go, I believe the report was well documented. Far more work had gone into it and the results were far more detailed than I would have expected from a report which was delivered so quickly. However, it did bring out the fact that crime and big money have been used to entice favours. At that stage where I start to get worried as to what could happen (and I say 'could happen') when organised crime and big money are involved.

I am not a gambler. I have only ever been into one casino and that was the Wrest Point Casino. I did that only because I knew the matter had been a subject before the House on a previous occasion and thought it was likely to become the subject of debate again, so I quite deliberately went to the Wrest Point Casino to look at the operations of that complex. I was favourably impressed by the way in which the tables were operated, the control of the gambling tables, the very strict manner of policing those entering the premises, the control of dress; any misdemeanours or bad behaviour on the gambling floor was very smartly dealt with and those persons very quickly ejected from the premises. I have nothing but the highest of praise for what I saw on that one night.

I do not believe that that is where all the problems of casinos lie. Australians, by their very nature, are heavy gamblers. I would like to quote from an article in *Choice* magazine of July 1979. Admittedly, it is some four years old now, but it reads:

Australians are the world's heaviest gamblers—by a long shot. We make the rest of the developed world look like beginners when it comes to throwing money away in pursuit of Lady Luck. It has been estimated that the per capita expenditure on gambling in Australia is \$710 a year, compared with \$440 a year in the United States of America, \$95 in the United Kingdom and \$87 in Canada.

I acknowledge that those figures are at least four years old, but they highlight the fact that we have plenty of opportunities for gambling in South Australia and in Australia already. When one considers that that \$710 a year represents for an average family of four an amount of \$2 840, the mind boggles as to what must be happening to those families. The amount of money spent in my immediate family on gambling is chicken feed: in fact, no-one in my family is a gambler. Having regard to figures based on averages, every non-gambling family must have a compounding effect on the figures in regard to families that do gamble. I am concerned that the effect on families who gamble heavily must be tremendous and, if the amount spent by the average family is \$2 840, the amount that passes through the hands of families who gamble heavily must be tremendous. I feel for those families, particularly those in the low income group who obviously must be suffering due to gambling activities.

In view of the large number of gambling facilities available for Australians and the fact that the Australian individual tends to be a heavy gambler, one wonders where it will stop. In the last few years a number of alternative gambling opportunities have been introduced, and now there is a push for a casino. If the casino is introduced, what will the next push be for? One might say that when we have a casino we will have the total requirements for those who like to gamble. As the member for Todd said, perhaps poker machines will be next. I believe that poker machines might be behind this matter, because I think that those who are actively promoting a casino in the back of their minds might have ideas about the introduction of poker machines. We

know from information obtained from interstate that there is considerable concern about the effects of poker machines.

Over the past few years we have seen the introduction of a number of gambling games: the lottery, the instant money game and various other schemes. There can be little doubt that there is a proven need for further gambling facilities. I do not believe that the casino in this instance can be justified. I do not wish to say much more, but I simply reiterate my opposition to this proposal. The Government's attempt to have this measure passed is simply an attempt to legislate by exhaustion and by complacency—fourth time lucky seems to be the order of the day! The Government has used its numbers in the House to convert what is really a private member's Bill into something that has Government support. The pushing aside of private member's Bills and motions currently listed on the Notice Paper is unreasonable. Furthermore, no-one could reasonably have expected that this matter would be given the prominence that it is being given at the moment, because it commanded the attention of this House less than nine months ago. We can only assume that there is an ulterior motive.

Mr Groom: Do you think Mr Bjelke-Petersen is wrong?

Mr BLACKER: The ulterior political motive is evidenced by the way the Bill has been introduced.

An honourable member: Exactly right!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BLACKER: It has been suggested to me that there is a hidden agenda. I have sympathy for the member for Eyre, who had three private member's motions listed on the Notice Paper (all of which I strongly support, although but I did not get a chance to do so). Now I find myself trying to debate a Bill which has been brought before us in a rather obscure manner. I strongly oppose the proposal; there is no proven need for a casino. The indications that I have received indicate that those in my electorate are opposed to it. No support for it has been indicated to me either by way of telephone or letter. However, I make the point that letters received by members from organised groups, and so on, do not necessarily mean that the views they express indicate the will of the electorate at large. However, in regard to social conscience matters one must look at the overall scene and consider the overall impact that such a proposal would have on the lifestyle of the community at large.

Members of Parliament are increasingly being made aware of community welfare type problems. A member of Parliament closely associated with those in the immediate vicinity of a casino or those who visit a casino would have an increased work load, although that work would be a minor proportion of that done by welfare officers, and so on. For all those reasons and the other reasons that I have explained on previous occasions, I believe that support for this measure is not justified. I oppose the Bill.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): To be consistent with my previous attitude, I indicate that I support the Bill. As has been mentioned by every other speaker, it was I who introduced a recent casino Bill. Also, I was fortunate to be a member of the select committee which investigated all the points raised by previous speakers. Evidence which resulted from that committee's hearings has been in the hands of officers of this House for some considerable period, although until tonight only one member had taken the trouble to look at that evidence. Tonight another member asked for reference to that evidence, so, therefore, until now only two members out of 47 have taken the trouble to look at what is contained in that evidence. That indicates a terrific concern about a casino in this State and about the impact of such establishments in other areas of the country.

I further extend that criticism to the people who protest against the establishment of a casino (although I respect

their point of view), irrespective of the varying points of view of those groups: the matters put forward are not justified by any substantial evidence. Not one piece of protest material has come to me (and we have all received it) which has been accompanied by supporting evidence. The Festival of Light had some in its pamphlet, but it is referring to things that were checked out by the select committee.

I have never denied that some individuals are hurt by gambling activities, whether in a casino, two-up, poker machines, and so on. Wherever there is any form of gambling people are hurt. It happens now at the racecourse every Saturday. It happens with bingo, or it may happen with X-Lotto: people can invest \$1 000 if they want to, and no-one cares one hoot. A person's family could starve because of excess bingo gambling, but no-one cares: but because a different form of gambling may be introduced suddenly it is a bad thing. I do not doubt that there might be people who go to a casino who do not gamble in any other way, but it is their democratic right to do so.

I will not be going there. Gambling is not a problem of mine and I suggest to members that it is not a problem for the vast majority of people in our community. The member for Glenelg spoke at great length about compulsive gamblers and dangers to the community. He repeated that subject time and time again and spoke about the Morin Report on gambling. There are compulsive gamblers. When the Casino Bill was presented by me some years ago I telephoned Gamblers Anonymous in Adelaide and said to its representative, 'We are talking about establishing a casino in South Australia. What difference do you think that will make to gamblers?' He said, 'It will make no difference at all. If you do not have a casino, they will gamble somewhere else.' He was a compulsive gambler, saw the light and formed the organisation called Gamblers Anonymous. According to him, it makes no difference at all, so, whom are we protecting?

Mr Ashenden: You.

Mr PETERSON: I am not protecting myself; I do not gamble. Where is the great army of people out there who are going to have their morals turned asunder and torn to pieces? We have talked to the community welfare people who assist these sorts of people. Not one member in this debate so far has been able to identify a problem caused to a person through gambling. We have spoken to sociologists, psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers and even the police and asked these people who have direct contact with the community whether problems in the community have been caused by gambling. Those people have said that gambling as a single issue has never caused a problem.

An honourable member is shaking his head, but the evidence is here; the committee met with representatives of every organisation in this field, and not one of those persons said that gambling was the sole problem. They stated that it could be there mixed up with alcohol, marital difficulties, work difficulties and other problems, but gambling as a single issue has never been shown as a problem. These are the people who should know. We went to the people in Tasmania where a casino has been in operation since 1973. Even in one's wildest dreams, if there were going to be widespread problems in the Tasmanian community caused by gambling then surely this would have happened over the 10 years that that casino has been in existence.

I spoke to representatives of Gamblers Anonymous in that State who said that people have problems with gambling, and the member for Glenelg tonight repeated several times the outcome of the interview with the representatives there. Again, the case came forward that gambling was a problem but it was never an individual problem, as it was always mixed up with something else. It was always part of an overall problem and not just an individual one.

In South Australia we suddenly changed into a different race of people. The member for Flinders quoted the Australian gambling figures. We do gamble fairly heavily, but South Australia's figures were not quoted. These show that South Australia is the lowest gambling State in Australia. We are not a ratbag State. People generally do not go out here and do radical things; they are sensible in their approach to things—and a casino is not going to change that. It will create a facility where people can go and enjoy entertainment that they do not have at present. The South Australian Jockey Club's representatives are a mob of hypocrites. They have sent out an open letter saying that it is terrible and that they do not want this measure, as it is going to drive them to the knees. They told the select committee that the establishment of a casino would be terrible unless they could run it—unless it is theirs and unless it is alongside a racecourse. What a great moral attitude that is!

Members interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: I said that this was in the select committee evidence and if members opposite are going to butt in they ought to get it right.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PETERSON: The Festival of Light sent us a pamphlet. One of the States that is battling to get a casino is Queensland. Premier Joh Bjelke-Petersen (in many ways I respect the man and in many ways I do not) is a State Premier fighting like billy-ho to put in a casino. On the back of the pamphlet from the Festival of Light it is stated that Senator Flo Bjelke-Petersen has been invited to South Australia to a Festival of Light dinner. There is a contradiction in terms there. There is the Premier of Queensland fighting like hell to get a casino approved, and Flo is coming down to South Australia as a Festival of Light representative. I have time for Flo, as I think she does a good job, but I object to the Festival of Light, which is criticising a casino on the middle page of its pamphlet, printing on the back page the news that it is bringing down here the wife of a Premier—

Members interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: As far as select committees are concerned, almost every State in Australia has investigated the establishment of a casino. Each State has done the rounds of Australia and I have read all the reports that have come from those studies. None of those reports can find any justification for the claims that are being put forward about the effects that the casino will have. All of those reports are available. The member for Glenelg said, I think, 15 times that the Morin Report is the greatest report on gambling that has ever been produced. It is not. The Morin Report is not relevant to Australia. The inquiry leading to that report was carried out by an American committee which looked at the American scene, with a totally different system of administration of casinos. Anybody who doubts that obviously has not read the Morin Report or the report of our select committee, and the evidence. All States of Australia have done a survey and the Morin Report is quoted as the greatest survey of the lot. Garbage! There is undoubtedly resistance in our community to the establishment of a casino. The moral aspect is also covered in evidence to the select committee, particularly at page 27 of its report which indicates that that aspect is not one that can be taken in any quantitative form by any committee or Parliament. One can have a point of view on the moral aspect, but one cannot really let that point of view influence the overall position.

I personally believe that the select committee is really the hope of our Parliamentary system. When one looks at the history of this Bill one can see the stupid attitude that has

prevailed. I introduced a Bill, with no interest except to get it Bill debated, which was defeated 45 to 2. Mr Justice Millhouse (as he now is) supported it but, he said, only on the basis of having the second reading to get it debated. What happened? No Parties at the time could see that perhaps some silly little Independent might get a bit of credit instead of their getting it, and they voted *en masse* against it. They threw it out. That is fair enough: that is the right of individuals and Parties.

Then, a short time later, the Bill was brought back, this time by the Liberal Party. This occurred under a bit of a cloud, and there was talk about money changing hands and promises of donations to Parties. However, the Bill was introduced; there was a lot of debate, and a select committee was appointed. When it came to the final stage of the Bill an agreement was reached by representatives of the two major Parties to come up with a Bill that would be acceptable, and it was not a bad Bill. It could not have been too bad because it is back on the table again now in exactly the same form. As the member for Torrens said, there is one word in the Bill different from that contained in the Bill presented to the House six or eight months ago: one word! I must admit that a situation such as that creates some suspicion in people's minds. Why should it come back again? Why should it be thrown out? By the same token, there was a lot of odd voting at that time, as recorded in *Hansard*. People voted against it for all sorts of reasons, some because they thought that it was a political charade, a shonk or some odd Bill. However, this Bill is basically as it was then. It will be interesting to see how consciences have changed since that vote.

I would like to raise a couple of matters now which can be answered by the member for Hartley when he replies. There are a couple of odd things about the structure: it states that the casino supervisory authority will be set up with three members. It will hold an inquiry that will determine at the inquiry stage the premises and the conditions of licence. I can understand the conditions of licence: that makes sense (how and when it is set up), but I cannot see how the inquiry will select the premises at that stage and how it will know who is interested. A committee will be set up to determine that matter. That recommendation will be submitted to the Governor, who will issue the licence to the Lotteries Commission, which will then appoint a suitable person to establish and operate the casino. That entails a bit of a grey area that I would like clarified, and I am sure that it will be.

One other thing that seems odd to me is the role under this Bill of the Superintendent of Licensed Premises who it seems to me has far too much autonomy and power. He is the man to whom any anomaly is reported. He is the single, sole person who makes a decision on what will be done, whether a matter will be taken back to the authority or the commission, and that could be something that needs clarification.

In relation to the age clause, there is no necessity for people to prove their age. I think that one of the previous Bills contained a clause that put pressure upon people to justify or prove their age. There is another odd provision, and that is the clause involving poker machines. I cannot see in the Bill any provision to implement this clause. Let us look at that seriously: there is estimated to be 3 000 or 5 000 poker machines in this State now. Each of those poker machines costs from \$250 to as much as \$1 500. Therefore, one is looking at an average of approximately \$300 or \$400 for perhaps 500 machines. How will one take them out of the system? What will one do: kick the door down if that is not covered in the legislation? The legislation provides that it will be an offence to have a poker machine and

provides for a \$20 000 fine. How do we enforce that? I do not see how we can do so.

As to the clause concerning the ability to stop certain types of people from entering the casino, there is no precedent for this. How does one interpret that? Will it depend on the colour of one's skin or on one's sex? It does not say. I think that that could be qualified more, and perhaps it will be in the later discussion. As to the investigative powers of an authorised officer, no power is given to such officer to seize or to really investigate, as far as I can see.

It looks as though we will go through the whole debate again, and we may be here all night, going over the same old arguments, the same old things about big crime, prostitution, and the social effects. Although they are all aspects of the total argument, will somebody please prove to me that such problems will arise? The matter of big crime has been mentioned already tonight. It has been said that big crime will infiltrate. Tell me how that will occur in the Australian system?

As I have mentioned, a casino has operated in Tasmania for 10 years now. Many people use the New South Wales experience, and there is no doubt in my mind or in the mind of any other member of the select committee which investigated this matter in New South Wales: in that State there is crime in casinos—there is crime in gambling.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: They are illegal casinos.

Mr PETERSON: You just stole my thunder. I was about to come to that. I was about to say that there are criminals involved in those casinos.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Torrens is now called to order.

Mr PETERSON: Of course, it is well known that the casinos in New South Wales operate illegally. That has shown through and it is in the evidence. There was evidence from Mr Bob Bottoms and another witness who are noted as criminal reporters or authors, having written books on this topic. It is clear and it is in black and white: one does not have to be a Rhodes scholar to work out from their books that things are crook in New South Wales. However, we are not talking about that structure just as we are not talking about the American structure (Nevada, Atlantic City), Monte Carlo or the English system, a matter which was brought up again. The member for Glenelg spoke about the English system. That is a private club system that has no relationship at all to the system of legal Australian casinos. I know that the member for Glenelg has always been against casinos, and I respect him for that. However, he used arguments that were not valid. That is not really strange in this place, but he used those arguments over and over again and made points that were just not valid. I did not write them down, because I was a bit put off by his speech. In fact, I was really disappointed.

Members interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: There are members who thought that it was a very good speech. However, I would ask those members who said it was very good whether they read the evidence of the select committee. Have they seen the evidence given by individuals involved in crime fighting (if we can use that term), in the investigation of crime, the prevention of crime, the structure of the casinos and the administration of the casinos? As I say, there are two people in this Chamber (obviously in the State, not just this Chamber) who have taken the trouble to look at that evidence. There are 1 400 000 people in South Australia, although I stand to be corrected there.

The SPEAKER: There are 1 340 000.

Mr PETERSON: There are 1 340 000 people in South Australia, and only two of those people, apart from the members of the committee, have any idea of the contents of the evidence or know who gave evidence.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: It is listed in the report.

Mr PETERSON: The report is a report: it does not show every word of evidence.

Mr Becker: Do you include me when you refer to two people?

Mr PETERSON: I do not know who those two people are. I kept in touch with the officers who were in charge of the evidence. Only two people of 1 340 000 people in South Australia looked at the evidence, and those two people oppose the casino for the reasons stated. I am sure that those people and the Opposition have put forward those reasons in good faith. But not one person could say, 'That evidence is not right. The evidence is crook.' It was stated that a whole floor of the Wrest Point casino is a brothel. That is not a bad claim.

Mr Baker: You would know more than I would.

Mr PETERSON: I would not know. The committee investigated the matter. I could find no evidence about that. The people who are supposed to know about crime in Tasmania did not know about that matter, either.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member might protect himself by saying that the whole committee could find no evidence.

Members interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: Members know who the members of that committee were. No-one in this House has ever asked me about the committee—not that I set myself up as an authority. No-one has ever asked me what the committee found.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: It is a terrific report, and I do not say that because I was involved in it. It was a good experience to be on that select committee, and it is a good and complete report. When members speak against the Bill, they should refer to specific pages of the report. The report reflects the views of the committee. One member was not too happy about it. Over the years, the member for Glenelg has stated that young people would be able to gain access to a casino, but he did not refer to that matter tonight. Perhaps he believes that the Morin Report covered that issue.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We must not squabble about these things.

Mr PETERSON: If the member for Glenelg referred to that matter, I apologise: I did not hear him do so. Over the years, that has been the main point of the honourable member's rejection of a casino. I did not hear him say that tonight. This Bill is an exact copy of the Bill that was thrown out some months ago. I am sure that the people of South Australia are waiting with bated breath to see how consciences have changed in the past few months. They will be interested to know the reasons why members say that this is a different Bill, the reasons for and against it, why the effect to the State will be different, and why we should not try to attract that investment to the State.

I believe that most members and most people in this State believe that the concept of a casino is related to the railway station development. I do not know, but I believe that it is. We have talked about a considerable sum being invested in that regard and the considerable number of jobs that will come from this development. The people of this State are interested to know why consciences have changed. Even though this Bill is the same as the previous Bill, the people will be interested to know why this is a different matter and why it should be considered in a different way from the way in which we considered it a few months ago.

I stated at that time that we were confronted with a good Bill: I supported that Bill, and I support this Bill tonight. I will be disappointed for South Australia if the Bill does not pass (not on a personal level, because there would be nothing

in it for me, as I normally do not gamble, although I will probably go to the casino to see how it operates). I do not believe that there will be a risk, as has often been alleged, and I do not believe that the risks outweigh the benefits to the State, if we can create some jobs, and achieve balance, and a better hope for the State. At present, we are coasting along, and there is nothing on the horizon.

The casino will be only a small part of the development. Members would know that the casino at Wrest Point does not take up 17 floors for blackjack and roulette. The casino area is comparatively small. Anyone who has been to Alice Springs would know that the casino there is not very much larger than this Chamber. The size of a casino can be geared to what is required. I hope that this Parliament supports the Bill and that members can see the benefit to South Australia. The advantages will far outweigh any disadvantages. As I stated previously, some people will obviously overspend, but many benefits will accrue to the State. If the Parliament rejects this Bill, it will be finished. I cannot see such a Bill being introduced again. This is the last chance for us to attract some sort of investment to the State.

Mr Oswald: You said that six months ago.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PETERSON: I did, but this is the last time. If we let it go this time, we will blow that investment out the window. We cannot get it in any other way: this is the only way in which to attract that investment.

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

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I oppose the Bill, as I have opposed similar Bills since the debates on this proposal began in the early 1970s. I suppose that I have been one of the main opponents of a casino and, in answer to the member for Semaphore, I believe that I am the only person who has been overseas to study the casino question, including Wrest Point.

The member for Semaphore referred to the evidence of the select committee. I do not believe that the committee considered a matter that has concerned me in past years. In the 1970s, I stated that this was not a moral issue for me. I would be a hypocrite to say that it was a moral issue because, if I went to Wrest Point, I would be liable to spend \$4 or \$5, or some moderate amount. I would be liable to outlay that sum at the races, although I attend the races only on official occasions. I do not follow the races to any great degree; they have never thrilled me. Over the years I have had to lend money to employees until the next payday after they have lost the lot at the races on a Saturday. I know the effect on families of gambling. That is not my main objection to the establishment of a casino in this State, although that is of concern to all of us.

I believe that the member for Semaphore was very sincere in putting his point of view, and he tried to be honest. However, I do not believe he was honest in his approach to the letter from the South Australian Jockey Club. I am commencing at a different point from where I normally commence in this regard, because I believe that that reflection on the Jockey Club should not have been cast. I am not a great supporter of that area, although I believe that it has a great role to play in this State and is of benefit to the State as a sporting industry. The industry argues that it contributes a lot to the State, and that is true. But I believe that, when we quote letters, we should be fair to people. If one reads the whole letter from the South Australian Jockey Club, one sees that at no time does it state that the establishment of a casino in the State would bring the State or a section of society to its knees. That letter was not in conflict with the evidence that the Jockey Club gave to the select committee, as referred to by the member for Semaphore.

Their point was that, if a casino was established in South Australia, it would take up some of the gambling money already being spent in the racing industry where it is needed and that, if that occurred, it would be detrimental to the racing industry and to other gambling sports. They tied this aspect also to the Bill now before another place in respect of the abolition of advertising of tobacco and cigarettes. Their argument is that if that is taken away that will be another loss.

The letter from the S.A.J.C. states that the evidence from Tasmania is that the establishment of the casino at Wrest Point had a marked and sustained effect on the decline of domestic disposable income directed towards racing, and there is nothing to suggest that the same decline would not occur in South Australia. That must be the case. Name me the person in South Australia who does not spend all of his or her disposable income within some area of the State's economy. Yet nearly 90 per cent of the people attending Wrest Point are local people, Taswegians. Therefore, if they are spending money in the casino, are they spending it on food, clothing and education, and gambling at the racing, trots or dogs? Of course they are not! The one thing that the select committee did not take up in strong enough terms was something about which I asked two members of that committee: when the casino was to be established in Hobart, that city had no nightlife, hardly a restaurant open after 11 p.m., virtually no hotel accommodation, and little or nothing for the tourist; yet suddenly one of the most conservative cities in Australia, on an island isolated from the mainland, gained approval from Parliament to have a casino, and one of the biggest operators in the hotel industry outside Australia put up a great sum of Asian money, not Australian or Tasmanian money, to establish a casino. Of course, they brought cabaret life because the casino could operate later, whereas many hotels had not been allowed to operate in that way up until that time. Suddenly there was an extension of nightlife for the people of Tasmania in general and Hobart in particular that had been denied them before.

Of course, there was a revival of interest on the part of people who wanted to see the nightlife the same as they would want to see it when they visited Melbourne or Sydney, regardless of whether or not there was a casino. When the first casino was established anywhere in Australia, let alone Tasmania, I am sure that people would go there, that those who wished to gamble would do so as part of their life, and that businessmen would organise their conventions at such places. However, would people come from France to Australia merely because there was a casino here? Would they come from New Zealand to Australia for gambling when they could go to Hong Kong to gamble at Macao, live in a hotel at a lower cost and buy cheaper goods? Of course not! If they come to Hobart, they will use the casino. About 13 per cent of all visitors to Wrest Point casino come from outside Tasmania, but they do not all go there to gamble. For a select committee, a police officer, or a member of the clergy to say, 'This person has ended up struggling financially or having family or personal problems solely as a result of gambling' is wrong, because we know that that is not the case, nor is it likely to be. Indeed, usually it is a composite group of factors that causes such problems and one can never be sure how the problem started.

It is part of my background that I have employed up to 60 people in a rather tough industry in which I believe I have worked as hard as anyone. I have seen what happens to some of those employees and their families: the nearer they work to gambling or drinking facilities the greater the problems have been for the family. We will not change that by having or not having a casino in South Australia, but the establishment of a casino increases the potential. Most people who argue that a casino would not be a problem in

this State are those connected with the news media where most people have the capacity to decide when to start and when to stop gambling; members of Parliament who we hope have a similar capacity; and other people who have that capacity. Such people are able to pass the word advertising the fact that there is no harm in a casino.

I challenge a select committee or any person to go to the individual homes and talk to the families to see whether there is a problem. That is part of the reason why I oppose the casino. The main reason is the effect on established businesses. As I said, in Tasmania there was nothing. In South Australia we have more licensed eating places per head of population than any other major city in Australia. What effect will it have if we centralise more night-life in the one establishment, whether they be interstate, overseas or local visitors to the city of Adelaide? Are all small restaurants and larger businesses already making a fortune and going through good times? Are they enjoying buoyant times? We know they are not. Are they employing people? We know they are. If they have to go out of business, are they going to employ the people? We know they are not.

Somebody will then argue that if we do have a casino it will employ a number of people. Who is going to carry out a survey and give a guarantee as to what effect it will have on the number of people unemployed and the businesses because a main centre of attraction has been established? When I wrote to the Hotels Association and said it should be concerned about this, I was informed that it was not. I made the same point to the racing industry. Most people in general conversation said they were not concerned, but I see that the Jockey Club has realised the position. I do not blame them for saying that if there is to be a licence they would like to have it.

In recent times Parliament has passed new legislation and made new provisions to help the racing industry get out of its serious trouble. Do we allow a casino and then find the racing industry in even more trouble? Then will Parliament have to approve more State revenue going to the racing industry? The Trotting Club wrote to me and said, 'We would like to have the casino at Globe Derby Park. We have a good piece of land.' It is a good site, close to the city and on a main road. Are we to give it to the Trotting Club, or are we going to give it to Federal Hotels? We do not know who owns Federal Hotels or where the money comes from. The two people who saw me in 1976 were definitely not Australians, but they have a tie-up with that organisation. Is it one of our own State entrepreneurs who is pushing the proposal? I do not want to name them.

It comes back to the point of why the Government brought the Bill forward as it has. Is there an offer of money to build an establishment in Adelaide now? If there is, the Government should be honest and say, 'We have a proposal for x millions of dollars to build a casino/hotel/convention centre/complex in Adelaide. We can disclose the site; we cannot disclose who has made the offer, but it is there.' The people of South Australia should know that it is there. Why not take this Bill to the point where Parliament has expressed a view and then ask the people of South Australia whether or not they support a casino? Gallup polls have been taken and surveys have been conducted by papers which have indicated that a percentage of the people supports a casino.

The same philosophy applied when this Government was in power in 1967. It said it would take the Lotteries Commission to the people and have a referendum. It was put to the people of South Australia as a major shift in philosophy. Why not do the same thing on this occasion? Is it scared of the result? Is it so short of money that it believes this is a chance to get a few dollars which will pull it through the mire now, regardless of the future? Human nature being

what it is, individuals, Governments and business, when in trouble, do desperate things. One of those desperate things is to take a punt, gambling, or whatever it may be. I believe the Government saw this as an opportunity to obtain a few dollars in order to solve its problems.

What happened with Federal Hotels in Tasmania? Originally, it was to pay 25 per cent. It complained so the figure was reduced to 21 per cent. The company operated for nearly three years and then said that 21 per cent was too high and it wanted it reduced. Once it got the licence and the establishment, it then put pressure on the Government to reduce the percentage but where was the money going? It was not stopping in Tasmania; it was going out of Tasmania.

That organisation was kind enough to put me up for a couple of days and, as I have said in the House previously, provide me with food and drink. Why offer that to a politician in an attempt to convince him it is a great place? Why not show him through the place and show him how it operates? When the member for Semaphore asked whether members know how it operates and whether they have read the evidence, those who went there in the early stages and saw how it operates do not have to read the evidence, because they know. Those members who attended the Constitutional Convention meeting in Hobart and who went to bed before 11 p.m., like the Premier of Queensland and a person from this State, know who the phone calls were from. An American aircraft carrier was in the next day (either the *Enterprise* or *Independence*) with 5 500 men on board, and those members know that the calls came from within the building.

Every politician at that convention knew at breakfast next morning what was taking place. There is no doubt the phone calls were made from within the Wrest Point Casino. The only way people could get the names of member of Parliament who were staying there would be from somebody within that hotel. All politicians know what occurred on that occasion.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: It was the *Enterprise*.

Mr EVANS: The member for Light tells me it was the *Enterprise*. I know the member for Light was there and is aware of the situation. I have had many letters from my electorate this time. The member for Flinders made the point it is not as many as on other occasions, but I have had more this time than last year, mainly because I gave the matter more publicity this year than last year.

That is the point I made when the first proposal was put for a casino. The press ran it on television for days and for a great period of time we gave it greater publicity. The economic problems and controversies being spoken of now were not being publicised then. People are becoming conditioned to those problems, as is the media, and the only interest now is which way the vote will go in the end. I am sorry for those who have to sit and wait to see what it will be.

I do not support the Bill, but I will attempt to amend it to make it better. If there is to be a casino in South Australia, it should be Government owned, and controlled. To give a licence to one private operator to make use of this whole facility would be improper. I have never supported that, and members opposite know that I have been consistent in that point of view. It is up to members whether they support such an amendment. I point out that people in other countries have doubts about gambling, and if hazards did not exist there would not be such strict controls and regulations. If it was thought that there was nothing wrong with gambling, one might say that there is nothing wrong with children going into gambling rings, although there are rules stipulating that one must be 18 before one can go into a gambling area.

Furthermore, in some other countries even though the age of majority is 18 years one must be 21 before one can enter a casino. In Austria, if one is a student older than 21 or dependent to any degree on one's family, the person's family has the right to lodge an objection denying that a person the right to enter a casino. In those places one must carry an identity card. In Greece or Italy, if one is in the Public Service or a member of the police, army or air force, or if one handles other people's money in the capacity of accountant, lawyer or treasurer of a club or association one is not allowed to enter a gambling casino. Obviously, if such conditions are imposed it is done because there is a concern about people spending other people's money unwisely or illegally.

I recall an article written by a prominent and capable Adelaide journalist which cited the case of Monte Carlo, saying that gambling had done no harm to the people of Monaco, so why worry about gambling. I point out that local residents are debarred and forbidden to enter the casino for gambling purposes. Of course, one knows how successful a casino in South Australia would be if it was ruled that South Australians could not enter the facility. People have argued about how well the Monte Carlo casino operates, but the rule to which I referred has been in operation for over 100 years. An Austrian company that is half owned publicly and privately, with a lot of Government control, set up a casino in Holland; it took up the offer to help Holland set up its three casinos (I think the third one is being built at the moment). The rules applying to those casinos would possibly be some of the strictest in operation. It is a rule that, if a business associate or someone within the family makes an objection to the casino that someone has been gambling too much, a credit check can be done on that person. The 11 casinos involved are all linked to a computer. All those entering them have identity cards, although the Government does not care about tourists who can spend as much as they like.

For example, the casino operators could say to a person, 'You have been gambling too heavily; we have had some complaints about your business operations,' and they could then check out that person's credit rating. If a person has interests not known by the authorities, such as an interest in theft, prostitution or collecting money on the black market, and not paying tax on such money, that information is not disclosed to anyone else. It remains private and confidential, as is the case in this country in relation to tax returns. After this investigation the manager could say to the person that the establishment intends to limit the amount of time that he can spend in a casino in a year, and indicate the periods of time during which he could enter and how much he could spend.

Such controls are in force because there is concern about the inability of some people to control their gambling habits. The member for Semaphore wonders why we should refer to other countries, but I believe that it is important to investigate the operations in other countries which have been there for longer than they have been in this country in the way of the racing industry and other areas of activity. In France and in England, card games and racing are not referred to as gambling. They call it a wager or a bet, because it is considered that there is some skill involved in judging the performance of the jockey, the trainer, or the conditions of the track, or, in regard to card games, knowing to some degree the pack of cards. However, spinning a wheel or throwing a dice is considered straight-out gambling and falls into a different category of the law. In England it is a rule that no person with any business interests outside of the United Kingdom is entitled to take out a licence or to have any interests in a casino operation. That is a blanket rule. Will we do that?

If any person presents a cheque in a casino it is not cashed at the end of the evening if that person is successful. A cheque must be presented to the bank within two clear banking days. This is to ensure that people do not write out cheques and then tear them up if they have a win so that the bank manager does not find out. Further, in England advertising of gambling casinos is prohibited. The philosophy in regard to gambling is a good one, namely, if the person wants to gamble he can seek out a facility. That is in contrast to the publicity given to lotteries and other things here, which I believe is scandalous. We encourage people to gamble hoping that they will win, but knowing they will lose.

I think that Parliament has a responsibility in this matter. The member for Hartley asked why Parliament should place restrictions on people if their activities do not affect anyone else. I ask whether the member for Hartley is prepared to support poker machines. If we had poker machines in clubs the local communities of an area would be getting back money from local residents, even if some people were over-spending, and the argument is that at least the money would not be leaving the State by way of a private entrepreneur. If a State wanted to, it could begin making its own poker machines. It has always amazed me that New South Wales has not tried that, considering the sort of money involved in the manufacturing and use of them and considering the philosophies that have prevailed in power in New South Wales during the last few years.

Why do people argue that it does not matter if there is a facility available for people to do what they like if it does not harm others? Why, then, do they say 'No' to poker machines? That attitude always surprises me. Yet that argument is not used. In Sydney poker machines are everywhere, and people say that they affect family life and that they put people in a bad situation in regard to meeting their commitments. With poker machines, horse racing, dog racing, and illegal gambling facilities, one does not know where it will end. There has been a call in this country by a responsible section of the community, namely, the churches, for us to place a moratorium on any further gambling facilities until a survey of their effects has been made throughout the country. They are proposing a proper and detailed survey of the effect that gambling has on our society.

I support that concept because to my knowledge, except for one survey in America, nowhere in the world, not even our select committee, has anyone pointed out the consequences that gambling has on the overall society. I would like to see that done just to find out what is really happening and who is on the right track.

I do not believe that there will be many tourists rushing to South Australia to look at the casino after the first six-month period. I believe that the Alice Springs casino is already in trouble, and the operators sent officials up from Hobart about three or four months ago to try and straighten things out, because it is getting into some difficulty in relation to clientele. We in Adelaide will be lucky to get an increase in visitors from outside South Australia. It will just give the locals another gambling facility. To me, it will affect other businesses. Initially, it will be creating jobs in the building industry. That is not denied. If one builds anything one will create jobs.

On balance, I am not convinced that a casino would be good for South Australia, and when a Government does what was done today in shabbily bringing on this Bill to the detriment of other private member's business, when it was not unanimously agreed on all sides of the House, I believe the Government deserves to have the Bill defeated. It did not have the intestinal fortitude to make it a Government Bill, as the previous Government did, but it made it a private member's Bill and introduced it by a back-door

method because it did not want to carry the stigma and the taint within the community for introducing this Bill. If the Government had thought that was good, then it would have introduced it as a Government Bill. It did not have the intestinal fortitude to do that, because it did not believe that it would do as well as it would have liked in creating another Casino in South Australia. It has got some electoral stigma that it wants to avoid. I oppose the Bill.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I have listened intently this evening to the contributions by members on both sides of this House. I went back through *Hansard* and studied the speeches on the last two occasions when Bills similar to this were introduced before the House, and I also studied in detail the speech made by the member for Hartley. I have read correspondence received from various groups in the community which are interested in this Bill. I have yet to read anything which makes me change my view that I just cannot see that South Australia really needs another gambling outlet.

As I said, I listened very patiently to the member for Hartley and I reread his speech on a couple of occasions. The main thing I got out of that speech was that he constantly reminded us of the benefits that he saw that we would receive from the casino. We heard about the construction phase of the casino and its benefits; we heard about the benefits that would accrue from the casino with increased employment in the hospitality and entertainment industries; we also heard of the benefits which would accrue to the State from spin-off effects (as he termed them) in extra goods and services that would be required by a casino; we also heard about the boost to the tourist industry that the casino would bring to the State; finally, we heard about the generation of profits which would go to the Hospital Fund. I think that the last comment I must refer to, as we all know that the Hospitals Fund is a bit of a laugh when we talk about money being channelled through it. I am sorry that the member for Hartley did not devote some of his time (or much of his speech either) on the casino to the vulnerable minority (indeterminable at this stage, but nevertheless a vulnerable minority) who may have the potential to be compulsive gamblers.

I am sorry that the member for Semaphore is not in the House at the moment, because he was saying that no-one has come forward with any examples of families that have been affected by casinos. I quote one of four examples which I was informed about when I visited Alice Springs just prior to the Bill being introduced into the House last time. On that occasion, I was talking to a former President of the Chamber of Commerce in Alice Springs who put it to me that several families (or the breadwinners of those families) had been banned from the casino, but that he did not know how many others who were still using the casino were in financial trouble.

He quoted one example of a fellow in Alice Springs who went to the casino regularly every night and lost. As he continued to lose he then went to the bank and made application for money, saying that he needed it for extensions to his home. The bank believed his story and gave the money to him because he had equity in a house. He borrowed several thousand dollars and, of course, one can see what happened. He went straight out to the casino that evening and, unfortunately, lost it. In other words, he was starting to chase his losses. He then went back to the bank after a few days and asked the manager to give him an extension on that loan because he needed extra materials and wanted to make further alterations to the extensions on his house. He got that extension of the loan, and he lost that. The banker was alert that something was wrong, and started asking the appropriate questions. He also found that the

man was slowly mortgaging off his house. That is an example that I think a lot of us who care about the social impact of casino want to hear about.

I was shocked to hear that this sorry thing had happened. I can see how easily it can happen and I think honourable members, before they vote on this subject, should think deeply on the social impact of a casino and accept the fact that there are people who, when they get involved in gambling such as this, just cannot stop. It is easy to compare gambling at a casino and on the roulette wheel with gambling at the races. It has been said, and I said it here last year, that certainly people can lose a whole pay packet at the races on a Saturday. However, there is some difference in that there are eight hours of racing and, after it is over, those people go home and in fact have a cooling off period. This is not so with roulette. It is spun every two or three minutes, it is set in a glamorous atmosphere, and people can get carried away after a few drinks and lose a lot of money; they can come back the next night and carry on. I refer members back to that example of the family in Alice Springs as what can and does happen to families that are affected.

A casino Bill was first before the House on 31 March 1982 and it was at that time that I expressed my lack of enthusiasm (for those members in my constituency who will be referring to my contribution tonight, I refer them to page 3811 of *Hansard* so that they can see what I said on that occasion). A similar Bill was again before the House on 18 August 1982, when I expressed my lack of enthusiasm for it (that can be found at page 600 of *Hansard*).

Like other members, I have studied the report of the select committee, and I congratulate that committee and its members for producing such an informative report. There is no doubt that it is an informative report, a balanced report, and should assist members in coming to a conclusion. However, as I said when I opened my remarks, nothing in that report or what I have read or heard since that makes me anything but extremely luke-warm in my support for a casino. Although it is a conscience vote, I believe that members should have some due regard for the feelings of the constituents whom they are here to represent.

During 1982, in an effort to try and gauge the feeling of my constituency, I undertook a survey in Jetty Road, Glenelg. Those members who were present when I last spoke on this subject in August 1982 would be familiar with this survey, because I went into great detail on the actual figures that I acquired. I took a sampling from more than 1 300 constituents. This was done by standing on Jetty Road, stopping people at random, and asking them the question, "Would you object to a casino being established in South Australia?" One would agree that from 1 300 constituents (not quite 10 per cent of my electorate, but getting very close to it) one can gauge some opinion of what one's electorate thinks. Of that 1 300, some 60 per cent of constituents actually said, 'Yes', to the question.

However, when one pressed them further, I suggest that approximately 20 per cent of that 60 per cent enthusiastically said, 'Yes, we must have a casino.' The balance of them were people such as myself and other members present. They said, 'We would never use a casino ourselves but who are we to stop others using one?' In other words, they would probably never use one but they did not really feel (civil liberties being with us) that they should stop others using a casino. However, I think that about 24 or 25 per cent of the people were vehemently opposed to it. They were very emotionally opposed, and it is generally accepted by pollsters who do street polls that one can add a factor of about 4 to a street poll. From that exercise it would be fair to say that, on that occasion on Jetty Road, about 30 per cent of the people in my electorate were very emotionally opposed to it on religious, ethical and moral grounds.

I believe that if one is to represent one's electorate, one must have due regard to what the minority thinks. So often on issues we are inclined to say, 'What does the majority think?' and go along with it. I think that there are times in public office when one does not have to go along with the majority and I think that this occasion is one on which members have to address the views of the minority. As I say, I am aware that there are members opposite who want to set up a casino as part of an entertainment industry, where it will be part of a total convention or hotel complex. This is no solace for those who oppose it on moral and religious grounds. I believe that their views have to be respected and not bulldozed over by the majority.

As I said initially, this majority is not the old majority of those for and those against, because a lot of people do not really care about the issue. Some desperately want it and a lot do not want it. I expressed the view earlier, when considering radical legislation which will affect the social equilibrium of the community, we should have due regard to this minority opinion. However, there is one time when the majority must be considered. I believe that if 30 per cent of my electorate is totally opposed to the casino, it warrants my falling in line with their wishes and it is certainly dictating to a large extent the fact that I will not be supporting this Bill. I am luke warm to it myself. I do not really believe that we need another gambling outlet in this State. I think that we are more than covered and I will certainly not be supporting the Bill when it eventually gets to the third reading stage.

I would now like to spend a few minutes of the time available to me referring to some of the correspondence that I have received. I believe that some of the letters sent to honourable members have been well researched and, as such should be recorded in *Hansard*. I am a member of the Uniting Church. I believe in the principles and the beliefs of the Uniting Church and I have taken careful note of the letter which was sent to me from the Synod of the Uniting Church. The letter is headed, 'Why the Uniting Church is opposed to a casino'. All members would have received it. There are five points made in this document and I think that it should be recorded in *Hansard* for posterity. The letter states:

What reasons were given for a casino in South Australia?

When introducing the Bill Mr Blevins indicated four benefits which would result if a casino were to be established in South Australia.

- (i) the first benefit, it was suggested, would come at the 'construction phase'. However, nowhere in the Bill is it required that a casino will require a construction phase. It is entirely possible that the premises with respect to which a licence might be granted is an already existing premises. This benefit is imaginary or, at least, is not a certainty!

That is, of course, unless the Government has something up its sleeve and will make some mammoth announcement after this Bill is passed. At the moment, it can put the casino in any existing premises and, therefore, the construction phase ceases to exist. The letter continues:

- (ii) The second benefit is supposedly the increase in employment in the hospitality and entertainment industries. Again, while it is a reasonable assumption that a casino might be associated with the provision of hospitality and entertainment, the Bill does not require it. If the association of casino and entertainment is intended it amounts to a condition upon which a licence will be granted, but the Bill does not require that a casino shall also provide hospitality and entertainment. Again, we are offered an uncertain benefit!
- (iii) The third benefit offered is the 'spin-off-effects' in the extra goods and services required. This point is an extension of the previous point. Benefits two and three are assumed on the basis of what happened at Wrest Point in Hobart. However, it remains to be shown that the effects in Hobart would be duplicated in South Australia. It depends on the kind of casino

which might be operated, and, when there are casinos in several places, whether the casino will require all the extra goods and services. This unproven benefit is offered as if it is a certainty!

- (iv) The fourth and popular benefit is the boost to the tourist industry. It is not at all obvious that the tourist industry in South Australia will benefit from the establishment of a casino, or that a similar growth pattern will occur as that which occurred in Tasmania following the establishment of Wrest Point in Hobart. The growth pattern which occurred in Hobart was due, at least in part, to the fact that at that time Wrest Point was the only casino in Australia. There is no convincing evidence that with a multiplicity of casinos they will continue to stimulate growth to the tourist industry!

The final point is the one which refers to this money going into the Hospitals Fund. It states:

- (v) Finally there will be the generated profits which will go to the Hospitals Fund. In introducing the Bill Mr Blevins, M.L.C. admitted that 'it is impossible to calculate just how much profit would be generated for the sole use of the State.' (*Hansard*, 23 March, 1983, p551). We are offered as a benefit what amounts to no more than an uncertain amount of profit!

That is the view of the Uniting Church. I would also like to refer to three points made by the Churches of Christ, because I believe that they are quite topical and quite correct. Its letter to members, dated 9 May, states:

- (1) A casino would do little for the development of tourism in S.A. beyond its immediate locality—

that is important now that there are casinos in every State (but certainly not in S.A.)—

and, with the opening of casinos in other states, is unlikely to be an influential factor in making people decide to visit S.A.

I believe that the second point is also valid. It states:

- (2) The economic advantages of a casino would be off-set by losses to existing tourist facilities and by the increased cost of surveillance and social welfare that would have to be met out of State revenue.

I will refer to the last point first—the increasing cost to social welfare. In that regard, I refer to the family in Alice Springs which was slowly raising loans on the home and mortgaging the home on fixed term—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

Mr OSWALD: That man was raising loans on fictitious building extensions so that he could spend the money at the casino. That family was heading towards social benefits, and would, no doubt, now be existing on such benefits. The letter from the S.A.J.C. highlights the leisure dollar, and I believe that it is a factual assessment. It states:

There is a practical limit to the supply of leisure dollars, particularly in South Australia. The competition for those dollars is growing at an alarming rate. . . The evidence from Tasmania is that the Wrest Point casino had a marked and sustained effect on the decline of domestic disposal income directed towards racing. There is nothing to suggest that the same decline will not occur in South Australia.

One could read into that that there will also be an effective decline in the domestic disposable income spent on tourism generally and the money that is available to be spread around the community by those who are patronising the casino. I refer now to a letter referring to comments by the Anglican Archbishop of Adelaide, Dr Keith Rayner, expressing the views of the Anglican Church, which I believe have come through loud and clear. It is stated:

Archbishop Rayner said that there had been a massive growth of gambling in Australia in recent years:

There are strong vested interests in promoting its further development. Large-scale gambling diverts resources from productive to non-productive fields; it fosters unhealthy covetousness by holding out the prospect of enormous wealth without work; and as a form of recreation it is essentially anti-social.

Of course it is anti-social. It was further stated:

Archbishop Rayner pointed out that at the time of the previous proposal for a casino the Council of the Diocese of Adelaide urged all members of the South Australian Parliament to continue to resist strongly any moves for the establishment of a casino in the State. Dr Rayner said that that resolution continues to express the position of the Anglican Church.

The priests are in close contact with families affected by gambling. The House should have regard to the views of ministers of religion in this case.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

Mr OSWALD: It is part of the role of ministers in their parish to keep in touch with those in need. If ever there was a group in the community which could advise members on the effects of gambling and could telegraph warnings to us, it is such people. I believe that we should have due regard to the views of the leaders of the Uniting Church, the Archbishop of the Anglican Church, the Conference Centre, and the Acting State Minister of the Church of Christ. In the *News* of 5 May, it is stated:

The Uniting Church moderator in South Australia, Dr. H.D. Wood, said resurrection of the controversial issue was a 'very unfortunate move which could only reduce the quality of life in S.A.'

The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Adelaide, Dr. J.W. Gleeson, said: 'I am sure legislation in favour of casinos is not in the best interests of our State. We South Australians do not want to be trapped into introducing so-called forms of entertainment which may ultimately degrade human dignity and create additional problems for family life.'

The ministers of religion are working with families and on family improvement: that is their sole role. I believe we should have due regard to that. I am sorry that I was not in the House when the member for Albert Park spoke in this debate. From my research and in studying for my contribution, I read previous contributions, and I believe that the member for Albert Park made four points which were sound and with which I totally agree. It is worth highlighting those points.

The honourable member outlined four reasons why the Bill should not proceed. In fairness, his remarks related to the previous Bill. First, he was concerned about the social and welfare consequences of gambling; secondly, he stated that there was insufficient statistical information available on gambling in Australia; thirdly, he said that there has been an increase in gambling from the lowest to the highest in the State; and, fourthly, he stated that a casino will lead to increasing social and welfare problems in this State. It is the last point on which I wish to conclude my remarks. If this Bill is defeated tonight (and I hope it is), I trust that the matter will be laid to rest, because, as I said previously, I fail to see why South Australia needs another outlet for gambling at this time. There are enough outlets in this State to satisfy people's needs to test their chance against mother luck. I urge members to think deeply on this subject, because they will be setting ground rules for social change if they support the Bill. This legislation, in years to come, will have an ongoing effect on our children. I urge members not to support this Bill.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I will not speak for very long on this matter, as I canvassed my opinions in the debate in March 1982. I refer members to my contribution on that occasion (pages 3816 to 3819 of *Hansard* of 31 March 1982). I will summarise the arguments I put on that occasion. First, I will address myself to the article that appeared in the *Sunday Mail* last weekend, under the heading 'Arnold stands firm'. It was not totally accurate: it reflected upon an action that I took in this Chamber when a procedural motion was being considered and divided upon.

The article is correct in that I will stand firm in my opposition to the casino, and I will vote against the Bill later tonight or early tomorrow morning. When I departed from the Chamber when the procedural motion was considered, I did so because by pre-arrangement I had a pair. I was due to go to Canberra to a meeting of the Australian Education Council, and it was anticipated that I might leave earlier than, in fact, turned out to be the case. As a pair had been arranged with the Opposition Whip and as it had been assumed that I would leave the Chamber, the Government Party Whip advised me of that arrangement and accordingly I left the Chamber. I would have done so had the House been dividing on any Bill whatsoever, be it the Barley Marketing Act Amendment Bill or the Casino Bill. I wish to put on record that the article in the *Sunday Mail* which implies that I walked out on the Government on a procedural matter was not correct.

The headline is correct in regard to my voting on the casino issue. My reasons for opposition are printed quite clearly in the *Hansard* debate on this matter and they are as follows. First, I can see no valid reason why we should provide a laundromat for criminal money or undeclared money in this State under Government sponsorship or under any other sponsorship. Believing that people who have large sums to throw away on the gambling tables may have some knowledge of statistics and financial affairs, and wondering why they should choose to do so knowing that they must lose, knowing that the odds provide that someone pays for the staff of casinos, profit of casino operators and Government tax, knowing that it must be those who gamble on the tables, and that, therefore they will lose money from what they invest, why do people gamble large sums of money in a casino?

It is my strong fear, I believe supported also by evidence from a number of sources, that criminal money or money that does not wish to be declared for tax purposes is laundered by such means. It is quite a profitable way of laundering money not to be declared for tax, because whereas only 40c in the dollar and on some occasions 50c in the dollar may be left in moneys declared for tax in certain income categories, if it were invested on the table and then the winnings taken as winnings, therefore non-taxable, there could be only a 30 per cent loss: therefore, there is some profit.

Secondly, I cannot see in a time of considerable economic stringency why we should want to provide an avenue of desperation gambling for many people in our society who are in grave social distress. As a member of a district which has very high unemployment rates and where daily I am dealing with constituents who are facing financial problems, I think it would be irresponsible of me to believe that an avenue of desperation gambling would be of help to this society. I cannot accept that.

Much has been made of the matter of gambling addiction on both sides of this House. My view is that it is possible for some people to become victims of gambling and that the casino type of gambling, as with poker-machine type gambling, is something to which those people who have that weakness would be especially prone, because of the very short time that exists between an investment in a bet and a decision about whether or not that bet has been successful. If one invests in a lottery ticket, one has to wait some period of time before one knows whether one's decision has been successful or not. Therefore, that time lag is enough to kill any desire to immediately reinvest to try to recoup the loss that one has sustained, whereas with instant forms of gambling, and I would incorporate Instant Money in that, the time between the investment and decision is so short that there is that urge for some to reinvest immediately

to try to recoup the losses they have made and consequently, statistically, they get themselves deeper into trouble.

The other point I made on that occasion, which I spelled out at some length, is that I do not accept the tourism argument as of any merit at all. I would believe that while one casino may have attracted people, the one in Hobart, and while the ones in the Northern Territory may also be an attraction, the stage is fast being reached where there are so many in Australia that any one we have here in South Australia would have no tourist pull whatsoever.

I cannot believe that family tourism, around which I would have thought much of our tourist industry is based, is going to have much of an attraction if we build a casino. I do not believe families are flocking around this nation in search of a casino. I have no doubt that, when families visit Tasmania, they make the statutory call to the casino, but that is not why they have gone there. It will not be why we will attract family tourism to this State or keep South Australian families within South Australia. Likewise, in the matter of international tourism, if there is an international jet set which seeks out casinos around the world, I believe they are relatively few in number and that, if Australia has added any to the Monte Carlo/Macau network, it would be either the Northern Territory casinos or the Tasmania casino, and the one we might have in South Australia would not add itself to that network. In any event, I stand by the other comments I made that, while I have used those tourism arguments to spell out as I believe to be quite fallacious the reasons that a casino would be of tourist benefit to South Australia, the other arguments are of greater significance to me and I believe that a casino would be a social disadvantage to this State. For those reasons, I cannot support a casino.

In closing, I must make one comment about the attitude of those people in my own electorate. We all have had many approaches from people concerning casinos, and it is true that I would think that all of us have had more letters expressing opposition than we have had letters in favour of the proposal. I acknowledge the fact that, in conversation with people in my electorate, I have come across a wide cross-section of my own constituency that would indeed support a casino. I acknowledge that; I think that the House needs to know that that is the case, and I believe that in regard to this matter I could even be out of step with a significant number of my constituents, if not the majority of my constituents.

However, this is a conscience vote when members are given the opportunity to express what their views are, and it is up to the electorate to make its decision of how they will view its member's decision on a later occasion when it weighs up the member's decision on this issue as opposed to the views of its member on other issues on which the elected member has represented the constituency. I hope that the members of this House will reject the call for a casino, which will not be of social or economic benefit to people of this State.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): I oppose the Bill and share the views that have been expressed so ably by the Minister of Education. As I recall, he shared the views that I expressed immediately prior to his speaking on the previous Casino Bill. The argument that I used on that occasion on 18 August (page 594 of *Hansard*) still stands. However, I would like to elaborate on some of my views and make some reference to circumstances that have arisen since the previous debate. I want to define what I consider a conscience vote to be. I was intrigued during the previous debate, more so during this debate, to find that many members seem to equate a conscience vote with what they believed the majority of their constituents wished.

