

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 24 March 1992

The **SPEAKER (Hon. N.T. Peterson)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITIONS: GAMING MACHINES

Petitions signed by 880 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to introduce gaming machines into hotels and clubs were presented by Messrs Atkinson, Bannon, D.S. Baker, Crafter, Lewis, Oswald, Rann and Wotton.

Petitions received.

PETITION: WATER RATING

A petition signed by five residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to revert to the previous water rating system was presented by Mr D.S. Baker.

Petition received.

PETITION: PUBLISHING STANDARDS

A petition signed by five residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to stop reduced standards being created by publishers of certain magazines and posters debasing women was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: TAILEM BEND RAILWAY YARD

A petition signed by 131 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to request Australian National to maintain and upgrade the pedestrian pathway through the Tailem Bend railway station yard was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

PETITION: SPECIAL EDUCATION

A petition signed by 1 406 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to increase special education assistance to schools was presented by Mr Matthew.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 217, 325, 335, 352, 354, 378, 387 and 406; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

CITRUS INDUSTRY

In reply to Mrs **HUTCHISON (Stuart)** 20 February.
The **Hon. LYNN ARNOLD**: Following the storm on 25 November 1991, I was advised of a proposed meeting of affected

growers on Mr Ron George's property in Loxton on 26 November 1991. As I was unable to attend, I instructed Mr Graham Broughton, Manager, Rural Finance and Development Division (RFDD), to be present so that he could advise the meeting of the Rural Adjustment Scheme (RAS) measures available. An assessor from the Rural Finance and Development Division was also available at the Loxton office of the Department of Agriculture on 27 and 28 November to interview growers and to assist them with their inquiries for financial assistance. Of the 17 growers who contacted the assessor, only seven formal applications have been received since by RFDD and there have been five approvals for RAS assistance. The remaining two applications are currently being assessed. This is an indication that the majority of affected growers have been able to refinance their operations from commercial sources. I thank the honourable member for her interest in this matter, and have requested RFDD to continue to provide me with an update on the number of applications received from affected growers.

STATE BANK

In reply to Mr **D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)** 19 February.

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: The honourable member is referred to the answers given by the Attorney-General to questions regarding the State Bank royal commission asked in another place on 18 and 19 February 1992 and appearing in *Hansard* on pages 2837-8 and 1908-9 respectively. The honourable member should also note the Attorney-General's ministerial statement made on 27 February 1992 (page 3093).

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Health (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

Drugs Act 1908—Regulations—Child Resistant Containers.

Occupational Therapists Act 1974—Regulations—Registration Fees.

South Australian Health Commission Act 1976—Regulations—Surgical Fees.

By the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

Fisheries Act 1982—Regulations—Spearfishing at Second Valley.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Teachers Registration Board of South Australia—Report, 1991.

Local and District Criminal Courts Act 1926—Local Court Rules—Strata Title Disputes.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. Frank Blevins)—

Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act 1956—Applications to Lease, 11 March 1992.

By the Minister of Lands (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—

Geographical Names Board—Report, 1990-91.

QUESTION TIME

The **SPEAKER**: Before calling on questions, I wish to advise that, in the absence of the Minister of Recreation and Sport, the Deputy Premier will take questions relating to recreation and sport and the Minister for Environment and Planning will take questions relating to housing.

GAMING MACHINES

Mr **MATTHEW (Bright)**: What assurances can the Premier give that his Minister of Consumer Affairs has revealed the true role of Mr Jim Stitt in moves for the introduction of poker machines in South Australia? The Minister of Consumer Affairs has agreed that the company, International Casino Services Pty Ltd, has been advising the hotel

and hospitality industry on gaming matters. However, the Minister asserts that the involvement of Mr Jim Stitt has been quite separate and distinct from that of International Casino Services. This is despite a document produced last week promoting a direct association between Mr Stitt and International Casino Services to provide political assistance and advice on legislation.

I now have a further document which confirms the very close association between International Casino Services and one of Mr Stitt's companies, International Business Development Pty Ltd. While the Minister has claimed that International Business Development Pty Ltd 'has had no involvement or interest in the matter', this document names Mr Brian McMahon as a consultant for IBD. He is the same Mr McMahon who is a principal of International Casino Services. IBD and International Casino Services have the same telephone number and address in Melbourne—437 St Kilda Road, Melbourne. A call to this Melbourne number this morning produced the recorded message response 'Brian McMahon's office'.

Financial records I have show that money has changed hands between IBD and Nadine Pty Ltd while Mr Stitt has been involved in advising on gaming matters in South Australia and that there also have been financial transactions between another of Mr Stitt's companies, IBD Public Relations and International Casino Services. Further, while the Minister has said the prime business of International Business Development Pty Ltd 'is matters relating to foreign investment' the document I have makes no reference to foreign investment but does promote Mr Stitt as a Director 'with an extensive list of State and national Government contacts' whose background 'provides clients of IBD with negotiating strengths in-house'. It has been put to me that statements the Minister has made have attempted to downplay Mr Stitt's full role in proposing and advocating the establishment of an Independent Gaming Corporation—a legislative model the Minister has supported in this Parliament and publicly.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the Premier, a problem in Question Time is always the dispute about the time taken for questions and answers, and I point out the need for brevity in both questions and answers. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: A bit earlier on an honourable member was talking about delegating responsibility for matters to junior members of the House. It is very interesting to see that the running in this issue, which we are told is of vital importance and great—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—gravity, has been granted to one of the most junior members of the Opposition—not the Leader, not the Deputy Leader or anyone else. Be that as it may, the honourable member in his question today quoted extensively from a letter that he sent me just a few minutes ago in which he asked a number of questions and purported to put information before me. I notice that the one and, I would have thought, pretty major significant omission from the honourable member in his pursuit of this in the public interest was the provision of those documents on which he relies for his allegations.

I wrote to the honourable member last week and suggested that it was pretty unreasonable, in a situation where allegations are being made by the media and by members of Parliament who are in possession, supposedly, of those documents, for the object of those allegations not to be provided with a set of them. The honourable member's response to that was, 'I will make them available to some

sort of separate inquiry', the implication being that, 'I can't allow my precious documents out of my possession to be shown to the subject of the allegation'—I would have thought a basic principle of natural justice—'unless I am satisfied with the sort of inquiry or tribunal that you may establish to examine them.' There is absolutely no logic in that, Mr Speaker. By all means let the honourable member pursue his vendetta. By all means, let him pursue his case for some sort of inquiry that would satisfy him.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: But the Minister or the Government having possession of those documents would not affect that one iota. It is not as if I am suggesting to the honourable member that he surrender those documents so that I can take them away and he has nothing. Of course, what he would be presenting would be photocopies of the documents that he has. They would remain uncensored and untouched in his possession. If, in fact, the Government or Ms Wiese, or anyone, tried to misrepresent them, the honourable member could make that quite clear. So, I cannot understand it, unless there is a deliberate cover-up, unless there is real concern—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—about the flimsy nature of this so-called evidence. The Leader of the Opposition already had his little burst last week. Fortunately, he has at least had the grace to keep his head down on this matter. Be that as it may, I am addressing these remarks to the member for Bright, who asked the question. I come back to the point and ask: what earthly reason could he have to hang on to those documents, unless he is playing some sort of political game? That is the starting point to letters and questions of this kind.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Minister is making a statement in another place in which she will, in fact, go further into what little extra information or allegation we have seen over the past few days. I remain in the position that I am satisfied that to date there has not been evidence—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—of a gravity or sufficiency—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Environment and Planning and the member for Morphett will cease this debate across the Chamber. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—to warrant the allegations of pecuniary impropriety that are made by the honourable member and some of his colleagues. That remains the position as far as I am concerned. The honourable member says that he has a major new piece of information in relation to some particular organisation and its company connection. In fact, that has been dealt with and is being dealt with again today in relation to activities aimed at representations and consultations in Victoria. Those statements were made in a document prepared for Victorian purposes. In fact, the honourable member himself confirms it—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—in his reference to ringing an office in Victoria and getting a particular response to it. So, there is nothing yet that, as the honourable member tries to eke out information and spread controversy—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is out of order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—would warrant going any further than has been gone so far.

TUBERCULOSIS

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): My question is directed to the Minister of Health, and I know that you, Sir, will have a particular interest in this question. Can the Minister give the House any information on the incidence of tuberculosis in the South Australian community? Recent speculation in the media, particularly in the western suburbs, has indicated that there is a high incidence of tuberculosis in that community. This morning I received a telephone call from a very racist person saying that we ought to deport Asians: hence my question and my anger.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: First of all, we need to look at the raw figures. I would commend to members a publication which is widely available and which is entitled 'The South Australian Health Statistics Chart Book, Supplement No. 2, Infectious and Notifiable Diseases'. This publication contains a number of graphs and simple tables which enable one to look at statistics in relation to a number of these communicable diseases.