To my mind, the wishes of the constituency are not relevant to the vote of a member in regard to a conscience vote. The Oxford dictionary defines conscience as 'moral sense of right and wrong'. It is interesting that Erskine May makes no reference whatever to a conscience vote. In terms of a moral sense of right and wrong, I do not believe that gambling itself is inherently wrong, but I believe that I would be doing the wrong thing if I were to in any way assist in measures which would create further opportunities for gambling in South Australia.

I have reflected very carefully on my opposition to gambling. I can find nothing in my childhood or education which was specifically directed against gambling. In fact, I never heard the word 'gambling' mentioned. Further, I did not even see my parents go near any betting facility, nor did I hear the subject discussed at school. I remember having a very vague recollection as a child that the occupation of someone known as a bookmaker involved a person who printed and bound books. I can recall nothing that specifically would have formed my views against gambling. I can certainly state that I have never placed a bet on anything, nor do I expect that I ever will. That does not mean to say that I have not bought the occasional ticket in a charitable raffle—whether that might be considered by people as a form of gambling I suppose is open to question. However, I go back to the principal point on which I based my opposition last time; that is, the report of the select committee and its first recommendation, namely:

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

That the Government consider approaching other State Governments and the Australian Government with a view to having the survey made on a national basis in order that the appropriate information could be at the disposal of each Government.

It then went on to say:

That the Government establish a committee to measure the social and economic aspects of gambling in this State.

Having admitted that the committee did not know what the effects of gambling were, it then proposed that a casino be established in South Australia. That seems to me to exhibit the most extraordinary lack of logic and lack of responsibility. Having read some—although not all—the evidence of the select committee, it comes through very strongly that people were not able to document effectively their views one way or the other and, in that regard, it is particularly interesting to read the evidence of the two groups which represent the views of women in South Australia, that is, the National Council of Women and the Women's Electoral Lobby. Those two groups could be said to represent different views of women, the National Council of Women holding perhaps a more conservative view (and when one looks at its affiliated bodies that is readily understood), and the Women's Electoral Lobby holding perhaps a more radical view. Although, if one takes the word 'radical' to its original Latin meaning of 'root' and 'going back to the roots of things', perhaps the National Council of Women and the Women's Electoral Lobby are not so far apart. Both of those organisations gave evidence to the select committee and opposed the establishment of a casino.

It was interesting to read in that evidence the strength of feeling of women on this issue. It was also of concern to note that they found it very difficult to document reasons which would substantiate their concerns. One can call it 'intuition' if one likes; one can describe it as 'accumulated wisdom', but the fact remains that women generally instinctively feel a threat to their personal, emotional and economic security when they know that gambling facilities are to be enlarged or new ones established. That intuitive or instinctive

feeling is soundly based in the fact that the woman's whole being is directed towards the protection of the family unit and they instinctively recoil from anything that they think could damage the family unit. That whole thing was stressed time and time again in the evidence of both the Women's Electoral Lobby and the National Council of Women.

I refer briefly to the lobbying which has been undertaken in respect of this Bill. I understand, although I did not see the report, that the *Advertiser* listed me as one of the members whose attitude to the Bill was doubtful. I do not know what the basis of that listing was because, as I say, on two occasions I have opposed the Bill. At any rate, following that listing I have received about 200 letters asking me to vote against the Bill. It is interesting that in my whole three years as Minister of Tourism and in the time since as member for Coles I have not received one single representation asking me to support a casino in South Australia. It may well be that people who would like to see a casino established felt that my views were so firmly held that it would be a waste of time to try to alter them. Nevertheless, it is interesting that I have had not one representation urging me to support the establishment of a casino.

I will refer briefly to the alleged benefits to tourism of a casino. This issue was made much of when the Bill came before the House when I was Minister of Tourism. Some people believed that there was a conflict between my responsibilities as Minister of Tourism and my personal views about gambling. I cannot say that it has been easy to oppose what is clearly the wish of the tourist industry in South Australia. Nevertheless, it has never occurred to me that I should do otherwise than pursue my personal belief in this matter and oppose the Bill.

In addition, practical common sense tells me, and the record shows, that it is not necessary to have a casino in order to enlarge tourism growth in South Australia. I will not put the figures on the record again because I have done so on several previous occasions, but during the last three years, without a casino and, incidentally, without an international airport, tourism growth in South Australia was not only unprecedented for this State but it outstripped the average national growth and, indeed, it considerably outstripped growth in many other States. That growth was achieved because of specific marketing initiatives undertaken by the Government and because of a developing sense of cohesion and determination in the industry itself.

That result bears out what has occurred in other States and in other countries. As I said in August 1982, in the whole of Canada, with a population of tens of millions of people, there is not one casino. Yet Canada has a thriving industry, and the Province which has the most prosperous tourist industry in the whole of the Commonwealth of Canada is British Columbia, which has never contemplated a casino; nor, according to its Tourism Minister, would such a thought enter the mind of the Government because it would reject any proposition which could possibly have an adverse effect on its citizens, particularly its youth.

Therefore, it would not entertain the question of a casino. However, tourism growth in that province has been phenomenal—40 per cent in four years. That has had a profound effect on the economy of British Columbia. The tourism Minister of that province told me that the whole thrust of tourism was directed at enhancing the lifestyle and enlarging opportunities for residents of the province. I heartily endorse that policy. Looking back over the last debate I was directed to the speech of the member for Stuart, who is now Minister of Tourism. I will be most interested to see how the Minister of Tourism votes on this Bill. On 18 August 1982 he said:

Anything to do with a casino at all I would want controlled by the Government.

Later in the debate he said:

I am strongly committed to the principle that a casino should be controlled by the Government and not by private enterprise.

Later, when referring to the Bill, he said:

If no such amendment is moved and if it is going to be a privately-run casino in South Australia, at the third reading I can forewarn the House that it will not have my support.

The Bill before the House provides for a privately run casino. It will be interesting to see how the Minister of Tourism votes on this occasion and whether the view that he so firmly held and so firmly expressed as recently as 18 August 1982 is consistent. On 19 August 1982, at page 634 of *Hansard*, the Minister of Tourism said:

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.

That is not the measure we have before us now. So, I will be listening with interest to the speech which I presume the Minister of Tourism will be making tonight, and, I will be watching how he votes. Another interesting speech which bears rereading, in light of the decision of the Government in the past 24 hours, is that of the then Leader of the Opposition, now Premier. He commenced his speech on 18 August by saying:

I have found the whole sorry saga of the examination and evaluation of a casino by this Parliament to be one that does little credit to the Government and the way in which it has handled this matter.

I believe that every member on this side of the House could echo the words of the Premier and say that the way it has handled the Bill does little credit to this Government on this occasion. I can say, as a constituent in the electorate of Bragg, that I bitterly resent the fact that the Government apparently intends to force this Bill through the Parliament immediately prior to a by-election, thus depriving the people of Bragg of an opportunity for their views to be expressed through their elected member. I say that, not having discussed the question of a casino with any of the candidates for Bragg and not knowing how any of them would vote on this issue if elected. It is a question of principle, of the right of people to have their views expressed in Parliament, rather than a question of what that view would be when it came to a vote, especially on a conscience measure and especially when the by-election is so close. The constituents have the right to have their views aired in this case and they have a right—

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It is true that one cannot guarantee that the views of the constituents would be taken into account, but I know that many Uniting Church parishes in Bragg last Sunday were invited by their Ministers to convey their views to their member of Parliament. There was a lack of awareness that Bragg at this moment does not have a member of Parliament. It seems wrong that that should be the case. One of the letters which I received was from a constituent involved with the Offenders Aid and Rehabilitation Service. He enclosed a clipping which I believe summarises the situation very well. It refers to the C.S.I.R.O. study into gambling. The statement by Dr Geoffrey Syme, of the C.S.I.R.O. Studies Unit, reads as follows:

The effects on their families are just as disastrous financially as that of alcoholics. Increasing numbers are ending up in gaol. Governments are going out of their way to promote T.A.B., horse racing and the lotteries, completely unaware of the incidence of the problem. It is totally irresponsible. We need a major national inquiry and we are not being wowers in suggesting it.

It is interesting that a select committee made an identical recommendation, yet, its following recommendation was that we should go ahead and establish a casino. The views of the Anglican Archbishop of Adelaide have already been read into the record. However, because one paragraph of his media release aptly expresses my own views, I will conclude by quoting Archbishop Rayner again, as follows:

There are strong vested interests in promoting its further development. Large-scale gambling diverts resources from productive to non-productive fields; it fosters unhealthy covetousness by holding out the prospect of enormous wealth without work; and as a form of recreation it is essentially anti-social.

I agree with those words. I also believe that the non-productive use of time and resources when there is so much worth while that can be done with hard earned income and when there is so much worth while that can be done with leisure and recreational time that it is almost an obscenity in a world beset by so many problems and in a world, particularly, where families are under increasing pressure which has not occurred in quite the same fashion in decades or generations past.

If a casino were to be established in Adelaide I believe that it would be a long time before its effects were fully felt. I do not think that we should take that risk. I see no reason why South Australia should be like the other States. Just because they have a casino there is no reason why we should have one. The Women's Electoral Lobby, in its submission to the select committee, said:

We need imaginative Government planning which applies lateral thinking and new ideas to deal with what the twenty-first century will plunge us into. A casino in Adelaide is not as important as seeing planned Government estimates for the future 10 years on how State finances are to be run and managed.

That statement is particularly interesting and ironical in the light of the fact that at one stage in the past week the Government put this Bill ahead of the Government's Bills dealing with State finances. The submission continues:

It is time we looked harder at the coming twenty-first century in terms of employment and in regard to what the community will be doing in its leisure time. We emphasise the question of leisure time. Throwing people the bone of a casino is highly unsatisfactory.

Those statements come from women who could never under any circumstances be described as wowers. The Women's Electoral Lobby is highly progressive in its views and attitudes. It is extremely hard working in the research it does on social issues and yet it has come down very solidly against a casino.

It is impossible at this stage to say how the vote on this Bill will go. I think a great deal hangs on it and I do not just mean the possibility of an international convention centre which may or may not be made viable if a casino is associated with it. A great deal more than that hangs on this Bill. The whole casino debate has become something of a *cause celebre* in South Australia. We are, in fact, witnessing for the fourth time in 10 years a struggle which really goes to the heart of the foundations on which South Australia is based. The people who settled this State were not in the get-rich-quick business, they were in the business of settling down to hard work to create worthwhile opportunities for their children. This is a State founded on a strong sense of ethics and morality. If early tomorrow, or on a subsequent day, this House votes in favour of a casino then I believe that we will be betraying some of the great principles on which this State was founded. I will have no part of that and urge all honourable members to support me in opposing this Bill.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I think I could say justifiably that most members have spoken on this issue previously. All that needs to be said has been said on previous occasions, but I would like

to take time to express some points of view, and I will refer to the report of the select committee in 1982. I believe that that report was probably the most comprehensive that one might obtain on this subject anywhere. I was privileged to be a member of the select committee. As the member for Torrens stated, we worked under extreme difficulty. Nevertheless, I think I can say without equivocation that all of the issues in respect of a casino are covered in the report.

I am sorry to say that last year this matter turned into a real shambles. I know that this is an emotional issue, but we should consider the matter in a commonsense, logical way, in what we believe quite honestly are the best interests of the State. Members will have diverging views, and I respect other points of view. I can say quite honestly that over the past 10 years I have given this matter a great deal of thought. I recall that in 1973 the then Premier, Don Dunstan, introduced a Bill into this House in regard to the operation of a casino.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I voted against a casino in 1973, because I believed, quite sincerely that, because the legislation provided that the casino had to be a certain distance from the metropolitan area of Adelaide (and I believe it was 60 kilometres)—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: It was 80 kilometres, or 50 miles.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: That would be correct. If that was to be the case, I considered that it would not be a viable financial proposition and I voted against the casino. I took the opportunity last year while a member of the select committee, as the committee visited all of the casinos in Australia, to assess in my own mind and of my own volition whether the establishment of a casino in this State would be beneficial. Members will recall that I instituted a private member's motion to establish a select committee, which was taken up by the Government. That select committee was established, and it presented a report to this House. I do not entirely agree with the member for Semaphore, but I suggest, particularly in regard to the contributions made to the debate, that, if members have read the report of the select committee, particularly the recommendations, they have not thoroughly absorbed the recommendations and findings of the report.

[Midnight]

I am going to support the Bill. I do so because I believe it is in the general interests of the State, but I have some reservations. One reservation I have is in relation to the adverse financial effects which a casino may have on the already established legal forms of gambling. I do not believe gambling *per se* is evil. I think it is a question of people having the opportunity to gamble legally, because history shows that, if it is not done on a legal basis, people will gamble illegally. The select committee's report at page 135 states:

One of the more apparent adverse financial effects which a casino may have is on other forms of gambling. It is difficult to measure the degree to which such an effect may occur but there can be no doubt that casino operations would have some effect, particularly on the night-time racing codes. Evidence tendered to the committee by the South Australian Jockey Club, the T.A.B., the Trotting Control Board, and the S.A. Greyhound Racing Control Board supported this contention.

In addition, it was pointed out that there had been a marked deterioration in the increase in the amount of money gambled in South Australia over the past few years. Appendix 7 of the report sets out the total legal gambling dollar invested from year to year and divides it into all forms of legal betting that exist. The conclusion one must draw from this table is that in real terms the gambling dollar in South

Australia is declining. I think it is fair to say, and statistics from other States indicate this, that in comparison South Australia is really not a gambling State. It might be interesting if I put into *Hansard* some of the figures associated with the legal gambling market in South Australia. In 1980-81 the South Australian T.A.B. turnover was \$120 900 000 and its market share of the total was 30.1 per cent. The on-course totalizator and bookmaker turnover was \$193 800 000, which was 48.3 per cent of the total market. The turnover from the Lotteries Commission was \$47 800 000, which was 11.9 per cent of the market share. Soccer pools, which were only introduced that year, had a \$1 100 000 turnover, which was 0.3 per cent of the market share. For small lotteries, including bingo, the turnover was \$37 900 000 and their share of the market was 9.4 per cent. The total legal gambling was \$401 500 000 and that indicates quite clearly that in comparison with the other States South Australia is not a large gambling State.

The evidence that was obtained by the select committee suggests that the introduction of a casino will mean that there will be some downturn in the already established gambling facilities in South Australia. This happened in Tasmania and the Northern Territory. Referring to the report, evidence given to the committee in Tasmania by the Chairman of the Tasmanian Racing and Gaming Commission, Mr Power, tended to suggest that the casino had taken a large share of what would otherwise have been racing investments. Mr Power was asked the following question:

Do you think that if we were to start a casino in South Australia that may have an effect on the T.A.B. operation?

In reply Mr Power stated:

It would have an effect on the T.A.B. operation.

Therefore, the Tasmanian experience was that new forms of gambling do not increase the overall market to a significant degree. The same experience might apply to the Northern Territory. I refer to evidence given by Mr Davis, who is the Chairman of the Northern Territory Racing and Gaming Commission. He stated:

In regard to other forms of gambling there was some impact on racing revenue and investments.

I point out to members of the House that the Northern Territory does not have a T.A.B. operation, although it does have legalised bookmakers, premises bookmakers. The figures given to the committee indicated quite clearly that with the advent of the casino in Darwin the racing industry (particularly greyhound racing, which is a night time activity) did decline significantly in regard to attendance and turnover. Therefore, I have some reservations about the effect that a casino will have on the legitimate or legalised gambling that exists in South Australia at present.

I feel some responsibility in this regard because, as Minister of Recreation and Sport, both the small lotteries activities and the T.A.B. are under my Ministerial jurisdiction. One would appreciate also that the T.A.B. is the most significant contributor to the racing industry in South Australia. I am a bit wary that any extension of gambling will reduce the share of money going into existing activities. Maybe the cake might be slightly bigger, but the slices will have to be cut smaller. I simply give a word of warning that with the advent of a casino, if the Bill is passed, there will be some significant effect in the short term on other gambling avenues.

Indeed, if that is the case that will have an effect on Government revenue, because it must be remembered that T.A.B. revenue is shared between the racing industry and the Government. I suggest that this may decline, so it will not be all a one-way street as far as the economics of a casino are concerned. I indicate that I will be supporting the Bill, because I believe that it would be inconsistent of me if I did not do so. As one of the members on the select

committee I had a chance to determine on all the evidence presented to us on a number of matters what I consider the situation to be. It was not an easy task, and I must tell members that quite honestly my opinion fluctuated considerably during the course of the proceedings of that select committee: I wanted to be absolutely sure that if a casino was introduced some of the disadvantages outlined by many of the people giving evidence did not occur.

One can never foresee the future with any great degree of certainty. One cannot always foretell the dire consequences which were expressed to us, certainly by many of the witnesses who gave evidence, and which might have occurred in regard to the introduction of this establishment in South Australia. I am not prepared to accept that all those consequences can occur, but, quite honestly, there will be some disadvantages. It will not all be the one way.

The thing that worries me a lot is the economic viability of the operation if it occurs. It may be interesting to note that the major operator in Australia—Federal Hotels—which operates and is part owner of the Launceston, Alice Springs, Darwin and Hobart operations (the only one which has operations in Australia at the present time, because the Queensland ones have not come on stream) had a downturn financially last year and, if I remember correctly, had a deficit of \$3 500 000 on all its operations. So, it might not be such a nest egg as one might suggest. All those things must be borne in mind when considering whether we in this House tonight vote for the establishment of a casino.

I said before that I would not take a great deal of time. I have said the things that I wanted to say. Certainly, it has been and still is quite an emotional issue; we must consider it in a logical and commonsense way. I respect the views of others, not only in this House but in the community at large, who believe that a casino will do all sorts of dire things to the State of South Australia, even though I do not agree with them. However, I am not prepared to accept that gambling in itself is intrinsically evil, because I believe that life is a gamble.

We all gamble, quite specifically, of course, when we become candidates for Parliament. I do not suggest that we ought to take extravagant chances, but all of us from time to time, particularly as members of Parliament, must make a judgment and a decision in regard to a multitude of matters. We are not always right. None of us is infallible, so I suggest, even though I will support the Bill, that there are certain dangers that I hope will be overcome. There are certain problems, although the select committee suggests one or two of the things which unfortunately are not incorporated in this Bill.

One of the avenues which I pursued as a member of the select committee, I recall, was the opportunity for the Government not to run the casino but to licence it, and have Government equity. There is no doubt that if this legislation passes a consortium of companies will have to be established if we are to build a casino. When I say, 'build a casino' the important things in relation to financial liability are location, operation and a number of other factors.

I see nothing wrong with the Government not only issuing the licence but also being part of the consortium. I suggest that that should be considered. Indeed, I think it would be in the interests of the State for the Government to do that. With those remarks, I indicate my support for the Bill and issue a warning, to use a gambling term: it is certainly not a lay-down miserere.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I am surprised at the speech made by the Minister of Recreation and Sport, because I can recall a speech that was delivered in this place not long ago. If my memory serves me correctly (and I believe it does), the Minister then blasted a similar proposal.

The Minister had the benefit of serving on the select committee that inquired into the establishment of a casino in South Australia so he could not claim ignorance about the situation. I think he said that it was a con job.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: That's when you tried to put it over us.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: There was no con job in relation to the presentation of the previous Bill before the House. At least the Liberal Government of that time came clean. There was a lot of speculation about that Bill. The Government said, 'Let us get it before the House, deal with it as a true conscience vote and then get rid of it.' The Labor Government is now having to resort to subterfuge. There has been a miraculous change of mind by the Minister of Recreation and Sport. That defies credibility.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: I supported it then and I am supporting it now.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will look up the record.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Go on, have a look.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: My memory dictates that the Minister voted against the Bill, but I will check that out.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: It is basically the same Bill.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, it is basically the same Bill. It is easily checked, but I apologise to the Minister if he supported the previous Bill. My memory was that he labelled it a con job.

Mr Lewis: Why did you call a division?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I find it amazing—

The SPEAKER: I order the Deputy Leader to resume his seat and remind him and all honourable members of the guidelines that I set down at the beginning of this debate, knowing it to be emotive. Standing Orders will be upheld.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am amazed that the Government has given this Bill such precedence. The Government does not have the courage to take it over as a Government Bill but is using the subterfuge of private members' time, which expired many hours ago, in an attempt to get this legislation through the House. As I pointed out earlier today, there is an enormous backlog of legislation to be dealt with. In fact, there are 29 items on today's Notice Paper and we have dealt with none of them.

In Parliamentary history this Bill was defeated quite soundly and quite roundly only months ago. For the Government to suggest that there is a pressing need for this Bill to have priority at the moment is an absolute farce. It is a subterfuge. It is an attempt to get a casino in through the back door. Many Government members are prepared to manipulate the Parliamentary system to get it in. I am sure that honourable members would be surprised if I said that I was supporting the Bill. Of course, I am not supporting it.

Mr Groom: According to the *Advertiser* you are supporting it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know whether the honourable member told the *Advertiser* that he thought that I was supporting the Bill. I will put the record straight right now. The member for Salisbury has suggested that he was misrepresented by the *Sunday Mail* in a report last weekend. I, too, was completely misrepresented in a report in the *Advertiser* on Saturday.

I was perplexed (which is not a strong enough word to express my feelings) on Saturday when I read the article. I sat down and penned the reply in longhand to the Editor. On my way through the city on Saturday afternoon I dropped

it in the copy box. The *Advertiser* phoned on Sunday to say it was putting in a correction. However, as happens in most cases, my name appeared in a prominent place in the paper and a number of people read it. Unfortunately, a number of people did not read the correction, which is usually tucked away well back in the paper. That is what happened in this case. The *Advertiser* did not, under those circumstances, see fit to publish the letter I had written as a correction had been made. I will put on record the letter I wrote, even though it did not appear in the paper. It stated:

I was surprised to read your newspaper's confident assertion on Saturday 7 May that I was supporting legislation to establish a casino in South Australia. The day before the report appeared one of your reporters sought me out at Parliament House to ascertain my views. I told him I was opposed. He asked me why. In response, the reasons I advanced were that my priorities dictated that we should be getting on with developing the resources of the State to generate real wealth to the benefit of all. A casino simply redirects and recirculates money and does not generate any real production in wealth, regardless of any moral judgment one may wish to impose regarding social dislocation. Moreover, I stated that all submissions from my constituents and leaders I had consulted were opposed to its establishment and that my electorate was the only one to vote against a State lottery in the referendum some years ago. As their representative I would oppose the Bill as I have done on each previous occasion it has been before the Parliament. I do not believe I could have made my position plainer to your newspaper.

These mistakes happen from time to time and one obviously happened here to my discomfort. Nonetheless, I believe that members in this place who have looked at my track record over the years would have been surprised to have read that report. Any member on this side of the House would have disbelieved it. That is the position. At no stage have I intended to support the casino legislation.

The major reasons for my opposition are outlined in that letter. The priorities of the former Liberal Government were to get on and develop the resources of the State. One of my responsibilities (and I was proud to shoulder it) was to try to develop some of the mineral resources in the State. We had some degree of success. It is in this fashion and in this way that we generate real production and real wealth and add something to the pool which can be shared by way of benefits in due course across the whole community. In my judgment that is not what happens in relation to the sort of project envisaged in this legislation. Also, as I pointed out in the letter I quoted, all representations I have had from my constituents in relation to this measure, both last year and to an increasing extent this year, are opposed to the establishment of a casino.

As all honourable members probably know, my district comprises, in the main, a large number of constituents of a conservative bent and frame of mind. They are small, independent land holders, in many instances living in the Barossa Valley and throughout the Adelaide hills. I have received a large sheaf of correspondence from throughout the whole of my district (and I think that the unfortunate mishap which led to an *Advertiser* report generated some more such correspondence), all opposed to the establishment of a casino. My personal view dictates that I would have a big question mark over the establishment of a casino in this State. I have considerable concern relating to the social dislocation involved with a casino. I am a firm believer in the principle of representative democracy. Members of the Liberal Party, fortunately, are free to vote on any measure on conscience lines and according to the desires of the majority, as they perceive it, of their electorate. That would be a compelling reason for me to oppose this legislation.

One interesting aspect of the current situation is that we, the members of Parliament, have received a letter from the South Australian Jockey Club. We have all received correspondence from the various churches, which I think are uniformly united in their opposition to this Bill. From

memory, the Churches of Christ, and the Uniting, Anglican, and Roman Catholic Churches have written to us. The Roman Catholic Archbishop has expressed his view on this matter publicly. All those churches are opposed to a casino. All of the women's organisations that have taken the trouble to write to members are opposed to this Bill (certainly the ones that have written to me are). I think this is a significant pointer to where concern lies in the community, because it is usually women who bear the brunt of any social dislocation that occurs because of measures such as this.

This is one area, the area of social questions, where it is essential (and it is essential in all such measures) and important that we listen to what women in the community have to say. Women and mothers in the home are often the ones to feel the backlash of social changes when they occur. All of the women's groups, including the Women's Electoral Lobby and the Women's Christian Temperance Union, that have approached me by way of letter (and have approached other members) are opposed to this legislation. I think that that is significant. Where is the majority that proponents of this legislation claim support it? The only letter I have received supporting this legislation is a self-interest one from the trotting club suggesting that it would like to have a casino on the club's property. Every other letter I have received opposes the establishment of a casino. These letters come from people in my district for whom I have tremendous respect, and they express a point of view that is solidly opposed to the establishment of a casino. This is an emotive issue. The most emotive issues to come before this House are social issues. We all know that the abortion issue was a very emotive one.

The question of the casino seems to have generated as much emotive overtone as has any legislation that has come before this House, and certainly that is reflected in the number of submissions that are coming to us. I was very interested that the South Australian Jockey Club is opposed to the establishment of a casino. A letter to all members of Parliament from the club states:

The South Australian Jockey Club, in its capacity of controlling authority for thoroughbred racing in South Australia and as principal club in South Australia, is concerned that the introduction of a casino will have a deleterious effect on the revenue earnings to the racing industry. That Bill, and the Bill proposing a ban on cigarette advertising at sporting venues, if successful, are two major initiatives which, combined, could have the most serious financial consequences for the future of racing.

I remind you that racing is the third largest industry in South Australia and the fourth largest industry in Australia, overall. Why is it, then, that we are under such dire threat? We are not concerned at the moral issues of either initiative. They are matters for personal conscience. We are concerned that our industry is suddenly experiencing this increasing intrusion into our ability to foster and control a sport which has such an enormous base of public support.

There is a practical limit to the supply of leisure dollars, particularly in South Australia. The competition for those dollars is growing at an alarming rate, while our ability to find sponsorship support is declining, not only in concert with the economic downturn, but through proposed restrictions on cigarette companies and the like, which would otherwise continue to support us in a substantial way. The very fact that both Bills are to be determined by a conscience vote, and not along Party lines, implies that the question of Party mandates cannot arise. As elected representatives, how is it, then, that conscience votes can be cast without fully canvassing the views of the electorate?

The evidence from Tasmania is that the Wrest Point casino had a marked and sustained effect on the decline of domestic disposal income directed towards racing. There is nothing to suggest that the same decline will not occur in South Australia. Your favourable vote on each of the Bills would be of long-standing concern to the Government of the day, if the very survival of the industry is threatened. The employment opportunities seen as concomitant with the Casino Bill... and advertising as seen in the totality of an anti-smoking campaign, bear little relationship to the most serious financial consequences for the future of the racing industry in this State, should either or

both Bills be enacted. I ask that you give these views proper weight during the forthcoming debates.

This is an interesting new sidelight, but the submission from the S.A.J.C. makes a couple of pertinent points. Honourable members will know that the racing industry was in serious straits last year just prior to the State election. Fairly massive public funds had to be earmarked to save the Jockey Club and the racing industry from becoming insolvent. The Labor Party, in its rush to out-promise the Liberal Party (in the end the Labor Party out-promised the Liberal Party in its desire to spend public funds to buy votes), undertook to give massive support to the racing industry. One of the major elements in that thinking was that the industry is a major employer and that there would be considerable social dislocation, to use that phrase once again, if the racing industry folded.

Here we have a submission from the industry suggesting that, if we widen further the avenues for gambling, we could very well place ourselves in a position where we would have to pour more public funds into that area simply because the competition for the leisure dollar (I believe that is the term) will be so much greater. Even arguing the case at that fairly basic economic level, I believe that all members must concede that the S.A.J.C. has a point.

Of course, that leads to a further argument that perhaps, if we look at the Australian scene, South Australia can handle only a certain number of profitable gambling outlets. Perhaps Australia is getting to the point where it is becoming saturated with casinos. Perhaps an isolated casino first off the mark has been profitable but, if casinos proliferate around Australia, none will make anything like a profit.

I will be most disappointed if this Bill passes because there is only one way that it can pass; that is, if a significant number of members have changed their minds on the matter since last year. I cannot accept that a member who considered the Bill last year has had any new compelling evidence presented to him over such a relatively short period that would influence the member to change his vote. From conversations with my colleagues, I doubt that there will be a great change on the part of members on this side of the House. I may be mistaken because I have not canvassed my colleagues. True, the matter comes up in conversation, but I will be surprised if there is a great shift in vote.

Such a shift would indicate that the vote last year was phoney; it would indicate that there was something wrong. I can understand that if only one or two members change their mind but, if there is mass defection, it will indicate that something is wrong.

The only way the Bill can pass is if there is a mass change by Government members; I do not believe that there will be a mass change from Opposition members. If Government members who voted against the Bill last year now vote for it, we will have every right to be suspicious about their motives if they support it this time. Certainly, I am suspicious about the way the Bill has been brought on. The Government is giving it priority over all these important matters that we do not have time to complete. The way things have been going since last Friday, I am not even confident that the Government, based on my experience of managing the affairs of the House from the other side, will get through its programme in the time allotted, including the extra week.

It is just not good enough for the Government to come in on a wing and a prayer with 17 Bills listed for yesterday when everyone knows that we do not have a chance to get through the programme. It is absurd that now, at 12.40 on Thursday morning we are debating a Bill that has taken precedence of Government business because it is a private member's Bill. The situation is a farce.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: It's phoney.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, it is phoney. That is one phoney aspect about this debate. Here we are debating in private members' time a Bill which the Government claims needs urgent attention. The Bill was before the House as recently as last year in almost identical form.

So, we have this phoney situation, and if this Bill passes, that will be even phonier, and the votes of members who have changed their minds since last year will indicate how phoney those previous votes were or how phoney their votes are this year.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask that the Deputy Leader come back to the substance of the Bill. The honourable member has been given the most extraordinary co-operation by the Chair. The honourable member himself two days ago objected to one small expression in the Australian vernacular: he has now been using the American vernacular and, in particular, the word 'phoney'. I ask honourable members to bear in mind that no less than eight members stand to be warned or have already been warned. The honourable member has used the American vernacular expression 'phoney'. I am well aware of the meaning of that word: it is a word meaning a person who has semi-criminal motives.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It does not mean the same when it is then recounted in the Australian vernacular.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will give the honourable member the benefit of that doubt but I warn the honourable gentleman and all honourable members that Standing Orders will be upheld.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I certainly was not aware that the word 'phoney' was considered an unparliamentary term.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member resume his seat. I have never suggested that it was an unparliamentary term; it was the honourable gentleman himself who took exception the other day to the use of the Australian vernacular term 'two bob each way'. The honourable member has now used the word 'phoney'. I am simply informing him of its American meaning. That is all I am doing as well as asking him to link his remarks. The honourable Deputy Leader.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: This is not a tit-for-tat session: I think that I took a point of order in relation to a comment from the Chair. The plain fact is that either what I am saying is unparliamentary and out of order or it is Parliamentary and I am at liberty to say it.

The SPEAKER: Order! All that the Deputy Leader is doing is defying the Chair. He knows his current position, and I remind him of it. The honourable Deputy Leader.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not want to have a disagreement with the Chair during the last three minutes of my allotted time. Let me simply say there will be gross insincerity on the part of members if there is a massive change in their vote on this occasion. I am suspicious that the Government dearly wants to get this Bill through and that it wants to get it through early in the life of this Parliament. One explanation for a massive change of vote would be that honourable members opposite went to water on the eve of the last election when the Parliamentary ear was very sensitive to the voice of the electorate. Maybe that is an overly cynical view, but that could be an explanation, because there was a very solid vote in opposition to a Bill which was identical to this one not all that long ago.

The only difference is that previously we were on the eve of an election, whereas we are now at a time early in the life of this new Labor Government. I cannot help voicing the suspicion that the Government has put up this Bill under the facade of a private member's Bill, although it is very dear to the hearts of at least some Government mem-

bers. I think I have made my position clear: it has never changed. I have opposed such a Bill on each occasion when it has been brought before the House and I would certainly be letting down the people who rely on me for voicing their opinions in this place if I were to change my mind.

I will be surprised, if the Bill is defeated and is put up again, whether I will change my mind in the future. But, as everyone knows, I am an open minded person, open to persuasion, but on a matter such as this I just cannot envisage that happening. Certainly, I have no intention of supporting this Bill.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I move:

That the debate be now adjourned.

Motion negatived.

Mr MEIER: I have moved that the debate be now adjourned because of a point brought up by an earlier speaker, the member for Coles, who mentioned that the electors of Bragg do not have a voice in this Parliament at this time.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. I ask the honourable member to address himself to the Bill. If in the course of that address he wishes to discuss—

Mr Gregory interjecting.

The SPEAKER: Order! I now warn the member for Florey. The situation is that there is no objection on the part of the Chair to the honourable member's referring to the absence of a representative for the seat of Bragg, but there has been a vote of the House which has said that the debate shall not be adjourned. He must not reflect on that vote.

Mr MEIER: On a point of clarification, if I can, I was under the impression that if I moved that the debate be now adjourned I would be entitled to 10 minutes to explain why I wished to move the adjournment of the debate.

The SPEAKER: Order! No. I must over-rule that; perhaps we can have a private discussion about it.

Mr MEIER: I am certainly opposed to the legislation before us this evening (or this morning, should I say?). I intend to speak on various matters, particularly as they relate to the social and welfare consequences of having a casino in South Australia. Therefore, I will refer to factors which relate to gambling in Australia generally and specifically in South Australia: the extent of gambling as it is known today, the concept of compulsive gambling and the social effects that derive from this unfortunate problem with many people in our society, the spiritual and moral aspects of casinos as such, the social impact of casinos, and factors relating to crime. I refer also to the fact that it would appear, despite arguments to the contrary, that we should not have increased taxes at this present time, but a casino will simply be bringing in another form of taxation on our community. We must also bear in mind the influence on the family of a casino in this State.

In fact, one will find that there are far too many negative aspects related to and concerned with a casino. There are no smiles on the faces of people when it comes to the hard gambling—only expectation and anticipation—but the rewards are few, if any.

Why should this Parliament endeavour to hurt members of our society? Members should recall that casinos are there to make a profit. In fact, shortly after the Bill was passed in another place, the Hon. Mr Blevins said on, I think, A.B.C. television that a casino would certainly want to make a profit and, if it was not making a profit, it should not exist. To make a profit people will have to lose their money. In other words, if a casino is established, we might have slogans such as 'Come and be ripped off,' 'Come and hurt your family,' 'Encourage employment in the Department

for Community Welfare,' 'Let us make sure that Lifeline can keep operating,' 'South Australia needs more problems,' and 'Make sure that some unemployed people have the opportunity to be dragged further into despair.'

What right do members of this House have to play on the weaknesses of human beings? In fact, I charge members to be prepared to accept responsibility for the social consequences that will follow if they vote for a casino. Someone will have to accept the responsibility, and I hope that it will not be thrown on to the Department for Community Welfare and its officers to try to solve the problems that this House could bring in. It is certainly a serious issue.

Some of the arguments have already been mentioned, but this Bill is so important that I believe that my arguments need to be listened to. Hopefully, they will convince members that a casino would be detrimental to this State. It was interesting to hear the Minister of Recreation and Sport state that, if members, having read the select committee report, were speaking against the casino, they did not absorb the spirit of the recommendations. I certainly hope that the words I have used are near enough to what the Minister actually said. I have read many aspects of the select committee's report, and I believe that much of it supports the idea that a casino should not come into this State. I will endeavour to show why I believe that is the case.

First, I refer to gambling in Australia and, in particular, to South Australia. We already have many different forms of gambling available to us. We have the T.A.B. for racing, Lotteries, X-Lotto, Instant Money, the Pools and other forms of gambling. Why should we endeavour to enlarge the gambling opportunities that already present themselves to the people of South Australia? Reference has been made to the select committee report and the fact that Australians are the world's heaviest gamblers. By a long shot we make the rest of the developed world look like beginners when it comes to throwing money away in pursuit of lady luck. Surely, it should tend to be the responsibility of members to try not to encourage further avenues of gambling when it is quite clear that sufficient avenues are already available.

It is interesting to note that the total amount of money gambled by Australians is so vast that it is comparable with major items of Government income and expenditure. I refer to a book by Alfred McCoy which states that in 1976-77 some \$4 600 000 000 passed through New South Wales poker machines. That is an amount considerably larger than the entire New South Wales State Budget of \$3 200 000 000 for that same year.

To that must be added the \$1 500 000 000 turnover in other forms of legal gambling and the estimated \$2 100 000 000 turnover in illegal gambling. Perhaps the most important statistic of all, McCoy states, is that the poker machine turnover was equal to 20 per cent of total household disposable income in N.S.W.

The reference here is made to a form of gambling, and some 20 per cent of the total household disposable income in New South Wales is going towards gambling. Do we want to try to encourage that in South Australia? I would certainly hope not.

I turn secondly to the concept of compulsive gambling, on which we have heard various viewpoints put forward in this debate. As is stated in the select committee report on page 25:

One person who has made a lifetime study on the effect of casinos and who was quoted from at length by several witnesses is Professor J. Skolnick, Director of the Centre for the Study of Law and Society and Professor of Law at the University of California at Berkeley.

The report further states:

In Professor Skolnick's definitive report, he asks two leading questions: "Can individuals control their gambling behaviour? Can it be controlled by the community?" In answering these questions he says:

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

Professor Skolnick observed a widespread view, even among gamblers, that the regular players around gaming tables are irrational, compulsive gamblers who are destroying their own lives and those of others around them.

I would hope that that is not what we would wish to see in our State. The select committee report continues:

How do people become gamblers? Once involved, gambling becomes a form of psychological conditioning. 'A typical casino-gambling game', says Skolnick, 'is a partial and random reinforcement experience that rewards with irregular frequency. Such a reinforcement schedule, as Skinner and others have shown, is the most powerful behavioural conditioner.'

It is further stated:

In a study of members of Gamblers Anonymous, a self-help organisation for compulsive gamblers, psychologist Joy Livingston concluded: 'The compulsive gambler continues to bet because the action has come to be a refuge from thoughts of the outside world. His anxieties associated with his wife, family, debts, or job disappear when he concentrates on money and action.'

Again, as has been referred to by other speakers, the extent of the problem researched suggested that 0.77 per cent of the population are gamblers at a level which creates a problem. So, we find that the survey conducted by the University of Michigan at the request of the United States Morin Commission, which has been referred to by several speakers, found that 0.77 per cent of the adult population of the United States were probable compulsive gamblers.

If we convert that figure (and I am underestimating the 1 300 000 in South Australia), we are looking at something like 8 000 compulsive gamblers in South Australia. With respect to potential compulsive gamblers, we are looking at a further 2.33 per cent, which could involve an extra 25 000 people. We are talking about many thousands of people as potential or actual compulsive gamblers.

Compared with other forms of gambling, casinos are more likely to produce addicted compulsive gamblers. The thrills of ever higher stakes and instant winnings are powerful psychological ingredients for potential addicts. Dr Skolnick states:

The very atmosphere of casinos is likely to produce more "tapped out" players, those who lose their bottom dollar, than lotteries or off-track betting. Those forms of gambling take place in an atmosphere that breeds a degree of restraint...

Considering further the spiritual and moral aspects of this matter, it was interesting to note an article which appeared in the *Advertiser* of 14 August 1982 under the heading, 'Evangelist warns of casino "evil"', as follows:

A casino would bring poverty and family breakdowns and boost crime and prostitution in S.A., the Rev. Sir Alan Walker said yesterday. "A vote to support a casino in South Australia will be a vote to pauperise many families," he said... "Any politician who votes for a casino in this State is morally and spiritually blind," he said. "He will be denying all overseas evidence of the terrible consequences of casino gambling. It will also be a vote to invite criminal elements to South Australia to cash in on the easy money... All over the world, casinos have brought suffering and crime." Sir Alan said, "Life Line workers in Hobart had terrible stories to tell about the effect of casinos. In the Bahamas the casino had such a bad effect on the people they introduced legislation prohibiting citizens of the Bahamas from entering," he said. "Casinos create addicts because the stakes are unlimited."

There have been many letters from various churches in this State about this matter. The Anglican Church's opposition to the casino is expressed in these terms:

Archbishop Rayner said that there had been a massive growth of gambling in Australia in recent years: There are strong vested interests in promoting its further development. Large-scale gambling diverts resources from productive to non-productive fields; it fosters unhealthy covetousness by holding out the prospect of enormous wealth without work; and as a form of recreation it is essentially anti-social.

The Churches of Christ letter states:

I write to inform you that, when a similar Bill was before Parliament last year, the Conference of Churches of Christ in South Australia unanimously passed the motion quoted below. The churches and members represented have not changed their position.

Sidetracking for a moment, the churches certainly have not changed their position. I wonder how sick and tired people are getting of Parliaments not being able to make up their minds on the casino issue, bringing it up and bringing it up again when society has expressed its view on the matter many times already.

Mr Mathwin: So has the Parliament.

Mr MEIER: So has the Parliament, as the member for Glenelg points out. The Churches of Christ motion relating to this matter states:

That because:

- (1) A casino would do little for the development of tourism in S.A. beyond its immediate locality and, with the opening of casinos in other states, is unlikely to be an influential factor in making people decide to visit S.A.
- (2) The economic advantages of a casino would be off-set by losses to existing tourist facilities and by the increased cost of surveillance and social welfare that would have to be met out of state revenue.

It refers also to criminal and illegal activities and to the fact that it would introduce instant and compulsive gambling with short-term games continuously available.

We know that the Uniting Church is opposed in various ways to a casino, likewise on lines that truism would not benefit to any great degree. Organised crime is referred to. In regard to the economic effects, it is stated that a casino would take money from one sector and divert it to casino gambling. Addiction to gambling is also mentioned. A submission from the Lutheran Church states:

The Lutheran Church of Australia recognises that opinions on gambling differ in our society. There are strong supporters of gambling and games of chance. There are also people who strongly oppose these forms of individual and communal involvement in what they see as a morally illegitimate and dangerous way of putting one's financial resources...

The Lutheran Church of Australia, South Australia district, is aware that the powers of legislation are vested in the Government. The responsibility of law making does not rest with the church but with the Government. The purpose of this submission is to make it known to the Government that legislation which affects the life of the community and which certainly has an impact on family life in this State is of interest and concern to the members of the church.

The Lutheran Church is also aware of the fact that secular legislation does not necessarily reflect the moral principles and guidelines operative in a communion of Christian people. However, a social legislation should at all times be aimed at the advancement of the common good of all citizens.

I refer to aspects put forward in the report of the select committee. One could consider the social impact. Certainly, it is stated:

The subject of the social impact of a casino is probably the most contentious issue in relation to the question on whether or not a casino should be established.

I refer to an article by Steve Stevens, under the heading 'Why we should say "no" to casinos.' It refers to the work done by Leigh Hatcher, of SDN. During his research, Leigh Hatcher, in relation to gambling in casinos, found the following:

It is extremely easy to come across cases of wrecked marriages, broken lives and in some cases lives that have been finished as a result of this form of gambling. He found that at Wrest Point

in the island the money that is being raked in is not just from tourists, because as one casino spokesman admitted: 'It'd be very quiet without the locals'. It is estimated that between 50 per cent and up to 85 per cent of those patronising Wrest Point are Tasmanians.

One could refer to various stories which Leigh Hatcher uncovered and which show great social suffering as a result of gambling in casinos. I will refer to only one. It was stated:

The man went to the casino, where he gambled for several hours and lost a substantial amount of money. Shortly afterwards he committed suicide and was later fished out of the Derwent River.

This is the type of social consequence that evidence shows a casino would bring. Therefore, again I say that members should be quite clear in their own mind and in their own conscience on what they are doing if they vote for a casino.

Other members have referred to crime this evening. There is clear evidence to show that crime has been current in the United States and in Europe, and certainly there is evidence that criminals have been associated with the Wrest Point casino. Known criminals have certainly been attracted to Wrest Point. This is evidenced by 63 known criminals supposedly being barred from admission in a little over three years. These figures applied in the mid 1970s. I, too, have had many letters and phone calls in connection with the casino issue, and I would like to quote some of those letters. One is from Mr and Mrs Rose of Clinton Centre, and states:

In the current economic time we feel that a casino can only take more from the pay packet, and families must then suffer. With the present unemployment in this State, the pressures of a casino can only cause further crime and violence and no significant form of employment.

The letter continues:

It is our wish that you do all in your power to convince the Government that the Casino Bill needs more study on the social effects of such an establishment.

I can only agree with those sentiments: the Bill needs more study. I go so far as to say that we do not need the casino. Another letter, from Miss L. Allen, states:

As a member of your electorate, I wish to express my deep concern at yet another attempt to introduce a casino in South Australia.

We have heard many speakers tonight express their concern about how this Bill has been brought into the House. The letter continues:

A casino in our State would foster the all too prevalent attitudes of greed and selfishness which militate against national unity and a strong family life.

A letter from Mrs Gerscht, of Snowtown, states:

I am writing on behalf of my husband and family to voice our disapproval of the Bill coming before Parliament re a casino for South Australia. Our main objection is on moral grounds as we believe that gambling wrecks family life, evidence of which exists in our local community.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: That is Snowtown. What are they doing up there, for goodness sake?

Mr MEIER: Perhaps the Minister should investigate for himself. The letter from the Women's Christian Temperance Union states:

We consider there are more than enough gambling facilities in this State already.

A similar letter from Mrs Gwen Eglinton states:

The gambling facilities in this State are more than adequate.

A letter from Mr and Mrs R.L. Adams makes this statement:

Who pays for support systems when families suffer through temptation offered by a casino?

A telephone caller said, 'There is plenty of opportunity for young unemployed to spend their money on gambling already.'

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: As I pointed out earlier, gambling offers the incentive to double one's money. The gambling institution is there to make a profit. It will make the money, and the individual has to lose; he cannot win. In my remaining one or two minutes, I will refer to the comments of my predecessor, Mr Keith Russack, who took part in the previous debate. In *Hansard* of 20 October 1981 he stated:

I took the matter seriously to the extent that I visited Tasmania in September 1973 to investigate the situation and to receive all the information that I could gather about whether a casino would help this State or whether it would be undesirable.

He further states:

I observed very closely those who were participating. I did not see a smile on any face, although I saw expectation and anticipation. On my subsequent visit I saw no improvement: perhaps the atmosphere had declined, if anything. What I was told and what I saw convinced me that South Australia would be just as well or better served without a casino.

Therefore, I feel that the arguments are overwhelmingly against the provision of a casino. Certainly if it were possible I would enjoy having some extra time to outline many of these things in more detail. I am certain that the establishment of a casino in South Australia would make no contribution to the quality of life.

The SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman's time has expired. The member for Mallee.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): There are occasions on which I consider that it is a blessing that I am deaf. In the first instance, I refer to the regrettable omission made by most members (including the mover) who support this measure. I refer particularly to the fact that there has been no definitive research of the social consequences of casino gambling or, for that matter, gambling of any kind. By virtue of the fact that no such material was available to indicate the extent of such effects, the select committee report strongly recommends that such an investigation be made. The select committee called on the Commonwealth Government to undertake such an investigation. Fair enough, the reason was given that it was as of much concern to the rest of Australia as it is to South Australia. However, I consider that to be a clear cop-out.

Just because the Federal Government and the other States have failed in their responsibilities to the people that they represent in regard to that matter, there is no reason whatever why South Australia should do likewise and say that it is someone else's responsibility and not ours.

If committee members had been sincere about that matter they would have recommended that the casino proposal not be proceeded with until we know more about the extent of the effects of such a facility on the lives of people, because it was acknowledged that there was a detrimental effect.

Members also knew, as was acknowledged in the report, that welfare-dependent people would create additional costs which would have to be paid by the taxpayer, and I refer to people requiring help after falling on hard times as a result of their inability to control their habit.

As on previous occasions I want to refer to a report in the *News* of 26 May last year, entitled 'Psychiatrist warns on casinos'. The article points out that a Sydney psychiatrist had warned that the two Queensland casinos would attract compulsive gamblers. The psychiatrist said that there were between 78 000 and 102 000 compulsive gamblers in Australia, or between 0.77 per cent and 1 per cent of the population. I point out that that refers to existing compulsive gamblers.

It has also been found by studies elsewhere in the world, including Sweden and the United Kingdom, that the percentage of the population that has a propensity to become

compulsive gamblers could be as high as 2.8 per cent. Mr Alex Blaszczynski was presenting a report on a new method of treatment that he had devised for use at the Prince of Wales Hospital in Sydney. It had been compiled from five years of programmes operated by himself, Professor Neil McConaghy, Dr Michael Armstrong and Dr Clive Allcock.

He pointed out, as the select committee discovered, that it is a hidden problem because what the gambler is doing he loves, but it leads to financial and social problems. The compulsive gambler is a deceptive character.

He said that more than 100 gamblers have been put through four different treatment techniques with an overall success rate of more than 60 per cent. He urged the Queensland Government to use some of the 20 per cent (or whatever it was) gambling tax on the casinos for treatment centres for uncontrollable gamblers (that is, compulsive gamblers).

We would be failing in our duty if we passed this Bill in its present form, because it makes no allowance whatsoever for contributions to come from the ill-gotten gains in tax revenue (that the Government will derive from the betting tax that it imposes) for the purpose of providing for the necessities of life for these people and treatment for them in their difficulties.

That brings me to the point that I want to make in quoting an article which was written by Ron Taylor and published in a magazine called *Signs of the Times*, in March 1983. The following is one of the points that he makes (and I think that it is entirely relevant to this debate):

Governments under pressure to raise extra money often look with covetous eyes at the wealth of the gambling industry, seeking from selfish motives to enlarge its income by increased facilities and outlets. But governments should realise that to legalise anything, gives it respectability. Most people accept that the government has a paternalistic role. If the government says a thing is legal, the public believes it must be good. Government cannot escape this role and must bear the consequences of any attempt to do so.

This Government is no exception to the opinion stated by Mr Taylor in that article. He also mentioned—and this is the fundamental belief behind many people's attitude to casinos—that it is clearly at variance with the most enduring law known to man, the law of the Ten Commandments on which our entire law is based: 'Thou shalt not covet' and other Christian principles such as 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself'.

Gambling, of course, emphasises chance and luck, and it is in direct conflict with that ethic. It in no way enhances man's respect for the necessity to enjoy the benefits of his labours and to derive his income and benefits from them. In fact, it leads him to believe that he can live in prosperity without doing anything other than allowing chance to provide him with that income. That is a mistaken belief. Every member of this Chamber knows, if they have read the select committee report, that playing in a casino is definitely not only a game of chance but that the odds are deliberately stacked so that the players cannot win; it is statistically impossible.

Casinos are a particularly bad form of gambling in that the action is seductive because of the rapidity with which it occurs, that is, the number of opportunities there are to place a bet are substantial, according to the game one is playing, compared with any other form of gambling. Other forms of gambling like wagering, where bets are placed on horses, or card games can be claimed to require some measure of skill. Indeed, statistically, if you take a random selection of the population and set them down to play with each other in some of those games or if you take a random selection of the population to the races with a given amount of stake money, it is quite evident from the results that some people are more skilful than others and will be more

successful in winning than their opponents, and thereby take the money from their opponents.

For better or for worse, and without moralising on the point, I do not think that members who do not hold those ethical standards need to consider them to find good reasons why they should oppose this measure. I have given what I regard as the main reason why they should oppose the Bill, and I will repeat it: simply because they know and the select committee found, in spite of all the things that it could have found but did not because it did not try, that there were unfortunate and regrettable social consequences that would accrue.

The report pointed out that those consequences had not been quantified and it acknowledged that point by recommending that there ought to be an inquiry into that aspect of gambling in general and casino gambling in particular. I urge honourable members who are considering their position on this measure to bear that in mind. Given the uncertainty about the consequences of gambling in a casino with respect to its social impact, now is not the time to introduce a casino in South Australia. If and when we have hard evidence that indicates for the benefit of those members who do not have the ethical standards to which I have referred, whether there will be an undesirable social consequence that can or cannot be matched by the gambling tax revenue obtained, we can make a judgement about it. Until that time is reached what we are doing is quite irresponsible, because we are clearly giving a person (and the Acts Interpretation Act defines 'person' to include a body corporate) with a lot of money the ability to make more money through that single licence. That person may already have plenty of money and we know that, if we grant a casino licence, they will make money from the rest of the population, some at least of whom (a number unknown) will not be able to afford to gamble in the casino.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: I welcome the attention of other members of the Chamber who seem to be intent on conducting their own conversations.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat immediately. The Speaker is in charge of the affairs of the Chamber. I called 'Order' and order was restored.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Speaker, I understood that it was within the competence of any member of the Chamber to draw attention to any disorderly behaviour and in so doing ask whether the Speaker will take action.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable gentleman is running very close to reflecting on the Chair. He will be able to see that if he reflects back on the words he has used.

Mr LEWIS: That was never, and never has been, my intention, Mr Speaker. I regret that you saw it as such. In quoting the ill-advised opinion of the casino select committee report, the mover of the Bill in this House said that it would assist tourism development.

That has to be codswallop. No evidence, statistically valid, has been put forward by anyone anywhere that that has happened. No attempt was made by the select committee to obtain that hard statistical evidence. In fact, I have read the entire transcript of the evidence and the questioning of witnesses, which purported and advocated that such a thing would happen. It did not require those witnesses to provide the statistical evidence on the environment in which it happened. If it had, the committee would have understood that it did not happen in the case of Wrest Point in Tasmania. At the same time that the licence was issued for Wrest Point, a most outstanding and substantial expenditure of promotion funds from both Government and private industry sources promoting Tasmania as a tourist destination was

undertaken. It was that coincidental time, but the committee neither found nor reported that that had happened. That was regrettable.

Whilst I am on the point, I am compelled, as many members have quoted the select committee report but have obviously not read the transcript of evidence, to point out that on those occasions on which I attended the select committee I was disgusted at the extent to which many members of that committee, instead of engaging in cross examination after hearing evidence from witnesses appearing before it (some being expert witnesses and acknowledged as such by the committee), rather took the course of debating opinions which they were expressing, and, on some occasions in less than complimentary fashion. In all instances when I observed that, I found that it occurred regrettably when the person giving evidence was providing information that would enable the committee to come to a conclusion that a casino was undesirable—

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Mallee to order for the last time before I start taking drastic action under Standing Orders. It is a dreadful reflection upon the committee appointed by this House to suggest that it was so influenced that it used its powers (as I have understood the honourable gentleman to just say) of cross-examination or questioning only in circumstances which would enable it to put a particular case. That reflects upon every member. I am not concerned that I happened to be one of the members.

Mr LEWIS: I wish now to turn to the sort of consequences—

The SPEAKER: Order! I take it that the honourable gentleman is not tendering any apology to the Chair.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I rise on a point of order. On what basis is the honourable member required to issue an apology? It was not asked for and, more particularly, I suggest that the committee to which he was referring was not even a committee of this Parliament. It was a committee conducted by a previous Parliament and bears no reflection upon the activities of this Parliament.

The SPEAKER: I will take advice on the latter point raised by the member for Light.

I uphold the point of order, first, on the rather strange ground that that it was an earlier Parliament. Secondly, and with some grave reservations after having taken advice, I think that I will ponder the question as to the earlier part of the point of order, that is, the suggestion, if I understood it correctly, that members of the committee only asked self-seeking questions. It seems to me that, if I uphold that as a valid, as it were, reflection or point of debate, there will be no end of debate about the activities of select committees appointed by honourable members of this House. I therefore think that I will further consider that matter.

Mr LEWIS: I regret that your understanding, Mr Speaker, of my remarks led you to that conclusion, as it was not what I intended. I turn now to the necessity for the State of South Australia, this Parliament and the citizens to be aware of the kinds of statistics which make it possible for us to quantify the effects of adding further forms of gambling to our social behaviour and leisure time activity patterns. I have a number of tables which I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard*. I assure the House that they are purely statistical and historical in nature.

Leave granted.

Mr LEWIS: The first statistical chart is an analysis of market movements compared with the c.p.i. for different types of legalised gambling in South Australia.

ANALYSIS OF MARKET MOVEMENTS COMPARED WITH C.P.I.
FOR DIFFERENT TYPES OF LEGALISED GAMBLING

Year	T.A.B.			On-Course Totalizator			Bookmakers			Lotteries			X-Lotto & Inst. Money			Small Lotteries			Total			c.p.i. % Movement
	T/O \$m.	% Movement	% Mkt. Share	T/O \$m.	% Movement	% Mkt. Share	T/O \$m.	% Movement	% Mkt. Share	T/O \$m.	% Movement	% Mkt. Share	T/O \$m.	% Movement	% Mkt. Share	T/O \$m.	% Movement	% Mkt. Share	T/O \$m.	% Movement	% Mkt. Share	
1973-74	59.3	23.3	31.7	10.7	—	5.7	98.4	—	52.6	7.1	—	3.8	1.0	—	0.6	10.5	—	5.6	187.0	—	100.0	—
1974-75	78.1	31.7	32.2	13.7	28.0	5.6	124.4	26.4	51.2	8.4	18.3	3.5	3.6	260.0	1.5	14.5	38.1	6.0	242.7	29.8	100.0	17.9
1975-76	87.7	12.3	30.0	17.0	24.1	5.8	152.7	22.7	52.1	7.7	(8.3)	2.6	8.2	127.8	2.8	19.7	35.9	6.7	293.0	20.7	100.0	12.3
1976-77	97.4	11.1	28.9	19.4	14.1	5.8	174.4	14.2	51.8	10.3	33.8	3.1	8.4	2.4	2.5	26.5	34.5	7.9	336.4	14.8	100.0	15.5
1977-78	97.3	(0.1)	27.1	20.7	6.7	5.8	184.5	5.8	51.5	12.2	18.4	3.4	12.8	52.4	3.6	30.9	16.6	8.6	358.4	6.5	100.0	9.9
1978-79	97.0	(0.3)	25.9	20.7	—	5.5	179.7	(2.6)	47.9	8.8	(27.9)	2.4	34.6	170.3	9.2	34.1	10.4	9.1	374.9	4.6	100.0	7.4
1979-80	112.0	15.5	28.8	20.0	(3.3)	5.1	172.8	(3.8)	44.4	8.9	1.1	2.3	39.0	12.7	10.0	36.6	7.3	9.4	389.3	3.8	100.0	10.1
1980-81	120.9	8.0	30.1	20.3	1.5	5.1	173.3	0.3	43.2	9.9	11.2	2.5	37.9	(2.8)	9.4	39.0	6.6	9.7	401.3	3.1	100.0	8.8

NOTES: 1. X-Lotto commenced April 1973, Instant Money commenced December 1978.

2. The above analysis shows that movements in the market compared with c.p.i. suggests that X-Lotto and Instant Money increases are not all new money.

Source: T.A.B., B.C.B., Lotteries Commission Annual Reports, Bureau of Statistics Reports and information from Division of Recreation and Sport (Department of Transport).

Mr LEWIS: The next table sets out figures for the South Australian Totalizator Agency Board from 1970 to 1981.

SCHEDULE A
SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOTALIZATOR AGENCY BOARD

Year Ended	Turnover	Per Cent Increase/ (Decrease)	Average Ticket Value
	\$		\$
30.6.70	25 480 717	—	1.25
30.6.71	31 465 762	23.49	1.26
30.6.72	39 090 122	24.23	1.29
30.6.73	48 134 574	23.14	1.35
30.6.74	59 286 102	23.17	1.41
30.6.75	78 091 369	31.72	1.64
30.6.76	87 658 156	12.25	1.80
30.6.77	97 474 795	11.20	1.97
30.6.78	97 259 575	(0.22)	2.04
30.6.79	97 030 079	(0.24)	2.19
30.6.80	111 962 803	15.39	2.64
30.6.81	120 903 603	7.99	3.04

Mr LEWIS: The next table points out the points at which agencies are established for the TAB, amount of turnover at those agencies throughout South Australia from 1970-81 financial year by financial year.

I think that this chart is important because we have to know 10 years down the track whether it has had an impact

on particular parts of the socio-economic community as could be identified by market researchers locality by locality. The next chart sets out the geographic location of turnover for on-course totalizer place by place and year by year from 1970-1981.

GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION OF TURNOVER FOR ON-COURSE TOTALIZATOR

Tote	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75
Adelaide	1 524 925	1 574 011	1 715 149	1 746 070	2 075 593	2 413 159
Angle Park	Nil	Nil	204 875	997 122	1 174 224	1 469 857
Balaklava	56 944	98 170	86 219	108 465	98 893	305 356
Berri-Barmera	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	7 412	15 640
Bolivar	1 297 563	1 411 331	1 181 433	1 199 566	1 202 128	1 506 182
Cheltenham	1 186 936	1 356 837	1 604 508	1 806 756	1 785 753	2 408 883
Clare	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	10 923
Coober Pedy	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
Gawler	258 115	259 922	669 739	614 218	777 346	1 009 682
Kadina	21 410	28 964	33 229	59 100	76 019	95 022
Kapunda	27 994	34 215	38 776	43 173	38 280	59 102
Kingscote	1 049	1 052	893	850	850	549
Marree	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
Mindarie	657	Nil	547	Nil	Nil	Nil
Morphettville	1 399 439	1 639 973	1 799 720	2 087 911	2 260 533	2 816 079
Mount Gambier	27 220	36 612	58 347	66 224	101 805	112 458
Murray Bridge	55 304	61 689	59 803	86 685	110 675	276 240
Naracoorte	4 460	11 166	9 998	12 283	36 946	23 288
Oakbank	141 064	144 937	157 424	171 004	230 832	213 614
Oodnadatta	754	1 554	1 554	2 163	1 645	2 843
Penola	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
Port Augusta	11 080	17 089	17 020	33 130	52 262	53 246
Port Lincoln	7 718	8 510	6 732	5 197	6 828	Nil
Port Pirie	26 290	31 589	43 314	97 477	138 334	182 340
Snowtown	11 297	7 594	24 034	Nil	Nil	Nil
Strathalbyn	81 833	140 538	345 725	356 645	403 014	542 933
Tailem Bend	14 716	21 645	29 046	23 381	Nil	Nil
Victor Harbor	32 595	37 309	50 732	52 876	72 726	111 373
Whyalla	8 987	12 810	52 492	62 925	80 353	100 167
Total:	6 198 350	6 937 517	8 191 309	9 633 221	10 732 451	13 728 936

GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION OF TURNOVER FOR ON-COURSE TOTALIZATOR

Tote	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81
Adelaide	2 713 035	3 265 331	3 449 904	3 843 524	5 758 076	5 289 126
Angle Park	1 740 694	2 039 633	1 948 116	1 857 174	1 753 276	1 693 513
Balaklava	287 344	344 945	343 245	386 141	463 823	462 043
Berri-Barmera	Nil	Nil	24 996	29 162	19 740	Nil
Bolivar	2 106 878	1 940 656	2 079 454	1 799 808	1 733 460	1 845 881
Cheltenham	2 901 988	3 388 213	3 212 763	3 379 815	4 844 366	4 546 844
Clare	17 181	21 369	28 624	35 938	39 449	43 475
Coober Pedy	Nil	4 317	3 058	4 160	3 470	3 435
Gawler	1 515 364	1 772 511	2 017 497	1 966 451	2 224 884	2 060 517
Kadina	114 198	112 404	133 737	107 334	114 342	104 215
Kapunda	170 709	313 377	249 626	287 716	288 501	278 961
Kingscote	1 188	1 057	1 111	998	1 676	2 213
Marree	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	4 256
Mindarie	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
Morphettville	3 436 042	3 877 536	4 925 874	4 785 788	382 111	1 619 933
Mount Gambier	120 005	134 988	156 721	219 920	260 907	308 743
Murray Bridge	355 851	485 132	542 974	554 322	539 417	672 252
Naracoorte	33 755	51 436	72 704	68 612	74 672	82 055
Oakbank	297 027	315 819	340 338	337 664	334 371	160 803
Oodnadatta	3 523	2 866	2 289	4 040	Nil	3 241
Penola	Nil	Nil	Nil	13 615	15 645	23 159
Port Augusta	79 764	103 497	109 678	114 613	71 640	157 937
Port Lincoln	Nil	Nil	Nil	21 129	65 656	85 362
Port Pirie	163 846	241 939	161 743	142 824	172 890	215 138
Snowtown	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
Strathalbyn	699 395	735 037	636 297	551 964	640 386	622 739
Tailem Bend	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
Victor Harbor	158 262	138 604	159 263	86 401	69 978	60 705
Whyalla	112 923	152 931	124 677	111 941	96 380	87 090
Total:	17 028 972	19 433 598	20 724 689	20 711 054	19 969 116	20 433 636

Mr LEWIS: The next table sets out bookmakers' turnover and percentage movement from 1969-70 and 1980-81 and gives the average size of the bet.

SCHEDULE E

Year	Bookmakers' Turnover \$	Percentage Movement	Average Bet \$
1969-70	58 165 117	+ 15.72%	6.36
1970-71	60 727 919	+ 4.41%	6.59
1971-72	73 544 486	+ 21.10%	7.18
1972-73	82 745 772	+ 12.51%	7.82
1973-74	98 404 825	+ 18.92%	9.42
1974-75	124 384 276	+ 26.40%	11.21
1975-76	152 705 903	+ 22.77%	13.14
1976-77	174 390 575	+ 14.20%	15.19
1977-78	184 563 329	+ 5.83%	16.14
1978-79	179 663 495	- 2.65%	16.91
1979-80	172 892 594	- 3.77%	17.76
1980-81	173 374 688	+ 0.28%	18.79

Mr LEWIS: The next chart refers to X-Lotto Instant Moneys:

X-Lotto Instant Moneys

Year	Total Annual Turnover	% Movement	Average Investment	Standard Deviation
1969-70	5 700 000	6.54	4.87	118.59
1970-71	6 000 000	5.00	5.02	115.35
1971-72	6 200 000	3.33	5.13	113.00
1972-73	6 745 743	8.80	5.50	105.27
1973-74	8 022 719	18.93	6.40	87.61
1974-75	11 965 195	49.14	9.52	38.94
1975-76	15 847 529	32.45	12.49	10.69
1976-77	18 669 821	17.81	14.54	1.49
1977-78	24 955 391	33.67	19.33	12.74
1978-79	43 369 855	73.79	33.46	313.29
1979-80	47 946 611	10.55	36.81	443.10
1980-81	47 818 582	(0.27)	36.06	412.09

N.B. Standard Deviation	12.15
Arithmetic Average	15.76
Coefficient of Dispersion	12.15

$$= \frac{15.76}{12.15} = 1.297$$

or 77%

251 registered agents of which 164 are in Adelaide metropolitan area.

Mr LEWIS: The next table deals with bookmakers' turnover.

GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION OF TURNOVER FOR BOOKMAKERS

Betting Control Board	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75
Adelaide	12 797 632	12 581 653	14 603 151	13 224 536	16 962 952	19 344 200
Angle Park	Nil	Nil	906 555	6 952 315	10 216 534	12 622 806
Balaklava	1 052 185	1 553 807	1 225 503	1 189 536	1 204 453	2 593 548
Berri-Barmera	361 582	336 850	410 368	484 793	543 236	872 356
Bolivar	7 503 998	7 694 104	9 041 420	9 250 423	10 663 892	12 829 696
Bordertown	17 901	32 721	37 060	38 905	45 016	84 417
Ceduna	15 056	11 004	15 153	14 059	28 365	32 506
Cheltenham	10 854 258	11 429 809	13 777 281	15 157 750	14 852 285	19 805 926
Clare	49 982	64 470	70 619	78 980	131 053	240 296
Cowell	26 661	26 785	25 944	41 267	48 341	104 551
Cungena	20 507	19 637	18 059	24 068	36 595	44 881
Gawler	3 397 214	2 918 559	5 377 261	5 511 554	7 838 134	8 927 773
Hawker	6 938	7 445	15 799	29 851	24 582	42 808
Iron Knob	71 487	66 498	62 698	113 000	142 710	172 536
Jamestown	21 082	14 067	15 165	16 901	21 362	50 342
Kadina	206 885	258 892	316 228	475 138	637 836	831 489
Kapunda	369 199	435 315	519 361	481 804	655 952	812 725
Kimba	47 451	47 349	58 560	62 776	18 259	115 772
Kingscote	11 381	14 089	13 849	10 139	11 060	15 018
Laura	29 538	30 305	15 452	40 092	47 269	68 540
Lock	33 125	25 470	40 802	58 929	56 630	46 015
Mindarie	32 736	19 234	27 531	38 548	63 719	66 326
Morphettville	11 823 491	13 045 547	14 964 720	16 854 951	17 822 550	22 987 513
Mount Gambier	493 828	543 191	677 501	896 482	1 298 774	1 563 033
Murray Bridge	855 292	978 967	830 511	942 550	1 168 622	2 430 255
Naracoorte	263 181	245 835	249 664	293 076	599 653	379 799
Oakbank	1 173 505	1 143 736	1 206 532	1 113 947	1 602 594	1 781 415
Penola	238 353	240 735	239 780	372 006	400 208	515 718
Penong	10 162	5 367	7 957	9 743	11 384	Nil
Port Augusta	603 073	554 189	613 951	587 954	838 434	1 362 246
Port Lincoln	390 978	416 590	379 397	435 890	547 206	742 904
Port Pirie	2 288 474	2 527 735	2 888 228	3 113 826	3 571 978	5 066 535
Quorn	27 264	40 908	Nil	97 340	65 969	77 155
Strathalbyn	1 249 641	1 509 226	2 305 275	2 378 718	3 421 607	4 135 704
Streaky Bay	26 514	25 269	35 089	36 931	56 694	54 727
Tailem Bend	456 108	306 278	384 554	314 289	Nil	Nil
Tumby Bay	56 953	62 512	42 988	62 458	41 838	94 611
Victor Harbor	382 874	420 965	572 052	564 590	857 158	1 098 610
Whyalla	751 419	917 793	1 241 040	1 299 041	1 751 214	2 294 626
Snowtown	83 084	67 099	230 785	Nil	Nil	Nil
Total	58 100 992	60 639 195	73 463 843	82 674 156	98 324 118	124 309 378

Totals do not include coursing and some prepost betting as indicated below, as the geographic locations cannot be determined.

Coursing	64 125	85 685	60 591	42 507	57 334	59 275
Pre-post	Nil	3 039	20 052	29 109	23 373	15 623

GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION OF TURNOVER FOR BOOKMAKERS—*continued*

Betting Control Board	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81
Adelaide	21 532 127	26 816 264	27 874 715	30 042 521	46 036 640	39 605 964
Angle Park	15 308 807	17 411 134	16 553 071	17 167 337	16 167 036	15 377 508
Balaklava	2 383 533	2 750 154	3 085 294	2 930 166	3 429 487	3 396 074
Berri-Barmera	851 526	973 222	1 861 771	1 718 251	1 899 378	1 989 257
Bolivar	17 004 962	16 309 892	17 532 947	14 728 110	14 353 017	15 719 138
Bordertown	75 259	164 541	142 333	233 622	179 691	307 185
Ceduna	44 600	49 181	51 305	53 154	55 458	58 922
Cheltenham	23 466 346	27 942 086	26 356 149	25 972 669	39 102 577	36 102 697
Clare	388 440	489 612	614 591	703 990	747 328	701 543
Cowell	105 928	79 395	87 071	86 536	101 743	113 860
Cungena	62 495	61 202	47 208	54 312	64 802	44 068
Gawler	13 840 707	15 630 467	17 493 708	16 073 358	16 089 496	15 398 296
Hawker	32 127	31 589	39 378	45 107	36 951	47 112
Iron Knob	159 893	150 469	124 968	85 529	84 369	106 422
Jamestown	56 504	64 159	85 158	67 773	54 639	54 175
Kadina	970 350	700 092	787 741	513 704	447 557	478 801
Kapunda	1 987 110	2 939 404	2 373 624	2 520 687	2 275 263	1 979 273
Kimba	97 398	128 776	128 188	119 958	142 619	102 719
Kingscote	32 968	34 094	30 048	37 991	59 982	78 253
Laura	87 755	114 246	97 281	102 193	96 279	115 212
Lock	109 579	120 264	148 514	151 622	108 698	158 202
Mindarie	201 964	188 866	219 414	262 647	253 279	257 280
Morphettville	27 142 395	31 186 071	38 214 975	36 305 432	2 711 940	10 346 552
Mount Gambier	2 243 673	2 391 569	2 305 609	2 472 459	3 111 786	3 392 810
Murray Bridge	3 002 021	3 832 345	4 523 731	4 781 655	3 824 050	4 554 821
Naracoorte	577 250	663 939	767 908	660 609	619 001	798 684
Oakbank	2 269 369	2 652 839	2 843 294	2 615 103	2 903 298	2 945 431
Penola	693 551	799 092	735 442	722 300	749 469	835 276
Penong	22 005	24 881	41 949	19 898	24 163	23 062
Port Augusta	1 848 551	2 296 783	2 158 121	3 177 125	2 283 810	2 684 780
Port Lincoln	953 648	1 238 638	1 394 706	1 817 520	1 822 711	2 034 112
Port Pirie	5 077 722	6 187 121	6 423 616	6 035 414	5 892 384	6 200 137
Quorn	89 544	96 177	167 874	86 357	Nil	68 997
Strathalbyn	5 654 775	5 744 769	4 599 312	3 730 710	3 780 016	4 005 111
Streaky Bay	71 065	73 720	75 798	72 254	88 801	77 026
Tailem Bend	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
Tumby Bay	97 916	118 971	163 419	74 029	77 368	91 226
Victor Harbor	1 631 491	1 257 048	1 570 365	834 454	627 791	476 208
Whyalla	2 457 686	2 582 612	2 729 833	2 485 460	2 468 760	2 547 473
Snowtown	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
Total	152 633 040	174 295 684	184 450 429	179 562 016	172 771 637	173 273 667
Coursing	58 992	80 064	90 039	85 886	99 036	90 763
Pre-post	13 871	14 827	22 861	15 593	21 921	10 258

SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Lotteries	Turnover \$	Per Cent Increase
1971-72	2 694 412	—
1972-73	4 977 293	84.73
1973-74	10 518 202	111.32
1974-75	14 551 272	38.34
1975-76	19 677 464	35.23
1976-77	26 509 528	34.72
1977-78	30 914 894	16.62
1978-79	34 107 169	10.33
1979-80	38 966 249	14.25
1980-81	48 650 112	24.85

Average Size bet unknown

Geographic location—Various (over 12 000 Clubs)

Mr LEWIS: The next table sets out the turnover for Tasmania, and is relevant in that it will be possible for us to make comparisons on what has happened in Tasmania historically and what will happen if the Bill is passed in South Australia. The same thing applies to the detailed analysis of racing, T.A.B., greyhounds and bookmakers for that State.

TOTAL TURNOVERS

	T.A.B.	Per cent Movement	On-course Totalizator	Per cent Movement	Bookmakers	Per cent Movement
1970-71			1 322 390		48 824 927	
1971-72			1 441 025	+9.0	53 038 097	+8.6
1972-73			1 427 398	-0.9	57 825 552	+9.0
1973-74			1 627 065	+14.0	62 479 725	+8.0
1974-75	9 699 976		1 678 008	+3.1	60 650 475	-2.9
1975-76	27 396 314	+182.4	2 025 660	+20.7	43 200 808	-28.8
1976-77	33 267 545	+21.4	2 288 667	+13.0	47 629 955	+10.3
1977-78	39 354 452	+18.3	2 254 676	-1.5	47 536 680	-0.2
1978-79	42 086 848	+6.9	2 218 196	-1.6	47 316 140	-0.5
1979-80	47 742 994	+13.5	2 502 629	+12.8	48 620 973	+2.8
1980-81	55 729 353	+16.7	4 346 313 ²	+73.7	55 077 164	+13.3
1981-82						

1. Closing of off-course premises (operations phased out and all premises closed on 16.5.78).
2. Taken over as part of T.A.B. operation.

RACING—T.A.B.

PACING—T.A.B.

	Tasmanian	Other Interstate and Overseas	Tasmanian	Other
1970-71				
1971-72				
1972-73				
1973-74				
1974-75	190 262	7 980 214	119 809	964 710
1975-76	535 149	23 174 947	342 922	2 212 914
1976-77	691 100	27 810 372	515 649	3 036 085
1977-78	792 943	33 230 550	595 293	3 434 949
1978-79	984 506	35 810 099	650 546	3 605 954
1979-80	1 120 043	40 171 743	865 217	3 985 801
1980-81	1 664 937	48 255 583	2 433 696	4 716 353

GREYHOUNDS—T.A.B.

	Tasmania	Other
1974-75	436 672	8 309
1975-76	1 130 382	+158.9
1976-77	1 205 984	+6.7
1977-78	1 296 013	+7.5
1978-79	1 029 511	-20.6
1979-80	1 361 174	+32.2
1980-81	2 454 514	+80.3

BOOKMAKERS—ON RACE COURSES

	Racing		Pacing		Greyhounds		Mainland	
1970-71	2 186 385		1 767 579		5 176 325		8 462 115	
1971-72	2 492 725	+14.0	2 177 439	+23.2	5 679 417	+9.7	8 622 994	+1.9
1972-73	2 767 180	+11.0	2 288 253	+5.1	6 714 204	+18.2	9 099 420	+5.5
1973-74	2 929 110	+5.9	2 748 937	+20.1	6 746 337	+0.5	9 354 576	+2.8
1974-75	3 563 673	+21.7	4 206 195	+53.0	8 056 174	+19.4	12 944 972	+38.0
1975-76	5 219 996	+46.5	5 637 168	+34.0	9 616 385	+19.4	18 154 317	+40.0
1976-77	5 832 202	+11.7	6 553 754	+16.3	10 286 692	+7.0	20 727 662	+14.0
1977-78	6 316 817	+8.3	6 400 500	-2.3	10 952 519	+6.5	21 021 289	+1.4
1978-79	6 710 659	+6.2	7 109 891	+11.1	11 275 637	+3.0	22 219 953	+5.7
1979-80	6 801 528	+1.4	7 612 538	+7.1	12 498 826	+10.8	21 708 081	-2.3
1980-81	7 553 500	+11.1	11 873 198	+56.0	11 835 480	+5.3	23 814 986	+9.7

Bookmakers figures will balance only with totals beginning from 1978-79.

Mr LEWIS: The next table sets out the statistical details of race meetings in Tasmania, showing gate takings, the number of people that attended, and the number of entries, indicating the healthiness or otherwise of the racing industry in that period.

STATISTICAL DETAILS OF RACE MEETINGS
1979-80 SEASON

Appendix 2

	Average Per Meeting														
	Meetings	Races	Attendance	Gate Receipts	Entries	Acceptors	Starters	Races	Stakes	Stakes Per Race*	On-course Total	Off-course Total	Local Bookmakers	Mainland Bookmakers	No. of Bookmakers
Racing Clubs:			\$						\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		
Tasmanian Racing Hobart	31	207	1 654	2 511	77	64	61	6.7	10 421	1 376	17 007	19 596	119 136	164 956	26
Tasmanian Turf Launceston	25	175	1 510	1 826	87	73	68	7.0	10 605	1 256	7 085	16 590	94 205	142 339	16
Devonport	8	54	1 874	3 096	81	68	63	6.8	6 533	963	4 131	8 887	60 160	89 834	12
Deloraine	3	21	2 339	3 797	77	61	56	7.0	7 116	961	5 698	8 903	72 182	139 188	16
King Island	5	34	392	586	59	50	50	6.8	2 336	343	501		4 561	5 474	1
Sheffield	1	6	1 410	2 500	88	53	47	6.0	5 350	877	4 642		32 568	111 690	10
Trotting Clubs:															
Tasmanian Pacing Hobart	24	178	1 951	2 751	128	80	73	7.4	10 371	1 320	20 463	13 670	137 765	179 074	25
Launceston Pacing	23	163	1 449	2 113	114	106	72	7.1	7 167	985	7 629	12 205	89 529	119 360	16
Carrick Park	9	63	1 169	1 908	143	111	69	7.0	6 277	896	6 005	13 985	89 580	88 298	18
New Norfolk	6	37	883	1 413	90	62	58	6.2	5 433	820	10 925	10 292	95 321	129 780	22
Devonport	10	62	1 671	2 021	110	65	55	6.2	4 737	719	4 225	5 230	44 599	34 765	11
Ulverstone	6	36	948	1 567	103	69	54	6.0	4 200	700	3 780	2 673	34 137	84 449	11
Burnie	6	36	960	1 437	92	55	50	6.0	4 500	758	2 752	3 257	27 295	68 063	11
North Eastern	1	7	1 037	1 865	65	59	58	7.0	6 650	904	1 792		24 810	22 288	3
St Marys	1	6	1 037	1 995	63	59	52	6.0	5 200	866	1 636		29 438	36 669	4
Greyhound Clubs:															
Hobart	53	632	889	934	132	105	91	11.9	3 465	273	8 711	8 839	97 455	21 982	15
Launceston	53	636	407	822	139	103	95	12.0	2 599	216	5 517	9 697	91 094	9 540	12
Devonport	41	465	306	640	117	100	87	11.3	1 610	146	3 308	9 234	61 113	3 801	10

* Less sponsorship and donations received by clubs.

RACE MEETINGS
STATISTICAL AVERAGES—1978-79 SEASON

Club	Meetings	Attendance	Gate	Entries	Acceptors	Starters	Races	Stakes	On-Course Total	Off-Course Total	Local Bookmakers	Mainland Bookmakers	No. of Bookmakers
Racing Clubs:			\$					\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Tasmanian Racing Hobart	31	1 876	2 378	78	66	62	7	8 600	15 112	17 373	123 960	177 240	23
Tasmanian Turf Launceston	13	1 743	3 144	93	72	69	7	10 390	6 528	20 483	100 004	139 881	16
Newnham	9	1 233	1 504	88	79	74	7	7 261	5 255	12 564	82 744	140 227	15
Devonport	7	1 968	2 203	91	74	62	6	5 129	4 222	5 873	48 536	95 036	11
Deloraine	4	2 316	3 376	74	59	55	7	5 785	4 347	5 975	68 236	124 116	14
Longford	3	1 016	1 813	83	70	64	7	7 750	5 873	7 313	64 632	119 333	12
King Island	5	292	586	52	38	38	6	1 720	749	—	2 945	6 059	1
Smithton	1	258	443	24	14	13	3	1 425	144	—	1 844	12 331	3
Sheffield		Meeting cancelled											
Trotting Clubs:													
Southern Tasmania	12	1 939	2 562	107	73	66	7	10 077	16 818	11 745	136 245	205 008	21
Hobart Metropolitan	13	1 735	2 174	104	76	71	7	8 518	16 111	10 316	119 575	182 376	28
Launceston	23	1 709	1 863	138	92	68	7	6 354	5 943	9 329	88 042	129 231	16
New Norfolk	5	892	1 231	73	57	54	6	5 112	9 697	8 286	97 789	141 680	21
Devonport	7	1 283	1 552	101	65	56	6	3 971	3 008	886	30 759	64 726	11
Carrick Park	9	1 082	2 165	123	113	71	7	6 022	4 854	12 355	99 045	107 504	11
Burnie	6	906	1 426	97	58	51	6	3 742	2 582	1 016	23 947	74 051	11
Ulverstone	5	1 181	1 891	100	60	57	6	4 270	4 159	4 256	34 804	98 392	11
St Marys	1	1 294	2 399	130	74	68	6	4 500	2 106	—	53 456	37 924	4
North Eastern	1	1 116	1 932	63	51	48	6	5 200	1 829	—	26 475	29 669	3
Greyhound Clubs:													
Hobart	52	891	1 016	146	—	94	12	3 004	8 284	6 998	94 745	12 243	14
Launceston	51	406	810	136	107	92	12	2 180	5 385	6 249	81 140	8 987	12
Devonport	39	318	681	133	102	92	12	1 642	3 649	8 895	56 686	3 760	9

Appendix 1

STATISTICAL DETAILS OF RACE MEETINGS
1980-81 SEASON

Averages Per Meeting													
	Meetings	Races	Attendance	Gate Receipts	Entries	Acceptors	Starters	Races	Stakes Per Meeting	Stakes Per Race	On-course Total	Bookmakers Holdings Local	Bookmakers Holdings Mainland
				\$					\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Racing Clubs:													
Tasmanian Racing : Primary (Hobart)	30	191	1 775	2 359	72	59	57	6.4	11 439	1 796	30 406	114 380	176 669
Tasmanian Racing: Secondary	5	29	1 337	1 777	50	43	40	5.8	4 180	721	26 293	72 361	165 874
Tasmanian Turf (Launceston)	27	181	1 521	2 022	88	80	68	6.7	12 127	1 809	13 232	99 763	134 510
Devonport Racing	10	68	1 764	2 030	81	67	63	6.8	7 080	1 041	8 454	71 339	107 315
Deloraine Turf	4	27	2 196	3 018	86	63	57	6.8	7 475	1 107	10 874	70 225	115 880
King Island Racing	5	28	334	757	55	55	43	5.6	1 966	348	650	5 106	8 089
Sheffield Racing	1	6	2 020	5 690	109	52	49	6.0	8 600	1 433	4 513	46 858	121 344
Harness Racing Clubs:													
Tasmanian Pacing Day (Hobart)	16	119	1 384	1 951	122	77	69	7.4	8 431	1 134	27 304	136 092	141 500
Tas. Pacing: Night	22	154	1 960	2 764	109	66	60	7.0	11 668	1 667	13 828	143 743	37 274
Tas. Pacing: Interdominion	4	31	9 000	17 461	157	77	69	7.8	74 475	9 610	91 061	459 465	88 201
Launceston Pacing	24	164	1 341	2 172	134	87	64	6.8	7 385	1 081	9 541	91 068	128 452
Carrick Park Trotting	9	63	932	1 854	132	91	68	7.0	6 261	894	6 061	81 052	99 429
New Norfolk Trotting	10	58	750	1 283	82	49	44	5.8	5 370	915	18 244	67 772	100 876
Devonport Trotting	13	78	1 364	2 308	101	59	53	6.0	4 683	780	4 827	45 097	27 772
Ulverstone Trotting	6	36	937	1 914	108	63	53	6.0	4 758	793	5 329	39 769	89 632
Burnie Trotting	6	35	988	1 718	100	67	58	5.9	4 708	807	3 247	30 756	68 771
North Eastern Trotting	1	7	1 321	3 052	59	57	57	7.0	6 950	993	2 093	41 182	44 770
St Marys Trotting	1	6	1 354	3 267		51	50	6.0	5 200	867	1 969	52 105	68 764
Greyhound Racing Clubs:													
Hobart	51	526	573	1 097	112	82	81	10.0	4 297	416	11 214	89 361	30 531
Launceston	51	598	475	908	137	102	96	12.0	3 740	318	7 524	90 610	14 756
Devonport	40	467	502	944	125	103	90	12.0	2 384	204	4 108	66 424	4 932

Mr LEWIS: The next table sets out the Tasmanian Racing and Gaming Commission statistics on raffles, Tatts Lotto and pools, since the same information is already available from South Australia.

Tasmania

Tasmanian Racing and Gaming Commission
Paul Horne 002-302605

Raffles

1974-77	only revenue figures available.
1977-78	\$7 m gross
1978-79	\$11.7 m gross 67.14% inc.
1979-80	\$16.8 m gross 43.59% inc.
1980-81	\$18.1 m gross 7.74% inc.

Tattsotto

1973-74	\$1.5 m gross
1974-75	\$1.9 m
1975-76	\$2.1 m
1976-77	\$6.9 m
1977-78	\$11.0 m
1978-79	\$16.9 m
1979-80	\$22.3 m
1980-81	\$25.3 m

Pools

1975-76	\$0.4 m
1976-77	\$0.9 m
1977-78	\$0.9 m
1978-79	\$1.0 m
1979-80	\$1.2 m
1980-81	\$1.1 m

Average size bet unknown

Geographic location—Various

Mr LEWIS: The next table for the interest and future reference of members relates to Victoria, the Totalisator Agency Board, cash betting, telephone betting, and the differences between the two, since they are comparable with what will arise in South Australia, and the on-course and off-course wagers that have been laid and, when the facilities have been available in that State, the bookmakers' holdings; that is, the amount that was turned over and the growth or otherwise during 1972-73 to 1980-81, also for Victoria. Another table refers to the Victorian Raffles and Bingo Permits Board and the amount of gross revenue derived from that, since it is comparable with what has been happening in South Australia. These statistics are vitally important to enable us to take a backward look as well as a forward look at these industries, if one can call them that (and I do) in the objective commercial context after being affected by casinos in the respective States, and to make comparisons that will give indications of whether there is a solid argument for or against casinos and the effect of such things.

TABLE 4: TOTALIZATOR AGENCY BOARD
AVERAGE BET SIZE (\$) 1976-77—1980-81

Year	Cash Betting	Telephone Betting	Total
1976-77	1.29	3.80	1.51
1977-78	1.32	3.90	1.53
1978-79	1.33	3.87	1.55
1979-80	1.38	4.66	1.73
1980-81*	3.40	4.50	3.70

Note *increase in average bet size in this year reflects the fact that the TAB implemented a system whereby more than one bet can be had per ticket.

TABLE 1: TOTALIZATOR INVESTMENT, 1969-70
TO 1980-81

Racing Year	On-Course		Off-Course	
	Investments (\$)	% Growth	Investments (\$)	% Growth
1969-70	—	—	203 771 215	—
1970-71	—	—	231 722 362	13.72
1971-72	—	—	275 426 954	18.86
1972-73	—	—	322 819 271	17.21
1973-74	—	—	365 711 373	13.29
1974-75	—	—	461 984 440	26.32
1975-76	—	—	497 346 976	7.65
1976-77	89 846 014	—	546 840 420	9.95
1977-78	101 186 357	12.26	570 821 358	4.39
1978-79	113 181 423	11.85	585 279 125	2.53
1979-80	125 312 989	10.72	628 456 492	7.38
1980-81	136 978 867	9.31	688 374 443	9.53

TABLE 2: BOOKMAKERS' HOLDINGS, 1972/73-1980/81

Year	Holdings (4)	% Growth
1972-73	228 168 482	—
1973-74	262 093 371	14.87
1974-75	337 902 780	28.92
1975-76	396 023 123	17.20
1976-77	448 170 165	13.17
1977-78	475 348 978	6.06
1978-79	495 894 521	4.32
1979-80	496 434 128	0.11
1980-81	509 650 191	2.66

Victoria

Raffles and Bingo Permits Board
Bob Charlton 03-632703

Raffles—only figures available are for revenue raised for the State, together with the total number of raffles.

Housie—

1977-78	\$13.2 m. gross
1978-79	\$29.5 m gross
1979-80	\$40.6 m gross
1980-81	\$52.5 m gross

Turnover unknown

% movement unknown

Average size bet unknown

Geographic location—Various

Western Australia

Lotteries Commission of W.A.
William Hartley 09-3817511

Do not keep totals of any figures, Statutory declarations required for each lottery—merely checked and filed in docket.

turnover unknown

% movement unknown

Average size bet unknown

Geographic location—Various

Mr LEWIS: I also have a table that sets out public attendance figures at Globe Derby Park from 1968-70 to 1981-82 for all meetings, and a standard deviation between months and years can be made on that basis. If there is a consistent impact by the operation of any casino which may come into existence in South Australia, honourable members in future will be able to do that, and the figures on public attendances at horse racing and trotting meetings are also included in the group of statistics, which will assist in making those deliberative and accurate assessments in due course.

ADELAIDE GREYHOUND RACING CLUB INC.
18 MAY 1982

	Total Attendances
1 July 1972-30 June 1973	125 400
1 July 1973-30 June 1974	147 868
1 July 1974-30 June 1975	149 959
1 July 1975-30 June 1976	141 959
1 July 1976-30 June 1977	131 205
1 July 1977-30 June 1978	118 228
1 July 1978-30 June 1979	108 815
1 July 1979-30 June 1980	91 148
1 July 1980-30 June 1981	83 040

These are paid attendances only and do not include free invitation
tickets

PUBLIC ATTENDANCE FIGURE COMPARISON AT GLOBE DERBY PARK
1969-1982

Month	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
July	1 336	1 611	2 194	1 475	2 630	1 873	2 070	1 669	1 985	1 400	1 308	1 336	1 219
	2 066	2 074	2 371	1 659	2 018	2 644	1 947	2 327	2 381	1 868	2 882	1 920	1 429
	1 379	2 015	2 243	1 758	2 739	1 995	2 196	2 034	2 066	1 630		1 718	1 870
	1 574	2 339	1 725	2 581	2 808	2 496	3 161	2 120	2 120	1 368	1 698	1 670	1 451
August								1 902	1 977	1 286	1 698	1 780	1 550
	1 669	1 944	2 339	1 026	2 999	2 404	1 700	1 402	1 977	1 286	1 698	1 780	1 550
	1 909	2 084	1 662	1 354	3 310	2 751	2 748	1 890	2 341	1 703	1 849	1 921	1 186
	2 320	2 085	1 631	1 827	2 783	2 564	2 643	2 341	1 995	2 121	1 080	1 716	1 708
Sept	2 444	2 387	1 647	1 660		1 838	2 644	2 427	2 579	1 857	1 355	1 475	1 617
							2 622	2 376			1 818	1 575	1 802
									3 067	1 279	2 009	2 147	1 778
							1 899	2 904	2 246	2 513	1 986	2 077	1 843
Oct							2 211	2 085	2 402	1 501	2 054	1 535	1 647
							1 810	2 303	2 682	1 947	1 056	1 913	965
					4 633								
	4 725	5 403	5 081	5 081	3 701	4 195	2 793	2 347	2 090	2 692	3 090	1 903	1 435
Nov	5 068	4 794	4 472	6 265	3 463	3 366	2 571	2 562	2 640	2 191	2 191	1 155	2 207
	4 942	4 997	5 539	5 269	2 501	3 711	2 048	2 104	2 605	2 435	2 251	2 179	1 953
	4 868	4 935			3 332	4 526	2 380	2 741	2 592	2 345	1 599	2 191	2 119
	5 798	5 119	6 184	5 017									3 457
Dec	5 606	5 950	5 980	5 078	3 456	3 827	3 411	3 486	2 815	2 376	2 137	3 088	2 542
	6 126	5 838	5 535	4 917	4 409	5 579	3 926	3 728	3 037	2 331	3 107	2 545	1 912
	5 705	5 631	4 482	5 615	4 584	5 262	3 130	3 394	3 194		2 091	2 734	2 258
	5 229	5 905	5 489	5 405	4 745	5 261	4 070	4 826	17 776	12 110	2 224	2 684	2 345
Dec						4 796					2 462	4 449	
	5 453	5 501	4 574	5 002	6 318	8 590	3 857	3 947	7 526	2 211	2 352	2 462	2 618
	5 338	4 576	4 619	4 536	4 129	4 241	3 230	3 042	2 758	2 448	2 461	1 826	1 652
	5 320	4 869	5 423	5 969	3 667	5 470	3 878	3 624	3 045	2 367	2 669	2 682	2 452
Dec	8 883	9 262	9 096	6 367	5 912	5 311	3 718	3 582	2 012	3 049	3 099	4 511	3 769
				7 192			5 281		2 575	3 654			

PUBLIC ATTENDANCE FIGURE COMPARISON AT GLOBE DERBY PARK
1969-1982—continued

Month	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
Jan	4 776	7 244	3 428	5 992	5 223	6 584	5 062	4 028	4 135	3 253	3 253	4 016	3 824
	7 931	7 637	6 397	5 842	5 377	4 928	4 816	3 246	3 105	3 277	2 725	3 700	3 430
	6 961	6 699	6 344	5 321	5 263	5 831	6 037	3 279	3 409	2 890	2 903	3 758	3 336
	7 021	5 061	5 319	5 717	5 375	5 158		3 112	3 021	3 593	2 751	4 198	4 548
	7 410	5 920	6 288								4 874	7 034	2 965
Feb	6 139	6 602	5 844	5 854	5 090	5 377	12 074	4 339	3 228	4 847	3 199	3 696	2 784
	6 348	5 752	7 708	6 036	5 251	2 392	10 384	3 247	2 769	3 129	3 165	2 834	2 638
	4 783	3 329	4 370	5 576	2 280	3 978	14 485	3 186	3 462	2 889	3 260	3 102	2 434
	5 296	4 916	5 558	5 346	4 882	5 038	25 456	3 549	3 390	3 745	3 023	1 645	2 889
	9 727	5 764				4 875	3 186						
March	5 171	5 851	4 710	5 951	4 884	5 281	3 837	3 624	4 090	2 685	2 458	2 567	2 302
	5 443	6 041	5 574	6 334	4 262	5 436	3 805	3 947	3 363	2 792	2 011	2 666	2 755
	3 581	4 232	4 190	2 895	4 941	3 186	3 246	2 824	2 630	2 708	2 122	2 843	2 729
	4 254	4 929	4 043	5 947	4 553	4 833	3 589	2 661	2 430	2 616	2 753	2 614	2 134
			4 733	5 009	4 954	5 643		2 784					
April	4 819	5 446	7 214	8 138	2 776	3 325	2 837	2 792	2 627	2 285	2 658	2 401	2 039
	5 833	7 695	5 209	6 670	4 536	5 055	2 814	2 927	2 469	2 978	2 587	2 566	3 034
	5 247	3 242	4 909	4 783	3 159	5 455	3 778	2 648	2 425	2 349	2 035	3 100	1 985
	4 625	6 055	3 798	4 353	3 168	3 415	2 045	2 923	2 518	5 575	2 503	2 419	1 819
	4 803	3 387	4 161	4 653	3 437	4 772	2 648				2 419	2 503	
May	4 628	4 457	5 031	4 491	3 190	4 295	2 209	2 118	2 379	1 767	2 014	2 063	1 956
	2 931	4 606	4 500	4 289	3 775	3 393	2 399	2 062	2 128	1 628	1 710	1 689	1 977
	3 989	4 381	3 930	5 696	3 206	4 067	2 135	2 246	2 315	1 810	1 815	2 916	1 981
	4 555	3 910	3 868	3 657	2 524	2 231	2 437	2 462	2 585	2 715	2 070	1 852	1 766
						3 358	2 378				1 880		
June	2 166	1 689	4 743	2 476	3 115	3 767	1 829	1 984	1 607	1 728	1 653	1 784	Using
	1 970	1 645	2 246	1 894	2 655	2 154	2 281	1 868	2 080	1 653	1 609	1 453	1981
	1 897	1 875	2 150	2 720	2 406	2 280	2 289	2 298	1 862	1 741	1 743	1 539	Figures
	2 074	1 957	1 753	2 609	2 382	2 928	2 014	2 482	1 941	1 754	1 243	1 593	
				2 541					1 400	1 203			
	222 136	219 541	210 304	215 843	176 781	209 165	206 619	138 431	149 438	129 702	118 778	129 743	112 478

PUBLIC ATTENDANCES—HORSE RACING 1.1.80-1.5.82

Course	Date	Attendance
Victoria Park	1.1.80	7 396
Victoria Park	5.1.80	5 116
Cheltenham	12.1.80	6 051
Cheltenham	19.1.80	5 997
Victoria Park	26.1.80	5 466
Victoria Park	28.1.80	5 303
Victoria Park	30.1.80	2 680
Victoria Park	2.2.80	4 933
Cheltenham	6.2.80	2 576
Cheltenham	9.2.80	6 051
Cheltenham	16.2.80	5 405
Victoria Park	23.2.80	5 068
Victoria Park	1.3.80	4 885
Victoria Park	8.3.80	4 644
Cheltenham	15.3.80	6 014
Cheltenham	22.3.80	5 267
Cheltenham	26.3.80	2 621
Cheltenham	29.3.80	5 470
Victoria Park	9.4.80	3 002
Victoria Park	12.4.80	4 819
Victoria Park	19.4.80	4 081
Cheltenham	25.4.80	5 843
Cheltenham	26.4.80	5 576
Cheltenham	3.5.80	5 231
Victoria Park	10.5.80	5 040
Victoria Park	17.5.80	5 586
Victoria Park	19.5.80	15 947
Cheltenham	24.5.80	4 838
Cheltenham	28.5.80	2 903
Cheltenham	31.5.80	4 621
Victoria Park	7.6.80	4 180
Victoria Park	14.6.80	4 229
Victoria Park	16.6.80	3 935
Cheltenham	21.6.80	5 100
Victoria Park	5.7.80	3 386
Victoria Park	12.7.80	4 105
Cheltenham	19.7.80	5 043
Cheltenham	26.7.80	5 203
Cheltenham	2.8.80	4 838
Victoria Park	9.8.80	4 568
Victoria Park	16.8.80	4 541
Victoria Park	23.8.80	4 654
Cheltenham	30.8.80	5 066
Cheltenham	6.9.80	6 042
Cheltenham	13.9.80	6 346
Victoria Park	20.9.80	4 952
Cheltenham	25.9.80	3 055
Cheltenham	27.9.80	5 507
Victoria Park	4.10.80	4 233
Victoria Park	11.10.80	4 669
Victoria Park	13.10.80	4 369
Cheltenham	18.10.80	6 323
Cheltenham	25.10.80	6 007
Victoria Park	1.11.80	4 519
Victoria Park	4.11.80	7 025
Cheltenham	8.11.80	5 837
Cheltenham	15.11.80	4 157
Cheltenham	22.11.80	4 976
Victoria Park	29.11.80	3 956
Victoria Park	3.12.80	2 145
Victoria Park	6.12.80	3 986
Victoria Park	10.12.80	1 520
Victoria Park	13.12.80	3 950
Cheltenham	20.12.80	4 767
Cheltenham	26.12.80	8 392
Cheltenham	27.12.80	7 012
Victoria Park	1.1.81	5 467
Victoria Park	3.1.81	4 160
Victoria Park	24.1.81	4 505
Victoria Park	26.1.81	3 503
Victoria Park	31.1.81	4 972
Victoria Park	4.2.81	2 830
Victoria Park	7.2.81	4 566
Cheltenham	11.2.81	2 417
Cheltenham	14.2.81	4 716
Cheltenham	21.2.81	5 080
Cheltenham	28.2.81	5 040

PUBLIC ATTENDANCES—HORSE RACING 1.1.80-1.5.82—*continued*

Course	Date	Attendance
Victoria Park	7.3.81	4 670
Victoria Park	14.3.81	4 495
Cheltenham	21.3.81	4 997
Morphettville	25.3.81	7 610
Morphettville	28.3.81	7 518
Victoria Park	4.4.81	4 040
Victoria Park	11.4.81	4 496
Morphettville	22.4.81	3 371
Morphettville	25.4.81	9 000
Cheltenham	2.5.81	4 752
Morphettville	9.5.81	4 745
Morphettville	16.5.81	6 743
Morphettville	18.5.81	22 988
Cheltenham	23.5.81	3 931
Cheltenham	27.5.81	2 531
Cheltenham	30.5.81	4 391
Victoria Park	6.6.81	4 796
Victoria Park	8.6.81	4 361
Victoria Park	13.6.81	3 386
Victoria Park	20.6.81	3 715
Morphettville	27.6.81	6 940
Morphettville	4.7.81	4 323
Morphettville	11.7.81	4 044
Cheltenham	18.7.81	4 680
Cheltenham	25.7.81	4 129
Victoria Park	15.8.81	5 694
Morphettville	22.8.81	3 887
Morphettville	29.8.81	5 701
Morphettville	5.9.81	5 123
Cheltenham	12.9.81	4 977
Victoria Park	19.9.81	5 510
Victoria Park	24.9.81	2 291
Victoria Park	26.9.81	4 578
Gawler Meeting		
Victoria Park	30.9.81	2 483
Morphettville	3.10.81	3 875
Morphettville	10.10.81	7 517
Morphettville	12.10.81	5 724
Morphettville	17.10.81	6 314
Cheltenham	24.10.81	5 335
Victoria Park	21.10.81	Free day
Victoria Park	31.10.81	5 456
Victoria Park	3.11.81	6 732
Victoria Park	7.11.81	4 967
Morphettville	14.11.81	4 564
Morphettville	21.11.81	4 892
Victoria Park	28.11.81	4 161
Victoria Park	5.12.81	4 178
Cheltenham	12.12.81	3 708
Cheltenham	16.12.81	1 899
Cheltenham	19.12.81	4 436
Morphettville	26.12.81	9 963
Morphettville	28.12.81	7 373
Morphettville	1.1.82	5 403
Morphettville	2.1.82	5 484
Cheltenham	9.1.82	4 699
Cheltenham	16.1.82	3 681
Victoria Park	23.1.82	2 480
Victoria Park	30.1.82	4 895
Victoria Park	1.2.82	5 712
Morphettville	20.2.82	3 889
Morphettville	27.2.82	4 741
Victoria Park	6.3.82	3 932
Victoria Park	13.3.82	4 144
Victoria Park	17.3.82	2 348
Morphettville	20.3.82	4 037
Morphettville	27.3.82	3 733
Victoria Park	3.4.82	4 093
Cheltenham	14.4.82	2 013
Morphettville	17.4.82	4 127
Morphettville	24.4.82	3 889
Morphettville	26.4.82	4 106
Cheltenham	28.4.82	1 439
Cheltenham	1.5.82	3 479

ATTENDANCES AT RACECOURSES—METROPOLITAN

(1) Trotting (W.A.T.A.) Period from 1 August to 31 July							
	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81		
Gloucester Park	372 793	330 164	317 116	336 652	317 318		
Richmond Raceway	92 600	87 000	93 200	87 400	92 400		
(2) Galloping (W.A.T.C.) Period from 1 May to 30 April							
	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82		
Belmont and Ascot	735 803	717 848	706 988	709 528	691 284		
(3) Greyhounds (W.A.G.R.A.) Period from 1 August to 31 July							
	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81
Cannington	123 665	172 051	155 267	151 116	126 247	105 009	102 564

Note: Greyhound racing commenced on 12 December 1974. Therefore the first set of figures are for a part year.

TABLE 3: METROPOLITAN ATTENDANCES, 1969/70-1980/81

Year	Racing	Harness Racing	Greyhounds	Total
1969-70	1 612 985 (69)	639 978 (37)	437 820 (110)	
1970-71	1 645 377 (68)	751 520 (43)	458 778 (107)	
1971-72	1 743 970 (69)	713 801 (44)	505 571 (110)	
1972-73	1 694 920 (69)	710 975 (43)	518 984 (110)	
1973-74	1 652 533 (68)	671 565 (43)	532 651 (110)	
1974-75	1 786 017 (75)	625 241 (43)	538 052 (111)	
1975-76	1 681 431 (76)	601 468 (44)	516 956 (110)	
1976-77	1 622 130 (82)	587 642 (53)	433 171 (110)	
1977-78	1 602 639 (84)	635 903 (55)	409 735 (109)	
1978-79	1 553 334 (84)	570 985 (55)	384 313 (111)	2 508 632
1979-80	1 526 418 (84)	611 090 (59)	348 947 (110)	2 486 455
1980-81	1 477 667 (83)	602 461 (60)	316 834 (110)	2 396 962

Notes:

- Figures in brackets denote the number of meetings held.
- Totals have only been provided in respect of the period since 1978-79 as prior to that year greyhound figures are on a calendar year basis rather than a racing year basis.