In 1991 there were 71 cases of TB in South Australia. That is 71 too many, of course. Nonetheless, it does put it in some sort of perspective. Secondly, it is also true that it tends to be located, to the extent that it occurs, in certain communities. For example, in the north of the State, it is to be located in some Aboriginal communities. In the metropolitan area, it is not unknown amongst some recently arrived migrant communities.

Given that there is a reasonable concentration of recently arrived migrants in the north western-suburbs, one would naturally expect that that would show out in the statistics. There is also an opportunity here. The Health Commission does not believe that we need to introduce universal immunisation. Certainly, immunisation of infants is automatically made available to those particular communities where the disease is found from time to time, and that will continue and we will continue to monitor the situation.

However, given that with the goodwill of the House I will be attending the Health Ministers' conference in the week immediately before Easter, I should say that this will almost certainly be a further topic of debate at that conference because for some time State Ministers have expressed their concern at the fact that, with a degree of deregulation, we may have gone too far in this country in relation to post arrival screening for the infection. Indeed, in preparing some material for last year's budget Estimates Committee, where it was anticipated that there would be some discussion on this matter, one of my officers said, 'There is no adequate post arrival screening of these high risk groups.'

As I say, for the past couple of years, certainly during the time that I have been attending these meetings, State Ministers have put this point of view to the Commonwealth and will almost certainly continue to do so. In the meantime, in relation to those communities that are already present, I make the point that automatic immunisation is available and we do not believe, beyond watching the situation very closely, that we need go further than that at this stage.

GAMING MACHINES

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): My question is directed to the Premier. Following the statement of the Minister of Con-

sumer Affairs last Thursday that Mr Jim Stitt 'has no financial interest in the company known as International Casino Services', will he seek an explanation from the Minister for two payments totalling \$5 000 made to International Casino Services in June and September last year by one of Mr Stitt's companies, IBD Public Relations Pty Ltd?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am happy to take that question on notice. It would have a little more weight if it was accompanied by the documents that I have requested from the honourable member. He likes to play these little games. He likes to ensure that he can get up here, and no doubt they will trickle out too.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Let us not forget the motive of this. The motive is to try to throw any obstacle that the honourable member and some of his colleagues want in the way of the gaming machines legislation that this House is debating. What is most disgraceful about it is that, in this matter, when members are being given a free vote of conscience, when we are addressing this issue as members of Parliament, certainly in the context of the Bill that the Government has introduced through the Minister of Finance, when the procedure has been laid out, when it was debated and agreed last year, initiated by an honourable member on that side of the House, and when this process has been gone through, right in the middle of it those who I suspect do not want this issue dealt with in a free and open way are trying to put barriers in the way of its consideration. From what one reads in the media—we have not had this confirmed as yet—there seems to have been some Party room decision about it, which is even worse. I find it quite unacceptable that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—the member for Bright tries, by these means, to prevent the Parliament from considering something which has been on the agenda and which is discussed openly. Yes, it is controversial. Yes, members have a number of different views about this legislation, Cabinet members as much as any other members of Parliament. But the basis on which we have agreed to consider it, I would have thought, is one that would be welcomed not just by the Parliament, not just by the Parties but by the public. To see this exercise going on must cause considerable concern and dismay among those in the hotel and hospitality industry, among those in the club industry, among those in the tourist industries—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It will give delight, though, to those across the border who are already moving in this area and who will see themselves getting some sort of free kick from the inability of this place to deal properly with that measure. I suggest that the honourable member get off the trip he is on. If he is seriously interested in this matter, he should supply the documents he is talking about, and we can get on with the business in hand.

OUTER HARBOR BOAT RAMP

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Minister of Marine advise the House whether his department will clear hazardous rocks from the old Outer Harbor boat ramp? Will he

consider charging fees for using the ramp so that the necessary revenue may be raised?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the member for Spence for his question. The Outer Harbor boat ramp, used as a launching facility for trailer boats, was built in 1947-48. As a consequence of its age, it is in some disrepair. Some minor works have been done to it to ensure that people launching their boats are on firm standing. Some rocks adjacent to the boat ramp are part of a breakwater that was there, and there might also have been some spillage of rocks when they were being loaded onto trucks for the creation of the continuation of the breakwater, which was recently completed.

I have been advised by the department that minimal repairs to the boat ramp would cost in the region of \$5 000, and all that would amount to is a cosmetic clean-up. It would cost about \$250 000 in order to replace the boat ramp entirely—and that is what is needed—and to secure the surrounds so that people using it can be assured that their trailers and motor vehicles will be there when they return from fishing. The department has no money in its recreational account for this financial year so, consequently, any work that is done on the boat ramp will be of an emergency nature. The need to replace the boat ramp is being considered in light of a number of factors, one being that there is limited use at the moment, because people who want to fish in the gulf use the excellent launching facilities provided around the North Haven Cruising Yacht Club. Those who use it want to go across to the area immediately opposite the container terminal, where they use channels through the islands and fish in the Angas Inlet. As only a small number of people are involved, it is not thought worthwhile to spend this amount of money on it.

Further, forward plans are being made at the moment for future use of the whole area for a container terminal and the unloading of goods. People who are familiar with the operation of the Department of Marine and Harbors would know that more and more goods are being exchanged across the wharves of Nos 1 to 4 Outer Harbor and Nos 6 and 6½ at the container terminal, unless they are exchanged in the inner harbor. Consequently, that area of land is very important. It may also be used as a terminal for the ferry to Kangaroo Island.

All these matters are being considered, and it is in the best interests of the department to ensure that the moneys are spent wisely. At this stage we have no complication as to spending any money there, and at the moment it is not our habit to charge for public access to public boat ramps. If we were to upgrade this facility at a cost of \$250 000, I would think that the charge needed to recover the moneys would be exorbitant and would not be welcomed by the boating public.

GAMING MACHINES

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier agree that, before participating in any Cabinet discussions about the introduction of poker machines in hotels and clubs, the proper course for the Minister of Consumer Affairs to follow was to advise her Cabinet colleagues of:

1. The role of Mr Jim Stitt and companies in which he has direct interest or association in proposing the establishment of an Independent Gaming Corporation as an integral part of the legislation;

2. The financial relationship between companies involved in gaming matters in which Mr Stitt has an interest and the company co-owned by Mr Stitt and Ms Wiese; and

3. Any financial gain that Mr Stitt stands to make from his involvement in moves for the introduction of poker machines in hotels and clubs?

If the Premier does not agree that the Minister should have provided this information to Cabinet, how can the public have any confidence in the practices his Cabinet follows for the declaration of the private interests of Ministers where there can be a conflict in matters before Cabinet?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In fact, it is quite an appropriate question and one that I am prepared to directly answer. First, there are in fact procedures in relation to the declaration of interest in Cabinet; those procedures are exercised on a number of occasions—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—and they have indeed been exercised by the Minister of Tourism. So, we are not dealing with a situation where either Cabinet practice or the Minister of Tourism's attitudes are such that these things would be flagrantly ignored or disregarded. Secondly, in relation to this matter, as I told the House last week and indeed, as Ms Wiese quite independently told another place last week, such a declaration was not made on those occasions on which Ms Wiese was present when that Bill was before Cabinet. In her statement today the Minister will in fact say quite clearly—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—that she should have formally disclosed that involvement to Cabinet.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Heysen is out of order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Mr Speaker, that is my view also, that in fact such formal disclosure should have been made—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Coles is out of order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The question then arises: in that situation, what is the appropriate penalty or sanction that one should impose? In my view, while such a disclosure should have been made, the Minister has explained the circumstances in which it was not made and—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Murray-Mallee is out of order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—I believe that, in taking into account all those circumstances, which I outlined to the House last week, the price the Opposition would want paid, that is, the dismissal of the Minister from the Ministry—the sacking of the Minister, the blood that the Opposition wants—would be quite outrageous. I think a fair-minded consideration by anyone would—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—come to exactly the same conclusion.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Coles is out of order. The Deputy Leader is out of order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We are not talking about whether or not a breach occurred. I acknowledge and the Minister acknowledges that, with the benefit of hindsight and looking at those circumstances—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—a declaration should have been made. In considering what follows from that, one cannot, I believe, raise circumstances that suggest that the Minister should be relieved of her portfolio.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Of course, it is in the political interests of members opposite to argue that. They would be delighted to see it, but are we to believe—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—this is their concept of what is appropriate in terms of declaration?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader is out of order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Are we really being asked to believe that each and every member opposite, fair-mindedly looking at that the situation that arose (the way in which this matter was discussed, the nature of the decision made by Cabinet, which was not the normal decision to in fact propose and support as a body, as a Government, a particular set of regulations, the understanding of the Minister about the knowledge of her colleagues and a range of other matters), is then saying that the Minister should be deprived of her job? I say that that is not appropriate. It is not appropriate in these circumstances and, even though—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Adelaide is out of order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Even though members opposite for their own purposes would like to see a particular result, I do not believe the public of South Australia would. Nor, indeed, would those organisations with which the Minister, as the most senior Tourism Minister in Australia, deals on a daily and regular basis. That price is not being called for, nor should it be called for.

POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Water Resources say whether the Government is examining ways to upgrade pollution control measures at sewage treatment plants? While South Australia has been a leader since the 1930s, when the country's first secondary treatment plant was built at Glenelg, there is now a worldwide move to review the tradition of discharging waste into inland water courses and into the sea.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The Government has allocated approximately \$2 million in a very aggressive approach to moving our reputation even further ahead of that of other States. It seems to me that what we will be achieving in South Australia is a level of tertiary treatment when States such as New South Wales are still looking at primary treatment. A series of investigations are currently being undertaken, and these cover treatment plants along the Murray River, along the metropolitan coast, in the Mount Lofty Ranges watershed, the Barossa Valley, the South-East and, of course, Victor Harbor.

The aim of the specific investigations and the fact that they are targeted at individual areas is to find alternative solutions to discharging waste into inland and coastal waters wherever possible. Where it will not be possible, because of physical constraints, or where it is not considered the best answer environmentally, the investigations will look at tertiary treatment to reduce further the levels of nutrients. I can confidently inform the honourable member that South Australia is, once again, poised to be a pacesetter in the

1990s and beyond in the latest investigation into land-based disposal and tertiary treatment of our sewage effluent.

GAMING MACHINES

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister of Finance confirm that the Minister of Consumer Affairs was pushing last year for the early introduction of legislation to allow poker machines in hotels and clubs? The Minister of Consumer Affairs has claimed that she has had only a peripheral involvement in this matter. However, a report in the *Advertiser* of 25 October last year stated:

The Executive Director of the Licensed Clubs Association, Mr Greg Cole, said yesterday he had talks with Mr Blevins and Tourism Minister, Ms Wiese, last week and was told they wanted the legislation brought on as quickly as possible.

These talks followed the industry's decision announced in August last year to establish the Independent Gaming Corporation.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have no doubt that the Minister of Tourism is on record as saying that she wants this for the tourism industry. I cannot see any mystery in that. I tell you what: she has not been pushing half as hard as I have or as early, because if there is any individual driving this legislation against, may I say, formidable odds, it is I. The contribution by the Minister of Tourism has been welcomed, but it has been no more and no less than very many other of my colleagues—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:—and, indeed, one or two people on the other side also appreciate the benefits of this legislation to the tourism and hospitality industry. It would be a remarkable Minister of Tourism who did not support making viable a great number of presently unviable clubs and hotels—in the electorates of everyone here—because that is what will happen. If this legislation did not go through, in my view a Minister of Tourism would have been derelict in his or her duty as Minister of Tourism, irrespective of who that individual was, if he or she had not supported making some of those establishments viable, because at the moment they are not. If this legislation does not go through, you will see some very significant bankruptcies in the industry, and very significant job losses. That is what the Minister of Tourism is trying to avoid—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Heysen is out of order.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:—and I am very pleased indeed to have had her support, as I have of very many of my colleagues and, indeed, a few members opposite. I appreciate that, and thank them for their clear thinking.

POLLUTION

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning's department take up the complaints of my constituents in Dry Creek about the pollution problems that are being caused by a commercial operator in that area? Residents in Dry Creek have contacted both me and the Department of Environment and Planning about the activities of a commercial compost producer. They allege that much of the activity occurs outside normal business hours and that it creates a great deal of odour and noise. This is causing great distress to my constituents.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for raising this matter on behalf of his constituents. I am aware of the company to which the honourable member refers. It is probably useful to provide the honourable member with a very short background. This company originally operated a composting activity in the Athol Park area. Following complaints from local residents and controls placed on the operations of the company by the Department of Environment and Planning in 1985, the company relocated to its present site in Dry Creek. The matter emanates from the fact that composting operations became a problem when citrus waste from a local fruit juice manufacturer was included in the compost heap and its size became too large and unmanageable.

In July 1989 conditions were placed on the company by the Department of Environment and Planning to cease to accept citrus material and to reduce the compost piles to a manageable size. However, I understand that it has taken some time for the company to be able to dispose of that large amount of compost and waste. Indeed, the complaints may be associated with the movement of the old citrus in this particular pile. I have asked the department to visit the operation and to check on the issues that have been raised by the honourable member which specifically relate to after-hours activity, and to have further negotiations about the recommendations and requirements that I placed on the company in July 1989.

GAMING MACHINES

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I direct my question to the Minister of Finance. In his discussions with the Minister of Consumer Affairs about the introduction of poker machines in hotels and clubs, including those held with public servants advising the Government on the matter, did the Minister of Consumer Affairs support the establishment of an Independent Gaming Corporation to purchase, install and maintain gaming machines as the agent for individual licensees?

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I beg your pardon?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Well, the member for Hayward appears to want to answer the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will direct his remarks through the Chair. The member for Hayward is out of order.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Speaker, it is on the record and it is no secret that the Minister of Tourism, the Minister of Finance, and a number of other members on this side and indeed members opposite, for the reasons I gave in the House last week, all agree that the appropriate way to operate poker machines in this State is in a similar fashion to the way we operate the Casino, that is, that the public sector—the Government—will have total control over regulations, supervision and licensing. Those of us who have this view believe that the industry itself ought to have the opportunity to do the leg work of running poker machines, exactly the same as the private company does in the Casino.

All this Bill does, for all the fuss that has been made about it by people who want to misrepresent it—and this is the only difference from the Casino legislation—is give the industry the right of first refusal of doing the private sector leg work. It does nothing else. It says to the industry that, if it can put together a package that is okay with the Liquor Licensing Commissioner and the Casino Supervisory Authority, we believe that it is not unreasonable for the

industry to have a crack at doing that itself. Let me tell you where that came from. That did not come from Jim Stitt or Barbara Wiese: it came from Frank Blevins about 10 years ago. The Casino legislation, on which this—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:—legislation is modelled, is almost 10 years old. It was long before I had ever heard of Jim Stitt.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The member for Coles has attracted the attention of the Chair on several occasions this afternoon. I caution her not to continue in this way. The honourable Minister of Finance.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Almost 10 years old. That is where the model for this is. I did not have a blinding flash 12 months ago and say, 'This is how it should be done.' I had a blinding flash a decade ago and said, 'This is how it should be done,' and it has been tested over that decade. It has been tested according to the Commissioner of Police, and that material has been circulated to members by the Commissioner of Police.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will read it out to you again during the debate. It has been tested by the crooks in this community who have thought they could beat the system, but they have not beaten the system because the Commissioner of Police has said that this system is the best system in Australia by far. That is where it came from. It came from me. It did not come from Jim Stitt. I had never heard of the man 10 years ago or eight years ago, or whenever it was, when this particular model was first presented to the House. What is complicated about that? Where is the mystery? Where is all the conspiracy? Just look at the Bill: it would have answered your question.

ONKAPARINGA HOSPITAL

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Will the Minister of Health advise the House whether the Government considered proposals by the board of the Onkaparinga Hospital to convert some beds to private funding as a way of cutting costs before a decision was made to withdraw funding for the hospital? An article in the *Advertiser* of Saturday 21 March reported the comments of a South Australian senator at a public meeting about the Onkaparinga Hospital. He was quoted as saying:

The Government had not considered the hospital board's proposal to convert some beds to private funding as a way of cutting costs.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Certainly the Government considered this option because it is an option which, in general terms, has some obvious attractions. I have explained to the House in the past that, when the Government has seriously put forward this proposal to the private sector of the hospital industry, it has been met with rebuffs, not from the administration of these hospitals but from the surgeons working in them. In fact, getting back to the specific matter of consideration, once the hospital had put together this proposition, and it had been considered by the South Australian Health Commission itself, and the Health Commission had made certain advice available to me, I then specifically invited the Chair of the hospital board to bring members of that board in here when they would have an opportunity to put the position very directly to me. In fact, the meeting was held in the ALP Caucus room, so I do not know how much at home some members of the deputation felt sitting around that table with me. It was during the

sitting of the House a week or so ago. I cannot remember the exact date, but I could certainly get that for members if for any reason they are interested—I am sure they are not.

On that occasion I gave them the opportunity to put their case. A number of questions, some by way of devil's advocacy, were asked, and, in particular, a medical practitioner who was there was invited to exercise his mind as to what reaction local medical practitioners with certain rights of the hospital would have to that proposition.