Mr LEWIS: I trust that the end result is that people will have the benefit of that information on the record.

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

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I have listened to the debate so far with much interest. It is unfortunate that we are going to debate this measure all night and probably through to the morning. Such action does not greatly enhance the standing of members of Parliament in the community when we are to make an important decision after sitting all night.

This is the third or fourth time since I have been in this House that the matter has been debated. We have the benefit of an extensive select committee report. I do not agree with the member for Mallee that the committee did not carry out its duties in a responsible and thorough manner. That report is one of the best select committee reports that I have had the pleasure of reading since I have been a member of Parliament. If every major piece of legislation received the attention that that Bill received, then most legislation would be greatly improved.

I want to make one or two other critical comments. I accept that every member of this House is entitled to his or her own point of view. Clearly, this is a social issue and members are entitled to make up their own minds. I wish there were more such votes in this House when members could exercise their own individual judgment. That way we would get better legislation. Further, I appreciate the views of those people opposed to the Bill. They have every right to make their views known to members. Likewise I appreciate the views of constituents who have approached me on this

subject, and I intend to refer later to some of the correspondence that I have received.

However, I do not believe that members ought to adopt such a hypocritical stance as I believe some members have. It is obvious to anyone who stops to think that most members who visit Tasmania make the Wrest Point casino one of their first visits. I can honestly say that I have never been in a casino, and it is most unlikely that I ever will. Gambling does not appeal to me. Most members, like most members of the public, participate in other forms of gambling or games of chance, and they will have a greater effect on people who are inclined to gamble beyond their means than will the operation of a casino in South Australia.

Since I have been a member of Parliament I cannot recall receiving one complaint about the operations of the T.A.B., the Lotteries Commission, Bingo, X-Lotto, instant money, beer ticket machines, or soccer pools.

Those areas of gambling are available across the State. Virtually within a few yards of their homes people can participate. I have not received any complaints. I well recall when the matter of the introduction of the Lotteries Commission was put to a referendum in this State. I was one of the people who voted against that proposition. I well recall the discussions that took place in relation to the T.A.B., when many people were running around expressing grave fears and concerns about that matter. However, people were opposed to the T.A.B. but quite happy to tolerate bookmakers operating illegally throughout the length and breadth of South Australia.

It is an unfortunate fact that people are going to gamble, and I do not necessarily support that. It is not that I believe

that they should be encouraged, but unfortunately it is a fact of life. Gambling will take place; therefore, it should be controlled on a regulated basis so that we can make sure that criminal elements are prevented from being involved in such operations. I have given the matter a great deal of thought, and I have endeavoured to look at it in a rational and responsible way, as one who by nature is not a gambler. I was brought up in a family that had involvement with the racing industry. My father bred race horses which were raced as a sport. I had a very occasional bet on a race horse and I think I have been to the trots once or twice, although I have never been to a dog race meeting in my life (not that I believe that there is anything wrong with it).

I believe that the House should support this legislation. I have voted against such proposals in the past, but I believe that one should examine what has taken place in other States. I have heard no great criticism of the operation of the casino in Tasmania. I believe that I should reassess my position following the position taken by the Premier of Queensland (Mr Bjelke-Petersen), who believes that it is in the best interests of Queensland to have two casinos operating in that State.

The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:

Mr GUNN: The honourable member says that we all make mistakes. He will have his opportunity to make his contribution. Perhaps one could say that he has made a mistake. However, Mr Bjelke-Petersen professes to have strong Christian morals and is a person who, I understand, regularly attends church. He is not noted for being a leader in bringing before Parliament social legislation; however, he believes that there are some benefits for the people of Queensland. His attitude made me take stock and give the matter my close attention.

Further, the Hon. R.C. DeGaris, in another place, has not been noted during his Parliamentary life for being a supporter or promoter of so-called progressive legislation, but he has given his support to this measure. I believe that we should look at this matter in a practical and logical fashion and that we should not engage in emotional arguments, which the member for Mallee indulged in.

We are talking of only one casino and not of a casino in every country town or district. We are not advocating more gambling. It is my considered view that there will always be illegal casinos and we are led to believe that there are illegal casinos operating within a kilometre of this building. In New South Wales illegal casinos are operated by the most devious scoundrels that one could think of. When that is occurring, all sorts of problems are created, such as corruption and the compromise of people's positions.

We should not allow that situation to operate in South Australia; we should do everything possible to prevent it. By allowing one properly run and managed casino in South Australia we will do something to keep out those who have acted so irresponsibly in New South Wales.

There will be some benefits to the tourist industry, and my good friend the member for Coles had a lot to say about this matter. The honourable member explained in some detail that it was a matter for each member to decide, and I entirely agree with her, but I recall that at the time of the opening of the casino in Alice Springs the honourable member was given an invitation to attend that function. People should be consistent in these matters or should give good reasons why they are adopting a particular course of action.

It would be the easiest thing in the world for me to oppose this piece of legislation and to be consistent with what I have done in the past, but I do not believe that it would be the responsible course of action for me to adopt because I really believe that this Bill should be passed into law.

There are one or two minor amendments that would improve the Bill, and in the future perhaps the Parliament

ought to look at such amendments, but I consider that, if South Australia is to take its place as a major tourist attraction, unfortunately it is probably necessary that we must have one casino. Regrettably, whatever we do we will not prevent people from gambling. I do not believe that the majority of people who visit a casino will be people whom one would describe as likely to spend more money than they can afford, because there are already, as I have explained, many avenues open to them to participate in all forms of gambling or games of chance, or however one likes to describe them.

I have been approached by certain people in my electorate and by others, and I have read with interest the press release of the Archbishop of Adelaide. I respect their viewpoints, and I sincerely hope that they will respect my viewpoint on this matter. I read with interest some of the comments made by the Festival of Light. That organisation is entitled to its views, but it is taking things just a little too far when it suggests that because of gambling we have to pay out of the public coffers some \$837 000 000—it mentions supporting mothers' benefits and other items. That is just taking things a little bit too far. It is necessary for the Commonwealth of Australia to appropriate that money, perhaps because we have a greater social conscience in a democracy, in a country where we believe in a fair go for everyone and we accept that the total community has a responsibility for the underprivileged.

I am conscious that when looking at a measure of this nature we must be very sure that by supporting it we will not on the other hand have to support an increase in the social welfare vote. That has always been a concern of mine with such measures, but I do not believe that that will be the effect.

A number of people have approached me and expressed concern about this measure. Most of those people have indicated that they would like the Australian Government to set up a committee to study the social effects of all forms of gambling. I support that proposal. In fact, in the next session of this Parliament I will be happy to move an appropriate motion. I believe that that would be a constructive exercise for members of this House. One of the letters that I have received opposing a casino refers to the following:

1. An increase in organised crime.

I know that people are concerned about that aspect. However, if we look at this matter objectively I believe we will see that that type of problem is associated with illegal casinos in New South Wales, where I understand people line up on the streets to attend those places. The letter also states:

2. Because of the above a greater tax burden through an increase in the Police Force and a greater burden on social services.

3. An increase in compulsive gambling.

I think that I have indicated quite clearly that, unfortunately, there are avenues available for people to engage in just about every form of gambling imaginable.

After a discussion with some of my constituents last week, I went into a local hotel and before I could get to the bar I had to shovel away piles of beer tickets with my feet. Beer tickets are readily available and I believe that they create a greater social problem than this measure.

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I do not think that interjections are worth replying to. I have tried to be constructive in my speech. I have endeavoured not to be provocative because I believe that this is a serious matter and members should give it their full attention.

I have received letters from people in other parts of my electorate expressing their concern. If I believed that great damage would be done to the community I would certainly not vote for this legislation. I suppose that I would have as conservative a voting record as any member of this Chamber

in relation to this type of issue. If I have ever had any doubts about legislation I have always been inclined to oppose it. On many occasions I have been on one side of the House with very few colleagues following a division. I believe that a member should do what he believes to be right.

On this occasion I believe that this measure is worthy of support. I assure those people who have approached me that I have given their views the most careful consideration. I believe it is quite proper for people to approach their members with their views. At this stage I intend to support the second reading. I think it is fairly obvious from the manner in which this debate has been conducted that this is a Government Bill in all but name. It is interesting to observe some of the members who opposed a similar measure on a previous occasion and it will be interesting to see how they vote on this Bill.

I do not believe that the Government can get away from the fact that it has provided Government time for this Bill to be debated. That is unusual, if not rare. In the 13 years that I have been a member of this Chamber I think there was only one other occasion when that course of action was adopted. Therefore, the Government cannot escape the responsibility for this legislation if it is carried, because it has facilitated its passage.

No matter what anyone likes to say, anybody who reads the report will soon come to that conclusion. I sincerely hope that the House will adjourn in a very short time so that members can have the opportunity, before this measure goes into Committee stages, to have some sleep so that they can come back and make a more constructive contribution to this measure. I believe that the public of South Australia would expect members to not rush legislation of this nature. They would expect that Parliament ought to organise its affairs in such a manner that members would not be in a state of physical exhaustion when debating a measure of this nature.

I believe it is quite wrong to keep the House in session so that this matter will be dealt with quickly. We are all aware that it is a difficult area for members of Parliament to be involved in. Obviously the Government believes that we will have a ruckus and the matter will be over and done with once and for all. I do not believe that that is the appropriate way to carry on. It would be wise if the debate concluded in the near future.

The matter was on the Notice Paper in the Legislative Council for a considerable time. It is only in the last few weeks that the matter has been brought on for debate. However it is my intention to support the second reading of the measure.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray): I only intend to speak briefly on this matter. I have had the opportunity to speak on two separate occasions in the debates that have taken place previously on the casino issue. I do not enter this debate with any great pleasure. To be quite honest, I have found the entire process by which the Government has introduced and dealt with the legislation to be most unsatisfactory.

Many of the members who have spoken previously in the debate have referred to the way in which the Bill has been introduced. The legislation to provide for a casino in South Australia was introduced in another place as a private member's Bill. However, by the time it had reached this House it almost appeared that the Government was treating it as Government business. When we look at the precedence that this legislation has taken over many other important issues and, in fact, over important financial issues before the House when a second reading was introduced, we recognise the importance that the Government is placing on the

legislation. So, it is not good enough to just say that it is a private member's Bill. It was quite obvious that the Government did not have what was needed to come out and say clearly and openly that the Bill had now become a Government Bill. However, enough of that.

I point out to the House at the outset that it is not my intention to support the legislation at either the second or the third reading stage. I have constantly opposed setting up a casino in South Australia and I intend to oppose this legislation this morning. Not one thing has happened since I last spoke in the debate in this place to change my mind. I have to say that I do not know accurately how my constituents feel about the matter. Certainly I have had a large amount of representation on the casino issue.

I have received a large number of letters about this matter and signatures attached to petitions during the time that I have been a member of Parliament. All those letters, without exception, have been against the establishment of a casino. The contacts that I have had with constituents I have questioned about this matter have represented a wide spectrum of views.

I am sure that as members we all realise that it is important to try to ascertain the effects of such things on the people whom we represent. I make it clear that on this occasion I recognise the need to respect the views of the electorate. However, as this is a social issue and a conscience issue, I intend to vote in the way in which I feel I should vote.

I have spoken at length on previous occasions in this House and indicated why I oppose a casino in South Australia. It is not my intention at 10 past 2 in the morning to canvass the same ground again. I make no bones about the fact that I am influenced in my decision on this matter to a large extent by seeing it through the eyes of a father of four young children. In this debate tonight, and in previous debates on this matter, members have referred to a number of matters that surround the casino issue, including the incidence of crime and organised crime associated with casinos. I agree with some of the facts that have been provided to back up their arguments in debate, but others I find it difficult to concur in. I indicated what I saw as the need for a national inquiry to study the social and economic effects of gambling in Australia when I spoke in a similar debate in August of last year.

I feel more strongly now about the need for such an inquiry on a national basis than I did at that time. I am sure that the House would recognise that that was one of the important points that came out of the report of the select committee—an excellent report, I suggest, and an excellent recommendation. The member for Eyre, the previous speaker, indicated that it is important that this matter be canvassed. If it is that honourable member's intention at a later stage to move the way he indicated I will be happy to support him.

Interesting statistics have been provided regarding the issues surrounding the casino establishment, one being the amount of returns from the casino. This has been referred to by a number of speakers tonight. I suggest that we need to look closely at the matter of price competition between all the casinos from the point of view of Governments reducing their tax take.

Both Tasmania and Queensland have already become involved in pricing competition. I am not sure about the Northern Territory, but I can see this happening more and more between the States. This is something at which we need to look closely. I can see this happening within the casinos themselves; by that I mean reducing the percentage that casinos take in profit.

I want now to refer to a matter which has been raised by other speakers and which is often referred to when this matter is dealt with generally: that is, what is referred to by

some as a strong positive effect that casinos have in attracting tourism. This matter has been widely canvassed last evening and this morning in this debate.

Figures provided by the select committee (and again I indicate my support for the excellent report that was brought down) in its report last year, if I read them correctly, indicate that, while there might have been some tourism effect in the early 1970s (and there is no doubt at all that the figures suggest that), there was also a falling away of interstate attractiveness with the establishment of casinos in other parts of Australia. If we are to talk about the promotion of tourism, I would hope (and I support the views expressed by the Minister of Education in this matter), and in fact I know, that we could provide more in this State to cater for the whole family in regard to entertainment. I believe very strongly that that should be our first priority.

When I debated this subject previously, I referred to matters pertaining to the compulsive gambler, who has also been described as the desperate gambler. Again, this matter was referred to by the Minister of Education. We are told that the compulsive gambler is most likely to be the middle income person, perhaps the person who can afford to gamble and lose. There is also the person who cannot afford to do that, who has run out of options and alternatives when he finds himself in a very tight financial situation—the person who, in these tight economic circumstances, turns to gambling in the hope that his problems will be overcome. He believes that perhaps he may be lucky enough to win the jackpot.

We all know, particularly because of our work as members of Parliament, that a lot of people seem to get themselves into financial difficulties. Some people are out of work, some are bored with the world, some have items on hire purchase, members of the family may become hospitalised, and they are at rock bottom. One alternative to which those people look to solve their problems is to put their last few dollars on the gambling tables. We know the answer in most cases.

In the majority of cases, these desperate gamblers must lose out, as has been pointed out by a number of members in the debate tonight. Statistics show that that is how casinos work, and we all understand that. Where does the desperate gambler find himself then? As most of my colleagues would know, I occasionally enjoy a day at the races. This is usually limited to the support of the two racing clubs in my electorate, and I am lucky that the Oakbank and Murray Bridge clubs are excellent clubs.

The Hon. J.D. Wright interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I suppose that I am lucky in that I have the ability to go to the races with a certain amount of money, I am prepared to put that money on one or two horses, and, when and if that money runs out (and it usually runs out very quickly), I am able to call it a day. I hope that I will always have that ability. I recognise that some other people do not have that ability and need to be protected. I have been to casinos in Las Vegas, Monte Carlo, and in all the States of Australia where casinos currently exist. It was an interesting experience but, as far as I am concerned, that is it. Whether we are to have a casino in South Australia as a result of this Bill is a matter for each member to decide according to the dictates of conscience.

Finally, I am not any more convinced as a result of the debate last night and this morning or on the two previous occasions when this matter has been debated that we need a casino in South Australia or that any good would come from such a facility. As I have pointed out, I have voted against similar legislation twice and, for the reasons that I have listed tonight, I intend to oppose the Bill at its second and third reading.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Davenport): Before I start debating the Bill, I must register my protest at having to debate it at 2.20 a.m.—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You made me debate a Bill once at 3.40 a.m.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: If honourable members wish to filibuster to that extent on this occasion, they can do so. I have been in Parliament for more than 10 years, and this is the only occasion that I can recall when private members' business has gone on like this. It is incredible that the Government has not got the guts—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten): Order! I ask the member for Davenport to come back to the Bill.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I am discussing it. The Government did not have the guts to make this a Government Bill. Now, at 2.20 a.m., we are still debating private members' business. It is ludicrous.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You can make it easier by—

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The sittings of the House are clearly in the Minister's hands, and he knows that. The Deputy Premier must take full responsibility and public accountability for the sittings of the House in the last few weeks.

Mr Becker: It's a shambles.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: That puts it too mildly—it is ludicrous to have Parliament sitting like this, not only in terms of hours, but it is even more ludicrous in not knowing when the House will sit from almost one moment to the next. On Tuesday I had an appointment for lunch at 1 o'clock, but I found that the House was to sit until 1.15 p.m. It did not resume until 2.30 p.m. That is just a small reflection on what it has been like for two weeks, and I must take this opportunity to register my protest against it.

Coming back to the Bill, this matter has been debated at length in this House on several occasions. I do not intend to speak at length. I have previously expressed my views to the House, and I would now like to indicate the experience that I have had in the last two or three years which may have slightly modified my previously expressed views. First, as we all know this matter generates much public opposition and strong feeling behind that opposition. All members have seen that from the letters they have received, both on this occasion and previously.

I well recall the first time this matter was debated, in 1974 or 1975, and the almost bitter opposition that developed within the community. During the last day or so, again members of Parliament have received large numbers of letters and telephone calls. In almost every case the views expressed have been from those opposed to a casino. I have not counted the number of letters that I have received exactly, but in respect of those people for the proposal and those against, the numbers of letters that I have received is running at 100 to one. I think that is a fair assessment of the situation.

That reflects the nature of the issue and the fact that there are people who have very strong personal and moral feelings about a casino. The point that they bring to the fore each time is that the casino is likely to lead to significant social problems, first, due to the influence that it will have on those who cannot control their betting behaviour and because, secondly, the Government is introducing such a measure to make a grab at the finances it can get from a casino.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Is that why your Government introduced it last year?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: No. I was about to say that I think that both claims are wrong. I am simply pointing out the claims that are made in many of the letters that I have received. While I think there is some truth in each of the

claims, I do not believe that they are as serious as perhaps people suggest in the letters that they write.

I do not believe that the prime reason why the Government has introduced this Bill (and after all, it is really a Government measure, although it is not prepared to admit that, but the Government has allowed it Government time) is in the pursuit of finance as such. I believe that it has pursued this measure because it sees this proposal as an easy way of obtaining a very significant convention facility for this State. I know from my own experience as a Minister when I was involved in some of the discussions that took place that there were people who wanted to set up hotels, and people also came along and asked whether they could set up a casino. All I could point out to them was that the Parliament would not allow a casino to be set up. However, those people stressed the benefits from capital assets. I believe that the present Government is promoting a casino, perhaps indirectly and discreetly at present, and that it would like to see this Bill pass because of its belief that perhaps \$100 000 000 or \$150 000 000 worth of capital works could swing on the end of it, with a very significant international hotel and convention facility.

We all know that the Government is hoping that overseas investors can be found successfully for the development of the Adelaide railway station. The Premier has talked about the matter in this House. There has always been an interest in this State about the establishment of a casino, together with an international hotel, on the old brewery site. Incidentally, I ask the Premier to give us a clear indication about whether any specific site has been considered or whether there is a preferred site. I realise that the Premier has dodged the issue when it has been raised during Question Time so far, but I think that he should indicate, as part of this debate, whether any sites have been considered or whether any sites are specifically excluded.

In particular, I ask the Premier whether Ayres House has been considered as a potential site for a casino, or whether that is likely to be considered by the Government. The Government is quietly pursuing the issue of a casino because it can see a very significant potential for development at the end of it. The Premier said only last week that he was hopeful that, within the next couple of months, he would be able to secure a financial backer so that the redevelopment of the Adelaide railway station could proceed. When I was Minister, I was responsible for some of the negotiations and some of the discussions with the parties involved in relation to details of that proposal, and I know that a very significant development project is entailed.

I know how much more attractive that is: it is a very marginal project without a casino, but with a casino included it becomes a very attractive proposal. What we could be looking at if a casino was passed by this Parliament would be an international hotel, with a casino either as part of that hotel or in association with it, perhaps using the existing railway building; a convention centre for seating perhaps 3 500 people; and other facilities. I do not intend to give too much information because certain information to which I was privy has not come out publicly so far, and it would be improper for me to disclose it, but what I have talked about so far is certainly well known.

First, the motive of the Government is not the finance as such, but it is a very easy indirect means of securing a significant convention facility; not that the Government still would not be required to put in some financial backing or to take the head lease for such a convention facility, but the whole economics of the proposal becomes far more attractive if a casino is associated with it.

On the second point of people becoming addicted to gambling, a great deal has been said by a number of members during this debate. I do not wish to go into too much of

the research and statistics that some of them have produced. Having seen casinos in Hobart and the Northern Territory, and also in four or five different locations elsewhere in the world, I do not believe that it would have quite the deleterious effect on the local community, in terms of creating habitual gamblers, that has been suggested in at least some of the correspondence sent to me and some of the arguments put to me. That side of the case has been stressed far too much and perhaps rather exaggerated by some of the parties opposed to the casino.

One area I find, likewise, has not been really appreciated. Perhaps I myself did not fully appreciate the implication until I had the opportunity in the last 12 months of having a detailed discussion with a very senior Federal Cabinet Minister. I was most surprised after a brief visit to a casino to find that this Federal Minister was opposed—

An honourable member: A former Federal Minister, do you mean?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: A former Federal Minister, yes. At the time we had our discussion he was a Federal Minister, and he was opposed to a casino. I discussed with him the reasons for that, and he pointed out that from his knowledge (and he was a person who I say had the highest knowledge of the functioning of national finances) casinos are probably the easiest means available in the community of washing untaxed money. I am not saying that there are not other means; there certainly are. I have little idea of how a person washes money if it is a large amount of untaxed money. I am not talking about stolen money. I am sure that that is also possible to wash through a casino and by other means as well, but I am talking of either people who have earned the money quite legitimately, but for various reasons would wish to wash it through a casino rather than declare it for taxation, or people who have earned the money illegitimately, say, through drugs, in particular. We know the size of the drug trade in Australia at present and the millions of dollars that must be spent by some members of the Australian community in that direction, and we know that somehow that must become eventually almost legitimate money or semi-legitimate money.

The Federal Minister expressed the view from his experience that a casino is probably one of the main areas through which much of that untaxed money could be washed very easily. He expressed the viewpoint from his own investigations that it is easier to wash it through a casino than it was through horse-racing or any of the more obvious, more trite and smaller means of gambling such as lotteries.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: What was the theory about race horses? Why can't you wash money at race meetings?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: His assessment was that it was easier for large syndicates to wash money through a casino than through race meetings. I stress to the honourable member that I do not profess for one minute to even understand, let alone be an expert in, this area. I cannot provide reasons why a casino is so much more attractive than race meetings for the washing of money. I am referring to the experience of a senior Federal Minister. I accept his judgment simply because of his position, his experience, and certain reports that he prepared to back up the evidence.

I am concerned that we could be approving a means of washing large amounts of untaxed money, particularly at a time when we know that the issue of dodging taxation has come to the fore in Australia. In fact, I believe that it has become one of the major national white collar crimes that this country must come to grips with. However, at long last, it appears that over the last two or three years the Federal Government (and it has been taken up by both Labor and Liberal Governments) has been tackling this crime; yet we are proposing to set up more facilities to make it easier and more attractive to launder this money.

I actually saw a gentleman sitting in the back room of an official casino acting on behalf of a syndicate. I was told that this gentleman literally lived at various times at the three legitimate casinos in Australia at Hobart, Alice Springs and Darwin. His full-time job was to move from one casino to another playing the tables. He would stay at each casino for up to a week at a time. He was not putting through his own money but was acting on behalf of an outside syndicate and washing funds for syndicate members.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: It's not possible.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I am surprised that the honourable member has come to. I am not sure whether or not he is talking in his sleep. Mr Acting Speaker, could you rule whether it is feasible for a member to interject while he is asleep and whether or not that would be out of order?

The Hon. J.W. Slater: You're not a wake up.

The Acting SPEAKER (Mr Whitten): Order!

The Hon. R.K. Abbott interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: He was asleep before I started. I have previously expressed my opposition to casinos. Frankly, I am still not convinced and I am not going to support one until, as I have said before, I believe that the benefits across the board in relation to a casino are of real benefit to the State. I think there are some doubts about that. Whilst I have said that there is a possibility that the point about habitual gambling is exaggerated, there is still a problem, and I do not think that anyone could deny that. I do not believe that the chance of large organised crime organisations getting in is so great. However, as I have said this evening, I am aware of the extent to which a casino can be used to launder untaxed money.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: It's not possible.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I am surprised that the honourable member should say that, because I think that the Deputy Premier agreed that a casino could be used to wash money. If the honourable member says it is not possible he is naive. Everyone I have spoken to says that casinos are a means of washing untaxed money.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: If someone wants to wash money, they can do it at the races or through the T.A.B.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The Minister now appears to be awake—I do not think he is walking in his sleep. He obviously did not hear my remarks two or three minutes ago.

The Hon. J. W. Slater: Yes, I did.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: We heard the Minister, too. I intend to vote against the Bill for the reasons I have outlined. I would urge, if this Bill passes (and apparently there has been a change of thinking by some honourable members opposite—which I will comment on briefly) and a casino is to be established, that significant resources be made available to carefully monitor the social consequences of it and to try to assess what action can be taken to help some of the families involved.

Once before in this House I mentioned the distress caused by poker machines to individual families I saw in Armidale where I lived for six years as a student. When one first looked at a town like that one would assume that there were no adverse social consequences through poker machines. However, after one had lived for some time in a small community like that one did see significant adverse effects. I saw children whose parents did not have the money to buy food for part of the week. I saw families and associated with children whose parents could not help but put through the entire week's or fortnight's earnings on the day they received the pay after paying all their immediate debts. For the next week or fortnight the family would go without any money except for what the parents could borrow or scrounge from friends. It was surprising to see how significant that group was even though it was in the minority.

As the Minister of Community Welfare is in the House, will he advise whether, if a casino is established in the State, his department will give consideration to welfare problems and to giving help to habitual gamblers? Will it give them wise counselling if they seek assistance from the Government? The Government needs to look at the overall picture. It has a unique opportunity to implement programmes, should the need arise, right from the outset. I hope that the casino is not established. I ask all members of the House to consider whether it is necessary and whether it will contribute anything significant to the tourist area.

The member for Murray indicated that probably at this stage the benefits in tourism area would be minimal. I think the select committee came to the conclusion that, based on the Wrest Point situation, about 50 per cent of money gambled in a casino is gambled from the local community and about 50 per cent comes from visitors to the town such as sailors or tourist people. I mention sailors because I could never get over the Japanese sailors sitting around the tables at Wrest Point with the pay they had obviously just received. They were gambling substantial amounts—\$1 000 at a time. Although I believe that the select committee's report suggested that 70 per cent of people who gamble come from the local community and 30 per cent are visitors, I believe that visitors spend the most money.

I will conclude my remarks by stating that I will vote against the second reading of the Bill for the reasons I have expressed and will also vote against the third reading. I am not automatically opposed to some of the suggested amendments. I believe they have some merit and I shall support them although I am opposed to the overall measure.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I do not think that anyone in this House would deny that the Bill we are considering is exactly the same piece of legislation as that introduced into this Chamber by the former Liberal Government that was overwhelmingly defeated on a vote by the then members. In the light of the overwhelming vote and support for this legislation recently in another place, I fail to understand, and am staggered to find, that the Government still flatly refuses to adopt this legislation as a Government measure.

We have been debating this Bill for many hours, hours of Government time, yet the Government still refuses to acknowledge that this is a Government Bill and that it will accept responsibility for it. With such an important piece of legislation, which is of great concern to the public of South Australia, we still have no indication from the Government that it is prepared to accept responsibility for it in this State. I believe that this is a quite incredible situation. When the Government is going to indicate its true position on this legislation, I do not know.

The Government is placing members of this House, particularly Opposition members, in an extremely difficult position when a measure such as this is before the House, an extremely important one, one which has generated much interest and concern in the community, but one which the Government fails to stand up and be counted on. As I said earlier, it is exactly the same piece of legislation as that introduced in this House by the previous Government. That Government did not get one of its members to introduce that legislation as a private member's Bill—it stood up and was counted. The public of South Australia knew exactly where it stood in relation to the legislation and that, if the legislation was passed, responsibility for it would rest fairly and squarely on the Government.

It is probably well known to members of this House, and certainly to my constituents, that by and large I have no axe to grind so far as this Bill is concerned. I am not particularly concerned, one way or the other, about gambling.

I do not derive a great deal of satisfaction from gambling on race horses, or from any other form of gambling. By the same token, I do not deny any person in the community the right to gamble if they derive enjoyment from so doing. I have a completely open mind on this matter. What I have endeavoured to do is gain some sort of indication of my electorate's attitude to this legislation. I believe it is fair to say that my electorate is probably evenly divided in support of and opposition to this measure.

About two weeks ago I indicated in a response to the Uniting Church that I believe that it is necessary and proper that one support the second reading of an important piece of legislation such as this to enable it to go through the full and proper Parliamentary process and to enable amendments to be moved. I also indicated to the Church at that time that I reserved the right to make a final decision about this matter at the third reading stage. I put to the Government that if it is serious about this measure it can still come out at this stage and indicate clearly to this House and to the people of South Australia that it is prepared to accept and adopt this legislation as a Government measure.

I believe that this measure is far too important to be put through this House and to become law in South Australia without the Government's expressing an official view. I will certainly wait with interest to hear the member for Hartley in his response to the debate and to see whether or not Government members will ultimately stand up and be counted. If Government members are not prepared to stand up and be counted, if the Government is not prepared to indicate to the people of South Australia that it is prepared to accept responsibility for this legislation, I will certainly reserve my position at the third reading stage, and I will probably vote against the measure.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I want to make very clear from the start that I will oppose the Bill at all stages. This is the fourth opportunity I have had to speak on such legislation, and I am beginning to find it very boring. Nothing new has been introduced into the debate since 1973, and certainly nothing new has been brought forward since the select committee brought down its report last year. Yet, we have heard criticisms of that select committee.

I do not feel that way. I believe it is extremely difficult to cover every aspect in investigating or researching the subject. All members would have received a copy of the Report to the Select Committee on Casinos presented by the Australian Club Development Association on behalf of the Licensed Clubs Association of South Australia. I believe that the report was well prepared and presented. At page 2 of the report it is stated:

It is presented by the South Australian Licensed Clubs Association, on behalf of 200 licensed clubs that are members of the association. The South Australian Licensed Clubs Association members are those clubs with a full liquor licence. In addition, there are some 1 000 other sports and social clubs with restricted liquor permits, who are precluded from full membership of the association by the fact that they do not employ labour. However, the association serves the needs of these smaller non-member clubs.

Thus, this document has considerable weight. It is another matter when we receive representations from the South Australian Jockey Club, which quite rightly points out that the economy of South Australia can stand only so much impact from gambling and that only so much money is made available to the recognised forms of gambling in this State at present. Unlike the member for Semaphore, I believe the Jockey Club is concerned that, if a casino is to be established in South Australia, it could have significant impact on the turnover of the T.A.B. and on attendances at the races. It would affect the racing industry, which is the third largest industry in this State.

It is worth noting that the South Australian Trotting Club was not prepared to tell us how to vote on the issue, but it certainly wants to be considered in regard to a suitable location if the Bill is passed. I do not know whether a casino on the Trotting Club grounds at Bolivar would be beneficial. I do not propose to consider that matter, because I honestly do not believe the South Australian population of 1 300 000, in the current economic recession that we are suffering, can afford to support a casino or an establishment.

I believe the arguments that have been put forward suggesting that tourism would benefit from such a move are false. The only benefit we would get would be as part of a package tour sold to the Asian market. I have been advised that those who would promote such a scheme would suggest to wealthy Asians that they come to Australia on a gambling tour and visit Darwin, Alice Springs, Adelaide, Launceston, Hobart and, hopefully by that time, Melbourne, Sydney and the Gold Coast, and then go on their way.

That type of tourist is really of no benefit to the community at all. All he would see would be the principal buildings in which the casino was conducted. If such tourists were successful, they would come back, and if not we would not see them again.

Much has been made of the suggestion that larger sums of money will be laundered in casinos. Government Ministers have said this is not possible. Unfortunately, during my 20 years with the Bank of Adelaide I know that two officers of the bank each embezzled about \$30 000. Under examination and subject to court procedures, both those officers admitted that they had embezzled the money and gambled it at the races. Subsequent investigation with clients and bookmakers at the races indicated it would be impossible to lose that amount of money in the time these people stated and any large punting by young persons would be easily picked up and recognised.

I do not believe it is easy to launder large sums of money at racing fixtures in South Australia. Certainly, it cannot be done through the T.A.B., because it would have a marked impact on dividends there. The only other way of laundering money, if there is to be this process, is through illegal gambling or casinos. I cannot even believe the amount of money would be used in casinos, because there is a far more successful method of laundering money today; that is, to establish a loss business. It is going on. Operations have been investigated. I refer to concessions being granted to an Australia-wide company at our airports. Such companies run at tremendous losses. The capital and main investment is from overseas funds and, for every \$1 that is lost annually, another \$2 can be brought into the country to make up those losses.

It is an unbelievable situation in regard to the concessions granted at Adelaide Airport. The companies involved would have to lose thousands of dollars. I have been told that they are losing hundreds of thousands of dollars but they are not worried because they are bringing in the extra capital from overseas at the rate of \$2 for every \$1 that is lost. It is just as easy to wash money in that way than it is to take the risk at a casino. That is one system that is being used.

I am also advised, although it is extremely difficult to prove (one could never prove it), that a certain courier is involved in at least \$2 000 000 a week being transhipped in cash through Sydney Airport alone, generally on Fridays. The informer would not give too much more information because it would highlight those operations, but there is a link with illegal gambling proceeds and other activities in New South Wales.

Illegal gambling and illegal financial cash transactions in this country are now at a level where certainly the Federal Government is concerned, because Federal Treasury is missing out on millions of dollars of income tax. That

means that the average citizen is paying more than he has to.

How we will ever stop this, I do not know. I certainly would not like to be a party to setting up a gambling system or method that will aid and abet persons wishing to launder money to escape payment of taxation. I find that aspect of the whole issue immoral. How does any member of this House support that sort of scheme? How can a Government support a scheme or a system, whatever one wants to call it, occurring under the pretext of a legalised casino? I believe it would be irresponsible to do so. I do not think that any politician could really face the average citizen in the community and say, 'We are sorry, but you must pay 35 cents plus in the dollar income tax and more indirect taxes, because we cannot stop these tax cheats.' That is what we would be really doing in our support for the setting up a casino—because the tax cheats are the only people who can benefit from it.

I do not believe there is a benefit to tourism inherent in the setting up of the facility because, by the time a casino was established in South Australia, there would be so many in Australia that our population would be unable to support them. We do not have a large enough population nor do we have a strong economic base to support a large number of these establishments. That is reflected by the limited number of special air charter flights taking persons to the Wrest Point casino. There are few people in South Australia who can afford to go on a package tour to another State for the purposes of gambling. In regard to the people who go on such trips, one wonders what sort of business they are in which enables them to afford that type of luxury—obviously their profits are excessive, and perhaps they are ripping off consumers. Again, they may be avoiding some normal business practices; I do not believe that profits are so readily available as to enable people to do that.

I was most impressed with some research that has been undertaken by a radio journalist, and I refer to Leigh Hatcher, someone whom I hold in reasonably high esteem. I am grateful to the Festival of Light for providing a document (dated 11 September 1981) which contains the following information:

Leigh Hatcher of 5DN Radio spoke out strongly against casinos every morning for a week. He believes that the Australian argument has been very one-sided on casinos. He did a great deal of homework and talked to many people who were against casinos and also to many who felt casinos ought to be introduced. During his research he found that it is extremely easy to come across cases of wrecked marriages; broken lives and in some cases lives that have been finished as a result of this form of gambling. He found that at Wrest Point in the Island the money that is being raked in is not just from tourists, because as one casino spokesman admitted: 'It'd be very quiet without the locals'. It is estimated that between 50 per cent and up to 85 per cent of those patronising Wrest Point are Tasmanians. The spokesman for Wrest Point also glibly said: 'There is not one piece of evidence to suggest that the casino has caused any harm to the social fabric of the community.'

Leigh Hatcher's response to that was: 'All I can say is he couldn't have looked very hard'.

Leigh Hatcher uncovered the following stories of tragedy:

this has already been mentioned by the member for Goyder—

1. The man who went to the casino, where he gambled for several hours and lost a substantial amount of money. Shortly afterwards he committed suicide and was later fished out of the Derwent River.
2. The girl who was only 17 when she first went to the casino. On her first night she won \$500 and kept going back and losing. She became so addicted that she started going every day of the week for three or four hours. Gambling became the only thing in her life. She used her house-keeping money, she borrowed, she stole. Those who argue that people like that gamble their money regardless of whether it is horses, lotteries or the casino are wrong. The only thing this young girl ever gambled on in her life was blackjack at the casino.

3. When Wrest Point opened Harry gave up 'the dogs' and 'the horses'. Week in, week out, he went to the casino. He would go there with a full pay packet and usually emerge hours later with nothing. Harry says he made hundreds of promises to his wife to give it up, but didn't. Eventually she left him and they are divorced.

4. Some time ago a lady of 71 was sentenced to six months in jail. She was a former Treasurer of the Women's Auxiliary at the Royal Hobart Hospital. Then she began gambling at the casino. She gambled away all her life savings and embezzled more than \$12 000 of the Fund's money.

Those who want casinos never mention tragedies such as these. Nor do they mention the involvement of organised crime.

Before we go on, I came across a case last Friday week of a charitable organisation in Canberra that has been raising money for several years. It thought it had \$5 000 in reserve. When the auditors came in they found that the treasurer had embezzled that amount of money. He was subsequently prosecuted. His statement to the organisation and to the police was that he embezzled the money to support his gambling habits at Wrest Point casino, in Hobart, where he periodically flew for the weekend. So, that is another case, unfortunately, where a charitable organisation has lost \$5 000. The person has admitted to it, but has refused to make any restitution because he claims that the charitable organisation should not have given him authority to be one of the signatories to the account.

By mentioning those four cases, plus that one, I am saying that if we establish a casino and one person is encouraged to gamble at the casino and, because of the compulsive nature and the glamour of supporting a casino, gets into trouble and commits a crime, the profits that the State will receive (whether it be \$1 000 000 or \$2 000 000 a year, and nobody really knows or has any idea, even whether we will get a profit, and I very much doubt whether we will receive very much, anyway) in the first or second decades will never compensate for the damage that it will do to that person and to that person's family. I do not care what amount is involved. I honestly believe there is just no way that we can compensate and justify risking somebody's future by putting this type of temptation in front of them. The article goes on:

Leigh Hatcher pointed to the Gold Coast casino which is run by a Sydney under-world figure with Mafia connections... his partner is another business man who used to work for the Mafia in Los Angeles. He also pointed out to us the illegal casino gambling in Perth and to the one in Victoria which has links with the famed Painters and Dockers' Union. Leigh Hatcher was also able to obtain a tape of a conversation that took place in a Sydney restaurant. It was a meeting of key figures of Sydney's underworld, organised by Stanley John Smith—or 'Stan the Man'.

He has been named in Parliament by Neville Wran as an underground leader. He wanted to 'get the game sewn up'... so that licences would be granted to existing illegal casino operators, not to outsiders.

It is interesting to note those comments, because I recall that someone by that name came to South Australia a couple of years ago and was involved in a mining transaction.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: What name?

Mr BECKER: Stanley John Smith. That name suddenly rings a bell. He was involved in a mining transaction with some people from Perth. In fact, I met a person of that name in the Minister of Mines and Energy's office two years ago. There is no doubt about what has been happening in Sydney in relation to the current Government and its problems with illegal casinos. I am aware of certain land transactions and arrangements by some New South Wales Government advisers and others in relation to speculation as to where a casino will eventually be established in that State. This has been suggested for some years.

A lot of money is tied up in large tracts of land in New South Wales for future casino development. I think the Acting Premier of that State should start investigating some

of the activities and investments of his advisers and Ministers. Sydney is full of intrigue and underworld activity, but it is too hard to prove. Investigations go so far and then run into a brick wall. There is no doubt Leigh Hatcher would have found similar information, and I know that some of his sources of information would be impeccable. The article continues in relation to Wran, as follows:

He talked of bribing politicians and the need to get their men on a board that would control legal casinos. He is reported as saying, 'Naturally you've got to have some control of who the board is and put on it men that are "sweet".'

The purpose of this article is to alert concerned people and suggest to them that they should speak to their own Member of Parliament...

There is no doubt that since the introduction of this Bill many members have been contacted. I have heard complaints from members who have said that they have received many telephone calls, conducted personal appointments and received letters from constituents and from people throughout the State.

It is a healthy situation when people will sit down and write to a member of Parliament. In fact, some people are prepared to sit down and write to all 47 members of this House. It is a healthy situation when people take the time and effort to inform us of their attitudes. In 1973, I prepared two petitions: one for a casino and one against. I believe that something like about 900 people in my district signed the petition against a casino; only 20 people signed the petition supporting a casino. The person who took the petition around to various hotels in Glenelg said he tried his hardest to generate some interest. In the current debate not one person has contacted me or has suggested that there is a need for a casino. I know of no-one who has called for a casino except the Hon. Mr Blevins in other place. I am suspicious that this current legislation is nothing more than a publicity stunt by a member of another place to test the water and get himself some notoriety.

He has got that notoriety, and he has also become a Minister through unfortunate circumstances. I do not think it did him any harm in that respect. I doubt the genuineness of the reason initially to bringing this matter before the Parliament. I do not blame the person now handling the legislation. It is wonderful experience for him as a test to see how he handles it. No doubt he is serving his apprenticeship and, at some time in the future, we may see him on the front bench. That is not the kiss of death for the member for Hartley. I am being realistic when I make that statement.

After 10 years and mountains of correspondence, reports and the tremendous amount of information I have received from overseas relating to casinos in London, Las Vegas and Nevada, as well as from contacts I made overseas on a study tour of Europe and in Germany, I have not seen any evidence to encourage people to go to a casino. We stayed at a hotel not far from the casino at Frankfurt but did not bother to go to it. In America the message was very plain and clear. No matter how many people I spoke to, whether they were Republican or Democrat politicians, they strongly recommended against a casino for all the reasons advanced by members who have spoken in this debate. There has not been one convincing or fool-proof argument in favour of the measure, nor was there any conclusive evidence in the speech made by the member for Hartley along the lines that the State would benefit in the long term.

The warning is there that we will provide a method whereby people will be encouraged to gamble beyond their ability and means; we will lead them into some form of crime. If one person becomes a victim of compulsive gambling which leads to his or her incarceration under our system, we will have frittered away a life that cannot be counted in money terms. For that and many other reasons,

there is no way that I can support a move to establish a casino in South Australia.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I support the Bill.

NATIONAL NATURAL DISASTER FUND

The Legislative Council transmitted the following resolution in which it requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

That, in the opinion of this Council, the South Australian Government request the Commonwealth Government to—

- i. initiate discussion on the establishment of a National Disaster Fund;—
- ii. appoint a select committee for this purpose; and
- iii. treat the matter as urgent in order to prevent a recurrence of the anomalies and shortages in existing schemes.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS ADVISORY COUNCIL BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CASINO BILL

Second reading debate resumed.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): I will not delay the House too long on this matter. However, I wish to say a couple of words about this casino legislation. I notice that I feature quite prominently on several pages of a propaganda article issued by the Festival of Light about this matter.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: A good photo, too.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I do not think it is as good a photograph as I can take. I believe that I take a better one. I notice that on page 3 of the second article, issued by the Festival of Light, and if there are any members of the Festival of Light in the Chamber tonight—

Mr BECKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. It is totally erroneous for a member to refer to the gallery, and I draw your attention to the fact that the Deputy Premier is addressing the gallery.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Premier should not refer to the gallery. Therefore, I uphold the point of order. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: That was a strict and abrupt message to me, Sir. I suppose I could reflect on the member for Hanson, who I thought was conveying this message contained in these articles. It was the member for Hanson I was referring to, rather than people in the gallery.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Has the member finished?

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable Deputy Premier to order and ask him to resume his seat.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: I should think so. You can't do that, Jack.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Alexandra to order. The list of those called to order now totals 11. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Yesterday morning, when I came to the front of this establishment, I was met by 15 or 20 people vying for my vote on this legislation. They asked me whether I was going to vote in the same way as I voted on the last occasion the casino Bill was before the House.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: How are you going to vote?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I do not intend to speak for long in this debate, so if the honourable member is patient I will soon tell him. I think that there have been two very good speeches given in this place tonight. The first that was of immense interest to me was made by the member for Eyre, who I think really justified his position in this matter, having given it a lot of thought. I commend him for that speech. It is not often that I find myself doing this because on most occasions the member for Eyre and I are at loggerheads during debates in this House. However, I think he disseminated his facts well tonight and knew what he was talking about. I commend him for that speech regardless of how he finally votes. The second speech to which I refer that was of tremendous significance to me was that of the member for Alexandra, who merely said that he supports the Bill. That was a significant speech because it meant that he had studied the Bill, and, consistent with what he did on the last occasion in the House, is supporting it. I am changing my mind on this occasion.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I hear oh's and ah's from the other side of the Chamber, but like any member of the community I am allowed to change my mind.

Mr Ashenden: What about people in your electorate? Have they changed their minds?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am going to deal with that matter if the honourable member for Todd will give me an opportunity to do so.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not a case of the honourable member for Todd giving anybody the opportunity to do so. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I must say that the member for Todd seems to enjoy interjecting when I am speaking. That is one of his habits. If he leaves me alone, the vote on this Bill will be taken sooner than if he interferes. On the last occasion I made clear in this House why I voted as I did. Let me clear up that point. I voted for the first part of the amendments moved by the then Minister of Recreation and Sport which provided that, if there was to be a casino, it should be controlled by the Government. I voted for that amendment, and I am on record as saying that. I am also on record as saying at the same time that, because of complaints that I had received from constituents, I would not vote finally for the Bill, irrespective of whether or not the amendment was passed.

Being a socialist, I thought that, if there was to be a casino, it should certainly be under the control of and developed by the Government of the day, whether the Government was Liberal or Labor. I am on record as saying that. On that occasion, quite a lot of concern was expressed not in regard to how I should vote but to the effect that there was a problem in regard to casinos and that people were worried about crime, losing money, and so on. On this occasion I have not received the number of complaints and I have not had the contacts that I had on that occasion. Perhaps there is a reason for that. It could be that there was more publicity on the Bill on the last occasion than there has been this time. I am not in a position to argue about that.

This Bill has been before the Parliament for at least three months, after being introduced by the Hon. Mr Blevins, or perhaps it has been even longer (I have not bothered to check). Until this week and until the Government decided last week that Government time would be made available to debate this Bill, I had received no complaints in my electorate office, nor had I received a telephone call in this

regard. That is the truth of the matter. This week, because of the indications I gave when I spoke earlier today about bringing on this debate, there were some contacts in relation to the Bill. The contacts were in the form of 22 roneoed letters, which were clearly prepared by one person but signed by 22 people, all of whom were opposed to the Bill. My secretary has taken 12 phone calls, and those people were divided seven to five.

They are the only complaints or comments I have received in relation to this Bill. I represent about 17 000 people, so the number of people who have bothered to contact the local member is pretty minimal. I am a Minister and I have less time than the member for Todd, who went out of his road to establish whether or not people in his district oppose or support the Bill (and I do not disbelieve the honourable member). I have come to the conclusion that, because of the lack of contact from my constituents on this occasion—

Mr Becker: Come on!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Well—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Premier not to reply to interjections.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The member for Hanson can laugh as much as he likes.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will not laugh as much as he likes if he wants to remain in the House.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The honourable member can say that I am inconsistent if he wants to. I refer to the forms of gambling now available to the people of South Australia.

We have horse racing, and we have the new form of gambling, namely, soccer pools, which has not been long in South Australia. I did not support it but Opposition members did support it because they were in Government. We also have greyhound racing, trotting, Instant Money, lotteries and the T.A.B.

If a person wanted to bet or gamble in South Australia he could do it almost every hour of the week. I could not come to terms with some of the debate advanced from the other side when members said that, because we were introducing a casino, we would allow people to be chronic in their gambling habits and that we should not introduce a casino for that reason. Are people chronic about their gambling now? Can they keep away from the T.A.B., races, greyhounds or Instant Money? Are people getting into chronic situations because those facilities are available? If they are, the logical conclusion is to ban all those activities. If every member was serious about the attitude expressed by some (not all) members in this House tonight that, if we extend the opportunities to gamble, people are put in a situation where they will possibly become chronic gamblers.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Alexandra.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I am afraid that finally I cannot come to terms with that argument. Although I go to the races, I do not bet heavily. I bet within my means and I go to the trots, the dogs, I buy lottery tickets and I bet with my friends on the football. So, I am part of the gambling fraternity in South Australia, and I have never run away from that. When this matter was last before the House, I had decided that we had just about reached saturation point in regard to gambling in South Australia.

I was not happy about some aspects of the Bill then, and there are some aspects of this Bill about which I am not happy now. I am not terribly concerned whether or not we have a casino. It does not worry me at all. The member for Semaphore, who made an excellent speech tonight, was associated with the select committee and has had the courage as an Independent member, without Party backing, to introduce in this Parliament a Bill to provide for a casino. He was involved with and supported the select committee that

dealt with the Bill introduced by the then Minister of Recreation and Sport. That honourable member has made his views very well known tonight. What the honourable member said appealed to me because he has stuck his neck out in support of this sort of legislation.

Although there is not much more that I can say, I wish to qualify my position about where I stand in regard to the opportunity for people who wish to gamble in South Australia. I do not believe that by passing this legislation it will increase or decrease the opportunities of people to gamble. If members opposite or even on this side of the House believe that, because a casino will be introduced people will become more chronic in their habits, I am doubtful about it, because opportunities exist to enable them to do so at present.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I have left my contribution to the last so that those members who had not contributed, particularly Government members, had every opportunity to do so. My contribution will be relatively short, but it is one that needs to be made. First, I refer to the previous occasion when a vote on a casino Bill was taken. Also, I want to refer to a document to which the honourable Deputy Premier referred, which was circulated almost immediately after that vote was taken in this House, and which purported to show that I had supported the passage of a casino Bill. Members would appreciate that there was no final decision in relation to that Bill: it was lost on the voices. However, a vote was taken on one particular clause as a test clause.

That was the only occasion during the term of the last Parliament, which ran for a little over three years, that I took part in the debate during Committee stages, and it happened to be in regard to the Casino Bill. So that there would be no misunderstanding regarding my position in the matter, I rose from the seat of the Chairman of Committees and made this contribution (19 August 1982 *Hansard*, page 634). I said:

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.

In other words, I took the opportunity to pinpoint the responsibility of the Chair, as I saw it, to allow debate to continue to the ultimate, while reserving the right to make a decision at that point. However, in the document that has just been mentioned by the Deputy Premier I was listed (as I had been in the *Advertiser*) as one of the members who supported the Casino Bill.

The document to which I refer is called *Festival Focus*, which is published by the Festival of Light in South Australia. In regard to that document, I wrote to the Director of the Festival of Light, Mr Steve Stevens. I referred to his letter of 13 October and to the copy of *Festival Focus* for October 1982 as follows:

I refer to your letter of 13 October, and to the copy of *Festival Focus* for October 1982. I believe you have been less than fair with your listing of my name in the group for the casino.

You will be aware that as Speaker I had no vote at the second reading stage, because there was no equality of votes; therefore it could not be claimed that I was either for or against the proposal. A check of the *Hansard* record at page 634, Thursday 19 August 1982, will show that I stated in the Committee debate (the only debate in which the Speaker may make a contribution) as follows:

That referred to my statement that I have already quoted. The letter continued as follows:

While the statement did not commit the Chair/Speaker/myself to a final decision, it very clearly indicates that the vote to which you refer (*Hansard* page 641, 19 August 1982) was a reflection of a long standing and important Parliamentary principle, and not as pre-stated a commitment to any final vote.

I would trust that you correct the published record at the earliest possible opportunity.

Shortly afterwards, I received a letter from Mr Stevens dated 28 October, wherein it stated:

I enclose a copy of *Festival Focus* and have made amends on the back page—in the words we agreed on the telephone.

This issue of *Festival Focus* contained an article which stated:

Casino vote.

Dr Bruce Eastick, the House of Assembly Speaker, has drawn our attention to the long-standing Parliamentary principle that the Speaker should vote to assist further debate on any issue. His vote shown in the October issue of *Festival Focus* did not mean support for a casino but only support for the debate to continue.

I make those points because, subsequent to this event and within the past two or three weeks, the self-same October *Festival Focus* has again been distributed, purporting that I was a supporter of the casino. My electors fully appreciate the fact—and it has been on public record in this place on earlier occasions—that that is not the case, never has been, and will not be on this occasion.

Coming now to the debate this evening, can I say what dishonest opportunism has been undertaken by the Government in purporting to put forward a private member's Bill, which is *de facto* and in every other sense a Government Bill. It may well be that calling the member for Hartley a few minutes ago to close the debate gives it the air of a private member's Bill, but we know that we now have been here since 3.30 yesterday afternoon—over 12 hours—debating a Government measure. There is no way that anything the Deputy Premier or the Premier can say will alter my appreciation of that being the situation.

It was compounded by *Nationwide*, which went to air last evening, and which indicated that in November 1982, on the creation of a new Government, the Hilton Hotel immediately started negotiations with the Premier in relation to an attitude to a casino. It was also indicated in the same segment that the Chief Secretary (the member for Stuart) had been in consultation on a tourist basis with a group of people who were interested in the building of a paddle steamer for a casino site somewhere on the Murray River.

Other sites which were also indicated as having been discussed with Government personnel were the Oberoi Hotel, the railway station and the West End Brewery site. If these negotiations have been proceeding, whether there has been a total commitment or not by the Premier, the Chief Secretary as Minister of Tourism, or any other Minister, and if there was no clear indication to the proponents of those projects that a casino was not a possibility in South Australia, the Ministers collectively (or those involved) have been leading this Parliament astray. I believe that the questions that the Premier has failed to answer in recent weeks relative to a proposed trip overseas, with an acceptance by the Premier that he was standing by to go to Asian countries, was also tied up with this forward Government commitment to a casino operation.

I accept and appreciate the realism of the contribution made this evening by the Minister of Education, who fortified and confirmed action that he had taken in this place previously, put the point very clearly, and gave what I believe was a very factual and telling commentary relative to the proposed introduction of a casino into South Australia.

I support and commend the courage of the member for Albert Park who, obviously against some recent advice that he had received by virtue of his telephone survey, found himself in something of a quandary but stuck to his guns, accepted that he had committed himself to a no-casino

situation on a previous occasion, and accepted the responsibility of fulfilling that previous commitment.

I was interested in the contribution by the member for Newland who sought to balance out the various factors involved. In the early stages of his speech I believed that the member for Newland was probably going to come down on the side of denying a casino for South Australia. I did not hear the end of his contribution but I believe that that was not the conclusion that he reached. Of course, it is the right of any member of this place to make a final decision on the matter. However, the member for Newland indicated that there were some possible short term employment advantages in the creation of a casino.

As another speaker quite correctly put it, that would not necessarily be the case, because the casino site and virtually the casino itself might already be in existence; therefore, the amount of additional short term work would be very limited. However, other speakers have clearly indicated that a short-term benefit which might accrue in respect of employment could be a long-term Government deficit in relation to the social issues that could arise. I stress the words 'could arise' because a number of members questioned whether there will be a likely social consequence as a result of the introduction of a casino. I believe that there would be. Apart from that, there was a clear commitment from my colleague, the former Minister of Recreation and Sport, who said on the occasion that similar legislation was before the House that it was necessary in the interests of the State, indeed, in the interests of the Commonwealth, to determine the size or the significance of that social consequence.

I am assured by the member for Torrens, who did not make that point during his contribution this evening, that he promoted the creation of a national committee to investigate the social consequences of gambling subsequent to the defeat of the Casino Bill in August 1982. It was certainly somewhere in the system, and we may have to ask the present Minister of Recreation and Sport whether in the contacts he has had subsequent to the election of the new Government, he has found that this matter is still under consideration by other States and by the Commonwealth.

Personally, I am firmly convinced that there is no justification for the establishment of a casino in this State until we are completely aware of the total social consequence. I believe that we do less than justice to the people we represent unless we are aware of the likely consequences of the social commitment. When the Minister of Recreation and Sport entered this debate he clearly indicated that there would be a consequence for South Australia's gambling industry. That is the reality. No one has ever denied that that would be the case. Indeed, it was part of the promotion of a contribution, which was an about face, forwarded to members of the House by the South Australian Jockey Club.

Beyond the difficulty or the consequences of betting and other forms of gambling identified by the Deputy Premier, there is another consequence that I will bring to the attention of all members, because it was brought to my attention by a number of sporting and social groups in my district. I think that every member would appreciate that the raising of funds for the continuance of activity (be it in a sporting or social direction, be it in a football club or a social organisation which provides dancing, games nights or whatever) is becoming more and more difficult.

An increasing number of groups of that nature have sought to raise funds by the introduction of bingo nights. Bingo nights are a very real operation with a number of these committees and are the only way in which they are able to maintain services to their members and obtain the finance to run their affairs. If members are ever in the vicinity of the North Adelaide football clubrooms at about 3.15 p.m. on a Saturday, they will see a large number of

people leaving the clubrooms at the completion of a bingo afternoon: it has a very large following. I am advised that the ability for that football club to function throughout the year rests heavily on the additional funds derived from such activities as bingo.

I have cited that club only because I have observed people coming from that venue whilst I have been playing bowls at the adjacent Prospect Bowling Club. I know of a number of other premises around Adelaide where similar bingo functions are held and where the organisations promoting them are dependent upon the money they generate. With the establishment of a casino in Adelaide and the assumption that it would have as a central part of its activity keno (it is played at Wrest Point and is almost identical to bingo), a large number of people supporting bingo in my district and in districts of members opposite would be attracted to that activity on a daily basis for a considerable period each day. I believe that we would be doing a great disservice to a number of clubs in our electorates by draining away from them the participation currently associated with their bingo promotion and, indeed, with some of their other fund-raising promotions.

The Deputy Premier indicated that he was appreciative of the speech made by the member for Semaphore. Whilst I did not hear much, I did hear some of the Deputy Leader's speech, and I accept the points he made. He dwelt on the fact that the member for Semaphore is Independent, notwithstanding that not 10 minutes before he had advised the member for Semaphore not to forget that he had the Whip on him tonight. It may have been said in a jocular sense but the Deputy Premier, seated alongside the Minister of Community Welfare, clearly told the member for Semaphore, as he sought to leave the House, not to be on his way home because he had the whip on him tonight. If that is not an indication—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have not had the opportunity to do any research on the matter, but I believe that common sense would dictate that that is a very unfair remark.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I rise on a point of order. On what basis, Mr Speaker, do you seek to admonish me for referring to an action which took place in this House?

The SPEAKER: Common sense.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I repeat the statement that I just made which is truthful and factual. I indicated that it might have been jocularly stated but it was stated in this House, and four people are witness to the fact that that statement was made. Let us move on to other matters which were related to the House by the Deputy Premier. The Deputy Premier conjectured as to why he had not had any reaction to this matter until this week. I can inform the Deputy Premier—

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I rise on a point of order. I do not think the honourable member is doing himself any good by repeating a statement that I made jocularly across this Chamber, and —

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader is debating the matter. What is the point of order?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: My point of order is that over the years I have been in this House there has been some sort of tradition, respect and honesty regarding matters not stated publicly remaining confidential, and I ask you, Mr Speaker, to request the member for Light to uphold that tradition.

The SPEAKER: I am not in a position to do that, as I indicated previously. I think that the whole matter is unfortunate. The honourable member for Light.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The Deputy Premier is particularly sensitive tonight.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: No I'm not, you are!

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: He is running away from the truth.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: It's a tradition of this House and you know it. You have broken that tradition.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I have broken no tradition.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: You have, and I'll break it on you when I get the opportunity.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Mr Speaker, as you have confirmed, I have broken no tradition.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have not confirmed any such thing.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the whole House to come to order. I think that if any members of the public were present to witness this disgraceful display they would be ashamed of their legislators. I ask the honourable member to continue. The honourable member for Light.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I was indicating that the Deputy Premier, in speaking to this matter, conjectured as to why he had not had a reaction in the public sense until this week. That is a situation which applies, I think, to practically every member of this House. The reaction has occurred since Wednesday of last week when, very clearly, by giving notice the Deputy Premier sought to place this measure in a position of advantage. Until a week ago, the public had no knowledge at all that this measure would come to a vote. One week ago today, it was anticipated that later today would be the close of the 1982-83 Parliamentary session. It had been foreshadowed that this would be the end of that session, and under the normal practices of the House a matter involving a private member's Bill would not have been concluded.

It was only when it became apparent from the action being taken to bring this matter into a situation involving the possibility of a vote that members of the public became concerned and I congratulate them on marshalling their efforts and becoming as concerned as they have. Unlike the Deputy Premier, who has received 11 roneoed letters (and other members have indicated how many roneoed letters they have received), I received one roneoed letter bearing one signature. I have received about 35 individual letters, most of them indicating 'Vote no', but about 50 per cent of them seek my support for a committee of inquiry to determine the likely social consequences of the introduction of a casino.

That has been my experience and I believe from comments that were made earlier that that has been the experience of a number of other members. On that basis, there is nothing at all to change the attitude I have held in the past relative to this matter, and unless and until a committee of inquiry is able to identify to the public not only of this State but also of the Commonwealth that there is no long-term social consequence to the body corporate of the public, I will not support an extension of the gambling ethic by way of the introduction of a casino and the variety of games that might be permitted to be played in that facility. I believe it is most unfortunate that this matter has surfaced again so quickly after the last disposal of the issue, and I trust that the defeat of the Bill later today will result in a burial of the document relating to a casino and that we will see no more of it.

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I do not propose to speak for very long. I thank honorable members for their contributions to this debate. I sincerely respect the views of those members who have indicated their intention to vote against the Bill and the reasons behind their vote. Equally, I respect the views and the courage of those members who have indicated their support for the Bill. I want to deal very briefly with the criticisms that have been made by some members, in a

procedural sense, in relation to the manner in which this Bill has been debated. The Bill has remained a private member's Bill, although the Government has allowed time for the debate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GROOM: However, in the final analysis, does it really matter about the niceties? Although the measure has been before the House on three prior occasions in the past 10 years, this is the first occasion on which it has passed one House of this Parliament, indeed, towards the end of a session. To that extent, it is unusual. In my opinion, it would be detrimental to South Australia to allow the matter to remain unresolved for the duration of this year. Some honourable members have suggested that other Government legislation should take precedence over this matter, but if members really search their conscience, I suggest they should ask the question, 'What other legislation that is currently before the House will generate millions of dollars in revenue for South Australia and has the potential to generate hundreds of jobs?' Indeed, a delay in resolving this issue could cost South Australia dearly. It is detrimental to the—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Deputy Leader.

Mr GROOM: It is detrimental to the private enterprise sector of our economy. The editorial in the *Advertiser* on Tuesday 10 May states:

It must be stressed once again that the issue has been thoroughly examined by an instrument of Parliament, and if that select committee found no reasonable objection to a casino, then it seems curious that its findings have not carried more weight. Perhaps this time they will. A recent Gallup poll found an increase in support for casinos in all States and in South Australia 52 p.c. were found to be in favour, with 44 p.c. against.

Throughout Australia 61 p.c. approved of casinos, compared with 54 p.c. a year ago. It seems fair that these findings should be reflected by the votes of our elected members. If it is a viable proposition, which could increase the State's tourist potential without bringing the evils of organised crime into the heart of the city, then there seems no reason why it should not go ahead.

That was a very strong editorial from the *Advertiser*. I will not mince words. Much of the credit for this Bill must go not only to the Hon. Mr Blevins, who introduced the Bill in another place, but also to the member for Torrens, as this Bill is in identical terms to the Bill that he introduced in the previous Parliament. Indeed, if the Bill passes, and convention facilities and the casino come to fruition, then those members, and the other members who support the Bill, will have done a great service to the State. In conclusion. I reiterate my thanks to all members for their contributions to the debate.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (28)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs P.B. Arnold, Baker, Bannon, M.J. Brown, Chapman, Crafter, Duncan, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom (teller), Gunn, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Rodda, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, Wilson, and Wright.

Noes (16)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, L.M.F. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy (teller), Hamilton, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, and Wotton.

Majority of 12 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MEMBER'S STATEMENT

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I want to place on record my very deep concern about the attack made tonight in this House by the member for Light in which he accused me of saying that the member for Semaphore was taking the Labor Party Whip this morning or during tonight's session. I did make that statement, but quite jocularly, to two of my friends and colleagues, members of the Labor Party sitting on the front bench. The member for Semaphore heard me say this, and took no exception to it.

However, I never intended for him to take the Labor Party Whip, nor did I expect him to do so. It is purely up to the member for Semaphore how he votes in this House on any particular motion. I have the greatest respect for the member for Semaphore, who decides himself how he will vote on a certain issue. However, generally speaking the honourable member votes with the Labor Party, for which I admire him. I want to place on record my belief that anything that is said in this House between one's own colleagues should not be repeated publicly when someone is speaking.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier is now—

An honourable member: Debating.

The SPEAKER: Whoever said that did not need to say it. I think the Deputy Premier has moved into the area of commenting.

In Committee.

Clause 1—'Short title.'

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Sir, will you say on what motion you have assumed the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is no point of order. The second reading of the Bill has been passed; the Bill is now in Committee, and the Chair is in the position of asking that clause 1 be agreed to.

Clause passed.

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

Mr EVANS: When does the member for Hartley anticipate that the Act will come into operation? I am referring not to the actual building of a casino or its operation but to when it is expected that the authority that would determine the issuing of a licence would come into operation and begin considering applications for a licence? I believe that that is an important aspect, because there would be people in the community who would want to begin to prepare and plan a case to put before the authority as to why they should be granted a licence.

I believe that their points would have to be taken into consideration by that authority. When does the member for Hartley believe that this Act will come into operation and be fixed by proclamation?

Mr GROOM: The Act will come into operation as soon as practicable after it is passed, assuming that it is passed. The authority would be duly constituted and appointed pursuant to the terms of the Act.

Mr EVANS: Does the member for Hartley have any guarantee from the Government of the day that that will be the case, because we are in a difficult situation? It is a private member's Bill, brought on by Government action, and the member for Hartley is saying that the legislation would come into operation as soon as it is practicable. The House needs to know what guarantees the member for Hartley has from the Government of when it will become operational. That is really the point that I am trying to get at.

Mr GROOM: I fail to understand the member for Fisher. This is simply a private member's Bill and, if it were passed by this House, it would become a matter for the Government to determine when it actually came into operation. The Government would have to advise the Governor.

Mr EVANS: If the member for Hartley cannot give an indication can the Premier say if the interpretation of the member for Hartley is right that it is now a Government operation, when he visualises that the authority and Act will be proclaimed and the authority will become operative?

The CHAIRMAN: I point out that the Premier is not dealing with this Bill. If he desired to answer, that would be up to the Premier.

Mr GROOM: Once again for the benefit of the member for Fisher, I point out that the constitutional requirements in this State are that the legislation will come into force, on the assumption that it is passed, as soon as practicable, and it would require the Government to so advise the Governor. I have no guarantee from the Premier.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—'Arrangement of Act.'

Mr LEWIS: I am disappointed, of course, that this Bill is constructed in the way that it is. Quite clearly, the arrangement of the Act is inadequate and makes it very difficult to appropriately schedule many of the provisions that ought to apply in relation to any casino which is to be licensed in South Australia. It leaves members who have reservations about the way in which a casino would operate with no alternative but to place a whole lump of things under the title 'Miscellaneous' by virtue of oversights that have been made in the structure.

I should have thought that the author or authors of this Bill, if not the Government, would have taken the trouble to familiarise themselves at least with the contents of the select committee report in redrafting the legislation in a way which took account of the concerns that the select committee drew to the attention of the Parliament.

Whilst I do not propose any amendments, it is nonetheless appropriate at this point for me to indicate that, along with many other aspects of the legislation, the arrangement as outlined in clause 3 is quite unsatisfactory and quite inconsistent with the sort of approach that ought to have been taken by the author. Presumably, that is the honourable Mr Blevins from another place, although I would not mind betting London to a brick that there were a good many other co-conspirators in that amongst his colleagues. For that reason, I rise to place on record my objection to the unnecessary and inappropriate structure given to the Bill by the arrangement as set out in clause 3.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—'Interpretation.'

Mr EVANS: I refer to the definition of 'poker machine' under this clause, as follows:

... device designed or adapted for the purpose of gambling, the operation of which depends on the insertion of a coin or other token (but does not include a device of a kind excluded by regulation from the ambit of this definition):

I do not know what form the regulation will take. However, I am aware that regulations can be debated by either House if there are any doubts. I ask the member for Hartley to indicate whether the definition should include bingo ticket machines or beer ticket machines, because those machines are a form of gambling. In fact, even the new T.A.B. machines could be included, although I believe that those machines take both coins and notes, not just coins. I am only assuming that is so, because they are a new machine that is not operating at the moment—but they could be operating in the future. I ask the member for Hartley to indicate which devices are to be covered by this legislation.

Mr GROOM: The legislation is quite explicit. It renders illegal the possession of poker machines, is designed to catch poker machines in that context and provides stiff penalties for the illegal possession of poker machines.

Mr LEWIS: I move:

That progress be reported.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (16)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Lewis (teller), Mathwin, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, and Wotton.

Noes (25)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs Bannon, Crafter, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom (teller), Gunn, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Rodda, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, Wilson, and Wright.

Majority of 9 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr EVANS: I am asking for a simple interpretation from the member for Hartley, who is handling the Bill. He said that it includes only poker machines. The definition of a poker machine, according to the Bill, is different from what we as individuals consider to be a poker machine. If this Bill becomes operative as an Act, it will define a poker machine as follows:

'poker machine' means a device designed or adapted for the purpose of gambling, the operation of which depends on the insertion of a coin or other token (but does not include a device of a kind excluded by regulation from the ambit of this definition):

Bingo ticket machines, beer ticket machines, cigarette machines (or whatever goods one wants to issue) are a form of gambling and are operated by coins. I am asking the member for Hartley, as the mover of the Bill, whether they are the type of machines to be excluded by regulation. If he cannot give a guarantee, because the Government of the day has to put it into operation, in handling the legislation, does he believe that that is the type of machine that will be excluded as a machine where a coin is inserted for the purpose of gambling?

Mr GROOM: For the benefit of the member for Fisher, I thought it was a matter of common sense. Anyone who has travelled interstate to New South Wales will know what a poker machine is. Quite clearly, the legislation is intended to catch that type of device. If the legislation passes, the regulations, quite clearly, will be drawn up in consultation with the Crown Law Office. It is not intended to catch beer ticket machines or similar devices operating quite legally in South Australia.

These definitions were those recommended by the select committee on the 1982 Bill. I do not recall from reading *Hansard* that the honourable member voiced any disapproval in relation to that debate. Indeed, the definition clauses are in identical terms to those in the legislation debated in August 1982.

Mr EVANS: I know it is late and the member for Hartley may not like me asking these questions. However, I had no chance to ask these questions during the previous debate, because it did not reach this stage. Secondly, common sense does not prevail where the law is concerned, and the honourable member being a lawyer knows that what is defined is what counts. The definition at the moment mentions any machine used for the purpose of gambling and operated by a coin. I know what sorts of machines are considered to be poker machines in other States, but I want a clear indication from the member for Hartley that the other sorts of machines used in this State will be excluded from this legislation. If the jibes he made are an indication of his approach to this matter, that will only slow things down more and more.

Mr GROOM: I thought that my answer was quite clear but, by way of repetition, I indicate that it is intended to catch poker machines only, poker machines in the commonly understood and visually observable sense. The regulations, which will be drawn up in conjunction with the Crown Law Department, will no doubt protect devices which presently

exist quite properly and legally in South Australia, so devices such as beer ticket machines will continue.

Mr MATHWIN: I am also concerned about this reference to poker machines, as there could be a lot of trouble with this matter. It is all very well for the member for Hartley to get niggly because it is early in the morning, but that is his problem.

Mr Ashenden: The Government controls the House, not the Opposition.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr MATHWIN: The member for Hartley, as the member for Fisher said, is well aware, being a lawyer, of the situation relating to definitions and to people wanting to know what those definitions mean. I have a concern relating to beer ticket machines, because there are many machines in clubs. Further, many machines in shops could come under the explanation given in this Bill, the returns from those machines going to charities. We have to get this legislation right and ascertain the meaning of the definition intended by the mover of the Bill. Will the member for Hartley say what is meant by 'gambling', because in the Bill 'gambling' means the playing of any game for money or other stakes and includes the making or accepting of a wager. How wide will that be? 'Gambling' means the playing of any game: are we going to start putting tiddly winks and snakes and ladders under that definition because they are 'any game'? One can think a lot of parlour games that come under this Bill. According to the dictionary I have here 'gambling' means 'risky undertaking or attempt'.

What does the member for Hartley envisage will be involved in this definition? One can put a monetary value on anything. If the honourable member has been to the U.K., he will know that a lot of money changes hands on dominoes or crib. Will crib or darts, which are popular pastimes in pubs in the UK, come under the definition of 'gambling'? The clause provides:

'gambling' means the playing of any game for monetary or other stakes and includes the making or accepting of a wager:

One can lay side bets in relation to two-up or blackjack. That is not unheard of. If a person is playing pontoon or poker in a card school and an ace is turned up, there will be side bets on the next card to be picked up. I require further explanation in regard to the definition of 'gambling'.

Mr GROOM: I appreciate that the member for Glenelg in the twilight of his years has extensive knowledge of games played for money or wager.

Mr Mathwin: And for fun.

Mr GROOM: If the honourable member plays for fun, as he stated in his three-hour contribution earlier—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GROOM: The honourable member should look at clause 4 and the definition provisions to assist in the interpretation of other clauses in the Bill, and the Bill as a whole, on which he can make commonsense interpretations. Clause 4 provides:

'authorised game' means a game of chance, not being a game involving the use of a poker machine, authorised under the terms and conditions of a licence to be played in a licensed casino:

I would have thought that the honourable member would not need to indulge in this exercise but would look at all the definitions if he were troubled by the meaning of 'gambling'. It is quite elementary: it speaks for itself. I repeat (because I am sure the honourable member will ask further questions if he gets the opportunity) that the purpose of clause 4 is to assist in the interpretation of other clauses of the Bill. The whole tenor of the legislation is to permit the licensing of a casino and gambling; authorised games are those that are duly ratified by the authority.

Mr MEIER: Can the member for Hartley clarify the meaning in the definition of 'the Secretary' of the words 'for the time being'? What length of time is that? Is it a matter of days, weeks, months or years? Can he clarify the words 'or acting'? Will that be clearly spelt out in regard to who will be acting? Would the person acting be doing that at the same time as the normal secretary, or will there be specified times set out in the clause?

Mr GROOM: With the greatest of respect to the honourable member, I would have thought the phrase 'for the time being' means exactly what it says. If the honourable member had listened to my answer to the member for Glenelg he would have understood that this interpretation clause is to assist in the interpretation of other clauses. If the honourable member had gone a little further down the page he would have seen that clause 9 deals with the appointment of the Secretary under the Public Service Act. If the Secretary is on holidays or someone is delegated to act in his place, one must have a proper definition of what the term 'Secretary' encompasses. It relates to the person who, for the time being, holds that position and the second alternative may be the person acting in the office of Secretary in case he is on holiday, sick, absent from the State or overseas.

Mr MATHWIN: I thank the member for Hartley for his explanation of my earlier question. He seemed to scold me for not knowing what the clause is all about. As a member of the legal profession, the honourable member—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair would appreciate it if the member for Glenelg talked about the clause.

Mr MATHWIN: I am simply thanking the honourable member for his explanation concerning gambling, and am saying—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: If you will hold your breath for 10 minutes, I will tell you.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr MATHWIN: It is no use the Minister trying to upset me, because I refuse to be upset. I am here speaking on behalf of the ordinary people of the State. The member for Hartley would know that there is a big move within his profession headed by Justice Kirby in advocating that simple and understandable terms should be used in Statutes to assist the layman, whom I am representing. Therefore, it is important that we get the explanation in the form that people will understand. The explanation was quite good in general terms, but it is hard for a layman to understand what is really meant by the provisions of clause 4, having regard to all those definitions. It is all very well for the bright, intelligent lawyers and solicitors of this land, whose business it is to do this sort of thing. Indeed, there would be a lot of money in it for solicitors, lawyers and barristers, because they delight in trying to battle out these matters in court.

I am concerned about the definition of gambling. I have undertaken some research concerning the dictionary definition of 'game'. Definitions are given as follows:

'A scheme, intrigue, undertaking, followed up like a game. A person's policy; also the course best suited to one's best interests. Tricks, dodges. The course or event of a game. The winning position, the victory, the mastery; also, the prize. A 'set' of players. The number of points required for winning. The state of the game. Sport derived from the chase.'

The definitions go on for almost a full column, but I will leave it up to the member responsible for the Bill to grasp what I am trying to get at. As I said, I am here representing the lay person and things must be put in reasonable terms so that they can understand them.

That has been advocated, as I said earlier, by his own profession, headed by Mr Justice Kirby, who is an authority

on law and on many things. That is why I am so keen to make sure that if one is making and drafting legislation, as is being done here, and adopting that legislation, one should see to it that the ordinary people of the State can understand it, and that is the point I take.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (27)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, P.B. Arnold, Baker, Bannon, Crafter, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom (teller), Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Rodda, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, Wilson, and Wright.

Noes (12)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Ashenden, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Lewis (teller), Mathwin, Meier, Oswald, and Wotton.

Majority of 15 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6—'Constitution of the authority.'

Mr MATHWIN: Paragraph (a) provides that the authority shall be constituted of the following members:

A legal practitioner of at least 10 years standing or a person who has held judicial office as a member of a superior court of this State, any other State or Territory of the Commonwealth or the Commonwealth (who shall be the Chairman of the Authority);

I take it that the nominations will be submitted, one of a judge and one of a solicitor, and the Minister will make a choice. Is that how it will work?

Mr GROOM: Yes, the Governor will make the choice on the advice of the responsible Minister.

Mr MATHWIN: I am glad that we understand that there will be two nominations—one will be a legal practitioner and one will be a judge, and the Governor will make the choice. I refer to paragraph (c). Will that other person be specified or will someone from, say, Gamblers Anonymous be considered? If someone involved in that type of organisation is to be considered (and I pointed out in my second reading speech that there is an organisation such as Alcoholics Anonymous), this Bill will have a big effect on that organisation, and it would be an advantage to the unfortunate members of that organisation if one of its members were a member of the authority.

Mr GROOM: The term 'responsible Minister' has meaning under British constitutional practice. I have no doubt that the appointment will be made by the Governor on the advice of his responsible Minister and that he will act responsibly and appoint a person with suitable expertise.

Mr MEIER: Subclause (1) refers to 'a legal practitioner of at least 10 years standing'. Why has that period been stipulated? It seems to me that a person would be chosen for his suitability by the way that he has performed in his field of endeavour. I can see a person with less than 10 years standing fulfilling the role if he proved to be very profound in relation to certain aspects of the casino supervisory authority.

Similarly, I can imagine a person with far more than 10 years experience who may prove to be not very adept at serving on such an authority. I am interested to know how this magic number of 10 years came to be the figure that would entitle a legal practitioner to be considered for membership of the authority.

Mr GROOM: The period of 10 years is considered an adequate period of experience for a person who serves on a responsible body such as the authority envisaged in the legislation. For the honourable member's benefit, numerous Acts of Parliament contain similar qualifications simply because it is desirable that a person who holds such a responsible position has had a very wide and experienced background. Indeed, the origin of the period of 10 years

comes from amendments moved by the member for Torrens in his 1982 Casino Bill.

Mr MATHWIN: The authority must be an authority of three. Subclause (3) provides:

Subject to subsection (4), the Governor may appoint a suitable person to be a deputy of a member of the Authority and a person so appointed may, in the absence of the member of whom he has been appointed a deputy, act in the place of that member.

Do I take it that the situation is that three people will be appointed, plus a reserve for that situation? If we are to have a deputy for any one of the appointees, unless that deputy is a legal practitioner or a holder of the judicial office, he will not be eligible if the person who could not get there was the one defined in clause 6 (1) (a). If we are going to make a reserve appointment, a deputy, he would have to be the one referred to in subclause (1) (a), otherwise if we appointed a layman under subclause (1) (c) and if the person appointed under paragraph (a) was not able to be there, he would not be able to fill the programme. He would have to nominate a number of suitable people to be deputies for the appropriate members of the authority.

Mr GROOM: I am indebted to the member for Glenelg. Clause 6 requires the authority to be constituted in mandatory terms. That mandatory constitution is a legal practitioner or, alternatively, a person who has held judicial office. The second appointment must be a person with qualifications and experience in accounting and paragraph (c) provides for a person of suitable expertise. Because these persons are not constituted under the Public Service Act and there are no powers of delegation, as a consequence of not being appointed under that Act, if one of these members is absent from the State, overseas, or sick for some reason, the Governor can appoint a suitable person to be a deputy, but he must be of the same category as the person being replaced, otherwise the authority would not be duly constituted. I hope that that answers the query of the member for Glenelg.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 to 9 passed.

Clause 10—'Functions of the authority.'

Mr EVANS: I am in the difficult position of getting an assurance from a private member with the Government having to pick up the responsibility. My concern is that, under the provisions of clause 10, we are virtually issuing the licence.

I am not a supporter of this proposition, I am concerned that, if the Bill passes, it is stated later in the Bill that only one licence will be issued. I know that the Parliament can amend an Act in the future to allow for more licences to be issued. I would be concerned if the authority issued a licence with a written understanding that there shall be only one licence in the State, thus binding future Parliaments to some degree because that undertaking has been given in a contract. For example, that sort of thing happened with West Lakes, which I know was different because it involved an indenture Act, and with North Haven when it was changed from initial acceptance to a final acceptance after a select committee considered the matter.

Does the member for Hartley visualise that there will be no commitment by the Government of the day through the authority, or by the authority to the first operator (if there is one), that they will for all time be the only operator of a casino in the State because the Bill provides that something may be put in writing binding matters to that extent? There is a principle involved, and future Parliaments may not be prepared to amend the Act to provide for more than one licence because there is a written guarantee that there will be only one licence.

Mr GROOM: If such a commitment were given it would be contrary to the Act, and, to that extent, invalid. The

purpose of the Act is for one licence only to be issued. That licence can be revoked by the Governor on the advice of the responsible Minister. That power cannot be taken away by any such commitment. Quite clearly, it is a review situation. The licence will be reviewed, say, on an annual basis, but it can be revoked at will, as it were, on the advice tendered by the responsible Minister to the Governor.

Mr LEWIS: This clause, like so many clauses in this measure, is ambiguous. It does not address the kinds of problems that could be created by the establishment of a casino in any locality. I do not understand why the author of this Bill and his cohorts overlooked the necessity to do that when in so many other circumstances these days we find that Governments, in particular, and more particularly Governments of the Labor Party, are concerned to give definition and clarity about the kinds of constraint that ought to apply to any development.

Where do we find in this clause, or for that matter anywhere in the Bill, anything relating to the impact of a casino on its environment? Why did the authors of the Bill not contemplate a consideration of that and give specific directions to the authority that this clause proposes to establish? The environment we live in is an example of that ambiguity. It is not only the visual environment; it is wider than that. It embraces impact on the natural environment, the built environment, and the social environment.

I heard cries from members opposite during the last Parliament about the inappropriateness of the location of certain buildings that the previous Government proposed to establish for specific purposes. The remand centre immediately springs to mind. There was a hue and cry from members opposite about the impact of that structure, which was to be built for a specific purpose and about which some members of the community have reservations (and no-one can doubt that large numbers, if not a majority, of people in the community have reservations about this measure).

Yet, we find that absolutely no consideration whatsoever has been given to the matters that the authority should take into account. Clause 10 (a) refers to terms and conditions, and that is the nearest I can get to determining how the Bill would define what the authority must take into account in deciding a location. Nowhere else is it mentioned. I want the member for Hartley to tell me why that has been overlooked specifically. Why could not some consideration have been given to that matter? Does the honourable member think that people do not care about it? Does he not realise that a lot of people would be upset about a casino being located within the boundaries of South Australia, let alone in the suburb in which they live or in the general area in which they work?

The relationship of a casino to other important buildings or structures such as Parliament House, churches, or other public facilities that people have to pass or go through each day will certainly cause the same kind of anxiety and discontent as expressed by members opposite in regard to the remand centre. It was stated that the remand centre would cause anxiety to people who live near it, work near it or have to pass it each day. Why on earth is it therefore not reasonable for the Parliament to be given some suggestion as to the guidelines that should apply in this matter? A casino could cause disturbance not only to the lifestyle of people but also to traders, and I do not understand how or why such an issue which is so important to members opposite, it would seem, was overlooked. If the honourable member can give a reasonable explanation, I will find it within my capacity to consider it and to agree that the clause should pass. I could not and would not presuppose what restraints should apply. I will be interested to know what the member for Hartley thinks (if anything) about this matter.

Mr GROOM: I thank the honourable member for his elucidation. Clause 10 simply deals with the functions of the authority. The duties, rights, and powers of the authority are dealt with elsewhere in the Bill. If the honourable member had read the remaining clauses he would be aware that there would be a public inquiry, in which any member of the public, represented by counsel, can appear before the authority and object to a licence.

In addition to that public inquiry the honourable member would have the right to object to such matters. There must be an annual report in regard to the operations of the casino. The subsequent clause is clearly designed to have a wide literal interpretation and would catch the matters to which the honourable member has referred.

Mr LEWIS: Although that information is interesting it is of no use to me. That information should have been spelt out, because no guidelines are present. Does the honourable member not understand the fuss created as a result of the objections to the location of the pie cart where it had been for years?

Mr Groom: I know all about the pie cart.

Mr LEWIS: Then does he not acknowledge the point raised in regard to the location of the casino and the attitude of people involved in the vicinity of it? Why was that not spelt out in the Bill? Only recently the Government decided to overturn the name of a port at Stony Point. It was Port Bonython—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is dealing with the functions of the authority and not Port Bonython. He will come back to the clause.

Mr LEWIS: I am not away from the clause. I am merely indicating to the member for Hartley that, when an inquiry is held, no-one contemplates who will be affected or expect that the unusual will occur. Does he want all the people in South Australia to appear before that inquiry? I refer to the example in regard to the name of that port. It was only as a result of last-minute efforts that the Government capitulated. In this instance we could have no such opportunity because, once the evidence is taken it is too late for anyone to object to the location and how it could affect the sex life of Torrens River carp or how seasonal fluctuations would affect refoliation and defoliation of Elder Park trees if the casino were located at the railway station.

Given the kind of fuss that was made by the traders who occupy sites adjacent to the railway station in regard to the pie cart, it is understandable that they might make equally loud noises and fuss about the location of a casino in that locality, knowing that it would trade into the early hours of the morning, possibly later than we are here now, and in due course cause their patrons offence, discomfort and lead to driving them away. I wonder why the member for Hartley cannot understand that point or, if he can, will he indicate to me why he does not consider that matter in the ambit of the terms and conditions that the authority must consider at the time when it makes its decision as to where, if anywhere, the appropriate site for the casino is?

The CHAIRMAN: In asking the member for Hartley to reply, I hope that he can also explain that matter to the Chair.

Mr GROOM: I appreciate the contribution of the member for Mallee: it has taken the debate far. The power to consider the matters referred to by the honourable member are implicit in clause 10 and in other clauses of the legislation. The whole purpose of a public inquiry is, by its very terminology just that (a public inquiry over a whole range of matters: the sorts of matters to which the honourable member referred— even carp in the Torrens). If that is a legitimate interest of the honourable member, he can make appropriate submissions concerning such a matter. The public inquiry will be a wide-ranging inquiry by the very nature of the

clause and the duties that would be imposed on members of the authority. They must consider all legitimate objections from the public, including those in regard to the site. I do not know where the site will be, if indeed this legislation passes. Quite simply that would be a duty of the responsible authority which it is proposed to establish under this legislation.

However, the public inquiry will be able to consider the matters referred to by the honourable member. Even if the honourable member was not satisfied with the results of such an inquiry and not satisfied with the recommendations made to the Lotteries Commission, he could still move his motions in this House and seek to influence the Government of the day to vary the terms of the conditions.

I really do ask that the honourable member not look at these clauses in isolation and speculate about them, but to connect them up with other clauses in the Bill and to read the legislation as a whole. I am sure if the honourable member does that, and does not take the clauses in isolation, he will gain a much better and deeper understanding of this legislation. Clause 10 is in exactly identical terms as the corresponding clause in the amendments moved by the member for Torrens in the previous Parliament.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Clause 10 is a key clause of the Bill. I would like to be able to question the member for Hartley on it, and to speak to it. However, I have been awake and working now for more than 22 hours. This House has been sitting for almost 19 hours. The Chamber is rent with the sound of snoring. I believe that the Premier is making an absolute travesty of the Parliament and of the capacity of its members to represent their electors in relation to this Bill. This has everything to do with this Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The question is that clause 10 stand as printed.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I move:
That progress be reported.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (17)—Mrs Adamson (teller), Messrs Allison, Ashenden, Becker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Oswald, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (24)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, Chapman, Crafter, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom (teller), Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr LEWIS: I support the sentiments expressed by the member for Coles about the despicable way in which the Government is handling this matter—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair is trying to be reasonable at this early hour of the morning. There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber, too many interjections and certainly too much personality is entering the debate. That is certainly out of order, and I ask honourable members to refrain from getting into personalities.

Mr LEWIS: Earlier, I referred to the effects of the location of a casino. I refer to the effects not only on human beings, their built environment and visual surroundings but also on the biosphere, which could be quite serious. I also referred to the inexact, ambiguous and completely negligent way in which this clause has been drawn. It does not give the specifications that I believe should be given in the form of guidelines for the authority.

Division II refers to the functions of the authority. If one of its functions is not to determine the site, then I do not know what its function is. Quite clearly, the authority is

charged with that responsibility, but it has been given no guidelines by the authors of the Bill as to the location of the casino.

Government members cry crocodile tears about every structure or development that is to take place in this State at any given time, but that is not the case in relation to this proposal. It is absolutely and utterly impossible for the authority to understand its responsibility in connection with this aspect of its functions. I see no other provision in this Bill which enables me to determine the intention of the authors of this Bill in this regard. It is not something that could have been contemplated prior to the sittings of the select committee in relation to the previous Bill. It could be that a similar clause was provided in that Bill. However, I do not hold the authors of that Bill in anyway responsible for this provision.

The Committee is informed that this provision was introduced by the Hon. Mr Blevins in another place. If that is the case, it is up to him to consider the constraints that should apply in relation to the responsibilities and functions of the authority in particular, because we are debating the functions of the authority. As yet, the member for Hartley has not given any indication of where the Bill directs the authority to consider the factors that I have mentioned. Unless he can explain where I am mistaken in that regard, I suggest that the inquiry to be conducted in the event that this Bill passes will take a good many years to conclude its business.

There will be a large number of people with a wide divergence of views about the location of the casino to ensure that those views are taken into account. There will be those who want it somewhere and those who do not want it in that place, those who want it elsewhere and others who do not want it in that place. We could have more effectively debated those constraints if more thought and consideration had been given to that in the same way it is given to all other pieces of legislation that set about establishing something like this.

I beg the indulgence of the House, as well as an explanation from the member for Hartley, as to why it was overlooked if that is the case. I have studied the Bill in considerable detail. The Bill did not come on to our Bill file until two days ago. As a consequence, most of us in this Chamber were not aware of the provisions that it contained. It is not good enough to argue that it was identical to the Bill before the House last year.

Mr Mathwin: It has nothing to do with it.

Mr LEWIS: Nothing whatever. We were not to know that. We had preoccupations with other legislation that was drawn to our attention—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair has been more than reasonable with the honourable member. The clause deals with the functions of the authority and not with any other aspect. When the Committee is in debate, it is a narrow debate, as it deals with a particular clause. The Chair does not intend to pull up the member for Mallee on this question anymore.

Mr LEWIS: I ask the member for Hartley to indicate to me the clause under which matters such as those that I have raised could possibly be drawn to the attention of the House in the specific way that I have done so. Although I have read it through and through I cannot find them and do not know where they are.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I put on record at this stage that my opposition to the Casino Bill will remain at the third reading stage. I dissociate myself from the tactics that we are seeing happen clause by clause in debate on the functions of the authority. If we are genuinely to put a viewpoint as to whether the authority in its functions should or should not apply, we should be concerned with the way

in which the processes of this Parliament are working. I believe that what we have seen last evening and this morning could have done grave damage to the way in which the Parliamentary system operates, by virtue of the tactics used by some members in this House.

Members should be asking themselves about this matter. If they are concerned about whether or not there should be a casino, the third reading is the critical vote. We should not be raising matters of the biosphere. It is arrant nonsense. This should not be a circus—it should be a sound debate on whether or not a casino should exist. I do not believe it should.

The CHAIRMAN: I put that clause 10 stand as printed. Those in favour say 'Aye', those against 'No'. I believe the Ayes have it.

Mr Lewis: Divide.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: On a point of order, nobody called against the motion, so the call to divide is inappropriate.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to the Committee that the Chair put the vote for clause 10 and in fact it was carried before 'divide' was called. On that point I intend to carry on with clause 11.

Mr LEWIS: Therefore, I move dissent from your ruling, Mr Chairman. I called 'No', and I also called 'Divide'.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (25)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, Crafter, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom (teller), Gunn, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Rodda, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, Wilson, and Wright.

Noes (14)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, Becker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Lewis (teller), Mathwin, Meier, Oswald, and Wotton.

Majority of 11 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Clause 11—'Powers and procedure of the authority upon an inquiry.'

Mr EVANS: I am concerned that a person can be brought before the authority to give evidence either at the request of the Secretary of the authority or on the person's own initiative.

A person is bound by this clause to make available whatever books or documents he has which the authority believes may benefit it in its inquiry, and he must answer whatever questions the authority asks, even though in answering the questions, the evidence the individual gives could incriminate him. I understand that in those circumstances an answer to a question could not be used in criminal charges against an individual. The inquiry would be public and therefore open to the press. Thus, an answer or information that a person may give may be of great benefit to the authority and it may also be a great news item. No one may move criminal charges against the individual, if there was an opportunity to do so.

If that occurred, that person's family, friends, business associates, or the person himself could be totally destroyed by a media campaign. The member for Hartley may shake his head, but I have observed this activity and I have seen how this can happen. If an individual makes a request of the authority, the authority should declare (and I am not sure whether it has that power) that matters presented before it should be kept confidential and not available for publication.

Mr GROOM: There is no entrenched right of the press to be present during the public inquiry in the sense that the authority can properly exclude the press on the application of any one person or company and it can exclude any

passage of the evidence that it may deem fit. That is implicit in clause 11.

Mr EVANS: I do not challenge that, but the authority decides whether or not to exclude the press or other people. The individual should be able to say that he is prepared to give evidence, make available books or documents, and it should be obligatory on the authority to exclude anyone and to ensure that no publicity is given to the evidence. Clause 11 does not provide that.

It is only fair that we offer that protection to a person who asks for it. Where is that provided for in the clause? I am not interested in the practice on other boards. If big crime were to be involved, any person wanting to give evidence or information should have reasonable and adequate protection, and it is not unreasonable for this to be in the Bill.

Mr GROOM: One must read clauses 10 and 11 together. The authority is in charge of its own proceedings. By its very nature it is a public inquiry. If everyone had the right to say that they did not want anything published, and said, 'Therefore, you cannot publish anything,' everyone would do that and there would be no public inquiry. It must be discretionary.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I move:
That progress be reported.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (16)—Mrs Adamson (teller), Messrs Allison, Becker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Oswald, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (24)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, Chapman, Crafter, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom (teller), Hamilton, Hemmings, Hoppood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 8 for the Noes.

Motion thus negated.

Mr MEIER: Clause 11 certainly provides wide powers for the authority, and from that point of view I can see some sense in it. As has been pointed out during the debate earlier, there is strong evidence to indicate that a criminal element can become involved with gambling casinos. There is no doubt that the provisions of clause 11 are designed to preclude such elements. However, the question remains whether an innocent person can get caught up in these strict provisions in regard to the inquiry and may suffer as a result. Certainly, the position alluded to by the member for Fisher could apply, although I will not attempt to repeat everything that he said.

The problem that I can see occurring is that clause 11 requires any person to make an oath or affirmation that he will truly answer all questions put to him by the authority relating to any matter being inquired into by the authority. On paper that provision looks very effective, but I question whether the criminal element would take much notice of the words 'will truly answer'. Surely such people could make a mockery of that provision if they were simply saying what the organisation that they were representing wanted them to say. Moreover, people who are honest gamblers but who are somehow caught up in an inquiry could have information thrown at them to make them look as unsavoury as the less honest gamblers.

It also seems to give wide sweeping powers to this authority, which can inspect any books, papers or documents produced before it and retain them for such reasonable periods as it thinks fit, and make copies of any of them. I wonder to what extent copies could be used at another time. One must consider a certain Federal matter with ASIO at present, where a certain organisation apparently got hold of

some originals and then stated that they had been destroyed. I did not hear of any statement that they had possibly made copies of the documents that they had.

Likewise, with this subclause (c), I question whether it is in the best interests of all concerned. I acknowledge that the member for Hartley has mentioned some of the safeguards that are there; he gave that answer in relation to clause 10 rather than under clause 11. As I said earlier, I see this as a possible protection against crime. It would seem without doubt that crime of various sorts applies.

That brings me to another point. Are we talking only of an inquiry about things that may occur within a casino or can we inquire into things that may occur outside of a casino? In a particular document that I was reading, I noticed that casino gambling invites street crime, and losers are one reason for it. Some of them are willing to steal from motels, gas stations and other players in order to make up for losses. I would be interested to know whether the authority would have enough power to inquire into a crime that might have occurred outside of a casino and it would then be difficult to relate that to proceedings that went on within the casino. In other words, it is hard for police to ascertain whether a person is stealing because he has lost his money in a casino or just out of a desire to steal for some reason or another. I wonder whether the honourable member can answer that one.

Mr GROOM: First, innocent people have nothing to worry about. Secondly, the clause deals with an inquiry into the establishment of a casino; therefore the casino is not in existence at that point of time. Thirdly, the powers are standard powers for a tribunal analogous to this one, and it is a replica of the 1982 amendment that was moved by the member for Torrens.

Mr MEIER: I will not take my discussion any further. Thank you for the answer.

Mr EVANS: I move:

Page 4, after line 33—Insert new subclause as follows:

(3a) The authority shall, if requested to do so by a person who has been required to answer a question by the authority or who has produced books, papers or documents to the authority, by order prohibit the publication in any newspaper and by radio or television of the name of that person, any answer given by him in proceedings before the authority or the contents of any book, paper or document produced by him to the authority and a person who fails to comply with the order shall be guilty of an offence.

Penalty: Ten thousand dollars.

The amendment picks up the point I raised earlier, but I will not go back over that. I am deeply concerned, when one is dealing in the area that casinos can be in taking evidence, with the risk that an individual's family can be placed in. I do not want to debate that any further. This is the last time that I can speak on the clause, although I am not sure of the ruling on the amendment. I do not want to delay the House, but I ask the member for Hartley to think seriously about it.

I know what the traditional practice may be. I know that the authority may be considered to have the ability to judge whether or not it is liable to harm an individual's family. Telephone calls and other infringements on a person's lifestyle can be involved. I do not think that the public needs to know all the details in relation to this type of inquiry. The important thing is that it is before the authority. A member of the authority has legal experience and he can make a judgment, regardless of the individual's request. I would prefer to protect the individual from any risk that is likely to arise. I ask the honourable member to please accept my amendment.

Mr GROOM: I thank the honourable member for his contribution. I well understand his concern in relation to the matter that he has raised. Personally, I have always

sought to retain discretions in the law. However, the honourable member's amendment would make it mandatory that an order be made once a request was made to the authority on prohibition. That would simply negate the whole nature of the public inquiry and it would destroy an integral part of the Bill.

For the benefit of the honourable member, prerogative writs, such as *certiorari*, *mandamus* or prohibition would still apply. Prerogative writs are still available to control any excesses of jurisdiction by inferior tribunals. That would be applicable here. There are two protections—one in relation to discretion. I dare say that discretion would not be exercised capriciously by any responsible body but that it would duly take into consideration the matters raised by the honourable member. If he is not satisfied with that, prerogative writs (which are applications to the Supreme Court by way of injunction) or something similar would still be available. Consequently, I must reject the honourable member's amendment. I well understand what the honourable member is getting at, but on this occasion it would negate an integral part of the Bill and, therefore, I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr EVANS: I am aware that writs are available. What a judge or the Chairman of the authority may consider to affect a person's lifestyle may not be strong enough to protect the individual. The process of taking out a writ can slow down the authority, and at times the error may have occurred before such action could be taken. When an individual takes out a writ, their name is attached to it. I believe that a copy of the writ can be witnessed by other people. I am not referring to its content, but the name attached to it.

The court or the authority, if an individual took that action, would automatically let the press know that a person took out a writ to protect themselves. I think that is different from an individual saying that he is prepared to give evidence but he is not prepared to give it publicly, because I believe ferretting would go on to find out the details of the writ. My proposal is a better protection for the individual. The public part of this type of inquiry is not important. The important thing is that the authority obtains the evidence required.

If the authority allows the publication of all sorts of material, regardless of a request by an individual, I believe it defeats part of its own purpose. I am convinced that my amendment is a protection for individuals while at the same time allowing the inquiry to take place to obtain the evidence required. I ask the Committee to support my amendment. I am disappointed that the member does not see the benefit in protecting individual families from harassment by idiots.

I do not believe that, in moving in this direction on this type of authority, I am denying the cause of justice in any way, shape or form where an individual gets the opportunity to protect himself or his family. I ask the House to accept the amendment as a reasonable one in the circumstances in which the authority operates.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I support the proposition put forward by the member for Fisher. I totally accept the statement made by the member for Hartley that there are other ways of achieving the result. However, I believe that in something so vital there should be an abundance of caution, which the proposition provided to the Committee provides. I would only question whether the third word should be 'shall' or 'may'.

Again, whilst it is not vitally effecting the attempt to bring about the abundance of caution, it takes away the mandatory 'shall'. The authority will have the responsibility of looking at the matter. The authority will then, on the evidence presented to it in the first instance, be able to judge whether it ought to use the discretion made available

to it by new subclause (3) (a). It in no way ties the authority to an action that the evidence may not support.

I trust that the absence of the member in charge of the Bill is for the purpose of obtaining assistance in respect of acceptance of the motion. The member for Fisher has canvassed a real concern relative to the matter. In case the member for Hartley was not aware of the minor alteration to the suggestion of the member for Fisher, I ask him to accept the proposition presented to the Committee by the member for Fisher with one further alteration, namely, that the word 'shall' be accepted. Naturally, the member who has moved the amendment will need to accept or deny the suggestion made to the Committee. I know that others would support the proposition with that simple change.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair wishes to raise a point with the member who moved the amendment. It would be a simple operation to seek leave to change the word 'shall' to 'may'.

Mr EVANS: As I wish to make it better than it is at the moment, and as it appears that I would have greater support if I changed the word 'shall' to 'may', with the leave of the House I seek to have 'shall' replaced by 'may'.

Leave granted.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I support the amendment now that the third word has been altered to 'may'. I hope that the member for Hartley has the text of it now.

I take this opportunity to point out that we are now deep into the Committee stages of this Bill and are discussing technical questions. We have had a discussion on prerogative writs and other very technical questions. I point out to the Committee that this is a ridiculous time of the morning to be discussing this sort of complicated matter because no-one can give his full attention to it and act to the best of his ability.

Mr GROOM: I am prepared to accept the amendment so that 'may' is substituted for 'shall' first appearing.

Mr LEWIS: As this matter is a conscience matter, I indicate that any reservations that I had about this amendment at the time it was put, given the wide ambit of powers necessary under clause 11 for the authority to be able to do its job to ensure that organised criminal elements cannot penetrate the organisational structure and administrative arrangements of the operation of the casino, it is now acceptable. I understand that each member is responsible for his or her decision on this matter. I want to make it plain to the Committee that my decision is to support this proposition. It would be a travesty of justice, given—

Mr Groom: Which are you supporting?

Mr LEWIS: I am supporting the amendment.

Mr Groom: The amendment to the amendment?

Mr LEWIS: I understood that as members of the House we gave leave to the member for Fisher to include the word 'may' at the third word point.

Mr Groom: We have accepted that.

Mr LEWIS: I did not say that you had not. I did not know that this was necessarily something upon which the Labor Party needed to caucus; I thought it was a conscience matter. To which group are you referring?

Mr Groom: Be responsible.

Mr LEWIS: I am pointing out to the Committee my support for the proposal in the belief that it will assist honourable members, both here and listening in their rooms, to come to the same conclusion. I understand that my declaration is made that this is a conscience measure.

The CHAIRMAN: The question before the Chair is the amendment moved by the member for Fisher.

Mr LEWIS: I am agreeing to support that amendment and giving my reasons for so doing. I was acknowledging that this clause must have within it the powers that it contains—the widest possible ambit of inquiry for the

authority. However, without the provision provided by the amendment of the member for Fisher, it could perpetrate an injustice on a citizen and prejudice that citizen's position in a higher court or at any other forum in which any such matter might be canvassed.

In making this explanation at this hour of the morning, I understand the difficulty that you, Mr Chairman, and other members in the Chamber are having in understanding me. Other members may have difficulty in concentrating at this hour of the morning, but I do not have the same difficulty. However, I lament the fact that it is necessary for me to have to explain my position, attitude and reasons at length to ensure that they are properly understood and that the very good reasons why this amendment is appropriate are understood in addition to the other provisions of the clause. Otherwise, I fear that honourable members may not understand and vote against the clause or against the amendment. I do not wish to cause any confusion. I move:

That progress be reported.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (16)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Eastick, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis (teller), Mathwin, Meier, Oswald, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (27)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, Chapman, Crafter, Duncan, Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom (teller), Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Klunder, Ms Lenahan, Messrs McRae, Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Rodda, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 11 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 12—'Inquiry to be held by the Authority.'

Mr LEWIS: I move:

Page 5, after line 3—Insert new subclauses as follow:

(1a) Subject to subsection (1b), in determining the location of the premises in respect of which the licence should be issued the authority must satisfy itself that, at the time of its determination, not more than one thousand people reside within one kilometre of that location.

(1b) Subsection (1a) does not apply where access on foot to the premises by persons who wish to gamble at the casino will not be available because the premises will be surrounded by water.