The proposition was therefore fully considered and was rejected. It was rejected on the grounds that the money that would be saved under that proposition would be only a fraction of the money that would be saved by outright closure of the hospital. I do not know that the South Australian senator—who I understand may have some interests in coming into this place should a certain resignation be tendered to you, Sir—had the opportunity to read the substance of an answer that I gave in this House last week, I think, when all these matters were fully canvassed. Without wanting to unduly delay the House, I remind members that that South Australian senator said, amongst other things, that the hospital does not run on empty beds. In fact, the truth of the matter is that a very large number of the beds at that hospital, for which it is staffed, are empty, remain empty and have been empty for a long time.

That is something we face in the country; it is something that we have always faced in the country. The member for Eyre would know that in his electorate there are a number of strategically placed hospitals where there are empty beds, but there is no prospect of us closing those hospitals because there is no other recourse available to the people in those areas because of the tyranny of distance. That is not the case in the Onkaparinga situation, which is why the decision was taken in the way it was.

GAMING MACHINES

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): What specific awareness did Cabinet have of the involvement of Mr Jim Stitt in moves for the introduction of poker machines in South Australia? In particular, was Cabinet aware that Mr Stitt was being paid by interests proposing the establishment of an Independent Gaming Corporation and that, during Mr Stitt's employment in this capacity, money was changing hands between companies involved in gaming matters in which Mr Stitt has an interest, and a company co-owned by Mr Stitt and the Minister?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader cannot help himself. He starts off quite well with a reasonable question and as he gets into it, down he goes, referring to money changing hands. I like the sound of that: money changing hands. This is a man who is in business. I understand that money changes hands for cut flowers or something in the South-East. I do not know why money changes hands in that way or to what company and where but, if the Leader would like to ask questions in that innuendo style, no doubt we can make something of that, too. The fact is that I have already covered the question that the honourable member asks.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have already covered it and so has the Minister. A declaration should have been made. Obviously, in the absence of a clear-cut declaration, Cabinet could not have had those details before it. I have stated that, as I stated last week, as I have explained further.

MOBILE MAMMOGRAPHY UNIT

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Health advise the House of any updated details on the mobile mammography unit which is to travel into the country areas of South Australia? The importance of this project is highlighted by the fact that both State and Federal Governments have contributed to it, as have organisations such as the CWA and Lions International.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I understand that the Deputy Prime Minister will be in South Australia within a week or so (I think there is a date in my diary, but I cannot recall it now), when there will be a launch of this very important program. I am sure that we are all looking forward to that and the services, in particular, that it will bring to women in country areas.

GAMING MACHINES

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Who first informed the Premier that Mr Jim Stitt was acting as a paid political lobbyist for interests seeking the introduction of poker machines into South Australian clubs and hotels, and when was he so informed? The Premier told the House last Thursday that he was not prepared to comment on issues such as this until the Minister of Consumer Affairs had made her own statement to Parliament.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I was aware that Mr Stitt was involved in advising the Hotels Association. I was not sure of the details of that. I cannot tell the House who told me or in what circumstances, but I was aware of it, and I did not think it was of great moment in terms of the way in which the Minister of Tourism comported herself in the course of consideration of this legislation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier is out of order.

PREPAID FUNERAL PLANS

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): My question is directed to the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place. Will the Minister advise whether there is any legislation controlling the operation of prepaid funeral plans and, if there is no such legislation, will the Minister indicate the Government's intention or otherwise to introduce such a measure into South Australia? Yesterday my secretary received a telephone call in my electorate office from a Semaphore Park constituent who is very much concerned about an article that appeared in the *SACOTA News* of March/April this year, which says in part:

All prepaid funeral plans are not the same. To check the safety of your prepaid funeral fund, start asking questions. Prepaying a funeral is a sensible and considerate gesture. However, you should think carefully about your choice of funeral director.

It goes on to say—and this is the kernel of the problem:

Are you aware that there is no legislation controlling the operation of prepaid funeral plans?

My constituent is very much aware that, should she participate in such a scheme, there may be no legislative protections for her and/or other people in South Australia who are involved in a similar scheme.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFT: I thank the honourable member for his question, and I understand that there are some deficiencies in the law with respect to this matter of prepaid funerals. It is a matter which has received the attention of

my colleague in another place, and I understand that officers are looking at the deficiencies of the law in this matter, also in consultation with the Commissioner for the Ageing.

GAMING MACHINES

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): Has the Premier or have any of his ministerial or departmental officers had discussions with Mr Jim Stitt about the introduction of poker machines in clubs and hotels in South Australia, including as recently as last week in the precincts of this Parliament? If so, will the Premier reveal the full extent of such discussions and who was involved?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not aware of any such discussions.

COMMERCIAL TENANCIES

Mr GROOM (Hartley): Will the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place, give consideration to assisting small business, to widening the commercial tenancies provisions of the Landlord and Tenant Act to enable compulsory conciliation before the Commercial Tenancies Tribunal and to allow for registration of associations to represent lessors and lessees before the tribunal in the same way as employer and employee associations represent their members in the industrial jurisdiction?

Section 68(2) (a) presently limits the conciliation jurisdiction of the Commercial Tribunal to conciliation only by agreement between the parties. If one party does not agree, there can be no conciliation. There are many disputes between lessors and commercial tenants which could, by this means, be resolved more efficiently and without a full-scale and expensive court hearing. These types of disputes include disagreements over who should repair premises, minor rental disputes and interpretations of the meaning of clauses in leases and so on, with associations being registered to themselves represent their members. This jurisdiction is also prone to devices being employed to get around the legislative intention of this Parliament.

To further illustrate my reasons for asking the question, I point out that this Parliament legislated to prevent land tax being passed on to commercial tenants and to share the cost of lease agreements. Where the commercial tenant is a company, some landlords require the directors of the lessee company in the directors' guarantees to additionally pay land tax and all costs, notwithstanding that the Act protects the commercial tenant. Compulsory conciliation and registration of associations, as in the industrial jurisdiction, would provide a more effective, efficient and less costly way of resolving such matters and would improve the position and viability of small business.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question. Indeed, the suggestions that he makes to the House by way of this question have considerable merit and, if it were possible to reduce the impost of legal fees and the time taken up in costly litigation for those members of the small business community, in particular of this State, that would be a great service to our community and to orderly practices in that sector of our marketplace. I will ensure that the question is passed to my colleague for consideration.

GAMING MACHINES

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): Has the Premier been advised that the Deputy Under Treasurer, Mr John Hill, as a member of the Lotteries Commission, had serious concerns about the role played by the Minister of Consumer Affairs in moves for the introduction of poker machines in hotels and clubs in South Australia, and will he consult Mr Hill to determine whether there is any relevant information he could provide to an independent inquiry into this matter?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No doubt the honourable member is referring to correspondence that was received from Mr Hill by a certain reporter for one of the media who is the subject of investigation at this time. Indeed, Mr Hill has shown me a copy of that correspondence, and I understand the background to it. It seems that the reporter and the honourable member—because they seem to be exchanging the same documents—are working hand in hand, and that is very interesting in the light of some of the events.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We will just let that ride for a moment, but it seems that he has been made privy to that. I would have thought that, having been made privy to that, he would not bother to ask his question. Mr Hill was misled and, if you like, tricked into certain statements, which were then grossly misrepresented.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Mr Hill is extremely concerned with that situation, wrote to the reporter concerned and quite properly provided me with a copy of that correspondence. It is pretty rough of the honourable member to try to raise that in this way, but it is further evidence of the way in which he is handling this matter. I concede that in the first term in Parliament there may be areas where one does go over the top.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I suggest that the honourable member look carefully at his methodology and sources of information, and other matters, before raising them in this way in Parliament.

SAFRIES

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Is the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology or his department undertaking any action in the aftermath of today's announced closure of the SAFRIES plant at Millicent? This morning I received a telephone call from a constituent whose nephew works at the Millicent plant of SAFRIES and who is worried about the announcement made today. He seeks information about what the Government is going to do about this closure.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question and I also want to acknowledge the approaches made to me by the local member in this issue, the member for Victoria (the Leader of the Opposition); he has already approached my office in regard to this same matter. I can advise that the Millicent plant had, until today I guess, a capacity of about 20 000 tonnes per year compared with the other French fries plant of SAFRIES at Penola, which has a capacity of about 60 000 tonnes.