This clause deals with the licensing of the casino but does not deal with where the casino should be located. The amendment requires the authority to satisfy itself that the casino is to be located outside any substantially developed area of population so that we do not make it too easy for impulsive gamblers to slip around to the casino for 20 minutes and still be there 10 hours later, having lost a substantial sum. It is intended to ensure that no traders or residents are adversely affected by the casino's operation outside of 'normal' hours.

I use as my definition of 'normal' in this context a reference which advocates of trade unions would use when arguing for over-award payments for award rates out of normal working hours.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: Abnormal hours.

Mr LEWIS: Exactly. Such hours as are causing these people and businesses the kind of inconvenience to which I referred earlier in the debate, when I referred to the way in which the pie cart was objected to, because it operated at abnormal hours. Distress can be caused to a large number of people whose lifestyles, which can be regarded as normal, are disrupted by the operation of a casino. It is for that reason that I have included the provision that not more than 1 000 people reside within one kilometre of the location of the casino. That would provide that the area would have to be substantially undeveloped.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Isolated.

Mr LEWIS: Not isolated, but just undeveloped. There are places within 12 kilometres of the G.P.O. where the casino could be located but still meet those requirements. I was not kidding earlier when I mentioned problems that might arise in the biosphere because of the upset caused by abnormal happenings and abnormal events resulting from people going to and from a casino. For example, the area around the building would be well lit, and that could upset animals and plants. It is a wellknown fact that a variation in the intensity of light can upset the pituitary glands of animals and cause the production of gibberellins in plants and, accordingly, cause differences to the norm. That sort of problem could still arise but, at least if the location was undeveloped, problems would not be suffered by human beings.

If this amendment is accepted, it would provide a far better location from the point of view of human amenity: those people unwillingly living in close proximity to a casino would be small in number. If the casino were established in simple circumstances and surroundings, people who might previously have decided to take up residence in the area might choose to do otherwise. Further, people who were thinking of establishing businesses, but who did not want their businesses to be in close proximity to the casino, would then know that they should establish such businesses elsewhere. I think that it is only fair and reasonable to have regard for people's feelings and their need to conduct themselves in a normal fashion.

This is the only attempt that I can make in all sincerity to ensure that consideration is given to such necessities. I think it is a legitimate consideration. New subclause (1b) covers circumstances where such provisions would not apply. For example, if a casino were located on a boat, a barge or a floating vessel capable of locomotion under its own power, the casino location would not remain stationary and might pass (for instance, if it were in Spencer Gulf) within close proximity of a densely populated locality; when it was in port, it would have to take patrons on board.

That provision, therefore, needs to be included with new subclause (1a) so that, in the event that a licence is issued to a floating casino, it can collect its patrons and supplies without being in breach of new subclause (1a). I do not want to preclude the possibility of the casino, if there is to be one, being located on a floating vessel of some kind that is capable of being navigated.

So, I have sought a form of wording as simple as possible that enables me to put that proposition, namely, that it will be simply because the premises are surrounded by water and people would have to get on to the floating casino by foot. So, I do not preclude by subclause (1a) the possibility of the casino being a floating casino and coming close to densely populated areas. I ask the Committee for its earnest consideration of the amendment, and urge members to support it.

Mr GROOM: I oppose the honourable member's amendment. His proposed new subclause (1a) is simply an unnecessary fetter on the authority. I would certainly not like to be the person who happens to move into the area and becomes the 1 001st person, because what sort of planning for private enterprise is that? It means that one's licence must be forthwith cancelled. If the investment is upwards of \$150 000 000, what a plainly ridiculous proposal! I have no doubt that these types of matters can be aired before the authority which, as I have said before, is at a public inquiry, and these sorts of fears that the member has can be brought before that authority. New subclause (1b) provides:

Subsection (1a) does not apply where access on foot to the premises by persons who wish to gamble at the casino will not be available because the premises will be surrounded by water.

What a plainly ridiculous provision! One might as well put it off the jetty at Glenelg, because that is all that it means. It is just impossible. An integral part of this legislation is a partnership between the Government and private enterprise, and private enterprise in this instance needs proper ability to be able to function flexibly. If the legislation is passed there will be a very large investment for this State. This is simply an unnecessary and plainly ridiculous fetter.

Mr LEWIS: It is not that I did not expect it at this hour of the day (6.40 a.m.), but the member for Hartley clearly has not read new subclause (1a). He tells me that the moment one more person than the first 1 000 came to live in the vicinity of the casino it would have to close down and relocate. If he just reads the subclause instead of handing out gratuitous insults to my intelligence and that of the people whom I have consulted in the drafting of this subclause, he will see that it says, 'at the time of its determination'. Thereafter, it does not matter.

People would come to live there or to set up businesses in the close proximity, if they wished, subject to whatever other planning regulations may be involved in the area at that time. If the member for Hartley does not care about the already established interests of people who have invested their life savings in their homes or businesses which are to be, perchance, adversely affected by the presence of the casino, I do care.

If he does not care about that, I do and I am sure that other members do, too. I remind him again that those who are interested in the establishment of a casino have suggested the railway station as a suitable site, if the Bill eventually passes. An extended argument about that site has been put forward in recent times by businesses in that area who believe that the operation of a casino would adversely affect their operations. That ought to be a clear illustration to the member for Hartley. I hope that other honourable members understand that these types of objections can and do arise.

The other illustration that I provided earlier related to the opposition expressed by people at Hindmarsh about the location of a remand centre in that area. Those objections came from people living in that area and from people who had businesses in that locality. Those people found the proposal objectionable. If the remand centre had been located at Hindmarsh I venture to suggest that it would have cost the people far more anguish than the \$150 000 000 in collective damages and compensation, if they had any recourse at law.

As it stands at the moment, this so-called private member's Bill could compel the Government, if it wished, to simply ignore that consideration and perhaps bring in an amendment to absolve the Crown from any responsibility for loss of amenity suffered by people living in the immediate vicinity of the casino. If the measure passes, I am concerned that the casino should be established in circumstances where as far as possible it does not upset people and will not detract from businesses already established. However, it should be located in an area that is judged by the authority to be appropriate for its purpose. I have made plain, although the member for Hartley ignored it, the effect of placing the casino away from densely populated areas and the effect that that would have on preventing people from becoming involved in the development of impulsive gambling habits.

That would certainly ensure that fewer people passed the casino or would be involved with it physically or geographically every day, because it might cause them offence and injury in terms of the effect that the casino would have on their psyche. It is for those reasons that I urge honourable members to seriously consider the implications of the alternative to my amendment before they decide to simply reject it, as did the member for Hartley.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I appreciate what the member for Mallee is attempting to do. Everything mentioned by the honourable member will be considered by the authority when it makes its recommendation in relation to the site. However, I believe that this amendment would fetter the authority. We might as well not have an authority if we are going to continually fetter it with amendments such as this.

I appreciate what the honourable member is trying to do and I sympathise with what he is trying to do. However, I do not believe that we can take away from the authority the power to make these decisions based on the evidence from the public and residents which the authority will receive when calling for applications.

Mr MATHWIN: I am disappointed that the member for Hartley dismissed this matter out of hand without realising what was in the motion from the member for Mallee's viewpoint. The member for Hartley scolded the member for Mallee and missed the main definition and explanation. If we want to get down to brass tacks on this issue, I can refer again, as I did 14 hours ago, to the Morin report. I would not like to read from that report again. Members will recall that part of the recommendations of that report was that it was desirable in some cases to place a casino in outlying areas. No doubt the West Australian investigation was placed in the same situation. The member for Mallee is trying to protect the location and suggests that it be as far away from the densely populated areas as possible.

Mr PETERSON: I cannot support the amendment. I can see the point that the member for Mallee is after but I cannot see why an arbitrary requirement like this should be put into the Bill. We are talking about a casino which will be part of a larger complex such as a hotel, convention centre and entertainment centre. The amendment provides that there not be 1 000 homes within its radius. How does one enforce that? That sort of requirement is not put on any other complex currently. It is not forced upon any industry or entertainment centre.

Mr Mathwin: It is a first.

Mr PETERSON: There is nothing wrong with firsts, but we must consider that the legislation we are envisaging does not provide for a small complex but part of a much larger complex. Its location is to be determined by the person investing the money. Everyone expects it to be the railway station and I have no idea whether 1 000 people live within that radius. Taken literally, if there are 1 000 people within its radius, the complex will not go ahead. That is not practical in a city. I was on North Terrace this morning and even at this time of day there is more traffic out there than anywhere else in the State. The honourable member is trying to say that people coming and going to and from the casino and associated buildings will cause disruption. That is possible. If it was in a built-up suburban area it could cause problems.

If the casino is to be in the city, this is an absolutely unnecessary provision that I cannot support. It is definitely not covered in any other type of industrial or entertainment legislation. It is obvious that nobody has read the 200 pages of the select committee report, because we investigated this aspect with the Police Department in Adelaide and spoke to them about the problem of traffic flow. As I recall, the Police Department submitted a separate submission detailing its concern about traffic control because it was concerned about the disruption to traffic flow and people. The department was therefore aware of this problem. If this commission is formed I am sure that it will have due respect for this problem. I am sure that any developer would also have due respect for it.

Regarding the casino being accessible over water, who knows where it will be. I do not think it is practical to have

it as a floating casino off Glenelg, or on the Murray River. These things have all been suggested. If a boat with a casino on it was at Murray Bridge, people would board the paddle wheeler there, where more than 1 000 people within the prescribed radius would be just as disrupted and interrupted in their recreation as would people on North Terrace.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: I was referring to people coming to and from that entertainment point, wherever it is. The whole point of this amendment is to lessen the effect on the people in any area close to a casino. If one is going to consider people in the metropolitan area in this regard, surely people in the country should also be considered. I should have thought that the member for Mallee would consider country people more than he has, because they are entitled to the same consideration. If there are 999 people within the specified distance, they are given no consideration, but if they are in the city they are considered. I cannot support that.

Mr LEWIS: Members who have spoken, as the member for Semaphore has (in fact, he opposed the proposition that I have put forward), have not understood the fundamental reasons for it. If a casino were to be licensed and located in South Australia near where people lived and slept, were it to be adjacent to Parliament House, at the Railway station, for instance, the patrons of the casino would arrive and leave at all hours of the night. The end result would be that those in high spirits coming or going from parties would disrupt the comfort and amenity of people sleeping in the immediate vicinity.

Mr Peterson: Don't they sleep at Murray Bridge?

Mr LEWIS: The honourable member misses the point that if there was a floating casino that docked, for instance, at Port Adelaide after a night trip and gambling, it would only cause disruption for 20 minutes or so while the passengers left. However, if it were located at a fixed location to which I have referred, people would be coming and going all night. It is to be expected that high spirited people will go to and from a casino. There were complaints by hotel proprietors in the vicinity of the pie cart in that regard.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind the honourable member that the amendment refers to the siting of a casino, and he is straying from that subject.

Mr LEWIS: I am trying to illustrate, for the benefit of honourable members, in a way they will understand, why I have moved this amendment. No-one has indicated an understanding.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: We understand but we don't agree. Can't you accept that?

Mr LEWIS: I invite the Premier, without interjecting, to say so. In the first instance I took some time to explain the amendment, and I received a gratuitous insult from the member for Hartley, who did not bother to read the amendment. A casino will affect the amenity value of homes, and the member for Semaphore did not understand that. To my dismay, you, Mr Chairman, have permitted the use of cameras from the Strangers Gallery.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will refer to the amendment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (6)—Messrs Allison, Blacker, Evans, Goldsworthy, Lewis (teller), and Mathwin.

Noes (35)—Mr Abbott, Mesdames Adamson and Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, Becker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Crafter, Duncan, Eastick, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom (teller), Gunn, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mayes, Meier, Oswald, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Rodda, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, Wilson, Wotton, and Wright.

Majority of 29 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clause 13—'Grant of licence.'

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (29)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, Becker, Crafter, Duncan, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom (teller), Gunn, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mathwin, Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Rodda, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, Wilson, and Wright.

Noes (13)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, Ashenden, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Lewis (teller), Meier, Oswald, and Wotton.

Majority of 16 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Clauses 14 and 15 passed.

Clause 16—'Activities in pursuance of licence to be legal.'

The CHAIRMAN: There are several proposed amendments to clause 16. The Chair intends to consider each amendment separately.

Mr EVANS: I move:

Page 6, lines 7 to 10—Leave out subclause (2).

As the rest of my amendments are consequential upon this amendment, if I lose it I will not continue with the other amendments. Therefore, with the concurrence of the Chair, I will debate the amendments in total, as one proposition.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair accepts that.

The amendment to clause 16, (page 6, lines 7-10, leaving out subclause (2)) and rest of the amendments included in the schedule seek to ensure that if a casino is set up in South Australia it is operated by a Government agency such as the Lotteries Commission, so that the Government operation is assured. I am not a supporter, where only one licence will be issued of giving that licence to some private entrepreneur or group of entrepreneurs who may or may not have their business interests in this State or even in Australia or where initial financial backing may be outside Australia, or this State in particular. If any profits are to go to that organisation, they could drift right out of the State and be used in other parts of the world for the benefit of the operators concerned.

In my amendment, I am not seeking to put the catering rights (that is, the rights for the supply of food, restaurant facilities, alcohol and accommodation) into the hands of a Government agency. I do not wish to move to that degree, but I hope that the Committee will accept the proposition that if the State will give the right to run a gambling facility, a one-only operation, it should not be in the hands of a private operator but in the hands of a Government organisation.

I know the arguments that will be used: will we get public servants who can do it? Of course we will. Will we be able to train croupiers? Of course we will be able to do that and employ them; there is no doubt about that. The Austrian situation is part Government and part private, but there are Government-operated casinos in the world. I have always maintained that if there is going to be a one-only casino in the State I hope that Parliament will see the merit in saying that the State should operate it. If the profit is there that people claim, the total profit can go to the Hospital Fund, and I am not seeking to change that.

I am merely saying that all the profit coming from the casino (the gambling facility) can go to the State, and private entrepreneurs can run the catering and accommodation areas, as I said earlier. The only amendment that I move at this stage is a test amendment, and I hope that it receives sufficient support.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I cannot support a Government-owned and operated casino. If this amendment

passed, I would be forced to vote against the Bill at the third reading. It may well be that that is what the member for Fisher is trying to achieve.

Mr Evans: No, that is important. I have always said it.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: That is all right. I am not casting any aspersions on the honourable member, but I am just saying that I cannot vote for a Government-owned and operated casino. I believe that the question of Government ownership is safeguarded enough. I am appalled at the thought of the new Government bureaucracy which would be required to operate a casino where the Government itself would have to go out and train the croupiers, get the expertise (that is personnel) from overseas or other States of Australia to come in and operate the casino, and arrange the advertising and the promotion. That is completely unacceptable.

Mr GROOM: I support the remarks of the member for Torrens, and strongly oppose the amendments moved by the member for Fisher. An integral part of this Bill is the partnership between Government and private enterprise. There are very stringent, strict governmental controls in relation to the operation of the casino. The honourable member really needs again to read the Bill as a whole and turn back to clause 14, which was just recently passed in Committee. Clauses 13 and 14 give the power to the Government to add to or vary the terms and conditions as recommended by the authority, and the Governor may, on the advice obviously of the responsible Minister, revoke all the terms and conditions of the licence.

If there was a mere suspicion on the part of the police that some criminal element was becoming involved, the Commissioner of Police could advise the Government, which would advise the Governor to cancel the licence. It is quite clear that this is an integral part of Government control. The licence is granted to the Lotteries Commission which then sublets it to private enterprise. I refer to the Report of the Select Committee on the Casino Bill at page 84 and the arguments in relation to private ownership or Government ownership, as follows:

... Casinos can and have failed financially. If some malpractice is involved in the case of Government ownership, the State itself is directly engaged in a public scandal and corruption of some sort which may have spread to other organs of Government.

(vii) Where the operator is the State itself, the Government is necessarily and actually gambling itself with public funds collected from the taxpayers. Should the casino enter upon a losing run, it is Government funds that must become the source of payment to winners; should default be contemplated or payment deferred for even a short period, it is default or deferment by the Government. It is this factor which distinguishes casinos from State Lotteries and the Totalizer Agency Board where the totality of prizes or payments in the form of winnings are within the limits of the amounts collected.

(viii) The maintenance and enforcement of controls are capable of better implementation when the State is outside the area and controlling it than when it is itself the owner and operator.

(ix) Controls should be free of all political interference and, because of the opportunity of corruption or nepotism, the further away the State is, the better. In the case of private enterprise ownership, the non-political, independent control body is a distinct possibility; in the case of Government ownership it is more remote.

Quite clearly, there are firm arguments. The partnership between governmental control and private enterprise is an integral part of this legislation. It will not work in any other way. The clause was basically inserted in the Upper House. It has been canvassed elsewhere. The member for Fisher's record is quite clear. On 31 March 1982, in relation to the previous Casino Bill, he said:

I oppose the Bill as I have done in the past, and I will continue to do so in the future.

The member for Fisher opposed the Bill's going to a select committee and he also opposed the Bill's concept. That is quite clearly on the record. One then must wonder about

the member for Fisher's motives in moving these amendments because, clearly, they provide for total and complete blanket control of the casino by the Government. What is the motive behind that? The honourable member knows that that proposal will not be accepted in another place. This matter has been canvassed in another place and the member for Fisher is hoping to deadlock the Bill.

Mr EVANS: I am sorry that I have to say to my colleague, the member for Torrens, and also to the member for Hartley that they have both unfairly interpreted my motives. Right from the beginning, whenever I have debated this issue or spoken about it in public, I have made it quite clear that I oppose a casino. I admit that. I have also said that if a casino is inevitable I will attempt to amend the Bill by attempting to make it better in my opinion.

I have said right from the beginning that I would not support a one-off privately owned casino in this State run by one lot of entrepreneurs and that I would attempt to provide for Government ownership. I ask honourable members when they start to have doubts about my motives to read all of my speeches and all of my comments.

Mr Mathwin: And your report.

Mr EVANS: And my report, if they wish. I have been consistent in this area. The member for Hartley said that if there was any evidence of improper practices the Government could do something about the licence. I was not referring to improper practices. Improper practices, malpractice and skulduggery can occur just as easily in a privately-operated casino.

Maybe it could occur more easily, I do not know. The point I was making in moving the amendment was that I do not believe we should give a licence to a private operator to make profit out of this area when the opportunity can be given to the State when it is not true competition. It is not competition—it is a 'one off' operation. I ask the House to accept that it be Government owned. That is the only reason I am doing it.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I have not contributed to this debate until now. However, I feel I must explain my position on this clause. Members will recall that when we debated this matter less than 12 months ago, my position was fairly much the same as has been expressed in the amendment moved by the member for Fisher. I was not persuaded, during the previous debate, that we could not arrive at a procedure whereby the Government could own and run a casino. That was not supported by the House at the time. Since then I have become Minister of Tourism, and as a result, I have been exposed to the tourist industry in South Australia which is extremely keen to have a casino in this State. If members suggest that this is not regarded as a tourist attraction, they have no idea of what the South Australian tourist industry believes.

Overwhelmingly the constituency I have as Minister of Tourism supports the establishment of a casino. I have had discussions, not with people seeking to establish a casino, but with people within the industry who would like to see a casino established. They are well aware of my stand last year. That is how discussions have ensued. Subsequent to those discussions I have been persuaded that a Government licence and lease to the appropriate organisation is the best way of having a casino in South Australia. That is why, on this occasion, I am supporting a casino and supporting a Government-owned privately-run casino as the Bill would suggest rather than adopt the position I did when the matter was before the House on the previous occasion when I insisted that it be Government owned and Government run. The previous Minister of Tourism has never felt inclined to hold such views.

Mr MEIER: The amendment has been brought forward to consider the aspects in favour of Government control,

and the member for Hartley referred to the select committee report, page 84, about the argument of private ownership. The arguments are certainly for and against Government control and/or private enterprise. Can we consider the argument supporting Government ownership and operation? First, it states that: in the national and public interest, criminality can be kept entirely and completely out of such an industry. I am very interested to read those remarks.

Mr Groom: Didn't you read the Bill?

Mr MEIER: Those words were stated in the select committee report. When one considers that criminality seems to be one aspect, that could be an unsavoury aspect of casinos, as evidence from overseas shows. I am surprised to hear the Minister and the member for Hartley not agreeing to the amendment.

Mr Groom interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr MEIER: I am saying that there are arguments for and against. I am against a casino. As we are considering whether it is Government controlled or privately controlled, I would consider the views in favour of Government ownership.

The second reason given for supporting Government ownership was that forms and costs of necessary Government control imposed on legal casinos conducted by private enterprise are so extensive and pervasive that it is tantamount to Government ownership and responsibility without the advantage of profits. Maybe that is one thing that makes Government control a little less attractive than private enterprise control. I think that any setting up of a casino is simply another tax on individuals and, in many cases, a tax on the people who can least afford such taxes.

The third point mentioned by the select committee was that Government revenues ought to benefit as to the totality of the profits rather than sharing them with private enterprise in the guise of revenue. I have already commented on that. It states, fourthly, that it would make the legislation more acceptable and give more public confidence in a casino's honesty and freedom from organised crime. To some extent that is probably elaborating on the first point that the committee pointed out. I still oppose the amendment as I opposed the original subclause because I do not believe that a casino should be set up in this State. I am surprised that the member for Hartley is not prepared to accept this as a possible amendment.

Mr Groom: You want to exclude private enterprise, do you?

Mr MEIER: I have not said that. I feel that you have put the points in favour of private enterprise and that I should put the Government's viewpoint. I am using evidence from the select committee report to indicate that there are two sides to the argument. It seems to me that only one side has been put by the member for Hartley.

Mr PETERSON: I have spoken in each debate on this matter since 1981 in favour of Government ownership.

Mr Becker: At least you are consistent.

Mr PETERSON: Except that I am about to change my mind. On 16 September 1981 when I put the Bill forward I said that the Government should run any casino. I reiterated that on 19 August 1982 just after the select committee hearing. Since then I have thought a little more deeply about the matter (and we all change our opinions) and I see difficulties with the Government running it. I will not state the reasons given in the report, as other speakers have put them, but Government departments seem to not be commercial departments in the true sense of the word. I can quote some Government departments to back up this assertion, but I will not do that.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: I do not believe, after being on the select committee and after speaking with many casino operators, that a casino should be Government run. We went to every legal casino operating in Australia with the select committee and to some that were not legal. We had an opportunity to get into the nuts and bolts of those operations and how they made them work and how they issued the dice, chips and other things before the casino opened. I doubt whether Government officers could be expected to be free of political influence or influence from outside, because they are just as susceptible to those influences and the corruption spoken of here tonight.

The Superintendent of Licensed Premises has a great responsibility in this respect. I cannot see that it is a Government function to run a casino. The points raised in the report are valid. Taxpayers' money will have to be used to set up the casino and for gambling: if money is lost, it will be lost from the public purse. The State cannot lose if it takes the other avenue.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: How often does that happen? I have the right to change my opinion, as has every member. I have been consistent in my support for a casino. The State badly needs investment and job potential. There is nothing else on the horizon.

Mr Meier interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr PETERSON: I beg your assistance, Mr Chairman. I am being harassed. I am concerned that the Government purse will be used for stake money or for the establishment of a casino. The State cannot afford to expend such a sum. We will be left with a casino where there is a 21 game and a roulette wheel in a corner.

Mr Gregory interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: That is right. The State needs a substantial injection of money. The only way we can achieve that is with private money. I must reject the amendment.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am in favour of a Government controlled casino, if a casino is to be established. I have visited overseas casinos, both Government-run and private. The Government-run casino was run as well as or better than the private casinos. I admit to feeling some discomfort in supporting an amendment moved by the member for Fisher, who is, to say the very least, an extremely late convert to the cause of Government enterprise. If it was not for Standing Orders, I would have something to say about his motives in raising this issue, but I appreciate that I am not permitted to do that. The honourable member stated that anyone who wants to question his motives should be instructed to read all the speeches he has ever made on the subject. That would be a most unusual and sadistic punishment, to which I do not wish to be subjected, so I will leave that matter alone.

If there is to be a casino, a lot of the fears and concerns expressed in the community would be put to rest if it was run by the Government. I have read the propaganda that has been force fed to us over the past few weeks by the Festival of Light and other bodies: it has been a very sickening diet in many ways. Those bodies consider that the danger of organised crime in gaining a foothold in a casino is an important issue.

I must concede that it will be extremely hard to keep organised crime in one form or another from becoming involved in a casino unless the licence and the operation are effectively in Government control. I realise that the wide powers in the Bill will ensure that as much control as possible can be exercised over the licensee, but anyone who knows legal devices and technicalities will know that, as soon as a licence is issued to private enterprise, there is the

possibility of that licence falling under the influence of organised criminal elements.

On balance, it would be better, therefore, to have the casino run by the Government. The sort of pat that has been put up by some members opposite that it would not be possible for a Government department to run a casino efficiently simply does not stand up to analysis. The most famous casino in the world, the Monte Carlo casino, is run by the Government of Monaco. The suggestion that the Government would be unable to run such a casino is baseless. Provided that the siting of the casino was offered as a lure or inducement, we would have no difficulty in attracting the sort of investment around the casino—a matter about which the member for Semaphore expressed concern.

If the Government offered to site its casino in an international-class hotel to be built in Adelaide, there would be no shortage of offers by people who would be only too happy to invest to have in their hotel the lure or drawcard of a casino, regardless of whether or not the Government was running the casino. I am in favour of the amendment, with the reservations that I have about the mover and his motives.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

[Sitting suspended from 7.39 to 11 a.m.]

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I move:

That further consideration of the Casino Bill be now resumed.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: The motion before the Chair is the first amendment moved by the member for Fisher.

Mr MAYES: I have views similar to those of some of my colleagues and also the direction of the amendment in regard to not only the control but also the operation of a casino under this legislation. My view is that a casino can effectively be operated and controlled but should be by the Government. As the member for Elizabeth has said, many casinos around the world are operated by Governments, but I understand that to support this amendment would inevitably lead to a deadlock situation whereby this Bill would fail. I do not want to see that happen, so I support the Bill in its original form.

Mr MATHWIN: I rise mainly to say how disappointed I was last evening at the way in which the member for Hartley attacked the member for Fisher by saying, in part, that the member for Fisher's amendment was moved in order to sink the Bill. There was no need to attack the member for Fisher in that way. It proves to me and I am sure it proves to my colleagues on this side that the member for Hartley had no intention of looking at the member for Fisher's report on tourism. If the member for Hartley had read the honourable member's report, he would have known that some of its findings were the reason for his moving the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind the member for Glenelg, as I did earlier this morning or late last evening, that we are dealing with an amendment, not personalities: I hope the member for Glenelg will discuss the amendment.

Mr MATHWIN: That was my intention, but I was annoyed and I had to register that annoyance on behalf of the member for Fisher who undertook the study tour to find out what was happening in casinos around the world. He found that many casinos were Government controlled. The last time this Bill was before us (when so many members voted on their consciences) the member for Fisher said that one of the advantages of some of the casinos was that they were State controlled.

Mr LEWIS: I do not support the views put by the member for Fisher, even though I know that he has held those views

sincerely and conscientiously for many years and that he has made no secret of them. However, I cannot support the amendment moved by the member for Fisher, because I believe that the legislation must direct that, so far as possible, the Government must not become involved directly in the operation of a casino, otherwise members of Parliament would be exposed to the prospect of coercion and bribes once the elements of organised crime gained possession of all the licences in Australia and began to muscle in, as they most certainly would do if my experience is to be taken as a guide.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I do not support the amendment, although I am not opposed to the principle of Government-ownership of casinos, as is the case in some other parts of the world. However, the Bill provides that there be Government control and I believe that that is essential. There will be control over the applicants who apply for a licence to operate the casino. When granted, that licence will probably be issued to a consortium of companies. If a large capital project is to be built, there will certainly be more than one group of people or companies involved in applying for the licence. Could the member for Hartley say whether, in his opinion, the Government might have up to 49 per cent equity in such a consortium? This was a recommendation of the previous select committee, and it is a matter that ought to be proposed and considered in regard to the establishment of a casino when the licence is issued.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I hope that the Minister of Tourism will speak on this amendment, and I hope that he will continue the approach that he has consistently maintained in relation to this particular matter. On 18 August the Minister of Tourism said:

I am strongly committed to the principle that a casino should be controlled by the Government and not by private enterprise.

The Hon. Michael Wilson interjected at that point and said:

Can you explain what you mean by a Government-owned casino?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Minister of Tourism spoke on this clause last evening. It seems the honourable member for Coles must have been asleep when he spoke and accordingly has missed the point: I suggest to her she might refer to *Hansard* to see what he had to say.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is no point of order and the Chair does not want the member for Coles to start replying to a point of order that is in fact out of order.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I had no sleep whatever last evening, but I want to hear the Minister of Tourism speak to this amendment. The Government has done an extraordinary somersault. In fact, one might describe them as a Government of acrobats; they have been somersaulting all evening. The Minister of Tourism said:

My only objection to the establishment of a casino in South Australia was that it might have been under the control of private interests.

It is quite clear that the Minister of Tourism is a most impressive acrobat, and in that respect quite an entertainer.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: When this debate started I was quite prepared not to say anything about the member for Coles, the shadow Minister of Tourism, and her responsibility to what is a sadly needed tourist activity in South Australia. The whole tourist industry in South Australia is strongly behind this measure: it wants a casino in South Australia, but it seems that the shadow Minister of Tourism in South Australia, who has a wide constituency to whom she is responsible, as spokesman for the Opposition in this House, is totally rejecting the unanimous view of that industry, and accuses me of not having spoken to the measure when everybody knows that I have.

This measure has been before the House four times: on the first two occasions I supported a casino with no reservation; on the third occasion I did not support a privately owned and run casino. I said that it was my belief that it ought to be Government owned, controlled and Government run. As I explained to the House, I have changed my mind as a result of my discussions with the tourist industry, which I represent and to which I have a responsibility, but to which the shadow Minister acknowledges no responsibility.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I am happy to apologise to the Minister of Tourism for not being aware of the fact that he had spoken. However, the Minister should be happy to acknowledge that I fulfilled my responsibility to the industry in every respect that it is possible for an Opposition spokesperson to do. The fact that I chose to exercise my conscience on this matter need not in any way diminish my proper fulfilment of my responsibility to the tourism industry.

I am well aware of the views of the tourism industry on this subject. I know that the industry keenly wants a casino. If the Minister had heard my second reading explanation he would have heard me acknowledge that. He would also have heard me say that this was an issue which I put over and above the wishes and the needs of the industry. In this instance I put what I believe to be the interests of the whole State and future generations first. I am entitled to do that. To suggest, as the Minister just did, that I am not properly fulfilling my responsibility to the industry is, I think, lower than low and I believe that he should withdraw that.

Mr BECKER: I oppose the amendment, I oppose the clause and I oppose the Bill. I am extremely disappointed at the level to which the debate has now sunk in respect of the whole issue before the Committee. The Minister of Tourism admits that he has changed his attitude in relation to his portfolio. For the benefit of the member for Coles, the Minister of Tourism spoke at about 6.45 this morning, and I do not personally agree with everything that he said. I have to wear the problem of an international airport in my electorate and I well remember the tourism industry wanting an international airport. When one considers the economics of an international airport and how much it costs to land a jumbo jet, one will find that it is not an economic proposition. The tourism industry wants everything, and it is not interested in whether it is an economic proposition or not. I am not convinced and, when one finds oneself in a situation such as this where the amendment is unacceptable and where the clauses are unacceptable, it makes it extremely difficult to know which way to vote. It is best then to vote against everything and be done with it.

What does concern me is that for the first time someone on the Government benches has admitted that, if we have a Government-owned and Government-controlled casino, taxpayers' money would be used to establish that casino and it could be used to cover any losses. For the first time we have received such a statement and, as the Minister of Tourism said, it was the member for Semaphore who was on the select committee, which has been accepted as giving a considered judgment and an impartial view, but no-one has said before that the State, if there was a Government-owned and Government-controlled casino, could have to fund the losses. Therefore, it makes me even more determined that the legislation should be thrown out, because no-one really knows how much financial benefit a casino could bring to the State as far as licence fees or commissions are concerned. There is no guarantee of any financial benefit at all. No-one is going to convince me that we should be wasting so much time in this Chamber as we have in the last 24 hours, when we have a mammoth amount of unemployment and economic hardship in this State.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (4)—Messrs Ashenden, Duncan, Evans (teller), and Goldsworthy.

Noes (37)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Adamson, Mr Allison, Mrs Appleby, Messrs P.B. Arnold, Baker, Bannon, Becker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Crafter, Eastick, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom (teller), Gunn, Hopgood, and Keneally, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Lewis, McRae, Mathwin, Mayes, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Rodda, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, Wilson, Wotton, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr Hamilton. No—Mr Hemmings.

Majority of 33 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated.

The CHAIRMAN: The next amendment on file is an amendment to be moved by the member for Mallee. Before calling on him the Chair wishes to point out that in some cases during the debate on the clauses or the amendments the question of personalities has unfortunately entered into the debate. The Chair believes that this is lowering the standard of debate and appeals to members not to bring personalities into the debate. I call the member for Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: I move:

Page 6, after line 10—Insert new subclause as follows:

(2a) The following persons may not be appointed pursuant to subsection (2) and if appointed, may not establish or operate the casino pursuant to that subsection:

- (a) an authority established by Act of Parliament;
- (b) a member of or a person employed by an authority referred to in paragraph (a);
- (c) a person employed pursuant to the Public Service Act, 1967-1981, or any other person employed by the Crown;
- (d) a person who has borrowed money from an authority established by Act of Parliament or from the Crown and has not repaid that money.

The amendment needs some explanation, I daresay. It simply means that whereas the Bill at present does not envisage, it would appear, that a Government agency would operate the casino, there is no such Government agency which has within its articles and terms of reference the power to operate or to become involved in the operation of a casino. However, that is not to say that within a few years, or even tomorrow or the next time the House is sitting, the Government could not create such a corporation, such a QANGO, and that agency then could easily apply for either part of or the whole of the equity in the licence of the casino.

Again, not being a betting man, I bet London to a brick that that Government agency would get the deal. I do not want ever to see the possibility of that happening without the legislation having to be amended if and when it becomes an Act. Accordingly, I have seen it as necessary, after taking capable legal advice on the matter, to introduce this new subclause.

By way of explanation I point out for those members or other people who may not know that under the Acts Interpretation Act a person is not only an adult human being but can also be a body corporate, so that whereas clause 16 (2) states that the commission shall appoint a suitable person who is approved of by the authority to establish and operate a casino on its behalf and that person shall establish and operate the casino in accordance with this Act and with the terms and conditions of the licence, nowhere does it say that a QANGO could not be created to do that. As I am moving it, the new subclause (2a) precludes the possibility of that ever happening without an amendment to the Bill. If honourable members who have already spoken in opposition to the amendment moved by the member for Fisher have any substance to the argument they put, it would mean that they must support this new subclause and I urge them earnestly to consider doing so. I can see no reason why they should not do so.

Mr GROOM: I oppose the amendment because it would make the Bill completely unworkable if it were carried. For instance, new subclause (2a) (a) would preclude the Lotteries Commission, which is an integral part of the legislation. In the same way, paragraph (c) would preclude a person employed pursuant to the Public Service Act, and the secretary of the tribunal would be deemed to be employed under that Act. Paragraph (d) would preclude a person who had borrowed money from an authority established by Act of Parliament or from the Crown and had not repaid that money, but a person might have been given financial assistance by the Government through the proper channels and so be excluded from appointment. The new subclause would be a completely unnecessary fetter on the legislation and, as it is completely unwarranted, I oppose it.

Mr LEWIS: Regrettably, I suspect that the member for Hartley has overlooked part of the amendment. In no way is the amendment a fetter on the legislation. For instance, the Lotteries Commission will not operate a casino: under the legislation the licensee will operate it. People better trained in law than I or even the member for Hartley have advised me on this amendment, and they say that it would in no way make the legislation unworkable. The points raised by the honourable member have been explicitly discussed in the drafting of this subclause. Had the member for Hartley told me his views before I moved the amendment, I might have sought further advice, but he did not do so. Clause 16, as it stands in the Bill at present, is ambiguous and that ambiguity is present throughout the Bill.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I seek guidance, Mr Chairman. It seems that what the honourable member for Mallee is trying to do is in accord with my own wishes. Nevertheless, I am concerned about the meaning of the explanation given by the member for Hartley, who said that, by accepting this amendment, the Lotteries Commission will be excluded from the Bill. The member for Hartley's point does not seem to make sense to me.

Mr GROOM: Under the Bill the Lotteries Commission is an integral part of the operation of a casino. This amendment would cause serious problems. It would end up in the courts, if this amendment went through, to try to resolve them and it is so ambiguous that it would fail. In the Bill the mechanism for control is adequate and strong. A person who is a member of the authority would not be granted a licence, as there would be a clear conflict of interest, and the Government would step in. There are other provisions in the Act where the Governor can alter or vary the terms of the licence. If there were a clear conflict of interest, anyone sitting on the authority who is wanting the licence would stand down. In relation to (d), that would exclude many companies that have received proper financial assistance from this Government and from the previous Government from even thinking of tendering for a casino licence or putting forward an application before the public inquiry. The amendment is unnecessary, but I know what the honourable member is trying to do: he is trying to exclude conflicts of interest, but I believe there must be confidence placed in the people on the tribunal to ensure that this conflict of interest does not arise, and the honourable member must have confidence in the Government of the day. It will not permit any abuses of this legislation.

I appreciate what the honourable member is saying, and I did not intend to be flippant in my remarks, but there are more than adequate controls existing to prevent a conflict of interest and conflict of duties. If this amendment were to be passed it would make the rest of the Act completely unworkable, as it would create conflicts in every clause.

Mr LEWIS: I have read the best advice available to this Chamber, but it is completely at variance with the view expressed by the member for Hartley. He is overlooking the point that persons may be appointed pursuant to sub-

section (2). The commission cannot appoint itself, but is charged with the responsibility of doing the appointing. The amendment merely prevents any nepotism and it prevents the risk of any backhanders.

Mr Groom: 'Person' includes company.

Mr LEWIS: Indeed it does under the Acts Interpretation Act—the body corporate. That was the context I used it in when I introduced the amendment, and I am astonished that the member for Hartley, with other members, has mischief aforethought by opposing this amendment and by refusing to consider the same opinion, as I have considered it, and furthermore by refusing to explain to me the reason for the difference. If necessary the redrafting could have been possible to ensure that he could not give this spurious answer, which conflicts with the best drafting advice available to us. I think his behaviour is either blatantly bad mannered or mischievous.

Mr PETERSON: I do not know who is right or who is wrong in relation to this debate. I will not support the amendment that will absolutely preclude the Government from operating the casino.

The CHAIRMAN: Before calling on the member for Torrens I draw to the attention of the member for Mallee that twice he has reflected on the Parliamentary Counsel, and I point out to the honourable member that he is completely out of order in doing so. He must keep in mind that he is the proposer of an amendment, and I ask the honourable member for Mallee to refrain from that sort of suggestion.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I am still not convinced that the member for Hartley is right on the legal point. I oppose the amendment, although I sympathise with the member for Mallee. I do not believe one can exclude companies which are in receipt of a tourism development grant, or other Government grants or assistance, and which may be worthy companies of the type that we would want to see interested in a casino. Therefore, the point I am making is that I am not convinced by the legal argument of the member for Hartley. I tend to agree with the member for Mallee. I will oppose the clause because of subclause (d).

Mr EVANS: My normal philosophy is one of supporting private enterprise and one would expect that I would support the amendments moved by the member for Mallee, because it is taking it further in that direction. However, for the reasons I have stated in other areas of debate, in this case it is not true competition. If there is only one licence, that is not true competition. To say that it is, that it is private enterprise operating in a competitive way and effectively operating as one would normally consider private enterprise should operate, is inaccurate. Therefore, I will not support the amendment.

The point made by the member for Semaphore is quite valid. There is still a chance because the legislation provides for the Government to operate a casino in the future, if it ever so wishes. It could be at the beginning if it so wished. I was approached by a group of people in 1976 with the idea of having a casino here. They thought that I was a strong opponent, or so they wanted to call me. I suggested that I would agree if it was operated by the Government. They said, 'How could it be done?' I follow the point made by the member for Semaphore. If the overall complex is built by an entrepreneur and that entrepreneur has the opportunity to control all the catering facilities and accommodation, then the Government of the day could say, 'We will take over the casino operation and pay you the inflationary trend of money per year on the capital invested to initially establish it, plus a percentage.' By that method, if the Government owned and controlled the casino operations, the building would not be owned by the Government. The Bill leaves that opportunity open.

I hope that the Government will take up that challenge on that basis, because it can be done without the State having to find the money as suggested earlier by the member for Semaphore. The State does not have to find the money under those circumstances. I believe that that is the way to do it and I hope that the challenge is taken up. Therefore, I cannot support the amendment moved by the member for Mallee because we are talking about only one licence and that is not true competition in the sense of competition in private enterprise.

Mr LEWIS: I wish to apologise for inadvertently referring, by interjection, to those people from whom it is possible for us to obtain advice on matters of a difficult nature relating to the structure of measures to be debated by the Parliament. I meant no diminished responsibility on my part for this or any other amendment that I might move. I realise now that that was a mistake, although, in frustration, I tried to point out to honourable members that they might consult opinions available to them readily and at hand. I am just sorry that the measure now reaches the point of impasse and it is a matter of credibility as to who is explaining the true position in relation to the effect of the amendment.

It seems to me that a number of members in the Chamber believe that it would not be a bad thing after all if the Government were to own and operate a casino. Of course, they now understand that that is possible as the legislation stands at present. I assure them that the amendments I move (without further amendment to this Bill if it becomes an Act) would make it absolutely impossible, and I urge them to support this amendment for that reason.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

While the division was being held:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There being only one member on the side of the Ayes, I declare that the Noes have it.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr ASHENDEN: I wish to speak on two matters at this point. First, I would like to make it quite clear to members opposite that my vote which caused a little bit of hilarity earlier was quite consistent with the speech I gave in the House on the Casino Bill when it was introduced by the previous Government, when at that time I opposed a casino in South Australia but I did say that if there were to be one I wanted it to be owned and controlled by the Government. I was being quite consistent with what I said in the previous debate.

I would like to address some questions to the member for Hartley and I want to preface my remarks to make sure that they are not interpreted wrongly. When I ask them I am not for one minute indicating that because of information I am given that the Government is acting in an underhanded manner but I do believe that possibly the Government has not been honest with the Parliament in relation to the Casino Bill.

We have seen that many members in the Government ranks have changed their vote from the way they voted just six months ago. Each of those members has given reasons for doing so but unfortunately I find it difficult to accept the reasons given by those members. The Deputy Premier, for example, indicated six months ago that his electorate was opposed to the development of a casino in South Australia, but something seems to have changed because now he does not believe that that is the case. The Chief Secretary has done a complete turn-around. Again, he spoke briefly but I cannot understand why he has changed his opinion from the one he held six months ago when he emphasised that because of his beliefs he would support only a casino owned and operated by the Government, but now he has spoken against that.

We have seen the Minister of Water Resources who voted against a casino six months ago now indicating that he will support a casino in this vote. Therefore, I think it is only quite right that members of Parliament should ask themselves why so many of the Government members have changed their vote. I have been given information that I believe goes a long way to explaining the change that has occurred, but for the life of me, if the information is correct, I cannot understand why the Government is hiding it.

The information I have been given is that an official approach has been made to this Government that if the Government is able to have a Casino Bill passed in the Parliament it is almost certain that a consortium will come to South Australia and provide funds for the development of a major centre in Adelaide which would include, among other things, a convention centre, possibly a hotel, but certainly a casino. I have also been advised that if this were to go ahead it would almost certainly be built at the railway station site, although I must admit that other sites have also been mentioned.

I am also concerned to have heard radio reports this morning that have indicated that discussions have been going on for some time between various entrepreneurs and the Government about developing a casino in South Australia. One of those relates to the development of a paddle steamer-cum-casino on the Murray River, and the other was a development on a site that was not named specifically. Certainly, the radio reports this morning clearly indicated that discussions on these matters were well advanced. In other words, assumptions had obviously been made that this Bill was going to be put before the Parliament again and in the opinion of the entrepreneurs hopefully it would be passed.

All I can say is that if this information is correct I really cannot understand why the Premier has not advised the Parliament that such approaches have been made to him and that if a Casino Bill is passed in this House it could go a long way toward a major development in South Australia. I believe that information has been passed on certainly to his Cabinet and probably to his Party, and if that is the case why could he not have taken the Opposition into his confidence because, after if all, that is a matter which affects not just the Labor Party in South Australia but all South Australians and I do not think it is anything the Government has to hide. It could also have a major effect on the way in which some members of this House vote.

Therefore, if the information I have been given is correct I really cannot understand the way in which the Government is playing its cards unless in two or three weeks the Premier wants to make what should be a surprise and major announcement that no-one else knows about to get himself perhaps a lot of kudos that he alone has brought about this development which, incidentally, is a development which was mooted long before this Government came to power.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: As the member for Coles points out, discussions about a convention centre along these lines were initiated by the previous Government. Will the member for Hartley ask the Premier the following questions and relay the answers to the Chamber: first, has the Premier or the Government been approached by any company, individual, or organisation indicating that a large commercial development could be introduced in South Australia if a casino Bill were passed, and would a consortium relying heavily on overseas funding be involved? Secondly, does the Premier intend to fly to South-East Asia within the next few weeks, if this Bill passes, in order to continue the negotiations to which I have referred?

Mr Groom: On a point of order, Mr Chairman. What relevance has this to clause 16?

Mr ASHENDEN: I am referring to clause 16.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! A point of order has been taken and the Chair must rule on it. The Chair has allowed this type of debate to continue, because this clause deals with the operation of a licensed casino. The Chair has therefore assumed that the member for Todd is debating the question as to who may obtain that sort of licence, and the Chair rules accordingly.

Mr ASHENDEN: Your assumption is perfectly correct, Mr Chairman, and that is why I have raised this matter at this time. My third question is as follows: in view of the information I have been given and in view of the previous two questions, is any developmental proposal, in relation to and including a casino, at present being considered by the Premier or the Government, contingent on the passage of this Bill through Parliament? If the member for Hartley does not have that information at his fingertips, will he seek it from the Premier and bring the answers to the Chamber?

Mr GROOM: The honourable member must have a low opinion of private enterprise if he thinks that, as a consequence of the passing of this Bill by another House, private enterprise would not be interested in the final outcome of the Bill. The passage of the legislation in another place for the first time in 10 years must, by its very nature, generate interest from private enterprise because of the publicity given to it.

However, I am not privy to where the Premier is going and whether he will visit South-East Asia or anywhere else. No-one has approached me. If the honourable member asks whether this Bill is being sponsored by an outside group, the answer is unequivocally 'No'. However, if the honourable member suggests that no interest would be expressed by private enterprise as a result of the passage of the Bill through the Upper House, he is wrong because it must generate interest. Certainly, the Bill has not been sponsored on behalf of anyone: this is a private member's Bill and not a Government Bill. The honourable member has other remedies available to him; for instance he could ask the Premier his questions during Question Time.

Mr ASHENDEN: The honourable member obviously does not have the information at his fingertips and that does not surprise me. Therefore, will he please raise those three questions with the Premier so that the information I am seeking on the Bill might be brought to the Chamber while the Bill is still being considered? We will not have a Question Time today, and I believe that the information I seek is both legitimate and important.

Mr PETERSON: Is it any wonder that Parliament and politicians are held in such low esteem.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr PETERSON: I was going to relate my remarks to the clause dealing with the operation of the casino. I am well aware of your instructions in this regard, Mr Chairman. Here we are debating the operation of the casino and exactly the same allegations as were made last year are being made now. Last year, it was alleged that \$20 000 had been given to the Liberal Party. The same allegations come forward every time this Bill is introduced.

Mr ASHENDEN: On a point of order, Mr Chairman, I cannot accept the wording the honourable member is using. I have made no allegations: I have asked questions to obtain information, and those questions were based on statements made to me.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. The honourable member for Semaphore.

Mr PETERSON: The same questions are asked every time this legislation is introduced, and the same innuendo is made that there is graft and that someone is on the take.

Mr ASHENDEN: On a point of order, Mr Chairman. At no time have I indicated that anyone is on the take, as the honourable member says.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. The honourable member for Semaphore.

Mr PETERSON: Every time the legislation is introduced the same comments are made. Obviously, someone will have to operate the casino. We have passed the clause providing that private enterprise will operate it, and obviously private enterprise is interested. I should be surprised if approaches had not been made to the previous Government when its Bill was introduced, but whether it is the same group this year as last year I would not know. I should be surprised if approaches had not been made to the present Government. So would all other members be surprised, yet we keep bringing it up trying to get media attention—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! That remark is completely out of order.

Mr PETERSON: I withdraw that comment, and say that members may be trying to get some mileage from their comments. We must vote on the Bill as it stands. It would be fair to assume that approaches had been made to each Government when in office. That must be accepted as a fact of life. There is only one vote on the Bill that is important and that is the final vote. In saying that, I do not wish to detract from any member's right to speak on amendments or on the Bill, but we have dragged out this debate for 15 hours.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! That line of reasoning is not in this clause.

Mr PETERSON: We have decided who will operate the casino. Everyone here and all South Australians will be happy to see the final vote taken.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I refer to the comments of the member for Todd concerning approaches made to the Government and to Ministers, and in this connection the honourable member mentioned my name. It has been mentioned about the paddle steamer, and my name has been associated with them by the media.

In January this year a director of River Murray Development spoke to me about what he thought was a good concept for South Australian tourism: a paddle-steamer casino. The director said that he had spoken to the previous Government about it and asked what could be done in that regard if the legislation was introduced again. I told him that it was a unique concept and that, if the Bill were introduced and passed, it would be of great advantage to South Australia.

That was the end of the discussion. He sent some plans to my office, and I looked at them three months ago, but we have had no further contact or discussion. He has not approached me further, and I have not approached him. It may well be that all of the other things the honourable member has heard about are also as tenuous as that.

Mr ASHENDEN: I ask the member for Hartley again: will he please obtain the information that I seek?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: This is I am sure a dynamic question! The honourable member has persisted with it now for about 10 minutes, but the Premier is not present.

Mr Mathwin: You know the answers.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I usually do and I am pleased you recognise that.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: If I am able to clear up the matter for the member for Todd, I will do so. The Premier is not present; he is attending a lunch with some important people, not about the casino. In my conversations with him over the past few days I have not been informed that he

has any intention of going overseas in the next fortnight or month about a casino project, or for any other purpose.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I thank the Deputy Premier for his reply. I hope he will make a real attempt to get that information for the member for Todd, and I suggest that if members on the Government side were to show the same consideration in answering questions from this side, from people who are only trying to elicit information, then we would be a lot further ahead than we are at present.

Mr LEWIS: It is now clear to me, on reflection, after having heard the member for Hartley's remarks and those of other people on this question, that we are now contemplating a Bill that would make it possible for the Government to use taxpayers' money to construct a building in which the casino is to be licensed, in spite of that fact that there is an enormous need for welfare housing in the community. There is no other place in this Bill in which we can address that prospect, and there is no other way that we can prevent that happening unless we defeat this clause.

The CHAIRMAN: The question before the Chair is that clause 16 stand as printed.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (25)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs Arnold, Baker, Crafter, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom (teller), Gunn, Hamilton, Hoggood, Keneally, Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Rodda, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, Wilson, and Wright.

Noes (16)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Lewis (teller), Mathwin, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, and Wotton.

Majority of 9 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

New clause 16a—'Gambling chips not be sold on credit.'

Mr GUNN: I move to insert the following new clause:

16a. Where a person (other than the person who is operating the casino) purchases gambling chips to use in an authorised game, he must, before the chips are delivered to him, pay for them in full by bank-note or coin.

This amendment is clear and straightforward, and is designed to prevent people from purchasing or having credit facilities in the casino. I believe that it improves the Bill, is appropriate, and I commend it to honourable members.

Mr EVANS: I strongly support the amendment. One of the principles that we should establish for the casino is that there should be no credit given for gambling facilities. Cheques are a form of credit, and I have made the point at other times that under English legislation cheques have to be cleared within two clear banking days and cannot be cashed back at the casino.

The gentleman in charge of the gambling board in England made the point that it would be better if there were no opportunity to use cheques, because there were difficulties with people overdrawing and taking a gamble that they might be able to recoup enough to pay for what they had lost earlier. The T.A.B. has a credit arrangement with some people, and the bookmakers probably do. When a Government is making a law to allow for a privately operated gambling facility such as a casino, there should be a restriction on the credit available.

Mr GROOM: I support the amendment, as it goes a long way to answering many objections made by some members in relation to protecting certain persons, albeit a small minority of the population, from gambling excesses and presenting cheques when funds are not available in their cheque account.

New clause inserted.

Clause 17—'Provision as to age.'

The CHAIRMAN: I intend to deal with the amendments on file as before, in order of priority. The member for Fisher.

Mr EVANS: I have withdrawn all of my proposed amendments.

The CHAIRMAN: The other amendment has been proposed by the member for Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: I move:

Page 6, lines 28 to 30—Leave out subclause (4) and insert the following new subclause:

(4) Where a person under the age of eighteen years enters the licensed casino in contravention of this section the person who is operating the casino shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding twenty thousand dollars and the person who enters the casino shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding ten thousand dollars.

At present under clause 17, there is no penalty for the person who operates the licence for allowing under-age gambling. The entire liability and responsibility is left with the person. There is no requirement whatsoever in the Act and no sanction to require the operator of the licence to keep out people who are not old enough to be there or who have otherwise been given directions that they must not enter the casino for whatever reasons. I believe that that is a mistake. Accordingly, I have moved the amendment to have penalties included that are consistent with other penalties elsewhere in the Bill. In this case it is far more serious than simply selling alcohol or showing movies to under-age children.

Mr GROOM: I oppose the amendment. The proposed new subclause (4) is really a massive intrusion in common law, as understood in the British system of justice. Under the proposed subclause (4) an operator of a casino becomes guilty of an offence simply if a person under the age of 18 years enters that casino, even if that is completely unknown to the operator. There seems to be no longer an intent to commit an offence, but it becomes a strict liability. On the mere physical act of an under-age person entering a casino, the casino operator commits an offence without knowledge. That is a substantial intrusion into the British common law system.

Clause 17 provides that it is an offence for a person under the age of 18 years to enter the casino, because that person knows he is under 18 years and thereby commits an offence if he wilfully does it. If such a person continues to enter the casino, then the ultimate sanction for the casino licence operator is cancellation, suspension, or complete revocation of his licence.

The member for Mallee wants to make sure (and I think that he is quite genuine about it) that minors are not permitted to enter a casino. The Police Force does an excellent job of policing legislation, and I have no doubt that it will make adequate checks and police this legislation strictly. If this matter is brought to the casino operator's attention then he must act in accordance with the police direction. Of course, at that stage, he has knowledge that a person under the age of 18 is on the premises.

That must answer the objection of the member for Mallee. The mere physical act of entry should not be sufficient to impose a strict liability burden on the operator without knowledge. Subclauses (5) and (6) are consequential, and a clause in the Bill states that any offences under this Act are dealt with summarily. The Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act provides power to impose bonds and other alternative penalties in relation to minors.

Mr MEIER: The amendment deserves credit, but I take the point made by the member for Hartley that it is perhaps a little severe where it deals with a person under the age of 18 years entering a licensed casino. It may be a better suggestion if the member for Mallee moved 'where a person

under the age of 18 years is admitted to . . . I have used those words, because they are used in clause 17.

It seems to differentiate between a person entering and a person admitted. It is clearly allowing the operator of the casino that chance to ask a person whether he or she is under the age of 18 years. I feel that this clause has relevance, although I do not know that I would be personally supporting it because I am against the Bill as a whole. It has relevance because, in the hotel industry and certainly in the theatre industry, I question whether there are enough safeguards at present to limit 18-year-olds entering. In fact, I would ask the member for Hartley (however, he might not have this answer), what are the penalties for hotel keepers or managers. I appreciate that he may not have that answer. I also ask what are the fines in relation to operators of theatres or similar movie places. That brings me to the latter part of subclause (4), which states:

. . . the person who enters the casino shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding ten thousand dollars. My first impression is that it seems to be a very high figure, although I fully agree that there should be some sort of fine or some clause making sure that the authority or the person overseeing the casino has a fair pressure on him or her to see that 18-year-olds do not enter. I envisage a real problem in getting someone to administer a casino if there is that possibility of a fine of \$10 000 over their head if they happened to do the wrong thing by letting someone who was under the age of 18 through.

Nevertheless, with that proviso, I see a lot of sense in this amendment otherwise. I think that it is a pity that clause 17 does not contain a provision to cover this possibility of allowing people to become more and more lax in the operation of the casino, in other words, allowing people to get in after some months or years simply because the person acting for the authority is not doing his or her duty properly.

Mr GROOM: The penalty under the amendment proposed by the member for Mallee is \$20 000, not \$10 000. Under clause 17, the fact is that the penalty is imposed on the minor and the minor commits the offence. Of course, the amendment proposed by the member for Mallee places the offence without knowledge on the part of the licensed operator. Of course, if the licensed operator knew that the person was under the age of 18 years, the operator would be an aider and abetter. He would commit the principal offence himself and he would be liable to similar penalties. Therefore, there is a very tight sanction and very stringent controls. I draw the honourable member's attention to clause 20, which states:

The Superintendent is responsible to the Authority to ensure that the operations of the licensed casino are subject to constant scrutiny.

I also refer to clause 21 ('Power of inspection') which states:

An authorised person—

which can be a police officer—

may at any time enter and remain on the premises . . .

Therefore, if the honourable member links up all those clauses, he will see that the Bill, as drafted, has the same provisions as the Bill introduced by the member for Torrens in the last session. The amendments that he moved are in the same terms. They are very stringent, consistent with the common law and they provide adequate protection.

Mr MATHWIN: For once I agree to a certain extent with the member for Hartley. The way that I read clause 17 (1), the onus is on the casino people. Subclause (4) puts the onus on the juvenile. That is the way that I understand clause 17. I think that one has it both ways.

Members interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: I am getting two lots of advice. That is all right: you have both got your own opinions. I support

and, to a certain extent, I understand the principle in the amendment proposed by the member for Mallee. However, I think that there needs to be something extra in it. Indeed, I could not support the penalty of \$20 000 that is set down because that relates to the casino people. I think that the maximum penalty in relation to juveniles is \$10 000 and, to me, that is unrealistic. It would be impossible for a juvenile to get anywhere near that and, therefore, it would mean imprisonment. The thing that stops me supporting the honourable member's amendment is that figure, particularly the maximum of \$10 000.

Mr PETERSON: The matter of the entry of juveniles into a casino was covered by the select committee and a clause was written in on page 89. It was suggested by the Superintendent of Licensed Premises that the Bill at that stage could contain a requirement that any young person must produce a driver's licence or proof of date of birth, and a young person must sign a declaration stating that he or she is not under the age of 18 years. There are comments in the report in relation to the concern that the member for Glenelg mentioned earlier in the debate. He has always been concerned about the entry of juveniles and I respect him for that. However, the question I wish to raise with the member for Hartley is this: is it possible, under regulations, to enforce this type of requirement on juveniles, or does it need to be in the Bill?

Mr GROOM: Under clause 17 (2), the honourable member will see that the authority shall determine procedures to be observed in order to ensure against admission of persons to the casino in contravention of subsection (1). That takes up the point made by the select committee. Therefore, the authority will impose the correct procedures. The authority may require people to produce their birth certificates at the door, for example, but that would be up to the authority to determine. It is in mandatory terms: the authority must determine procedures; it is not discretionary. The clause states that the authority shall determine the procedures, so procedures must be imposed upon the casino licence holder with regard to the entry of persons.

Mr EVANS: I take it that I am allowed to talk on the clause generally at this point, or am I to talk only specifically to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: Now that the member for Fisher has raised the matter, I point out that the Chair has endeavoured to deal with the amendments as they come before the Chair, because there are so many amendments. This does not prevent the honourable member from debating the clause except that, in the past, the Chair has endeavoured to wait until the amendments were dealt with. However, there is nothing to stop the member for Fisher.

Mr EVANS: I will take the opportunity of recording the views I have on clause 17 so that, at least, the authority may in the future, if it becomes operative, take the opportunity of looking at those views. I started being concerned about the under-age aspect before the member for Glenelg started talking about identity cards or photographs on drivers' licences. The member for Hartley referred to the production of birth certificates or driving licences being perhaps one of the conditions that the authority might prescribe as being necessary for a casino operator to ask for to determine proof of identity.

One of the great difficulties we have is that in this country we do not have photographs on drivers' licences. I understand that New South Wales is looking at it at the moment. Therefore, a driver's licence means nothing because a person over the age of 18 can pass his driver's licence to a person under the age of 18. That person can produce the driver's licence and that already happens in licensed premises. That person can say, 'This is my driver's licence,' and it is

difficult to prove unless the police or somebody is approached and an actual challenge is made in that way.

The same applies to a birth certificate. A birth certificate means nothing as far as producing it to prove one's identity on the spur of the moment. If there is a further investigation, it is a similar procedure.

For many years I have been an advocate for identity cards so that people can be identified and their ages proven easily. My concern is, as it was in 1969 and 1970 in relation to the Licensing Act, that it is very difficult to assess the age of a person, particularly a young woman between 16 and 20 years who is dressed in a more mature way than her actual age would normally demand. The reverse is often the case with young men. The other difficulty inherent in this is that young men usually fraternise with a female person about two years younger than themselves. That means that if a male aged 18 years is admitted to a casino his female friend could very likely be under that age. I know penalties are contained within this clause but I believe the authority would have to work extremely hard to ensure that people under the age of 18 do not enter a casino.

It is believed that tens of thousands of young people enter licensed premises illegally every year. We have no way of stopping that because there is no method of proving accurately an identity or a person's age. I know the member for Hartley and most members are of the view that no-one under the age of 18 should enter a gambling facility. I hope that if and when a casino is operating steps are taken to make it difficult for people under the age of 18 years to enter. I do not support this amendment of the member for Mallee because I do not really think it covers the point I am trying to cover. I do not necessarily support any part of the Bill but I do not object to clause 17 as it stands because I believe the penalties are appropriate.

Mr LEWIS: It occurs to me that but for a few members the majority of the House really does not care whether people under 18 go into a casino or not. They are treating it pretty much in their attitude to it as is presently the case in relation to the non-observance of the drinking in hotels of minors. I find that attitude appalling. The apathy and the indifference leaves me cold. I do not understand how honourable members can ignore the importance of precluding people who do not have the adjudged capacity to make that kind of judgment about whether they should be gambling or not, who will be there, if they are there at all, gambling with money they have not earned themselves. There will be no liability of any substantial nature accruing to the person who operates the licence and the end result will be that the first day the licence is granted everything will be bright and shiny and according to the law, but 15 years later it will be Rafferty's rules and the licence operator will be grateful for every patron he can get and will turn a blind eye to the whole thing and encourage anyone else who might be in a position to prevent that from happening to do likewise. I regret that. I will not be calling on the House to divide if no other member does. I will take it that they do not view the matter as seriously as I do.

Mr RODDA: The honourable member's last remark made me rise from my seat. He said that he believes no-one cares. That is not a very nice thing to say because I join the member, who is my electoral neighbour, and I deprecate those remarks. As a member of the select committee I went through casinos with a fine tooth comb and I want to assure the honourable member that casinos employ many security people.

The member for Fisher made a point about the difficulties in telling the age of young women who are often dressed beyond their years. If this amendment is passed there will be a heavy penalty on the proprietor of a casino who has unknowingly allowed minors to enter the premises. I think

the honourable member seriously tries to cover all those points but he will put a lot of people into a straightjacket. Every member of that select committee was concerned about the identification of young people entering casinos illegally. I can assure the honourable member that the casinos we visited had plenty of security men whose job it is to make sure that young people do not enter the premises.

Amendment negatived.

Mr MATHWIN: I desire to ask the member for Hartley how he intends to have this matter policed. Subclauses (1) and (4) provide:

(1) No person under the age of 18 years shall be admitted to the licensed casino.

(4) A person under the age of 18 years who enters the licensed casino shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding five hundred dollars.

How is this to be policed? The honourable member will know the situation that pertains in relation to minors entering hotels and cinemas showing R-rated films. He would know, as the member for Fisher pointed out, that it is very difficult to tell the age of girls between the ages of 16 and 20. That is a very big problem. The member for Fisher said that the suggestion has been made that these young people would have to show perhaps a driver's licence. That would mean nothing at all because a driver's licence can be given by one person to another person.

There is no way in which this clause can be policed. The member for Hartley said in answer to a question earlier that the police officers do their duty in relation to this matter. Maybe the member for Hartley should have said that they try to do their duty to the best of their ability, because I put it to Parliament that it is impossible to police that situation unless photographs are attached to drivers' licences. In that way there would be proof of identification. There is nothing wrong in doing that, in fact, the majority of countries of the world use identity cards.

The Minister did not reply on this point when summing up on the second reading, so I must ask him again. How will this provision be policed? The position will not be satisfactory for the parents of children or for the people who operate the casino. Will the staff be responsible for keeping young people under 18 years of age out of the casino? At Wrest Point, where we had to go through the casino to get to the entertainment area, Mr Glazbrook, a fellow member of the Select Committee, and I saw three or four girls who were under-age and who had sneaked past the guards. The surveillance cameras did not pick them up either. Even had they been picked up, how could the authorities have proved that they were under-age? The member for Hartley, who is saddled with this Bill, has had a long rough night.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I bring the honourable member back to the debate on the age of potential gamblers.

Mr MATHWIN: Thank you, Mr Chairman, for helping me get back to the clause. My reason for concern is obvious: I am concerned with juvenile problems. Will the member for Hartley say how this provision will be policed and how successful he expects such policing to be?

The CHAIRMAN: I will put the question.

Mr MATHWIN: I did not think that I had put the member for Hartley to sleep. If the honourable member does not know the answer to my question, let him get up and say so and get the information from somewhere. After all, he is in charge of the Bill. Let the honourable member get up and say that he will ask the Minister.

Mr Groom: I've answered your question.

Mr MATHWIN: The honourable member has not answered me at all. Let him give me an answer.

Mr MEIER: Seeing that an answer does not seem to be forthcoming, I take the opportunity to speak to the clause.

I am concerned about the possibility of under-age people using the casino and the problems that this could cause. The policing of this provision will be difficult, as we have seen in the policing of similar provisions in hotels, licensed clubs and cinemas. It is a matter of proper identification. In *Psychology of Gambling*, Harvey Greenberg states:

In most cases compulsive gambling begins in adolescence.

So, we are talking about a person younger than 18 years of age. Greenberg continues:

A preoccupation with gaming often starts in the early teens or even pre-teens. Typically, the beginning teenage compulsive gambler develops a keen interest in and extensive skill at play and often experiences exhilarating big wins that make him feel uniquely special. He evolves a fiercely competitive style in relation of relating to peers. He is highly independent, individualistic, athletic.

The words 'independent, individualistic' show that the casino operators need a specific way of identifying an 18-year-old. If the young person is a real individualist, obtaining a driving licence showing a false age or borrowing a friend's licence will not be difficult. Indeed, it will be something that comes directly to the mind of that person.

Mr Mathwin: He could use his dad's.

Mr MEIER: If he is a master of disguise, that would not be difficult either. This problem involving the teenage compulsive gambler should be considered before a casino is established. Greenberg continues:

He is bright but uninterested scholastically.

A bright person will have sufficient intelligence to work out ways of getting into a casino even if he is younger than 18 years of age. Such youngsters at present work out ways of getting into hotels for drinking, and it will be a much greater problem in respect of a casino.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]

Mr MEIER: Clause 17 refers to people not being admitted to a casino if they are under the age of 18. A person who is a compulsive gambler and who is an adolescent seems to be a highly independent individualistic person. That type of person has been referred to as being defiantly resentful of parental intrusion. It will be difficult to prevent such a person from entering a casino. Clause 17 (3) provides:

The person who is operating the casino on behalf of the commission shall diligently observe and carry out procedures determined by the authority under subsection (2).

It is all very well to say that the person operating the casino was diligently carrying out the procedures, but we can just as well apply it to the parents of the under 18-year-old person. If he is resentful of parental intrusion, if he is defiant of them, he will be able to get around any person who is endeavouring to carry out procedures determined by the casino authority. The parents must play an important part in this and I believe that it will place an added burden on police officers if they have to try to keep these adolescent habitual gamblers out of the casino. A habitual gambler is obviously a clever person. The report states:

Having been raised up in the work ethic, he prematurely undertakes adult responsibilities, contributing to his family's support and spending cash liberally on himself to foster a dynamic, hyper-successful image.

This adolescent compulsive gambler will be capable of producing evidence to show that he is, in theory, over 18 years of age. I have serious reservations about the ability of the authority to police people under 18 years of age who try to enter a casino. The report also states:

Twenty-five per cent of Lesieur's (1977) subjects had tried to make gambling their sole employment; most soon returned to regular jobs. Contrary to the popular image of the compulsive gambler as a callous narcissist, he is usually profoundly committed to family life and, at least, early in his career, struggles valiantly to preserve his family from the inroads of his gambling excesses holding down several jobs and juggling loans and credit card advances secretly.

Clause 17 is dealing with a clever person who will be able easily to deceive the authorities. I believe that Parliament should consider carefully the use of some sort of identification. Much pressure is also placed on the person operating the casino when he has to 'diligently observe and carry out procedures determined by the authority'. If the parents who are normally in charge of those under 18-year-olds cannot curtail their habits, how can the person in charge of the casino prevent those persons from entering and gambling in the casino? I have expressed my grave concern about under 18-year-olds entering a casino, and I hope the member for Hartley will give my comments serious consideration.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Crown Lands Act Amendment,
Statutes Amendment (Irrigation),
Statutes Repeal (Agriculture).

CASINO BILL

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I move:

That further consideration in Committee of the Casino Bill be now resumed.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Mr MATHWIN: I still believe that the member for Hartley has twice refused to answer my questions. He said that he had answered them a little earlier, but all he did was refer members to subclause (2). I asked him, as a person, a lawyer, a person of some authority, a person who introduced this Bill and who is mothering it through all stages, how on earth it is possible for either him, the Minister, the police, people within the casino itself, the security guards, and the authority set up by this Bill, to police this matter in relation to juveniles being admitted into casinos. The honourable member has said that it is up to the authority to sort out this problem. Young people should be forced to produce some form of identification, otherwise it would be impossible to police these provisions.

Clause passed.

Clause 18—'Exclusion of certain persons from casino.'

Mr LEWIS: I move:

Page 6, lines 39 and 40—Leave out subclause (4) and insert the following subclause:

(4) Where a person against whom an order is in force under this section enters the licensed casino in contravention of the order, the person who is operating the casino and the person who enters the casino shall both be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding twenty thousand dollars.

If a person has been banned from attending a casino, the sanctions against that person need to be stiffer than they are. People should be made aware that there is a heavy penalty for this offence.

Mr GROOM: I oppose the amendment, for the same reasons I gave in connection with the honourable member's amendment to clause 17 because it purports to impose upon the holder of the casino an offence when a person indulges in the physical act of entering the licensed casino without knowledge. It is traditional in British common law countries that there are two elements of the offence: the *actus reus* and the *mens reus*. This amendment imposes strict liability, or takes away the aspect of intent or knowledge to commit an offence. It is rare indeed for British common law countries to permit intrusions of this kind, where the intention to commit a crime is taken away.

People should not be penalised or be made guilty of criminal offences when they have no knowledge or no intention to commit criminal offences. The mere act to do something is not sufficient. I can appreciate that the honourable member seeks to tighten up the law on licence holders, but the proper sanction is cancellation, revocation or suspension of licence, and that is the ultimate sanction on the licence holder.

Mr LEWIS: I find that astonishing, especially as it applies to the Road Traffic Act. If somebody was shoved through the door momentarily, we could trust the wisdom of the courts to deal with that situation. Under the terms of this legislation no authorised officer would be so foolish as to press a charge against the licence holder, if the person, who was subject to an order precluding him from entering the casino, was simply shoved through the door.

A conviction could be upheld but not recorded and no sentence given. I cannot understand why the public cannot be made to realise that the Parliament regards the offence seriously if the licensed holder or one of his servants has aided and abetted the entry of someone who has been precluded. I do not understand the difference between having no sanction and ripping the licence off, or having a sanction that enables one to be fined \$20 000.

Mr Groom: One could suspend the licence.

Mr LEWIS: A suspension of the licence is highly unlikely given the amount of public pressure there would be for the casino to remain open and the way in which the Government of the day would respond to that. I do not believe that the member for Hartley is sincere. It is either ripping the licence off or nothing. I believe that there ought to be a penalty other than that, and that is why I have made the penalty stiffer for the person who contravenes the order to which he is subject, and have included a penalty also not exceeding \$20 000 for the person who is operating the licence. I believe that it is a reasonable proposition.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 19—'Accounts and Audit.'

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Mallee has two amendments before the Chair: does he wish to move them separately?

Mr LEWIS: With the indulgence of the House, I move:

Page 7, lines 24 and 25—Leave out subclause (5) and insert the following subclause:

(5) The person operating the casino shall pay not less than fifty per centum of the net gambling revenue of the casino to the Commission.

I separate this from the amendments to include new subclause (6a), (6b) and (6c), only in the context of getting the opinion of the members on each amendment. I believe that to discuss both amendments will enable members to express independently opinions about each of those propositions. From the casual conversations I have had, they have varying degrees of support: some will not pass, but others may.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair wants some clarification from the member for Mallee, because I am interpreting that the honourable member has at least four amendments before the Chair and that he wishes to deal with each one separately. Is that the situation?

Mr LEWIS: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has moved the amendment to subclause (5)?

Mr LEWIS: Yes.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Are we allowed to discuss all of the amendments, or are they to be put separately?

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair finds itself again in a rather difficult situation in that members have the right to speak three times to an amendment or to a clause. I suggest to the honourable member for Torrens that we are dealing

with the first amendment, but that would not deprive him from canvassing the others.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I oppose new subclause (5); I support subclauses (6a) and (6b); and oppose subclause (6c). New subclauses (6a) and (6b) do little harm and, in fact, improve the legislation. One admission in the select committee's report was the paucity of information relating to the social effects of gambling. Indeed, the member for Coles in the previous casino debate made that the cornerstone of her speech. I believe that the accruing of 1 per cent of this net gambling revenue to an institution for the purpose of research into the effects of gambling and the operations of the casino on the community would be a great advantage. However, I believe that there needs to be a tidying up, because, if those two amendments are passed, I will not support (6c), in which case there would need to be something written in lieu of (6c) to deal with the distribution of the rest of the net gambling revenue.

Mr GROOM: Am I permitted to deal with the amendment to subclause (5) and comment on those to subclause (6)?

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair has already ruled on that situation, but I make quite clear that there are four amendments.

Mr GROOM: I oppose the amendment to subclause (5), because it is an unreasonable and unworkable fetter to impose on the licence holder at this stage without proper investigation as to the viability of any project.

In relation to the amendment to subclause (6), I believe that the Government of the day will act responsibly concerning the distribution of revenue received from any casino operation. I believe that those matters can properly be aired at a public inquiry and be the subject of subsequent consultation, not only as a result of airings at the inquiry but also because the Governor, acting on the advice of the responsible Minister, can impose additional terms on the licence holders as well as on the authority. The situation may arise in which should this legislation pass, a major developer would need to be attracted to South Australia and I really think that that condition is imposing too much at this time without proper consultation and discussion.

I certainly oppose paragraph (c). As for paragraphs (a) and (b), I just do not think that those fetters should be imposed at this time. They may well be, but any person can make submissions before a public inquiry and, indeed, make representations in this House by way of motion as to what the Government should do. However, I do not believe that the Government of the day (whichever complexion that is) will act irresponsibly in relation to the distribution of the proceeds. I do not think that the Government should be fettered at this stage, particularly with a new piece of legislation.

With the passage of time and, if this Bill passes, with the establishment of a complex, there may need to be appropriate amendments in line with what the member for Torrens is suggesting. I commend him and the member for Mallee for their sentiments, which are in line with my own. However, I do not think that those restraints should be imposed at this time. I think that, if the legislation is to pass, the operation of a casino should be given some time to enable the actual revenue that may come from it to be gauged.

Mr RODDA: I want to lend my support to the member for Torrens, because we were quite strong in the report that there should be some subvention from the proceeds of the casino to a faculty in the universities to look at the question of the compulsive gambler. We were not that cold hearted that we were not mindful of it. However, as mentioned by the member for Torrens, as the amendment is drawn it cuts across, rather than circles, such an intention. The select committee was mindful that there should be provision to

take account of some of the things that concern the community in this regard.

Mr LEWIS: I am very disappointed that the member for Hartley cannot see what real merit there is in the overall proposition or, at least, in subclause (6) paragraphs (a) and (b) as they stand. Clause 19 (5) provides:

The commission shall pay into the Hospitals Fund all sums paid to it in respect of the operation of the casino.

That subclause is about who gets what, and I am disappointed in it, because it does what the member for Hartley has just said he did not want it to do. Further, it does a very dishonest thing in that it sugar-coats, as it were, the gambling tax in order to satisfy the simple minds of members of the public. It has been an old trick in this Parliament for over a decade to try to convince the public that money is going to the Hospitals Fund, and that is a lot of nonsense. We all know that the money paid in from these taxes imposed on gambling including betting on T.A.B., and so on, does not really make any difference to the level of money in the Hospitals Fund. If the tax level goes up, the general revenue contribution from Treasury goes down by exactly the same amount, and the water level in the bucket stays the same.

If we were to be completely honest about it, the member for Hartley should simply have said that it goes into general revenue. Be frank: let the people of South Australia know that we have given up that sort of politics, for goodness sake. It is not on. That is my first objection to subclause (5) as it stands. My second objection is that it does not specify what, if any, funds derived as gambling tax can be allocated to those two areas about which members of this place have expressed most concern. We know that there will be regrettable social consequences. There will be destitute families: that is a certainty. We just do not know how many families will suffer that misery or how many people not presently compulsive gamblers will become compulsive gamblers and lose their entire life savings and assets as a result of gambling at the casino.

We know for a fact that people will compulsively squander their money in a manner beyond their control (as admitted in evidence by Gamblers Anonymous members themselves and testified to in the Select Committee Report), yet we make no provision for that in this Bill. I think that that is regrettable. Therefore, I am keen to ensure that at least a fixed amount of the net gambling revenue goes towards providing additional facilities through that dedicated fund, the Housing Improvement Fund, where the water level in the bucket will go up because the amount coming from other sources (whatever the arrangements are between the State and Federal Government for housing finance) will stay the same. In that way, we will be caring for those people who may be members of the family of a compulsive gambler who has gone down the tube and who, therefore, through no fault of their own, fall on hard times.

Secondly, the important thing about paragraph (b) is that the select committee found in the course of its investigations (as members on both sides of this House have acknowledged in their contributions both on this occasion and in the previous Parliament) that there were these unfortunate sociological consequences from gambling in general and casinos in particular. Nobody anywhere in the world has set about doing an in-depth ongoing study of this problem or tried to address it effectively. It is all very well for those of us who have an inclination to gamble to be able to do so. I acknowledge that a number of forms and codes of legalised gambling are presently possible and that, accordingly, most people quite clearly take their measure for whatever reasons (entertainment, or the like) without any ill effects.

However, there are those few who cannot cope and, when they fall on hard times, we do not know where they go. They feel ashamed, as do members of their families. They

have lost everything, and there is absolutely no way that we could find out what tragedy has been suffered. Welfare agencies do not have resources to analyse their case studies sufficiently and develop meaningful statistics from which we can draw conclusions. Nor can welfare studies, therefore, give us an objective view on how gambling has adversely affected certain members of the community. I am not only concerned for those people in the community who become compulsive gamblers: I am more particularly concerned for those families of compulsive gamblers who suffer through no fault of their own.

We heard the testimony presented to the select committee which the member for Glenelg read out during the course of his contribution to the second reading debate last night.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Especially that from Dr Fereday.

Mr LEWIS: In the first instance I was referring to the evidence given in Tasmania by members of Gamblers Anonymous (Garth and Mr Stone). The evidence from Dr Fereday also supported their view. How on earth could we, as a Parliament, knowing and acknowledging that these things are happening, ignore the fact that they will continue to happen, and at a greater rate, if we are to believe the psychological research that was presented by Dr Blaszczynski from Queensland and the psychological research that has been done in the United States and in Scandinavia? Knowing that there are people predisposed to becoming compulsive gamblers, but doing nothing about it, in all conscience is just not a moral way to proceed. I would regret it very much if the Parliament on this occasion cannot find sufficient compassion and flexibility in considering these clauses to at least attempt to make some effort towards desirable goals. What will the public think of our regard for their welfare?

Let me also say that paragraph (c) of proposed clause 19 (6) should be considered an important provision. Last night I went to great trouble to incorporate statistical tables, which were the result of hours and hours of effort and research so that we do have bench-marks against which we can begin to measure the effects of this new form of gambling on the existing codes, the existing sports and leisure time activities. The gambling revenue for each of the racing codes, whether it be harness racing, gallopers, the dogs, X-Lotto or the T.A.B., and the on-course totalizator all interact with each other, and the greater number of participants competing in the market place for the gambling dollar automatically means that the revenue to each is less; although the total amount spent on gambling may increase slightly, it will not be sufficient to sustain the same level in each.

I am not saying that I support gambling; I am not advocating that we should encourage it. I am merely pointing out that it has been drawn to the attention of this House that the existing organisations are dependent for some of their revenue at least (if not all of it) on one or other form of gambling. Pleas have been made in the evidence given to the select committee, as well as to us as individuals during the time when the previous Bill was before Parliament, to have regard to that effect when considering whether or not we will allow a licensed casino in South Australia.

If we license a casino in South Australia by passing the Bill, unless this provision of this proposed amendment is contained within it we would be ignoring the genuine concern that has been expressed. In this provision I have also sought to take into account the effect that the increased dollars spent in leisure gambling activities will have in reducing the amount of money not only for other forms of gambling but also the amount of money that will go to other clubs and leisure activity organisations which are in no way associated with gambling in their activities. I am referring to things like amateur football, tennis, water-skiing, basketball and marching girls—I could go on for hours. I am sure that

honourable members know the types of organisations that I am referring to. They will lose revenue, because within the total community there are only so many dollars to go around.

How unfortunate it will be if we deny those organisations any access to the tax revenue that could be and may be derived in the event that we license a casino and thereby destroy their capacity to provide good, healthy, desirable physical activities which in my judgment are far more appropriate for people to be engaged in than sitting around a table gambling. However, if this is the wont of honourable members and the measure passes, those organisations will suffer. We know that they will suffer because they have told us so, and we have acknowledged that. We should be doing something about the matter. I ask the House to give earnest and compassionate consideration to the measures that I am proposing in my amendments to clause 19.

Mr PETERSON: In regard to the amendments, the accusation has been made before in regard to the previous Bill that certain clauses were inserted to make it more palatable and more attractive to people. I think the amendments before the Committee would come within that ambit. I have no objection to revenue being paid to the Housing Improvement Fund, which would be a reasonable application, although I do not know the relationship between gambling and that fund. There does not seem to be any link at all, although similarly there does seem to be a link between gambling and the hospitals. However, such matters, as have been suggested by speakers at different times, could simply be a palliative, a way to make it more attractive. I have no objection to the proposals contained in paragraph (b). That paragraph really links the matter to one form of gambling. In regard to the findings of the select committee (page 102 of the findings and recommendations in the report), one notes that the investigation of the effects of gambling was not into any one particular form of gambling. As has been pointed out, people affected by casino gambling (and I refer particularly to the investigations I have read) have often been involved with other forms of gambling previously. Very few become addicted simply by casino gambling, as such. The majority of such people become compulsive gamblers before they discover, if you like, casino gambling.

Moreover, many people in our community may be hooked on gambling on horse racing, trotting, or bingo, which are all forms of gambling which all have their addicts. In regard to Instant Money, I have never walked up to a counter without having to wait in a queue before obtaining a ticket. I point out, however, that gambling is not one of my sins or vices: I have an occasional flutter, but it is not something that I have much to do with. Having regard to, say, the numbers of people who buy Instant Money tickets, obviously there are many people who like to gamble that way.

If we take the provisions in paragraph (b) as they stand, one would be ignoring all the concern that has been expressed in regard to compulsive gamblers. We must show some compassion for them. However, members tend to be saying that we should forget about the people who are losing thousands of dollars a week on other forms of gambling.

Restricting the legislation purely to the casino is far too selective. The select committee found that gambling, as such (not just casino gambling), creates a problem. To isolate casino gambling means that other forms of gambling are ignored, and that is how this provision is worded. Surely, if there is a problem with gambling, the effects of gambling across the spectrum must be investigated. The Tasmanian committee of inquiry found that way, as did our own select committee.

If we are genuine about our concern for the gambler, all aspects of gambling must be examined. This amendment means that we forget about the punters on the gallopers,

trots, and dogs and also about those who gamble on the lottery. Why is no investigation into the effects of gambling in our community proceeding at present? The previous Government did nothing about it, and there is no sign of such an inquiry being initiated by the present Government.

I do not accept what the member for Mallee said about paragraph (c) in his amendment, because I believe that this is merely a palliative to throw a few dollars to sporting bodies. All that this provision would do would be to reduce the grants now being received by those bodies that benefit from the provision. Members must bear in mind that casinos can fail financially. Indeed, on a visit to Las Vegas I saw one casino that had closed down: apparently it had failed. I believe that paragraph (c) is regressive and merely a white-wash. I agree with the reference to the Housing Improvement Fund, although I see no relationship between that fund and casino gambling.

Mr LEWIS: I apologise to the member for Semaphore and other members for the fact that apparently the words 'gambling and' do not appear in copies of my amendment. Paragraph (b) provides that an investigation should be carried out into the effect of gambling and the operation of the casino on the community. That wording includes all forms of gambling.

The CHAIRMAN: It is correct that the honourable member for Mallee inserted those words in the amendment but, unfortunately, because of the constraints of time they were not included in the typed copy of his amendment.

Mr LEWIS: I see a connection between the operation of a casino and amateur sport, and I believe that the member for Semaphore acknowledged that. However, I think he is mistaken about the Housing Improvement Fund, the Recreation and Sporting Fund, and the South Australian Association of Regional Tourist Organisations: all three funds are dedicated funds and different from the Hospitals Fund. It is not a matter of part-filling the bucket with what you have from one source and topping it up from another source such as general revenue as is the case with the Hospitals Fund. In this instance the Parliament would vote the sum that would go to those funds from general revenue and whatever came from fixed contribution from the casino gambling tax would be in addition to that. It would not be topped up to a general level.

An honourable member: But it must affect it.

Mr LEWIS: It is a subjective opinion which has been explained to me by wiser and more experienced people that that would not be so and I went to some pains to determine that at the time. I simply want to make the point that I am concerned about ensuring that funds are made available to the South Australian Association of Regional Tourism Organisations from some source or other to a far greater extent than is presently possible.

I believe that any revenue derived from a gambling tax ought to go in some part towards that organisation. As regards tourism, to my certain knowledge in a regression analysis of statistics of the money that has been spent on the promotion of tourism in Tasmania, the casino at Wrest Point had a null effect on the increase in the number of tourists going to Tasmania. That null hypothesis cannot be proved on the figures available. In fact they prove the contrary. Given the numbers of dollars spent and the response to those dollars and making comparisons with the same number of dollars spent in neighbouring mainland States and the effect which those dollars have generated, the standard deviation is well within the limits of acceptability to determine the probability of that event occurring. I am sorry for that mumbo jumbo, but that is a short explanation of the way we can ensure that statistics do not lie.

I want to stress the point that the general revenue allocations if nothing else must be increased for tourism development if we are to get more people in beds and bums in seats here in South Australia to enjoy the benefits we have here and because it is said that the casino can help in that regard; in the event of the Bill passing, let us make sure it does.

Now I am happy to say that during the course of the remarks of the member for Semaphore it was possible for me in a flurry of consultation with other parties in this Chamber vitally interested in this measure to arrive at some consensus and thereby to save some time and some difficulty in the course of resolving what might happen to subclauses (5) and (6). If, as, and when they return to the Chamber, I will be pleased to withdraw the existing amendments in my name and place those new subclauses in their stead. In the meantime I will allow any other member to make a contribution.

Mr MATHWIN: I would like to take this opportunity of expressing my appreciation to the member for Hartley for helping us reach some agreement in this matter so that there will be a provision for an allocation of funds to the inquiry into gambling. This is a private members' Bill and I realise the member for Hartley is doing a magnificent job, even though he must be getting tired.

We are bringing in something new and we have an opportunity to do what has been suggested by other States. Every State Government we visited as a committee suggested that there ought to be a national gathering of statistics on gambling. The Northern Territory Government said that, if there could not be a national inquiry, each State should get on with the job and start compiling statistics which are so important to any investigation into gambling. It is no use trying to hold any inquiry into anything at all without statistics. Some people, particularly some departments, believe that they are threatened if statistics are made available to inquiries. They believe that the statistics could reflect badly on them but it is not a reflection at all. It is giving the message that perhaps they are on the wrong track and they should try in another way to solve the problem that is being investigated. The gathering of statistics is of paramount importance, as was said by the member for Mallee in relation to some of the information gleaned by the committee. The committee received much information from Gamblers Anonymous in Tasmania. I read to the House part of the evidence given by witness Garth which I think touched the hearts and shocked every member of the committee in relation to that person's particular problems as a compulsive gambler and how it had wrecked not only his own life but the lives of his wife and family. He said that he would be in debt until he died. We had evidence to the effect that some people were so deeply involved in gambling that they had to raise 27 loans in an attempt to solve their financial problems. That seems ridiculous to us, but that is what we were told.

We must try to do something about this problem and tackle it in some new and better way. There is no doubt that this Bill will pass but in passing it I believe we will create another problem for some people. We have an opportunity to do something about it and I am glad that the member for Hartley who is handling the Bill has accepted the fact that some funds can be put aside so that we can tackle this particular problem. As I have said before, in the 13 years I have been in this place we have never had such an opportunity to tackle a problem at its beginning. We will have a casino and it is quite possible that that will cause a problem. If there is a problem it will cause a drain on the finances of the State. One of the main concerns of the National Council of Women was that the problem it could cause could take away finance from other areas of welfare

because only a certain amount of money is available for the department to share around.

Those women felt that, by creating a further problem of need, more money would have to be provided, more finance would have to be found, which would have to be taken away from somewhere else, either welfare, hospitals or education. As a Parliament we need to take all of these matters into consideration. As much as I am against the Bill, we are now at the stage of passing the Bill and we must try to get the best Bill possible. The member for Hartley has been good enough to see the point and is going to agree to some amendments to it.

Mr LEWIS: I seek leave to withdraw the amendment standing in my name and in its place to insert the shorter amendment which is being circulated. I am delighted that we can include in the Bill sufficient provision to ensure that at least 1 per cent will go to the Housing Improvement Fund, and that, for all time under section (b) of new subclause (5), we will do away with this semantic chicanery in Acts of Parliament where we think there is some odium attaching to the operation of the mechanism for collecting taxation by saying to the community as though they were gnomes and dills, 'We will put it in the Hospitals Fund' when it is really going into the general revenue. I welcome any statement from the member for Hartley which would confirm that.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Mallee is seeking leave to withdraw his amendment.

Mr GROOM: On a point of order, the honourable member is withdrawing the amendment standing in his name to subclauses (5) and (6) and substituting the new subclause (5).

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. The Chair is recognising the fact that the honourable member must seek leave to withdraw. Is leave granted?

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

Mr LEWIS: I move:

Page 7, lines 24 and 25—Leave out subclause (5) and insert the following subclause:

(5) The commission shall pay moneys paid to it in respect of the operation of the casino as follows:

- (a) an amount that is not less than one per centum of the net gambling revenue of the casino must be paid to the Housing Improvement Fund;
- (b) the balance of those moneys, if any, must be paid into General Revenue.

Mr GROOM: I support the honourable member for Mallee's new amendment. I am indebted to the honourable member for Mallee for his persuasive argument in relation to that matter. I am advised by the Premier that, if the legislation passes, the Government will give, via the Premier, an undertaking that appropriate sums will be expended on research into the effects of gambling on the community. The reason that undertaking is given in that form is quite simply that 6b in its old form would have had the capacity for research into the operation of the casino to gradually increase and magnify over a period of time far out of proportion to grants for other research matters and everybody will agree there are worthy research projects such as infanticide, alcoholism and other medical problems in the community which would warrant Government expenditure and this one must not be out of keeping with these other matters.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 20 to 22 passed.

Clause 23—'Annual report.'

Mr LEWIS: I move:

Page 8—After line 30, insert word and paragraph as follows:

- and
- (c) a statement of all allowances and expenses paid to members of the authority pursuant to this Act.

Line 32—

After 'Parliament' insert 'within nine sitting days after it is presented to him'.

The clause does not include an audited report on the authority itself, since the authority is not operating the casino. My understanding is at variance with the view and interpretation expressed by the member for Hartley. I cannot see how, as it presently stands, it is possible to interpolate that the authority itself is also included in that audit provision. I believe it should be. I would want to know what allowances are paid to the members of the authority on a year-by-year basis, and I would want to be satisfied that the Auditor-General believes that the books of the authority, and a statement of what it has obtained for its members by way of allowances, are properly accounted for and it is public knowledge. Then justice is not only done but it is seen to be done by all members of the general public, and members of the authority are not above and beyond the scrutiny of both the Auditor-General and the public.

It is unfortunate that I do not have the same understanding or it would be a matter which could be easily and quickly resolved by the Committee. If the Committee believes that my interpretation is incorrect and that the interpretation of clause 23 is other than I believe it, then so be it. I believe that I will test the Committee and if any members are as concerned as I am, I will leave it to them to call a division.

Mr GROOM: Once again, I do appreciate the honourable member's concern but I really think that it is already catered for in the existing clause 23 because one has to bear in mind that these clauses are all interlocked, they work together and are not isolated segments. Quite clearly, the authority is going to want to know, and when one asks for a report of the operation of the licensed casino it means exactly what it says: the whole of the operation and that must encompass the financial operation.

I think that the honourable member's concern is safeguarded by subclause (2) in that a report under this section must include copies of the audited accounts prepared and audited under this Act in respect to the relevant financial year. An 'audited account' means just what it says; it must contain the items of expenditure and revenue. So a statement of allowances and expenses is intrinsically contained in 'audited accounts'.

I know that the honourable member can (if the legislation is passed) in years to come if he is not satisfied promptly question the Ministers in relation to any defects. At this stage, what the honourable member is seeking to do is really a repetition of what is already contained in existing clause 23.

Mr LEWIS: The member for Hartley, in private discussion, has indicated to me that he believes that it would not be possible for the Minister to bring the audited report into the Chamber within three sitting days because of the mechanics of getting it to Cabinet and to Executive Council. I do not understand the necessity to do that. If the Auditor-General has given the report and his imprimatur, I do not really see what possible consequence it can be to Cabinet to approve it or reject it. If it is a formality that with my inexperience I am unfamiliar with, then forgive me and at least allow that nine sitting days would be a fair thing. If the Minister cannot get it passed by Cabinet and Executive Council in that time, then he or she is not doing his or her job.

Mr GROOM: I oppose the insertion of the words to line 32 after 'Parliament' the words 'within nine sitting days after it is presented to him'. I do not really think that it is proper to fetter the Minister with that type of restriction. Subclause (3) is already in mandatory terms. It is a public duty imposed on the Minister which is enforceable by law, or by writ of mandamus, if necessary. I know that the

honourable member would not want to go that far. The clause reads:

The Minister shall cause copies of the reports to be laid before both Houses of Parliament.

If the member does not feel that he is getting a fair go if this legislation is passed then he has got other remedies available to him in this House to illustrate it to all members at that point of time that the Minister of the day is not doing the right thing. I do not think it is proper to fetter a Minister or a Cabinet operating in this century with that restriction.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 24—'Possession of poker machines prohibited.'

Mr PETERSON: This is one clause that really concerns me. From information I have received, there is something like an estimated 3 000 to 5 000 poker machines in our community. There has been approximately 3 000 sold through official outlets in our State—

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: Yes, I have seen one there. It concerns me that there is something like 5 000 poker machines in our community. These poker machines are valued at between \$300 and \$1 500.

I do not like poker machines and I will fight tooth and nail to keep them out of our community because of the problems that they cause. If anyone reads the evidence from the select committee it will be seen that there was an extremely strong case put forward by the Licensed Clubs Association for poker machines. That is by-the-by just now. There are some problems with poker machines at the moment and this legislation does not cover them. One problem is how are we going to police the privately-owned poker machines; secondly, is there going to be some authority that will go out into these areas and seize them; thirdly, is there going to be any compensation for people upon the seizure of their poker machine as these people bought those machines in good faith? These machines are housed in people's lounge rooms, or rumpus rooms, and suddenly if this legislation is introduced the machines will cost them \$20 000. I ask the Minister, how is it intended to police this? Is there going to be a right of seizure of the machine; is there going to be some special right of entry into homes to search for these machines; and what happens to people who have spent many thousands of dollars on them—

Mr Mathwin: Like Auntie Jack, rip their bloody arms off.

Mr PETERSON: They bought these machines in good faith previous to this legislation being passed. Those people now find that through a change in legislation those machines are illegal and they will have to pay \$20 000. Can the member for Hartley give an explanation because there are a lot of people worrying about what is going to happen.

Mr GROOM: One has to be fair dinkum about this legislation. One either prohibits poker machines or one does not, and quite clearly clause 24 is making the possession of poker machines illegal. The reasons behind that are quite obvious. The community is not ready for the use of poker machines and if they are allowed to build up so that there will be thousands in circulation, the obvious consequences will be that the pressure for legislation of poker machines will be there.

What normally happens in situations such as this is that the regulations provide for a moratorium to allow people a proper amount of time (it may be up to six months or even 12 months) to dispose of any poker machines in their possession. That has been done on other occasions where there have been moratoriums announced by the police from time to time.

Mr Peterson: Where do they dispose of them?

Mr GROOM: There is only one State in which you can dispose of them. In 1973 or 1974 I was instrumental in exposing a loophole in our current lottery and gaming laws through my professional practice where the possession of poker machines was found not to be illegal at that point of time. It is the use to which one puts the poker machine that is an illegal use.

One really has to be fair dinkum about this legislation, because the community is not ready for legalising poker machines. The point has come where either they will be prohibited or there will be a gradual encroachment. The honourable member's objection can be overcome by a moratorium which, I am sure, the Government is more than prepared to give.

Mr BAKER: I follow up the point raised by the member for Semaphore. People in the community have poker machines for recreational purposes which have an automatic pay out and I think that guests are quite often refunded the money they put in.

We must make a distinction here. I do not have one so I have no axe to grind. The principle is that it is a form of recreation for some people. Obviously, if a machine is being run for profit, then I do not have any argument with the member's viewpoint on this matter. However, some machines are kept on private premises and are not lethal weapons, such as guns. They are used by the family who bought them in good faith, because the existing law does not prevent them from doing so. It is quite a ludicrous situation that these people should be prosecuted or brought before the courts for something that is outside the realms of this legislation.

We are not referring to machines operated for profit: we are speaking about a recreational facility. Whilst I am totally opposed to the introduction of poker machines in South Australia on a commercial basis, I see no harm or difficulty in respect of any machines used today. I ask the honourable member to insert a provision to make the distinction (which I think is so necessary) between commercial purposes and for purpose of profit.

Clause passed.

New clause 24a—'Certain persons not to gamble.'

Mr LEWIS: I move:

Page 8—After line 37—, insert new clause as follows:

24a. The Minister and a person who is a member or the secretary of the authority or a member of the commission or an authorised person referred to in section 21 shall not gamble at the casino.

Penalty: Twenty thousand dollars.

The effect of this is to simply ensure that the public of South Australia, in the event that the Bill passes and a casino is established, can be reassured that all people charged with some measure of responsibility and integrity in the way in which the casino is established, operated, and controlled, are beyond reproach.

It is the old saying: justice must not only be done but be seen to be done. I believe that at some time in future there is a grave risk of any person referred to in this amendment becoming a compulsive gambler. The probabilities are near enough to indicate that that is highly likely.

That being so, it would be inappropriate for people in positions of authority to hold office in that authority if they were gamblers in the casino whilst holding that office. Accordingly, I and more than 80 per cent of my constituents and probably most South Australians need to be reassured that any casino that may be established will be controlled, administered, and secured by men who themselves are beyond taint, and/or beyond the likelihood and justification for accusations of being tainted.

I urge all members to consider that aspect and support this amendment. It does not impose an unreal, unfair, and

unjust hardship on any person who is an authorised officer working in the casino. I sincerely believe that, if they are competent in their work and dedicated to the cause, they will not be interested in gambling and would not want to gamble.

Mr GROOM: I understand what the member for Mallee is saying, but I think it would be foolish for a person who holds such an official responsibility to, in certain circumstances, gamble at a casino. However, if one imposes this fetter on the Minister, the secretary, a member of the commission, or, indeed, an authorised person, one really gets to the stage where, in other legislation, one should consider banning the Ministers and such other persons from the T.A.B., from buying a lottery ticket, from going to the race track, and so on. I think that this is in something of a separate category.

Honourable members should bear in mind that one needs to distinguish a Minister acting in an official capacity from a Minister acting in a personal and private capacity, and similarly to consider other members of the community. Consequently, I cannot agree to the honourable member's amendments. It is not proper to mix the two capacities in which people run their lives: their personal capacities and their official capacities. However, I am quite mindful of what the honourable member says and, in certain circumstances, it would be quite foolish for any of those persons to indulge in gambling at the casino.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (6)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs D.C. Brown, Evans, Gunn, Lewis (teller), and Mathwin.

Noes (35)—Messrs Abbott and Allison, Mrs Appleby, Messrs P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Bannon, Becker, Blacker, Chapman, Crafter, Eastick, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gregory, Groom (teller), Hamilton, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mayes, Meier, Olsen, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Rodda, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, Wilson, Wotton, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr Oswald. No—Mr Hemmings.

Majority of 29 for the Noes.

New clause thus negatived.

Clause 25 passed.

Clause 26—'Regulations.'

Mr LEWIS: I move:

Page 9, line 3—Leave out 'two' and insert 'twenty'.

I do not see why there should be a difference in the penalties that are to be imposed by a breach of regulations that could be serious, given the way that the Bill is beginning to emerge. I do not see why the penalty relating to those regulations should be any less than for a penalty for owning a piece of junk called a poker machine: the penalty in that instance is \$20 000. The penalty in the next clause but one is a mere \$2 000 for breaches of a kind I would regard as being far more serious. I moved this amendment to draw attention to what I regard as an anomaly in the way in which penalties are provided and sanctions made against people who transgress the law, whether it be by Statute or regulation.

Mr GROOM: I cannot accept the honourable member's amendment. The regulations are for the purposes of making the Act expedient. One is not dealing with prime criminal offences as one is under a parent Act: that is the reason for the distinction. A penalty of \$20 000 would be too burdensome, and few Acts have provisions for that sort of penalty.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

New clause 27—'Expiry of Act.'

Mr LEWIS: I move:

Page 9, after line 5—Insert new clause as follows:

27. This Act shall expire on the thirty-first day of December, 1989.

I believe that, given that there is a probability, or even a possibility, of this Bill passing I have tried to make the legislation more meaningful and more workable so that it more clearly reflects what I believe the community would accept. This new clause provides that a reasonable amount of time would be left for the licence holder, in the hypothetical circumstances to which I have just referred, to get the casino operational and to then provide the raw data, that is, statistics and other related experiences to be used for a debate in this place before December 1989. There would be ample time for us to be able to make a judgment about whether it is desirable to continue with the operation of a casino should one be established in South Australia.

I sincerely believe that it would be remiss of us, given that this legislation is introduced, if we did not provide for the re-examination of the licence at some time before 1989. I say this because when monsters such as these are created without providing a capacity in the legislation for it to self-destruct if it gets out of control, then it in turn will destroy. As legislators we should be responsible as representatives of the people to take up that challenge not irresponsibly or ill-advisedly. Many of the hypothetical questions that have been posed of the kind to which I have referred throughout this debate will have substantial answers provided for them by 1989. I urge all members to consider the implications of not re-examining, in the light of evidence that may be forthcoming, the necessity, desirability, and advisability of continuing the operation, in the hypothetical circumstances that the Bill passes the third reading.

Mr MEIER: I understand what the member for Mallee is trying to achieve. I certainly spoke against the casino in the early part of the debate, and I still hold the same views. However, at the same time I am a realist, and I cannot envisage that this Parliament could do anything if the Act expired and the situation was re-evaluated in 1989, and the decision was reversed. I cite an example of the matter that was raised several weeks ago, when I considered that it was a tragedy that the decision taken in regard to Honeymoon and Beverley was reversed.

Much money had been spent on those projects, but the decision taken meant that the State would not receive the benefits that it had hoped to receive. I am not suggesting here that the casino will bring the State benefits: in fact, I argued earlier that I believed the social problems and issues that would arise from the establishment of a casino in this State would be on the conscience of members who voted in favour of it. We will see what the future holds, but I do not believe that the new clause provides for a realistic option, especially if a private company spends millions of dollars on establishing a casino.

Mr GROOM: I oppose the new clause, which is sunset legislation that would have the effect of subsequently making Parliament embark on another debate in respect of the casino. Which sector of private enterprise would invest millions of dollars in this State if there was a chance of that investment being cut off? Any company would be foolish to do so in those circumstances, because it would risk a collapse after only a few years operation. If private enterprise is to establish a casino, it must be given security of tenure.

Mr GUNN: I have always believed Parliament does not spend enough time examining measures that have operated for some years. Unfortunately, measures are passed and go on the Statute Book, and Parliament does not take the trouble or have the opportunity to scrutinise their operation as it should be scrutinised. This is new legislation that has received the greatest amount of time of any legislation since I became a member more than 13 years ago. There is a good case for this Parliament to have another look at this matter in 5½ years time.

I support the concept of sunset legislation, and I believe that the new clause is reasonable. The member for Hartley said that no-one would be game to invest millions of dollars in a casino if this new clause were inserted in the Bill, but I remind him that we are talking about a total facility encompassing many other aspects besides a casino, which would be only a small part of the total enterprise. His argument is therefore not as valid as he would have us believe. Parliament has a responsibility to check up on the decisions it makes from time to time but, unfortunately, Governments and members generally are loath to reflect from time to time on the actions they have taken.

The Committee divided on the new clause:

Ayes (6)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Blacker, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, and Lewis (teller).

Noes (37)—Messrs Abbott and Allison, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Bannon, Becker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Crafter, Duncan, Eastick, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom (teller), Hamilton, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mathwin, Mayes, Meier, Olsen, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Rodda, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, Wilson, Wotton, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr Oswald. No—Mr Hemmings.

Majority of 31 for the Noes.

New clause thus negatived.