The Millicent plant is small and, in the way of industrial equipment these days, is referred to as aged, although it was opened only in 1986, I think, and has operated under

limits of scale. The new owners believed that increased productivity and efficiencies could not be achieved with that size plant and equipment in that location. Therefore, the capacity of the Millicent facility of SAFRIES will be transferred, by and large, to the Penola facility where there is scope for increased efficiencies, because that plant is a modern plant and does have a capacity for scale. A key factor that apparently worked against the viability of the Millicent plant is the use of LPG as a fuel source in a fuel intensive process. Members will know that the Penola facility draws upon natural gas resources within the South-East of the State. That natural gas access by the Penola facility provides considerable operational cost savings.

The new owners have indicated to my department a willingness to find a buyer for the building but understandably not for the equipment, because much of that is being transferred anyway and they do not wish to dispose of it as a competing business. My department has begun the process of searching for suitable buyers for the building. Clearly, it is not good news that the facility has closed down, but we are pleased to see that it does represent a reinforcement of the presence at Penola, and that represents a continued future for that plant.

Some ill-founded rumours were going around that that plant was itself under a question mark, and that is clearly dispelled by today's announcements. Obviously, we are concerned at the job loss in Millicent and will do our very best to find alternative buyers as we seek new investment opportunities for that area. I also want to acknowledge my appreciation of the Leader of the Opposition's role in his work as local member on behalf of the employees of that plant.

ETSA HEADQUARTERS

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Minister of Mines and Energy reveal how much the Electricity Trust is paying to purchase the building at No. 1 Anzac Highway and how much the trust is receiving for the sale of its Greenhill Road headquarters? On 22 June 1988 the SGIC board approved a fixed interest loan for \$20 million to enable United Landholders to build a property at No. 1 Anzac Highway, which has been unoccupied since its completion. This loan was for 100 per cent of the purchase and construction cost when SGIC's usual practice is to lend only two-thirds of the value of the asset. United Landholdings is a company owned by Mr Bill Hayes, a former Chairman of ETSA, and Mr Vin Kean, the current Chairman of SGIC.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: This situation is one in which ETSA is buying a building, and there is a back-to-back deal whereby the other company is buying the ETSA building but, while the contract has been signed, there are a number of what I think are called conditions precedent, which means that, until these conditions have been met, the sale will not go through and the contract will not be honoured. Until those conditions precedent have been met, obviously, other information cannot be disclosed, but if the honourable member watched, I think, Channel 2 last night he would have seen the General Manager of ETSA indicating that, once the contract was valid, information of that nature would be made available. I am perfectly happy to go along with that and ensure that that information is made available to members after the contract has been validated to the satisfaction of the conditions precedent.

PORT AUGUSTA GAOL

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Correctional Services advise whether he will consider a proposal

from the local swimming club in Port Augusta to use the swimming pool at the redeveloped Port Augusta gaol on two nights a week for one hour for training purposes?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am aware of the request and will give it every consideration. I know the problem that the Port Augusta swimming club is having, and I know that members drive down to my home city of Whyalla twice a week, which is an hour's drive; they have an hour's swim and then have another hour's drive back, so it is a real problem for them. Whether the problem can be solved by using Port Augusta gaol is, however, another question.

It is different from Cadell, where there is also a swimming pool, as Cadell is a low-security institution with very many activities, as the member for Chaffey will attest to, since it is in his electorate. The facilities there are used quite extensively by the local community. The library at Cadell Training Centre, for example, is the only library in Cadell, and members of the local community come into the prison to use the library. However, there is a problem with Port Augusta Gaol as it is a high security facility. At this stage I am not sure whether it would be appropriate for people outside the prison to come into a high security prison to use its facilities. The situation may well be quite different. However, that is not to say that some arrangements cannot be made. I can assure—

Mrs Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I beg your pardon?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I can assure the member for Stuart that I will consider that. In summary, I think there have been two or three incidents of escape at Yatala while I have been the Minister; there were 20 a year before I became the Minister when the Liberals were in power.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: GAMING MACHINES

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Last Thursday the Minister of Tourism made a statement to Parliament totally rejecting slurs cast upon her reputation in relation to the introduction of gaming machines legislation. It has been suggested that sums of money have come to the Minister of Tourism through the companies of her partner, Mr Jim Stitt, and as part of his involvement with the Hotel and Hospitality Industry Association, and that he has influenced the Minister of Tourism in relation to the legislation.

There is no substance to these imputations but battling them has been like boxing with shadows because the Opposition, which claims to have material to substantiate the allegations, has refused to present it to the Minister of Tourism or to the Government. What the ABC journalist and members of Parliament have done is piece together a ragbag of unrelated documents and information in a shabby attempt to discredit the Minister of Tourism and her partner and thwart the gaming machines legislation.

These allegations all hinge around a company called Nadine Pty Ltd which Mr Stitt and the Minister of Tourism originally set up to jointly own a unit in Perth, and when they bought their house in Adelaide the company was used to purchase that property.

The Minister of Tourism has now had the opportunity to check relevant financial records in detail, has assembled

documents and made further inquiries. The Minister believes the documents show that the allegations against her are without foundation. She wishes to make the following points:

1. That in the opinion of Nadine's accountant she has received no personal monetary benefit from loans made to Nadine Pty Ltd from Mr Stitt's involvement with the Hotel and Hospitality Industry Association. (In any event there is nothing improper in two people who live together permanently pooling financial resources).
2. Mr Stitt was not involved in the preparation of legislation on gaming machines, and he was never present at any meetings with Government Ministers or officers who had responsibility in this area.
3. The Hotel and Hospitality Industry Association has made it clear in public statements in recent days that the role of their consultants, including Mr Stitt, on gaming machines has not been to lobby the Government but to provide advice to the association.
4. The Hotel and Hospitality Industry Association has stated also that no consultant employed by them will receive a success fee or bonus on the passing of the legislation or other matters.

The Minister of Tourism has studied the records of Nadine Pty Ltd, particularly those relating to the period from November 1990, the time at which Mr Stitt's consultancy with the Hotel and Hospitality Industry Association was approved. They showed that since Mr Stitt began work for the Hotel and Hospitality Industry Association there have been only two payments by Mr Stitt's companies to Nadine Pty Ltd—one of \$250 on 15 March 1991 and the other of \$1 000 on 16 August 1991, a total of \$1 250.

These payments were in the form of loans from Ausea Network Management Pty Ltd and International Business Development Public Relations Pty Ltd respectively to supplement Nadine's cash flow to meet mortgage repayments to the Town and Country Building Society in relation to the unit they own in Perth. The Opposition has referred to a document suggesting that International Casino Services would work in association with one of Mr Stitt's companies, International Business Development Pty Ltd, in assisting the preparation of gaming machines legislation and the provision of political advice where necessary.

The Minister of Tourism made it clear on Thursday that this related to Victoria and not South Australia. She now has documentation from both International Casino Services and the Victorian Government confirming this. Furthermore, the Hotel and Hospitality Industry Association has advised in writing that it has no knowledge of the document quoted in Parliament. The Minister of Tourism believes this material refutes any allegations of financial impropriety. However, she has asked the Attorney-General to review the documents and financial records.

The Minister then addressed herself to the issue of her participation in discussions in Cabinet on the proposed gaming legislation. She indicated on Thursday that she believed Mr Stitt's involvement with the Hotel and Hospitality Industry Association was well known among her Cabinet colleagues. The Minister stated that she has since learned that this was not so in all cases and accordingly with the benefit of hindsight she believes she should have formally disclosed his involvement to Cabinet. However, the Minister of Tourism stresses that in this instance no damage has been done. Cabinet was not considering the content of this Bill and was not taking a decision on it.

The Minister of Tourism can have no more or less influence than any other member. Members are free to move amendments if they do not like the Bill as it stands. All members are free to lobby other members. The Minister of

Tourism has no intention of lobbying others and, as she has previously indicated, her involvement thus far has been peripheral. From the outset the Minister of Finance has had carriage of the Bill and he has determined its content. This can be confirmed with him. The allegations made on this issue have been a beat-up of the worst kind. Mr Stitt's relationship with the Minister of Tourism has been a constant source of rumour and innuendo. This is the latest in a number of false accusations that have been circulating in the community, stirred by people with their own vested interests.

Lamentably, last Thursday, and in a public statement yesterday, the Minister of Tourism understands that the Hon. Mr Elliott regurgitated yet another such story currently circulating among environmental organisations, namely, that Mr Stitt is deriving income from the proposed Tandanya development on Kangaroo Island. This is not true. Mr Stitt's involvement with this project ceased in January 1990, more than 12 months before the original proponents sold the development. It is also untrue that Mr Stitt was responsible for introducing the current owners to the previous owners.