Title.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair points out to the honourable member for Mallee that he has a further amendment on file in respect of the title of the Bill. However, the Chair believes that the title as it now stands conforms to the clauses of the Bill, especially having regard to the amendments passed. The Chair will put the title as it is in the Bill.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: In speaking to the title of the Bill I in no way resile from my remarks about the way the Government has conducted the business of the House. However, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the member for Hartley on the way he has conducted this Bill.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

I intend to speak briefly to the third reading which, of course, I am supporting. I congratulate all members on their contributions to this debate. It is an important issue for the State which will bring important benefits if the Bill is passed. I think that after 10 years it is really time to put an end to the charade on casinos—that we put an end to this matter so that South Australia gets the casino which will boost its tourism revenue.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): As the Bill comes out of Committee it falls short of the expectations of many of us and, in keeping with the brevity with which the member for Hartley has spoken, let me say that I would like to put an end to the speculation about casinos in South Australia today once and for all and urge all members to oppose this measure.

It comes out of Committee in a form which enables public money to be spent on its construction and administration in spite of the fact that an attempt was made to ensure that that would not happen. I think that is regrettable, because there are plenty of other projects more pressing than a casino upon which those funds could be spent. During the course of Committee, I believe I gave every member of this Chamber an opportunity to express his or her view of the measure's most contentious aspects which are now incorporated in the Bill.

Regrettably, the shape it has and the kind of animal it will be is not the shape or kind of animal I would like, not only because I do not want such an animal but also because I do not think it will function in the best and most appropriate way in the event that the Bill regrettably passes the third reading.

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): We now have a first in this State—the establishment of a casino in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MATHWIN: It appears that—

An honourable member: You're conceding defeat.

Mr MATHWIN: Of course I am not conceding defeat. When members have finished scolding me I will get on with the debate.

The SPEAKER: Order! All interjections are out of order. The member for Glenelg.

Mr MATHWIN: I do not support the third reading as I have not supported the Bill at any stage. Even when I was brought on to the select committee I opposed the building of a casino in South Australia. What I gleaned from the select committee did not alter my opinion; in fact, if anything, it hardened it. I believe that, if one assesses one's losses (or what appear to be losses) in a case such as this, the Bill is better for the perseverance of the members who opposed it.

There still needs to be some explanation given of the interpretation of the Bill. The authority will comprise three members as well as some reserves, which was explained to us by the member for Hartley. One member of the authority will be a lay person, and I would hope that that person would be chosen conscientiously for what he or she can contribute to the authority. Clause 11 is a powerful clause, but it has to be in a Bill of this nature. Dealing with the select committee's report, I believe that its impact on the establishment of a casino in South Australia has been considerable. The considerable research and homework done by that committee has been of great benefit to this Bill.

Clause 17, relating to juveniles under the age of 18 years, remains as it originally appeared incorporated in the Bill. This clause causes me great concern, and I have still received no satisfaction from the member for Hartley about the questions I asked him as to who will police the provisions of this clause. I know I might have posed difficult questions about 18-year-olds entering a casino or, for that matter, any other building under discussion. The suggestion was made that the problems could be solved by identity cards or by drivers' licences with photographs attached. There should be no worry about that. If one wishes to travel abroad it is necessary to have a passport with a photograph attached to it. I do not think anyone who wishes to travel abroad objects to that.

I also take this opportunity of congratulating the member for Hartley who has had the monstrous task of steering this Bill through this Chamber. It has been a difficult job, and I am glad that he saw fit to accept amendments in relation to financing an investigation and collecting statistics on the problems of gambling generally. Many people who gave evidence to the select committee stressed the need for such an investigation to be carried out, particularly nationally. However, as it will be almost impossible to carry out such an investigation on a national basis, the next best thing will be for each State to undertake its own investigation.

It is of great importance that we do something about it. We have had an opportunity of doing it, and I am pleased that it was accepted by the member for Hartley. We are now saddled with the situation, although I fought it tooth and nail. It has been a long debate; about 24 hours, I understand. When the vote was taken on the second reading it was a conscience vote and members were able to use their

conscience. I am pleased that two Government members still have a conscience in regard to this matter: the honourable Minister of Education and the member for Albert Park.

It is a private member's Bill, introduced here by the member for Hartley, and the Government was good enough to make time available because of the importance of this Bill, without saying, 'It is a Government Bill.' We are now to vote on the third reading: I oppose the Bill and I oppose the third reading.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): In opposing the third reading of the Bill, I acknowledge that as it comes out of Committee it is better than it was when it went into Committee, notably in respect of the amendment moved by the honourable member for Eyre prohibiting the extension of credit in the casino. That clause gives me genuine comfort, because I believe that worse disasters that may occur in respect of exceeding capacity to gamble will now be limited.

I congratulate the members for Glenelg, Mallee, Goyder, and Torrens for the part they have played in Committee: they bore the heat and burden of the day and of the night for those who wanted to see the Bill examined closely. I also acknowledge the skill and the diligence with which the member for Hartley conducted his part of the debate.

Also, I believe that the Chairman of Committees, the member for Whyalla, deserves the gratitude of the House for his patience and his good humour. He did not, as far as I am aware, leave the Chair at any stage. It was an extraordinary and marathon effort for a Chairman of Committees, and I think the way in which the Bill came out of Committee is all the better for his chairmanship.

I make the point that, if the Bill passes and if a licence is granted otherwise than in association with an international convention centre, any alleged benefits for tourism in this State will be illusory. I make two final points: first, I deplore the manner in which the Government has quite brutally used its numbers to ensure that this Bill passed in the time that it wanted it to pass. It has caused, I believe, much suffering to members of staff of the House. It has certainly meant that those of us who would have liked to debate intelligently each clause have not been able to do so because of sheer fatigue.

Also, clause 19, as amended, in my opinion is an admission of the irresponsibility of this whole measure. It ensures that the percentage of moneys paid to the commission in respect of the operation of the casino will be paid into the Housing Improvement Fund. In other words, the Committee agreed that there will be deprivation as a result of this measure and that somehow compensation is going to have to be paid to those who will suffer.

The second part of that clause, that the balance of those moneys, if any, must be paid into general revenue, is accompanied by an undertaking by the Premier that funds will be made available to research into the effects of gambling. What an extraordinary thing for a responsible Parliament to do, to say 'We are going to embark on this new venture, we know it is going to cause deep suffering, so we are going to make a little bit of provision for that, but we do not really know to what extent that suffering is going to be caused, so we will conduct some research into it after the event.' That is a most appalling thing for this Parliament to do, and I have no doubt that in decades to come future generations will blame us. Finally, I reiterate my strong opposition to the Bill, but at the same time give my undertaking that I will redouble my efforts to assist the development of tourism in South Australia.

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): I wish to explain my position on the third reading. I gave an undertaking in the Party Room before the rules of the debate were set down that if the

Government did not have the honesty to take this Bill on as a Government Bill, then I could not support it, and I have obviously learned that Parliament does not work as well as it should.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: So the merits of the case do not matter?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BAKER: I hope that we can all work for some improvement, given our experience over the past few days. I did have the honesty to communicate that to the member on the other side. That is my decision.

Mr Groom: Change positions.

Mr BAKER: I cannot go back on that undertaking.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BAKER: I notify my position that I will abstain from the vote.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I indicate to the House that I will be opposing the third reading, but in doing so I must inform members that I will feel considerable discomfort when I have to sit on the benches with certain other members whose behaviour I believe over the past 24 hours has not been to advance the progress of this House. I believe that the opposition to the casino issue in South Australia in this legislation has been exceptionally poorly handled. Views have been canvassed expressing opposition to casinos in South Australia in this Parliament several times.

However, what we had was a great deal of prolixity of views being canvassed time and time again, and I believe that the exhaustion of the staff, and the exhaustion of members, should not be laid at the feet of Government members but at the feet of members who expressed their opposition in a non-clear way and kept on repeating their points of view, when it was clearly obvious to all members what were their viewpoints on those issues. I attempted to assist in the deliberations of this debate by keeping my contribution as brief as possible in the early hours of this morning, and I thought that other members could have done the same.

Through no fault of you, Mr Speaker, or of the Chairman of Committees, who handled these proceedings with great skill, what I believe will happen is that the public interpretation of what has taken place in this House will be to lower the esteem of the Legislature. It will be a great pity if the public hold the view that we are not capable of expressing our views simply and briefly, and then pitting our views against each other, recognising that the Westminster system relies upon the fact that the simple expression of views then implies the acceptance of the will of the Parliament. We are not like a Southern States Legislature that believes that filibustering is the way to govern: it is not.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I indicate that those in the community who have expressed to many of us in Parliament their opposition to the casino have been very poorly served. I do not know what will happen at the third reading: we can make estimates that this Casino Bill will pass, and I believe that the behaviour of some of those who oppose a casino must bear the responsibility for that.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I had not intended to speak during the third reading debate because the member for Coles said most of what I would have said in wishing to pay a compliment to people who have participated in this debate. Maybe the Minister of Education has not been in this place long enough, but the facts are these.

This debate was foisted on Parliament by the Government seeking to manipulate members' time in a way which is quite unprecedented, and which is bordering on dishonesty, when the Government did not have the courage—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order. This is the third reading of the Bill and the honourable gentleman is now repeating what he said almost 24 hours ago in relation to not only the second reading but also the procedural motion.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Very considerable latitude was given to the Minister of Education in attacking members on this side of the House under the guise of speaking to the third reading.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Deputy Leader to resume his seat. I hope that he is not reflecting on the Chair. I also point out that, in the time that I was in the Chair throughout a good deal of last night, very considerable latitude was given to members of the Opposition.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: In canvassing the matters canvassed by the Minister of Education, I point out that there are members in this House who have strong views about this Bill, and there are members in this House who have equally strong views about the way the Government handled it. The only weapon open to an Opposition to show a protest at the way in which matters are introduced in this House is to talk about them. Quite frankly, as Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I am proud of people like the member for Mallee who showed their opposition to the way this was done and the way the Government has used members' time to do it, and for the Minister of Education to get up in the third reading debate and abuse the Parliamentary process—

The SPEAKER: Order! That is clearly a reflection on the Chair and I will not tolerate it. I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to withdraw that remark.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I withdraw that and say that for the Minister of Education to get up here and abuse members of the Opposition who were doing nothing but exercising their rights is shameful. I pay a compliment to the people who did contribute to the smooth running of this long debate, and I pay a compliment particularly to the Chairman of Committees for his good humour and common sense which he conveyed during the Committee stage which was the most tiring. I make no apology, and never will, for the behaviour of Opposition members during this debate. They took the only course open to them to debate this Bill to the fullest. Feelings have run high in relation to this matter, and the only way that the Opposition could express its protest to the Government, which has the numbers (the sittings of the House are in the control of the Government) was to behave in precisely the way Opposition members have behaved, and I am proud of them.

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): I wish to express my support for the Bill. There seems to be some unnecessary heat coming into the debate at the moment, and I call on all members to moderate and abbreviate their remarks so that we can get this over and done with.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I, too, wish to compliment all those members who took part in the debate, particularly those who were against the Casino Bill. I was disturbed to hear the Minister of Education say that Opposition members should have kept their comments much briefer. I was under the impression that we should have debated this matter to its fullest extent, certainly in the light of the lobbying that was occurring within our community and the lobbying that occurred in my electorate. I make no apologies for the time taken.

The SPEAKER: Order! Nor should the honourable member have to do that. If we can just calm the whole process down, the only point that I was making to the Deputy Leader was that the whole democratic process means that people will have different views and will express them differently, and there is no wish on my part to bridle any member.

Mr MEIER: In simple terms, the responsibility to care for the social welfare of the citizens of South Australia is, to a large extent, in the hands of this House. The establishment of a casino in South Australia will simply constitute another negative influence in a complex socio-moral area affecting individual families and communal living in South Australia. The Bill should not proceed.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): A lot of what I wanted to say has been said by the member for Coles, and I will not expand on that. I support what she has said including the reference to the Chairman of Committees and the way the business was conducted. The way the Bill has come out of Committee will not be supported by me. I have always opposed the concept of a casino being established in this State. The way that the Bill has come out of Committee will please many people in the hotel, restaurant and related industries who will think that suddenly there will be a boost in revenue and clientele if a casino is established in South Australia. Except for the people concerned who happen to be close to such an establishment, most of the others will suffer, and, in particular, many of the smaller operators. We will see a significant number go out of business, their employees having to seek employment in the larger establishments, if there is that opportunity. I believe it is inevitable that a Bill such as this which will establish a casino in a State that already has more restaurants and hotels per head of population than has any other State in Australia, must cause problems.

I take the point made by the member for Coles that there may be an opportunity for a convention centre to be established with a casino if this Bill passes, but nowhere in the world, to my knowledge, does a convention centre run at a profit. These centres are usually subsidised by city, central or State Governments or by businesses as a group. If such a centre is established, people might hope that the casino will subsidise the convention operations if the Bill becomes an Act.

The Minister of Education referred to attitudes of the Opposition in the way the Bill was debated. It is true that this is the first time that private members' business has been handled in such a way, and it is the first time there has been no consensus or agreement by both sides as to an extension of private members' time, except in the case where a Government has taken over the Bill and said that it was Government business. That was the big difference. The point I make is that this is the only way an Opposition can show that it is opposed to the unfair use of the practices of the House in regard to the business of private members. We saw that we were being manipulated and pushed aside.

I congratulate each member who took the opportunity to debate each point that arose in the debate even if sometimes it seemed to involve repetition. I still oppose the Bill, and I hope that if it does pass those who see benefit in it can demonstrate that benefit to me at a later stage. I oppose the third reading.

The SPEAKER: Before putting the question I would like, as Speaker, to place on record my appreciation of the magnificent effort which was rendered to the House by my Deputy and Chairman of Committees in a highly emotive situation. He has already received the highest praise of members and he deserves every word of it. I add my words to it.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (24)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs Bannon, M.J. Brown, Chapman, Crafter, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom (teller), Gunn, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Rodda, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, Wilson, and Wright.

Noes (18)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, L.M.F. Arnold, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Duncan, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy (teller), Hamilton, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Olsen, and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mr Hemmings. No—Mr Oswald.

Majority of 6 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

Mr TRAINER: I rise on a point of order. Mr Speaker, I seek your clarification. There would appear to be a photographer in the gallery who may not be from the press. Could you clarify the situation?

The SPEAKER: I am not aware of any photographer in the gallery who is not accredited under the normal Speaker's rules.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the House at its rising do adjourn until Friday 13 May at 10.30 a.m. and, further, if the House be sitting at 1 p.m., that the sitting shall be suspended for one hour.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the speaker on the next item of business, it is a matter of neglect on my part that I have not called the member for Newland, who notified me much earlier of his wish to make a personal explanation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: O'BAHN SYSTEM

Mr KLUNDER (Newland): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr KLUNDER: The member for Todd, in his contribution to the Casino Bill debated last night and elsewhere, has intimated that I have maintained a presumably unjustified silence on the O'Bahn situation. An examination of the facts will show that I have, in the past few days, asked a question in the House on the O'Bahn, commented on the O'Bahn on the ABC, was quoted in the *News* regarding my views on the O'Bahn and had an article in the local newspaper, the *North East Leader* about the O'Bahn. To accuse me, therefore, of not being willing to air my views is ridiculous.

Secondly, the member for Todd has, by insinuation and juxtaposition of phrases, accused me of not representing my electorate properly. I utterly repudiate this snide and baseless bit of nastiness. I work long hours and to the best of my ability to represent the electors of Newland, and I believe that I do it well. In fact, I am so busy working to represent my district that I do not have the time to check on what other honourable members are doing in their districts.

INDUSTRIAL SAFETY, HEALTH AND WELFARE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 20 April. Page 954.)

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): The Opposition supports this Bill. It is a brief Bill with one operative

clause. It simply lists the removal of asbestos as one of those activities about which regulations can be made to further strengthen the hand of inspectors in relation to its removal. The significant part—

The SPEAKER: Order! Can members be quieter.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Part of the second reading explanation states:

However, given the extreme dangers involved, the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Board, the tripartite board established by this Act has recommended that additional steps be taken to give departmental inspectors more teeth.

The explanation further states:

The licensing of such contractors is also supported by the National Health and Medical Research Council . . . in line with the approach taken generally, it is intended to contain the detail of the new licensing provisions in regulations.

Obviously the crunch point in relation to this legislation will be written in the regulations. Therefore, as the Bill stands it simply allows for those regulations to be made. The members of the House will certainly be interested in perusing the regulations when they are promulgated. If there is any form of conflict it will be in relation to those regulations in regard to their stringency and their application. I do not think that I need say any more. I guess it is rather refreshing for members to have a Bill before the House with not much accompanying debate, in view of the marathon session we have just been through. The Opposition supports the Bill.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour): I merely want to thank the Opposition for its support for this Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Amendment of schedule.'

Mr BLACKER: Can the Minister advise whether the programme of asbestos removal within hospitals, and in particular, in relation to Port Lincoln Hospital, will proceed within a reasonable period of time? I think we are all concerned about this matter and would appreciate knowing how that work is proceeding and whether there has been any finalisation of the plans.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I thank the honourable member for his interest in this matter. Asbestos is a major problem for the Government and for the hospitals and for all those owners of properties where asbestos was installed. It is a great pity that that product was ever used. It is damaging not only to people working on the premises where it exists, but also to those who merely go into the buildings. I cannot give the honourable member details of the programme in regard to Port Lincoln, but I can tell him that I am in the process of setting up a new standards committee which will be brought back under the control of the Department of Labour for the purpose of monitoring programmes. I will have a much closer connection with it than I did in the past. In regard to the honourable member's specific question, I will obtain a detailed reply.

Mr BECKER: In the future can the Minister provide a statement concerning a programme of removal of asbestos from all Government buildings: I would hope that this will be an ongoing programme. I believe that all legislation should carry a financial impact statement in which case we would know how much the costs of implementing legislation would be. I said that while the Liberal Party was in Government, and I am only being consistent. I realise that it would be difficult for the Minister to come up with such a statement at this stage when no definite programme has been planned. However, I certainly hope that there will be one for the next financial year, and I am wondering if this matter could be isolated in the programme performance

budget papers. As the Minister would remember, the former Minister of Industrial Affairs was subject to considerable questioning during the Budget estimates debates. I ask that this matter be borne in mind. More importantly, I would like to see a programme drawn up for the continuing removal of all asbestos from Government buildings in a very safe manner.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I thank the honourable member for his comments and his concern. I am delighted that the honourable member has an interest in this matter. At the moment I am not in a position to give the honourable member a full programme run down but I can provide the details, because a new committee is being established. The previous committee was under the jurisdiction of the Public Buildings Department. I hope to be able to monitor the whole of the programme. The Minister of Health and I have met with the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare people, the unions, and the employers in this area. We are designing the programme at the moment. I cannot give the honourable member the details off the top of my head. Once the committee is established and the programme is under way I will provide a report for the honourable member.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SURVEYORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 April. Page 850.)

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): This Bill is the result of a review undertaken by the Surveyor-General and the Surveyors Board of South Australia into the existing provisions of the Surveyors Act. As a result of that review it was recommended by the Surveyor-General that it was necessary to ensure better protection of the public and the maintenance of the State Cadastral Survey, and also for increased protection of survey marks, as well as additional disciplinary controls over registered and licensed surveyors in this State, and further, to review the penalties that currently apply.

I believe that it is important to note that the review was undertaken not only by the Surveyor-General but also by the Surveyors Board of South Australia. I think it is interesting to note the composition of the Surveyors Board, as provided in section 7, which is as follows:

(1) The Board shall consist of the following members:

(a) the Surveyor-General;

and

(b) six other members appointed by the Governor, of whom—

(i) three shall be registered surveyors, of whom at least two shall be licensed surveyors, nominated by the South Australia Division;

(ii) two shall be registered surveyors, of whom at least one shall be a licensed surveyor, nominated by the Surveyor-General;

and

(iii) one shall be a registered surveyor who is engaged in the teaching of surveying at an institution of tertiary education in the State, nominated by the South Australia Division.

The review has been undertaken by a competent body headed by the Surveyor-General. While I fully support the Bill, I note that, whereas all the penalties except one have been increased 10-fold, clause 14 provides for a 25-fold increase in penalty. As this seems to be a dramatic increase compared to the 10-fold increase in all other cases, will the Minister of Lands say why it has been necessary to increase that penalty 25-fold? The Opposition supports the second reading.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Lands): I thank the honourable member and the Opposition generally for their support of the measure. It is important that, as surveying becomes a matter for high technology, this legislation should embrace all aspects of that technology. I have not had the opportunity to check through the parent Act in order to reply to the honourable member's question on clause 14. However, I will get that information for the honourable member and, if I get it following the passage of the Bill through this House, action can be taken, if necessary, to correct any anomaly in another place.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 13 passed.

Clause 14—'Regulations.'

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: This clause provides for a 25-fold increase in penalty to which I referred in the second reading. Can the Minister now explain the reason for this steep increase? If he cannot, I am happy that the explanation shall be provided in another place.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I thank the honourable member for his co-operative spirit in this matter. Section 47 (2) of the parent Act provides:

(2) Without limiting the generality of subsection (1) of this section, those regulations may—

(g) prescribe penalties not exceeding two hundred dollars for contravention of, or failure to comply with, any regulation.

Therefore, whereas earlier in the Bill the provisions are specific, here we are dealing with a more general provision that must be secured by regulation, which would be subject to Parliamentary review by the Subordinate Legislation Committee. The clause does not provide that a fine of \$5 000 must be imposed: it provides for a fine not exceeding \$5 000, and it would be competent for a regulation to provide for a penalty well short of that amount. I shall take further advice from the Surveyor-General and inform the honourable member.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

TRAVELLING STOCK RESERVE: OODNADATTA

Adjourned debate on motion of the Hon. D.J. Hopgood:

That portion of section 1184, north out of hundreds, set aside as a teamsters and travelling stock reserve, as shown on the plan laid before Parliament on 8 December 1982, be resumed in terms of section 136 of the Pastoral Act, 1936-1980; and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

(Continued from 20 April. Page 953.)

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): This motion concerns an application by Telecom for a radio telephone site in the Oodnadatta area. The Opposition has no objection to this motion. I have discussed the matter with the member for Eyre and also with the United Farmers and Stockowners, and both parties are in full agreement for the motion to proceed in order to provide the necessary land for Telecom to construct this installation.

Motion carried.

TRAVELLING STOCK RESERVE: BALDINA

Adjourned debate on motion of the Hon. D.J. Hopgood:

That the travelling stock reserve, sections 292, 293 and 294, hundred of Baldina, as shown on the plan laid before Parliament on 5 October 1982, be resumed in terms of section 136 of the Pastoral Act, 1936-1980; and that a message be sent to the Leg-

islative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

(Continued from 20 April. Page 953.)

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): This motion deals with a larger parcel of land in the Burra district which has been causing some concern to the Burra council. That council is prepared to accept responsibility for this land and incorporate it in the reserve for which it is currently responsible. Once again, the Opposition supports this motion, and they assure the House that the member for Eyre, as the local member, is in agreement also.

Motion carried.

PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL (1983)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 May. Page 1057.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): In speaking to this Bill, I wish to take the opportunity to point out that the former Liberal Government in its policy speech promised on re-election to immediately raise the exemption level for pay-roll tax purposes to \$160 000 and to progressively increase the exemption thereafter to \$250 000 in a three-year period. Shortly thereafter, the then Opposition grasped on our initiative and made a definite commitment to do likewise, with an additional commitment (and this is important) to index the base exemption level of \$37 800 in line with wage and salary increases.

As presented, the legislation does not comply with those commitments. I spoke at length in the House, I think on 9 December 1982, when the Premier in presenting his first piece of legislation failed to honour his commitment to immediately increase the exemption level from \$125 000 to \$160 000. As history has recorded, the Premier backed down from his promise to the business sector and raised the exemption level to \$140 000 as from 1 January 1983.

I am pleased to support the increased maximum levels, which will be of considerable benefit to the business community in reducing costs of operation and thereby hopefully creating employment prospects. The increased maximum levels are in the best interests of all South Australians, particularly those businesses which, as a result of tight liquidity and constraints, have had difficult trading periods in recent times.

However, with the legislation before the House, once again, the Premier has only partially met his election promise. The Premier promised the employers of South Australia to increase the base exemption level of \$37 800 in line with wage and salary increases. Furthermore, in this House on 9 December 1982 the Premier indicated that the Government was preparing pay-roll tax legislation in terms of A.L.P. election policy, including indexation of the minimum base exemption level.

All of a sudden, the Premier has achieved a remarkable turn-around, something to which we are becoming accustomed. He now intends to abolish the minimum base exemption level of \$37 800 and says that the maximum cost to any individual employer will be \$1 890 a year and that this new initiative is expected to generate an additional \$2 000 000 in revenue a year, which amounts to nothing more than an increase in State taxes. This additional revenue will be obtained at the expense of all the major employers in this State—those same employers who had expected to receive benefits through indexation of the minimum exemption level.

I am surprised at the inconsistencies apparent in the Premier's attitude to pay-roll tax. When Leader of the Oppo-

sition, the Premier continually argued that, for this State to maintain the competitive edge, its pay-roll tax exemption levels must move in line with those of Victoria, but I cannot recall any moves by Mr Cain, the Premier of Victoria, to remove that State's minimum exemption level.

The Premier now intends to offset the cost of his election promises by proceeding to abolish the minimum exemption level of \$37 800, thereby allowing the tapering of the exemption level to zero. That ought to be recognised by the House (I hope that the Premier will be joining us soon, because I do not intend to speak very long on this measure). For the year ended December 1982 the average weekly earnings in South Australia increased by 17 per cent, and that was an added financial burden on employers. I therefore call on the Premier to honour the commitment given in the election campaign and reiterated in the House last December to lift the minimum exemption level to \$44 200 in terms of his pre-election commitment.

We also find that the Premier intends to abolish the pay-roll tax refund and exemption scheme introduced by the Tonkin Government to stimulate youth employment. Any such stimulus is important, particularly for youths. I believe that the scheme should be complementary to employment schemes initiated by the previous Government. However, I commend the Premier for accepting the request to exempt a number of institutions from pay-roll tax liability but express my grave disappointment that the Government intends to fund some of its initiatives at the expense of South Australian employers.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I think that the points covered by the Leader can best be raised in the Committee stage if he wishes to raise them at that stage.

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

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 3 May. Page 1059.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports all components of the Bill. An amendment to the definition of 'final salary', by the inclusion of a higher duties allowance as prescribed, will bring the fund into line with the rules and regulations governing some private sector employee sponsored funds. It is pleasing to see that the Government has rectified an anomaly relating to the definition of a spouse, which has recently been highlighted by the financial problems facing the widow of a former contributor who recently contacted me in this regard. The retrospective nature of the Bill will benefit not only this person but other spouses previously precluded in that category. The amendment will conform with an existing provision of the Commonwealth Superannuation Fund. It is of great importance that people contemplating retirement can plan to do so with a greater degree of certainty. The introduction of the fixed commutation rate factors will assist in making that decision much easier. The remaining aspects of the Bill also correct anomalies that exist between the fund and some benefits available to contributors of various private sector employee sponsored funds. With those brief comments and in view of the time the House has been sitting, I conclude my remarks and indicate that the Opposition supports the Bill.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I endorse the remarks of my Leader but, in doing so, I am concerned as to the financial

impact this will have on the fund; ultimately, I will obtain some information in that regard. The State Superannuation Fund is potentially one of the largest and fastest growing commitments that the Government will have in the next few decades. I am particularly anxious about extending and providing additional benefits to those under the State Superannuation Fund; that these amendments, minor as they appear, may have a financial impact that could at some time in the future present problems. I wonder why, when somebody is on a higher duty allowance for 12 months he must decide whether to elect to have that allowance taken into account for superannuation purposes.

I understand that it has proved very difficult to ensure that, first, contributors are aware of this provision and, secondly, that they understand the sometimes complex issues involved in deciding which way they should elect. To me, that is purely a communication problem. It also highlights the ridiculous complexity of all superannuation funds, and of course the insurance industry is part and parcel of that. One would have thought that by now, in this modern day and age, these formulas would have been streamlined. I also understand that at present the spouse of a pensioner who married the pensioner after his retirement cannot qualify for a pension upon the pensioner's death. The Commonwealth Superannuation Fund, however, pays the spouse's pension in these cases, as long as the marriage existed for at least five years. This Bill provides that a spouse's pension will be payable on the death of the pensioner, not only where the marriage occurred before retiring, under the present arrangement, but also where a legal marriage occurred at least five years prior to the pensioner's death.

This amendment will increase by a small proportion the number of spouses who qualify for a pension. On the basis of the very spouse statistics which are available to us from the Public Actuary, it is estimated the actual cost will build up gradually but will eventually approximate about 0.4 per cent of the Government's total pension cost. The amendment makes the change retrospective to 1 December 1982. We rarely consider in this Chamber legislation that is retrospective and, whilst I appreciate the Government's wish to assist in these few cases by making the amount retrospective, I do question and query that. I am really concerned with the projected cost to the fund, and ultimately to the taxpayers in South Australia. In the financial year ending 30 June 1982 (page 362 of the Auditor-General's Report, under the South Australian Superannuation Board), we see that \$65 354 911 was paid in pensions, commutation of pensions benefits, and lump sums. Pensions were about \$59 200 000 and commutation of pension benefits about \$6 000 000.

The superannuants of the Public Service can commute only 30 per cent of their superannuation. Even so, the amount in pensions was \$8 600 000 higher than for the previous 12 months. Of course, that must be of real concern to the State Government.

In the report on the long-term projections of the cost to the State Government, the Superannuation Fund, and related matters, I notice that certain formulas were applied to try to estimate the cost to the Government in future decades. It was estimated that in 1981, the Government cost in (1980-81 dollars) of public servants and teachers superannuation was to be \$29 600 000. There is a component for the railways of \$1 600 000 which makes a total of \$31 200 000. By 1985, it was estimated that the overall cost would be \$35 600 000, yet we find that we are nearing that figure and the Government had to put in some \$37 400 000 for the year ending 30 June 1982. By 1990 the figure will be \$38 500 000; by 1995, \$41 800 000; by 2000, \$45 700 000; and we get to an extreme peak in the year 2020 of \$74 900 000.

There are problems with the Superannuation Fund and its impact on the State Budget. I am informed that as at 30 June 1981 approximately 17 900 contributors and 8 700 pensioners from Government departments, including teachers and railway employees, were in the State superannuation scheme. Additionally, about 4 000 contributors and a few hundred pensioners from statutory authorities were members. The contributors to the scheme paid \$19 700 000 and the Government paid \$29 600 000 in 1980-81. In addition, some statutory authorities made payments for the liabilities, and the amount paid to pensioners in 1980-81 was \$44 500 000. As I said, in 1981-82 that figure has reached \$59 200 000 and the Government contribution was \$37 400 000.

I am also advised that the average return from investments made by the fund was 9.37 per cent in 1979-80. The fund meets 28 per cent of the basic pension cost plus 5 per cent of cost of living supplements while the Government contributes the remainder—72 per cent of pensions and 95 per cent of cost of living supplements. At present, about one-third of eligible employees contribute to the scheme.

This is something which concerns me as we get on to the further explanation provided by the Treasurer. The last triennial valuation as at 30 June 1980 (therefore, there will have to be one at the end of June 1983) showed that contribution rates for new entrants were sufficient to provide for 28 per cent of their pension plus 18 per cent of their cost of living supplements. The valuation showed that the fund will be approximately in balance by 30 June 1983 (the next valuation) if it increases its cost of living supplement contribution to 6½ per cent from 1 July 1981. Consequently, the valuation report recommended on 24 February 1981 that there should be no change to the superannuation scheme except that the Government reduce its cost of living supplement contribution to 93½ per cent.

The report from the Public Actuary on long-term costs to the Government (prepared in April 1981) indicates that the Government's commitment increases from \$29 600 000 in 1981 to a peak of \$74 300 000 in 2020 (in 1980-81 dollars). In actual out-turn prices the amount paid will be far greater. For example (and this is where we have a little concern), at an inflation rate of 10 per cent per annum the amount paid will be approximately \$1 300 000 000 in 2020. In addition, the Government indirectly makes contributions through provisions made by statutory authorities which are not self-funding; the amounts involved are understood to be quite small.

What we have to face is the economy and the responsibility of this Parliament and the Federal Parliament must be to reduce inflation, and its impact in the community. If not, the blow-out on the superannuation budget will be such that it will cause enormous problems to the Government of the day. I believe that that is the responsibility we have now. To think that we can be faced with a pay-out of \$1 300 000 000 for superannuation in one year, in less than 40 years, must be quite frightening for Treasury.

The Bill allows a contributor to elect at any time to purchase additional benefits by way of increased fortnightly contributions. At present, such an election is available only to contributors upon joining the fund. This amendment will not affect Government costs, as the whole of the cost of such additional benefits is financed by the contributor. Whilst that is true, the Government still must meet its share of the cost. I have seen this in other superannuation funds, where contributors preparing for retirement decide to bring their payments right up to date to qualify for maximum superannuation benefits and quite often putting themselves in debt to meet those payments. It is difficult and I think that it is a very generous benefit to the members. It means that they have not paid their full contribution during the whole period of their employment and have taken the

opportunity at the last minute to bring themselves to the full amount that they may elect and receive a much higher pension at retirement. I think that that is a very generous provision indeed. However, as these benefits are being provided for Government employees, I hope that they will realise the responsibility that they have and the impact of this measure on future Budgets of this State.

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): The member for Hanson has outlined some of his concerns about superannuation. When I was in the Public Service there was an adjustment of 1 per cent downwards in the total benefits available. This adjustment took place about 1½ years ago, and was a recognition that the funds available today are not going to be able to meet some future liabilities which in fact have built up over a vast number of years.

I think that I am only signalling a few points in the Bill which I would like clarified in Committee (if they cannot be satisfied beforehand). When is it estimated that the contributions to the Superannuation Fund will be unable to meet the liabilities imposed on it? I think we are all aware that the Superannuation Fund operates solely from contributions at the moment, unlike the private sector funds. In the private sector funds, the employer pays in a certain percentage to match that of the employee (of the order of 50/50 or, in some cases, two to one, depending on the person). Quite obviously in that situation the liability is calculable. It is met at the time it is incurred and it is in fact good budgeting.

What calculations have been made as to the stage when the Superannuation Fund will be unable to meet its liabilities? From that point onwards, the superannuation withdrawals from the fund will far exceed the moneys coming in from the regular collections. We will see a massive escalation in the debt, and I would like some answers on that matter if they are available.

The second point I wish to make in respect of this Act is that there has been an alteration at the top of page 2 relating to section 5 of the principal Act. There is a provision that the wife of a pensioner will receive a benefit, provided she is married to that person for not less than five years. I would like to know, as a matter of information, how many people normally fall within that category.

There are other alterations, such as the fees which will be met by the Superannuation Fund for those people having medical examinations to determine whether they qualify. I know that when I went through the process of having a medical examination when I joined the Commonwealth, it was done by the Commonwealth Department of Health. When I was in the State Government it was met by me. I would like further clarification as to what is the likely cost of this initiative.

I turn to page 4. I am signalling these matters because I think that we can deal with them in Committee, unless the Premier can answer them beforehand. I refer to the point made by the member for Hanson about the election to bring benefits up to date three months before retirement. We are all aware of the situation and the member for Hanson has spelt it out very clearly. There are some people who are either promoted or have been promoted quite rapidly, and find that the burden of superannuation towards their latter years becomes quite extensive. By not meeting their contribution at the time, they increase their income because they are not meeting the liability. Of course, in the process they can bring their superannuation payments up to date prior to retirement. I would have thought that the Superannuation Funds, as they stand today, need every dollar applicable to the time at which the liability is incurred. I would suggest that Superannuation Fund contributions need to be met at the time, rather than having an election policy. In relation

to section 45 of the Act, I wonder whether paragraph (2) (a) or (b) should, in fact, be (2) (a) and (b), or some other wording. Again, I ask this merely by way of picking up the matter concerned.

I now turn to the Provident Account. I seek further clarification on the Provident Account. We always have the situation in both State and Commonwealth where people are medical risks, as they say. There was a case in Victoria recently where someone initially was deemed to be at risk because of her size. The possible liability and the probability of her retiring early was too great for the fund to bear, and she was initially excluded from the fund. I would like further clarification as to the circumstances in which people can change from the Provident Account (which is normally those people who are a greater risk) to the Superannuation Fund. I signal those points for discussion in Committee.

I am concerned and I know that the Australian community is extremely concerned about what will happen to superannuation over a period of time. I did some calculations in 1978 and I felt at the time (and I do not have the papers available) that the funds would become non-liquid in about 1990. However, that point can certainly be clarified. I have some tremendous concerns because we will then have a situation where the elderly could be disadvantaged. Because the money is not available and because it is coming out of recurrent revenue, the costs of the services provided will become so massive that the Government will be forced to withdraw its total support from the funds, and this is of great concern to me.

Therefore, I leave those matters with the Premier and I presume that they can be answered either in the second reading stage or in Committee.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the Premier speaks he closes the debate.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I thank the Opposition for its support of this measure and the remarks that they have made. Both the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Mitcham have mentioned the case which is covered under the amendment in respect of the remarriage of a pensioner, after the person has left the service and has become a pensioner. It is one of those odd coincidences. I understand that no case of its kind has really been placed before the funds for consideration until recently. What happened then was that two appeared at almost the same time. At this stage no others are identified and a long period of time had gone by before that first one appeared.

The retrospectivity involved is simply because those two cases have drawn attention to a possible inequity in the Act which ought to be corrected. It would have been pretty unfair if we had not covered those specific cases. Such retrospectivity as there is, is fairly minor, going back to 1 December to pick them up. As to what cases there might be in the future, it is unlikely that there will be a large number. However, the provision is now in place to cover such a situation.

In response to the member for Hanson, the Government is well aware of the costs of superannuation. The actuarial calculations into the future obviously have to be made. It is difficult, because of the length of time over which one has to calculate the drawings from the fund, to make them precise. However, my understanding is that so far they have tended to be pretty accurate, despite the volatility of interest rates and the general rate of inflation. Of course, the fund's investment portfolio and its ability to get adequate return on the funds it holds has improved quite markedly in recent years. It is much more flexible and much more responsive to the market and that has assisted in hedging against the high inflation rate.

However, the point made by the honourable member is quite valid. The key to a successful operation and prediction is: low interest rates, low rate of inflation and, therefore, a much greater certainty of prediction. The triennial assessment to which the honourable member referred will take place from the end of June 1983, and by the end of the year that will give us up-to-date information, the ability to make new calculations and get a contemporary assessment of the funds.

However, there is no evidence at this stage that anything is going seriously awry or that there will be major problems building up. That periodic reassessment will help ensure that that does not happen. Certainly, any contemporary Government must look ahead and not land a major debt or responsibility on future Governments. In relation to these amendments, the question of their cost (not just immediate cost but cost to the future) has been very much to the forefront. Balancing that against the equity of the provisions, I do not think that there is any real cause for concern.

As to the question raised by the member for Mitcham about medical examinations, the costs are borne by the fund: that is, effectively by the contributors. They are not costs to the Government as such, and in terms of the size and operation of the fund, it does not represent a substantial commitment. It is probably a reasonable way of spreading the burden for those examinations.

I think that a lot of the general questions that have been raised in the course of this debate are better answered after the assessment that will be taking place. Of course, one can make predictions and discuss these things. We are now so close to that triennial assessment that the feeling of the Government is that, any look at more fundamental amendments or changes in contribution rates or whatever, cannot really be contemplated at this stage. Equally, it is probably fairly fruitless to speculate on the condition of the fund until we have that information to hand.

No doubt the opportunity will present itself in the annual report of the fund, some assessment of which should be available later this year. I hope those remarks cover most of the points raised by members opposite. I thank the Opposition for its support and commend the Bill to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 10 passed.

Clause 11—'Purchase of contribution months.'

Mr BAKER: I refer to subclause (2), which provides for the purchase of contributions. It states:

An election to purchase one or more contribution months by way of the payment of a lump sum must be made:

- (a) before the contributor's first contribution adjustment day;
- or
- (b) within the period of three months preceding his retirement, being retirement on or after attaining the age of retirement.

There are further subclauses referring to commutation. Is it the Government's intention with this clause to allow people within three months of their retirement to catch up with their contributions in order to give them a more substantial benefit on retirement?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There are considerable complexities in this Act as all members will realise. My advice is, 'Yes', they can catch up by this means, but it should be borne in mind that they are bearing the cost themselves: it is not a cost to the Government as such.

Mr BAKER: I fully understand that catching up can be a very expensive process. However, the situation has now been left open. I seek clarification concerning the situation applying to those people who are perfectly well, can offset their contribution rates in the early periods, and catch up in the later periods. I am referring to the person who is healthy and well and expecting to live to a considerable age.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The point is that this aspect involves no subsidy by the Government. In fact, it is something that a contributor can elect to do. Obviously, the contributor would have to produce medical evidence at the time of election of rates under this provision, but a contributor can purchase additional months by way of a lump sum, and that election can be made at the point of retirement. However, there is no problem in terms of funding that, because the contributions effectively mean that the contributor has covered the return that he will get, and that part of his pension is not subsidised by the Government.

Clause passed.

Clauses 12 to 17 passed.

Clause 18—'Contribution to the Provident Account.'

Mr BAKER: I have stated already what I understand to be the aims of the Provident Account, and I have referred to the sort of people who are in fact covered by that account. I seek further details about what this clause will actually do. Will it make a person eligible for a pension which would not necessarily have been the case under the way the previous system operated?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The purpose of the Provident Account is to assist that very small proportion of applicants whose health does not allow them to be admitted to the fund, even with the limitation of benefits. There are a number of categories: there are those who receive limited benefits and those who just do not qualify. In that case, those people turn to the Provident Account, which provides them with benefits. The 1974 Act allowed them to receive at retirement a lump sum benefit equal to 3½ times their accumulated contributions, providing them with a lump sum entitlement and not a pension.

An amendment to the Act in 1976 provided that a Provident Account member who was still employed at age 60 would automatically be transferred to the Superannuation Fund. I guess that the principle of that is that previously such a person was excluded by the rules for health reasons, but at age 60, when that person is then contemplating another five years in the service, in crude terms one could say that it could then be deemed that, because the person had survived to age 60, it would suggest that the person's further survival was very likely, if the person's health was good enough to continue in the service after 60 years of age.

The amendment allowed people in that category at that stage to opt to go into the Superannuation Fund proper. They were then entitled to a lump sum, a pension, etc., under the provisions of the Act. The intent of the 1976 amendment was that the Provident Account member who had survived to the normal retirement age (that is aged 60) should not be deprived of the right to the same pension from age 60 as that of a normal contributor.

Under that amendment, once that person contributing to the Provident Account reached the age of 60, that person was required to take a pension: the lump sum was not available. It was felt that this discontinuity was illogical and that it could certainly influence the choice of a retirement date, which might not be desirable in regard to the welfare of a person or the interests of the service. It certainly seemed to be unfair to force a person with a below-average life expectancy to take a pension on retirement when he had already been disadvantaged during his service *vis-a-vis* the contributor to the Superannuation Fund proper with full death and invalidity cover under that fund.

Bearing in mind that this individual had been a Provident Account member, and health factors are taken into account, one would expect a shorter life expectancy. When an individual reaches age 60 he moves to a superannuation fund, but he is only entitled to receive a pension. In some senses, the advantages and benefits in receiving a lump sum are

even more desirable than someone who expects to live another 20 or 30 years. It is on this basis that the board recommends that retirement at anytime after age 55, a Provident Account contributor can receive a lump sum payment or can elect to transfer to the Superannuation Fund and receive a pension benefit with normal commutation rights. In effect, after age 55 there is a right of election, and it puts them on a normal basis.

Mr BAKER: I presumed that it would operate in that way. How is the superannuation benefit calculated if someone elects to go on to superannuation? The contributions to the Superannuation Fund are somewhat different to the contributions to the Provident Account. Does the final benefit relate to what has been contributed or does it relate to the salary that they were receiving when they retired?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It relates to the salary they were receiving at the time, if they have made that election.

Mr BAKER: We have discussed the problems that could arise in the immediate future. Can the Premier justify why a person who pays lower benefits is entitled to remuneration at a greater rate than was paid in?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Provident Account payments made by a member are the same as would have been made into the Superannuation Fund. The benefit is calculated on the basis of the level of those payments. There is no difference.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (19 to 21) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

COUNTRY FIRES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed to correct a problem which has occurred in the application of section 27 of the Country Fires Act, 1976-1980, concerning the payment of compensation to registered C.F.S. volunteers injured whilst attending fires or other duties undertaken by the C.F.S. Specifically, section 27 (2) provides that person so injured may as 'employees' of the C.F.S. Board be paid a 'prescribed wage' in accordance with the Workers Compensation Act. However, the 'prescribed wage' has never been set by regulation and therefore the absence of a basis upon which to fix a rate of compensation poses extreme difficulties of a legal and administrative nature.

This measure, expressed to have retrospective operation from the first day of January 1983, has been prepared in order to rectify difficulties which have recently arisen. In relation to compensation for injuries sustained during the bushfires on 16 February 1983, the insurers of the C.F.S. Board, the State Government Insurance Commission, agreed to establish a provisional rate of compensation which was tied to average weekly earnings in South Australia (as determined by the Australian Bureau of Statistics), but these arrangements must be now clarified.

The intention of the Bill is to fix parameters for compensation to injured C.F.S. personnel based on the Commonwealth Statistician's determination of average adult weekly earnings without overtime. In practice, that compensation rate will be expressed as a percentage of such average weekly earnings and determined or adjusted from time to time by regulation under this Act. All indications are that this should be 100 per cent of those earnings (presently \$314.50 per week). There is sufficient flexibility under the proposal to

take account of unemployed persons who might be members of a C.F.S. brigade. The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure, which is expressed to be the first day of January 1983.

Clause 3 strikes out subsection (2) of section 27 of the principal Act and substitutes new subsections. The Workers Compensation Act, 1971-1982, is to apply to a person to which the section applies as if the person was in the employ of the Board, at a prescribed rate of earnings. In the application of that Act, the presumptive employment under this section is to be regarded as sole employment, but the degree of any incapacity is to be determined by reference to the person's normal employment. These provisions clarify possible areas of confusion. A regulation which prescribes a rate of earnings under this section may be given retrospective operation. The rate of earnings is to be a percentage of average weekly earnings.

Mr GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

The SPEAKER: Order! As a matter of clarification, I did not call the honourable member for Mount Gambier because, first, he did not rise and, secondly, I think he was consulting other papers. There was no reflection on him.

CASINO BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendments.

EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 19 April. Page 850.)

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): The main thrust of the Evidence Act, that is, the abolition of the unsworn statement, has been broadly canvassed over the past three years, and it is still the view of the Liberal Party the choice of rights of an accused person to make an unsworn statement is quite clearly either for abolition or retention. The Liberal Party firmly favours abolition of the unsworn statement when the accused in the dock is not liable to cross examination. Oddly enough, prior to the 1979 election, the Labor Party was also in favour of its abolition. Attempts by the former Liberal Government after 1979 were frustrated twice by the Australian Labor Party and by the Australian Democrat in another place, the Hon. Mr Milne. The former Labor Minister, the Hon. Don Banfield, on 7 November 1978 when replying to the Hon. John Burdett, stated:

I have been informed by the Attorney-General that the recommendation of the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee that 'unsworn statements in criminal trials be abolished' will be included in legislation that is currently being drafted.

The Hon. Anne Levy on 20 July 1978 also stated in the Legislative Council:

I know that the Mitchell Committee has recommended that the practice of giving unsworn statements from the dock on which cross-examination is not available be abolished, not just for rape trials but for all trials. I hope that this recommendation can be implemented as soon as possible.

I acknowledge that the Hon. Anne Levy has since reversed that opinion, but nevertheless it does represent quite a strong body of thought at that time. For example, the Women's Adviser in the Premier's Department, Ms McCulloch, also favoured abolition. In December 1977 she wrote to the then Attorney-General urging quick action on the Mitchell Committee's reforms.

The question of disadvantage to the Aboriginal community was also raised during previous debates. In fact, I believe that the present Speaker himself raised this issue on behalf of the Aborigines. I ask the House generally to consider that the Mitchell Committee did in fact address itself to this specific problem. I quote from the Mitchell Committee Report which, on page 126 (which is also quoted at page 737 of *Hansard* on 28 August 1980), states:

We have been concerned particularly with the case of the unsophisticated type of Aborigine who tends to give the answer which he believes will please his questioner. We think, however, that the judge and the jury, in their respective ways, can be relied upon to appreciate and to make allowances for the witness who may be at a disadvantage for lack of education or lack of comprehension. One danger with the illiterate or semi-illiterate witness is always that he may answer a question as he did not intend to answer it merely because he did not comprehend all the words in the question. It is for the judge and for counsel for the accused to be alert to appreciate any difficulties which the witness may have in understanding what is put to him and to see that such difficulties are corrected.

It is suggested that the jury is likely to compare the demeanour of an accused person giving evidence with the demeanour of 'professional' witnesses, for example police officers, whose bearing is likely to impress the jury. We think that the jury is likely to be favourably impressed by the demeanour of a police officer giving apparently straightforward evidence. This will happen whether the accused gives evidence or makes an unsworn statement. Juries are aware of the fact that the accused may elect to give evidence and are certainly not likely to be impressed by a statement read in a faltering and unconvincing fashion when it contradicts evidence given by policemen not shaken in cross-examination. On the other hand sometimes the illiterate person becomes more convincing under cross-examination when he stands his ground on vital matters although he may give unconvincing answers on others.

I accept that there may be divergence of opinion on the attitude to unsworn evidence in such circumstances, but to suggest that the Mitchell Committee and members on this side have not given that matter full consideration would be quite incorrect.

The use of the unsworn statement in other States or countries is interesting. The unsworn statement was referred to quite recently (within the past 18 months to two years) in the United Kingdom, and that royal commission recommended abolition. The unsworn statement has not been permitted at all in the United States. It has been abolished in Western Australia, New Zealand and Queensland. The Victorian Government has been considering abolition of the unsworn statement, although in a report brought down by Justice Minogue recommended retention. Another report which, I believe, was for the Law Reform Commission recommended abolition. Again, there is some divergence of opinion.

It is interesting to note that approximately 11 per cent of cases in the United Kingdom used the unsworn statement. Approximately 14 per cent are estimated to have used it in Victoria. In South Australia, the Mitchell Committee referred to 1973 statistics and said that 67 per cent of Supreme Court actions in that year used the unsworn statement, whereas 32 per cent in the Central District Criminal Court used the unsworn statement.

I believe that subsequent figures produced in the Legislative Council debate by the Attorney-General (Hon. Chris Sumner) indicated that in recent years (1980-81) the incidence of the use of the unsworn statement in South Australian criminal cases had dropped quite considerably from that high 1973 figure quoted by the Mitchell Committee. In fact, the figures referred to by the Attorney-General indicate that in 1979, 13 per cent of accused persons made unsworn statements and that in 1980 there was a slightly higher figure of 24 per cent. So, the figure is declining quite considerably from that of the 1973 level. When one sees the study and the quite marked decline in use of unsworn statements in criminal cases it begs the question why we are retaining it

when elsewhere there has been a steady tendency to abolish the unsworn statement.

The reasons behind the Liberal Party's strong contention that the unsworn statement should be abolished lie in the alleged advantages of an accused person making such a statement. I acknowledge that Justice Bray, in evidence given before the Mitchell Committee (or it may have been before a select committee), said that he believed that a person making an unsworn statement did incur a penalty in the eyes of the jury.

On the other side of the coin, the defendant does not have his own character brought into question under cross-examination if he chooses to make an unsworn statement. He can make false and malicious statements; he can denigrate the character of Crown witnesses; he can denigrate the character of the Crown Prosecutor; he can denigrate the character of anyone at all, while he goes unscathed.

The Women's Adviser to the South Australian Government in 1979 pointed out that the victims in sexual crimes were subjected to the grossest cross-examination and interrogation to draw out details of character as well as details of the offence (a very harrowing experience), while the accused can make a host of denials and accusations impugning the victim's character when having his own character or actions questioned.

Fears for the rights of illiterates of any colour, race or creed before the courts have been addressed by the Mitchell Committee, which pointed out that there are also occasions when the accused, having difficulty in expressing themselves because of literacy problems, may also appear better by virtue of being cross-examined, and stand out quite firmly on crucial points of evidence. I believe that the latter part of the statement which I quoted from page 126 of the Mitchell Committee Report referred specifically to that possibility. However, the right to make unsworn statements is historically a vestigial relic which dates back to times when the accused was simply not permitted to make a statement in his defence, and the unsworn statement was a relaxation of that rule. The unsworn statement has lingered on long after the original rule was removed from the Statutes. There have been many inquiries across the world and a great body

of evidence has accumulated against the retention of that unsworn statement.

As I mentioned, the situation is especially unpleasant in sexual offences. Conduct of the court has generally been weighted in favour of the defendant, and we may rightly be accused of taking a chauvinistic attitude in retaining the unsworn statement which carries the right to abuse and denigrate the character of the victim (the prosecutrix).

The Mitchell Committee recommends abolition. The amendments which I have placed before the House and which I intend to move in my name achieve that recommendation of the Mitchell Committee. The present Bill offers very little solace to those groups in our society which are in favour of total abolition. To name a few, they are the Rape Crisis Centre, the Victims of Crime Service, and the Women's Electoral Lobby. The Hon. K.T. Griffin (the former Attorney-General), in another place, in the debate in that House, said that this Bill in fact enshrines an anachronism in our law and elevates the unsworn statement almost to the status of evidence, which it most certainly is not.

I acknowledge that the legislation before us is some improvement on the former situation regarding unsworn evidence. However, we believe that this Bill is still a relatively weak one and that it continues to pander to dissentients within the Government ranks. It really represents a substantial about-face from the now Government's former strongly avowed intentions prior to 1979 to abolish the unsworn statement. I will be moving amendments which will have the effect of reinstating the Bill which was twice before the House when members on this side were in Government during 1979 to 1982. I hope that the Minister in charge of the Bill will give the amendments his very serious consideration.

Mr MATHWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.17 p.m. the House adjourned until Friday 13 May at 10.30 a.m.