Destructive rumourmongering in Adelaide is becoming an art form. Perhaps this has always been so. But what is worse is the willingness of the Liberals and the Democrats to give credence to the most unlikely and outrageous allegations by raising them in this place without attempting to verify their accuracy. The damage of these cowardly attacks for politically expedient purposes reaches far beyond Parliament. It impacts on the broader community, damages individuals and their businesses, and devalues the parliamentary system. The Minister of Tourism wants to stress that she resents in the strongest possible terms this latest slur on her reputation in the media and in both Houses of Parliament.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I lay on the table the ministerial statement relating to the National Crime Authority, and the documents referred to in that statement, made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Attorney-General. I table the following documents:

1. Final Report of National Crime Authority (January 1992)
2. National Crime Authority Summary of Charges and Convictions under South Australian Reference No. 2
3. SAPOL report on Anti Corruption Branch (13 March 1992)
4. SAPOL report on Operation Abalone
5. Report of Committee of Review on the operation of the South Australian Listening Devices Act (1972-1989).

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is that the House note grievances.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): It is unfortunate that the Minister of Mines and Energy cannot be here today whilst I address this problem. For many years, like many other members of Parliament, I have been called upon to address many issues, some of which are perceived to be major and some of which are perceived to be everyday, run-of-the-mill issues. However, none is so important in my opinion as those that affect the retired and elderly people in our community. As we all know from statistical data

available, the elderly population of South Australia is increasing quite dramatically. The reason I raise this issue today is in the context of a request for a bus shelter on Frederick Road at Seaton, which falls within my electorate.

For many years my constituents and I have attempted to obtain a bus shelter at this location, which is almost the corner of Brebner Drive and Frederick Road at Seaton, so that many elderly residents who catch a bus from this vicinity could rest with a degree of safety and be protected from the elements in summer and winter. Unfortunately, we have run into problems with this because the area that is required for the erection of the shelter is on a footpath that is not very wide. The local council has attempted to assist in this regard by requesting that the State Transport Authority helps and that ETSA provides a piece of land that would enable the recessing of this bus shelter into a small area of land that is currently located on the Grange golf course. I am advised that ETSA has stated that the STA indemnifies ETSA from and against the following:

(1) All claims, demands, writs, summonses, actions, suits, proceedings, judgments, orders, decrees, damages, costs, losses and expenses of any nature whatsoever which ETSA may suffer or incur in connection with loss of life, personal injury and/or damage to property arising or resulting from the use of the bus shelter, except in respect of loss of life, personal injury and/or damage to property suffered as a result of any negligent act or omission of ETSA or its servants, employees or agents.

(2) All loss and damage to property caused by STA or its employees, agents or invitees.
That ETSA shall not be liable or in any way responsible to STA or to any of STA's employees, agents or invitees . . .

So it goes on. When I showed this to my constituents, they said it was bureaucracy gone mad. All they are asking for is a small piece of land so they can erect a bus shelter. They do not want to know about all this nonsense in which Government departments are involved. They have been asking for years, in the eventide of their life, to have a bus shelter erected so that they can sit in comfort out of all the elements. They do not want to have to put up with this bureaucratic nonsense.

I appeal to the Minister to look at this case urgently and to change it. Mr Speaker, you and I are not far from retirement—we do not know when, but it is some time down the track. It may well be that, if we look after people, they will look after us, be they young or elderly. In this case, I believe very strongly that they should be looked after for the sake of a small, miserable piece of land to site a bus shelter. Surely it is not beyond the wit or compassion of ETSA to provide this piece of land to my constituents. It may well be that a relative of an ETSA employee wants to sit in this bus shelter. I ask that all the elderly residents in this area be looked after in a compassionate way. That is what Government is about, that is what Opposition is about—to try to look after our constituents and give them a little bit of comfort.

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

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): Since last Thursday the Government and the Premier have held this House in contempt. Last Thursday morning allegations were made about the possible conflict of interest of the Minister of Tourism. That was questioned by the Opposition during Question Time on Thursday and again today. We were forced to debate the poker machines legislation on Thursday afternoon and we will have to debate it again today.

All the Opposition wanted to do was hold up that legislation, some of the most important legislation to come before this House, while this matter is cleaned up. That is all we wanted to do.

It is a conscience issue, and individual members would have voted as their electorates dictated to them or as their consciences prevailed. That is a very fit and proper thing to do, but we have been held in contempt. The Premier says that we will not have an independent inquiry to find out exactly what went on in Cabinet or whether there was a conflict of interest, although we have had an admission today that perhaps there was a conflict of interest—a wonderful admission from the Premier. All we got from the Premier was that the Attorney-General will conduct an investigation. That is like Caesar investigating Caesar. Then the Premier said today to the member for Bright, 'If you give me the documents, I will investigate it.'

Mr S.J. Baker: What a joke!

Mr D.S. BAKER: That is the greatest joke that this Parliament has heard for a long time, because the Premier's credibility in this place and in this State is zilch. The Opposition has no confidence in the Premier, who will get in the documentation and cook up a story that he thinks the public of South Australia may swallow. Not good enough! As a proponent and supporter of poker machine legislation, I am very firm that, while this farce goes on, my conscience says that I will not support the legislation, and a lot of other people in South Australia would be urging other members of this place to do exactly the same thing. All we want to do is debate the legislation without this smell hanging over it. That is what every member in this House should want and, of course, it is being denied.

It is not the first time that this Minister has got into trouble with a possible conflict of interest. In 1988 and 1989 when questions were asked on two occasions those issues were glossed over by the Premier, who said that there was no conflict at all. It is not the first time since this Premier has been in charge of Cabinet that there have been conflicts of interest by other members who have come under question. We had the infamous incident involving the Minister of Recreation and Sport who, in 1988, invoked a section 50 notice at the other end of his street to protect his interests, and we questioned very greatly whether there was a conflict of interest there.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr D.S. BAKER: The conflict of interest was there, of course, but the Minister and the Premier would not recognise that. So all we want to know from the Premier is the standards which he expects his Cabinet colleagues to follow. They are allowed to do anything in Cabinet and then try to get away with it afterwards. Today we have seen the Premier admit that in hindsight he did know something about Jim Stitt's involvement with the hospitality industry—he admitted that. Hindsight is a wonderful thing, and we have seen a bit of hindsight on SGIC, the State Bank, Scrimber and 83 000 unemployed in South Australia. There is a hell of a lot of hindsight in this State and, in fact, the Premier has said that, in hindsight, perhaps there was a conflict of interest.

The Opposition is simply saying that it does not want to debate this legislation until this conflict of interest is checked out. We want to make sure that, if there was conflict of interest, there is evidence to support that to an independent inquiry. We do not want an inquiry by the Attorney-General or the Premier, who could cook up some story—we want an independent inquiry so that the people of South Australia will know that every member in this House will debate the poker machines legislation with an absolutely clear conscience and not with this shadow hanging over every person in this place while we try to debate the Bill. There is no question that the Minister should be sacked, and there is

no question that the Premier does not have the guts to do it.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I think the contribution that has just been given is lamentable. However, I must say that, although I do not agree with the message, the Leader of the Opposition spoke better on this topic than, sadly, he has in the past two years. It is with great regret that I point out that the content of his speech was not only vacuous but, quite clearly, it was an example of where he will pillory anybody on any charge on any day of the week for some advantage. It is pleasing to see that, this time, the Leader did it without notes. In fact, had he done that two years ago he may not be in the position now where Senator Olsen is likely to make a comeback in this place. I make those comments because that is the sort of innuendo that has been coming across from the other side and which lowers the tone of debates on every issue in this place.

What is more, members opposite, led by the current Leader, get up and claim that all they want to do is talk about the gaming machines legislation. They could have fooled me and everyone else around here, and they could have fooled the public of South Australia, because one thing is clear: right now the Opposition wants to talk about anything—anything at all—anything to filibuster on this legislation, because they see some short-term advantage in it.

It was the same story last week with the MFP Bill. I am still waiting to find out where the Opposition stands on that issue. In the two years I have been in this place, the one thing that has become quite clear is that the Opposition is incapable of governing. It is incapable, because it cannot make any of the hard decisions and it cannot see where it is going. There are a handful of members opposite who, where that is concerned, have got some brains, and there are leaks in the corridors. Unfortunately, they are not all that happy with the current establishment over there.

It will be interesting to see whether they are happy with the new one that comes up shortly. The Leader of the Opposition asked what is expected of Cabinet Ministers. I ask the House, 'What do the people of South Australia expect in an Opposition?' One of the things they expect is some sort of vision, some sort of alternative government and, above all else, the one thing they need—and the public of South Australia will be demanding it from them—is some integrity, and the way they have conducted themselves since last Thursday—

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: The member for Mount Gambier is part of that whole show and, what is more, he has been there longer than many of the other members and ought to know better. He always lectures the House about the correct procedures and all the rest of it, yet he has been party to this grubby little campaign waged in this House. No longer is one innocent until proven guilty: one is guilty as soon as the Opposition thinks there can be some mileage in it. The member for Mount Gambier is now silent, but a moment ago he was quite happy to jump in on all that, as he has been on many other occasions.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: Of course, we expect it from the member for Murray-Mallee. In the past four days the standing of the Opposition in this community has reached a lower level than at any other time in my political life. It needs to be made quite clear in this matter that some procedures ought to have been adopted in this case. If the Opposition believed an issue needed airing in Parliament, it should have done the following couple of things.

First, it should have attempted to check the veracity of the information it had. Secondly, the Opposition should not be at all reticent in coming forward and presenting that information. The information which has been alluded to in this House ought to be made available to the Premier and the Attorney-General; if there is a case to be answered, that is when the case will be answered. It is clear in this instance that the Opposition will make as much of a smokescreen as it possibly can—

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

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I did not intend to get into the area of the debate that the past two speakers have referred to, but I wish now to make a brief comment. The member for Playford raved on about what the Opposition was trying to do concerning the Minister of Tourism. I want to be brief. It has been proven that there was a conflict of interest. The Premier has admitted that, the Minister has admitted it and we have heard a statement—it is true. Surely that is enough for the Minister to step aside so that we can go on to debate the legislation, free in our own minds that the matter will be resolved somewhere down the track through some form of inquiry. That is all we are asking.

Whether the Minister is reinstated or has to step aside totally is irrelevant to the debate at this stage, but it is critical, for the sake of democracy, for the sake of the Westminster system under which we operate, for that to happen. If the reverse were the case and we were on the Government benches, the same request would be made, and quite justifiably so.

I want to refer briefly to a comment in today's editorial in the *News* which I found interesting. It states:

The latest bizarre test is that a backbencher, the Liberal Party's Mr Stan Evans, now wants to exclude poker machines from the casino.

Nice of them to call me Mister.

The Hon. J.P. Trainer: You can't quite score 'the honourable'.

Mr S.G. EVANS: No, I am in the same category as the honourable member who just interjected. The editorial continues:

Never mind the investment made. Never mind the Party of private enterprise. Mr Evans disapproves.

The trouble is, the *News* changes reporters, editors and subeditors so often that people do not remember that over the years I have kept on trying to win that sort of vote and have been opposed all along the line. Still, you have to give them credit: they are having trouble at the moment, and I realise they have to make a point now and again, so I do not mind a little jab from them. But they also need a memory.

I want to raise a matter I was hoping to raise by way of a question, although that has not been possible, so I hope that the Minister of Transport is listening somewhere, or someone will pass this on to him: I am concerned about a circular sent out to all travel agents by Australian National on 3 March 1992, which stated as follows:

Dear agent—Manual Pages.

Please find enclosed your new travel agent's manual pages, updated fares, timetables and information as from 1 March 1992. Should more manuals or updated pages be required by your agency, please complete the attached request form.

Daylight saving—South Australia. From 1 March to 21 March 1992 [and that day has now gone] daylight saving continues in South Australia. However, the new timetables are correct. We will speed up or slow down our trains to meet the printed schedules.

I find that interesting. I should like the Minister to report back whether he has had any complaints from travellers on Australian National lines about the danger of trains trying to gain an hour on the trip from Melbourne to Adelaide. It is not so bad going the other way, as they will be losing an hour, but I was interested to find out what would happen when a train left Kaniva for Adelaide and was going to try to meet the time scheduled for Bordertown. It has to gain an hour from Kaniva to Bordertown, which I think would be a rather thrilling trip.

I find it quite amazing, and trust that the Minister will look at it in case we have extended daylight saving again next year. There will be no problem going the other way, because the train will be doing as it usually does—going too slowly for most of the passengers and usually arriving late. That would be among the most stupid circulars anyone could send out to travel agents—to tell them that there is one hour's difference in the time according to the printed schedules but that AN will speed up the trains coming to Adelaide and slow them down going to Melbourne. I take it that the situation will be the same with the Indian Pacific, etc. I hope that one day we will do away with daylight saving altogether, as Queensland has.

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): In the time allotted to me today I should like to speak about a very important announcement that was made on 26 February 1992 in the One Nation economic statement of the Prime Minister, Paul Keating. That statement engendered in me a great deal of optimism, because I believe, unlike perhaps some people I have heard carping and criticising, that Australia is still, in fact, the lucky country. The summary of measures in that One Nation package are as follows: it is a four-year plan, beginning now with an immediate boost to spending and employment and ending in 1995-96, with the budget back in surplus and dramatically reduced marginal income tax rates for most Australians.

Under the plan the Government's aim is to add 800 000 jobs over four years—which is a realistic assessment, I might add, unlike the Fightback package—and also to make up our losses in economic growth five times over, while keeping our firm commitment to low inflation. That is one very important aspect of this package, as is paying our way in the world with higher exports. Obviously, that must be an aim of any Government at the Federal level.

Over the four years of the Keating Government's plan, the aim is to reform the aviation and electricity industries, rebuild the railways and road highways, stimulate competition between ports, reform workplaces, encourage private investment with new tax rules and transform skills training. All these things will have a marked effect on South Australia and on the everyday lives of its citizens.

Under the heading 'Bringing forward recovery' there is a fiscal shot in the arm of \$2.3 billion by the end of 1992-93. Much of that, I am very pleased to say, will be spent on improving Australia's infrastructure. Whilst one of the pet projects that I have in mind was not mentioned, I think it may still go ahead with some of the other mechanisms included in this One Nation package. The project to which I refer is the building of the Alice Springs-Darwin railway line.

As part of 'Bringing forward recovery' there will also be a one-off family allowance payment to provide a boost to consumer confidence, and the cost of that as at April 1992 will be \$317 million. There is also a cut in the sales tax rate from 20 per cent to 15 per cent for new cars so as to revive the motor vehicle industry. Effectively, that will save \$800 on a family sedan and will cost \$185 million in 1992-

93. There will also be some small business relief with the deferral of the initial payment of company tax, and that will be at a cost of \$10 million.

Under the heading 'Building a stronger Australia' and the subheading 'Stimulating private investment', one of the things I particularly support is a new competitive depreciation regime which will reduce the write-off time for a 20-year asset by more than half, and that will cost \$490 million by 1995-96. There will also be the depreciation of industrial and tourism buildings which will be increased to 4 per cent at a cost of \$15 million in 1994-95. There will be a tax concession allowing private companies to issue non-assessable, non-deductible bonds in order to finance land transport and electricity generating projects which, in the end, will provide services to the public. That will be at a cost of \$10 million in 1993-94 rising to \$100 million in 1995-96. There will also be structural improvements including some earthworks that were previously ineligible, and they will be depreciated at 2.5 per cent.

There are a number of other initiatives under the heading 'Building a stronger Australia'. There will be assistance in helping and encouraging major projects by a new 10 per cent development allowance, as well as providing streamlined approval processes for those major projects. The next subheading is 'Making low inflation a habit', in other words, to keep low inflation on the agenda continually. Under 'Rebuilding our workplaces', the Industrial Relations Act will be amended to encourage workplace bargaining. I believe that this is a much more workable solution than the contracts employment legislation which is being promoted by the Federal Government. Under the subheading 'Increasing the rewards of work', there will be a reduction in marginal tax rates affecting the great majority of workers.

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

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to be able to take part in this debate this afternoon. The first matter I wish to bring to the attention of the House—and I am pleased that the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs is in the Chamber—is the desire of Aboriginal police aides to join the South Australian Police Association. Currently Aboriginal police aides are not permitted to join that association because the necessary legislation needs amending. I have been approached by people in the northern part of my electorate who have expressed concern that there has been some delay, and they cannot understand why, because only one very simple amendment is required. They were of the view that there would be unanimous support in the Parliament for such a proposition.

On Friday I sent the Minister of Emergency Services a fax advising him of my total support for this concept, and of my hope that he could bring the legislation to the Parliament as soon as possible. I sincerely hope that we will see the legislation in the very near future, before this session concludes. I am aware that there is an attempt to extend the session. However, I believe it should not be necessary for those people in the Police Association who wish to participate in this matter to have to wait that time. I understand that the Police Association is totally in support of this matter. I have been advised by the association that it can see no problem, either from the association's point of view or from the Police Department's point of view, with respect to administration matters.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I sincerely hope that there is not industrial action, because a bit of commonsense ought to apply. The Minister should make a statement, either today or tomorrow

at the latest, to the effect that the legislation will be brought in forthwith. I understand the reason for the amendments to the current legislation: it relates back to the early days of the Victorian police when police wardens were used against the police involved in industrial activities. However, time has marched on and the Aboriginal police aides have been doing an outstanding job in the northern parts of the State. It is one of the success stories of the administration of Aboriginal Affairs, and we should do everything possible to ensure that this program continues in an orderly and responsible manner. Secondly, unlike last year when the Government went back on its word.

I want an assurance from the Minister that funds will be provided to enable police aides to be stationed at Ceduna and Coober Pedy. The Government promised those funds, but did not provide them, and the community had to be deprived of this excellent policing facility. There is a need for this facility. Anyone who knows anything about Aboriginal Affairs recognises that the best way of policing these areas is to have a number of Aboriginal police aides involved in the field. Fewer people were arrested and fewer put in gaol when this was the case. Commonsense prevails, and most people recognise that fact. I call on the Minister to give unqualified support for the establishment of police aides at Ceduna and Coober Pedy and, hopefully, a number of other places around South Australia. The amount of money actually involved would be more than that saved in other Government expenditure incurred in building bigger gaols and dragging people unnecessarily before the courts.

Finally, I am concerned that there appears to be a systematic program in place to the effect that chief executive officers of hospitals will not be replaced when they retire. I am told that there is unlikely to be a replacement at Quorn. I would like the Minister of Health to clear up this concern. I am told that there is likely to be a resignation at the Coober Pedy hospital, which has a \$2 million budget. This information was given to me last night. I raise it in the hope that the Minister can clear it up. Both hospitals will be administered from Port Augusta. I want to know whether my information is correct. I would have thought it is not possible, but the Chief Executive Officer at Quorn has resigned and there is likely to be a resignation by the officer at Coober Pedy. I am told that the aim is to have these hospitals administered from Port Augusta.

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

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (DETENTION OF INSANE OFFENDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill was originally introduced as a Private Member's Bill by the Hon. Dr R.J. Ritson. The Government formed the view that it supported the principal thrust of the measures proposed, and agreed to support the Bill, subject to some amendment.

In general terms, the law in relation to persons charged with an offence and found unfit to plead, and persons found to be

legally insane at the time at which they committed an offence, is to be found in a combination of the common law and statute law. The relevant statutory provisions are to be found in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and the Mental Health (Supplementary Provisions) Act. The common law and the statutes applicable have remained in fundamentally the same form since the early part of the nineteenth century. There is universal agreement that the state of the law in this area is very unsatisfactory. There is less agreement about what ought to be done about it.

This Bill is an important first step in the long overdue reform of this area of law. The Honourable Dr Ritson has long had an abiding interest in this area of law, and he is to be congratulated on his efforts in this regard.

Broadly speaking, the Bill does three things:

- it takes the decisions about the detention or continued detention of a person found unfit to plead or not guilty by reason of insanity out of the hands of the Governor in Council and places them in the hands of the court, and provides for the applicable judicial procedures;
- it provides for the concerns of the next of kin and the victims of the 'offence' in the decision about the future of such people; and
- it compels the formulation of a 'treatment plan' for such people.

The major measure of reform in this Bill is the abolition of the Governor's Pleasure system of detaining persons found unfit to plead to a criminal charge or not guilty of a criminal charge on the grounds of insanity. Under that system, all such people are detained indefinitely at the pleasure of the Governor, which, in effect, means that they are to be imprisoned without a release date and that release is a decision for the Governor in Council.

The abolition of the Governor's Pleasure system has been a matter of some controversy for many years. In particular, there has been controversy about the crucial fact that release decisions reside in the political process. For a variety of reasons, most, if not all of the persons held in this system have been charged with homicide: perhaps gruesome homicide. Inevitably, difficult questions arise for Cabinet to decide to release such a person, even though he or she has not been found guilty of any offence and even though he or she may have been released after a definite term had he or she been found guilty.

The Governor's Pleasure system has been under attack for many years, but it is not hard to understand why Governments of all political persuasion have hitherto failed to change the system, in this State and elsewhere. After all, the voluminous literature on the scientific prediction of dangerousness boils down to a certainty rate of less than 50 per cent. If the release decision goes horribly wrong (as it has recently in Queensland), it is the Government that will bear the brunt of any community outrage, not matter where the decision is taken. With responsibility comes right: if the Government will wear the blame, surely the Government should take the decision. Arguably, the Government should bear the responsibility of considering the wider public interest and the preservation of public confidence in the administration of justice.

But all of these reasons apply equally to release decisions made in respect of other detained people, who may be equally 'dangerous' or more so. After all, a person may be unfit to plead, not because he or she is insane, but because he or she suffers from an intellectual disability. We have decided, as a community, that these decisions should rest with the courts as guardians of the public interest and the due administration of the criminal justice system. It is not obvious why these people, all of whom have not been found guilty of any crime, should be treated differently. In the end, the move in this State and elsewhere has been consistently to de-politicize these kinds of decisions which are, after all, fundamental decisions about the liberty of the subject. The essential correctness of this attitude can be seen in the support that this Bill has had from all political parties.

Whether the release decision should reside in a court or a specialist Tribunal/Board is a question to which there is no one right answer. Current Queensland legislation diverts the decision making from the courts to a Mental Health Review Tribunal. The Victorian Law Reform Commission recommended a specially constituted Parole Board, headed by a judge. The New South Wales legislation splits decision-making between a court and a Mental Health Review Tribunal.

In general terms, the argument for having a court make the release decision is that it fixes accountability; and it locates the decision about liberty in a forum best fitted to address it in terms of custom, procedures, accountability and openness. The argument in favour of a specialist Tribunal/Board is that it enables the decision to be made by a specialist body having special knowledge and that it enables the decision to be integrated with public policy and other areas of decision in relation to the uni-

verse of legal and moral decisions about the mentally ill generally, and the person concerned specifically.

Generally, it is true to say that South Australia has moved to system of court based sentencing and court based release. Perhaps the deciding factors are that a court can hear, and is, by the provisions of this Bill, obliged to hear, expert evidence; and that considerations of public accountability and responsibility tend to favour the court option.

The Bill also provides for a significant accommodation of the interests of the next of kin of the person concerned and the victims, if any, of the offence in relation to which the person is detained. These provisions have been amended in order to ensure that the philosophy which informs them is consistent with that contained in the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act.

In the words of its sponsor, 'The Bill deals only with the matter of court orders replacing the Governor's Pleasure and the formal consideration of victims and relatives. It is designed to be flexible, scientific and divorced from political pressure'. However, the Government acknowledges that this Bill is just a first step—albeit a very important and great first step—on a reform process, the rest of which will follow once the discussions on a National Criminal Code have reached the appropriate stage. That will happen in the very near future. I commend the Bill to the House.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the detention of a person found not guilty on the ground of insanity in a secure institution until further order of the court. Clause 3 provides that a person judged not fit to plead because of insanity will be detained in a secure institution until further order of the court.

Clause 4 sets out the powers of the court to release a detainee on licence or to discharge him or her from detention absolutely. Treatment programs must be established and revised annually, and these must be furnished to the court, the Crown and the detainee. The Minister of Health must provide counselling services for the detainee's family and the victims of the offence each time that an application is made for release on licence, variation of licence conditions or discharge of the detention order. The Crown must furnish the court with reports on the view of the detainee's family and of the victims of the offence in relation to any application. The court, in exercising its powers under this section, must take into account not only the psychiatric reports on the detainee, but also the interests of the detainee himself or herself, the interests of his or her family and of the victims of the offence and the interests of the community at large. Release on licence can be cancelled by the court for contravention, or likely contravention, of a licence condition. Further imprisonment automatically cancels release on licence. After three years of a detainee's release on licence the court must review the detention order and may discharge it. There must be at least six month intervals between unsuccessful applications by the detainee for release or discharge. Clause 5 sets out two transitional provisions designed to bring current Governor's pleasure detainees into the new system on the commencement of this Act.

Mr S.J. BAKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION (EXPIRY) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill proposes changes to the automatic expiry provisions of the Subordinate Legislation Act. In 1987 this Parliament passed legislation that provided for the sunset of regulations after seven years. The legislation was introduced primarily to allow for the consolidation, rationalisation and simplification of regulations which have become outdated and was part of a package of deregulation initiatives introduced by the Government at the time. Under the package the development of new or amended legislation must undergo a stringent prior assessment process to ensure that the benefits of regulation clearly outweigh the costs.

The mechanism to continually review laws which govern activities and behaviour is appropriate given the dynamic regulatory

environment in contemporary society. However, one of the major problems with the expiry program to date has been the delays in completing reviews. These delays have, in most cases, been caused because the review of regulations under an Act has prompted, quite naturally, a wider review encompassing the Act itself. It is quite proper for Acts to be reviewed, but this is a much more comprehensive task and contributes significantly to finalising the review of regulations.

Regulations made after 1 January 1986 have a seven year life. Between 20 and 6 new sets of regulations have been made each year since that date. If no adjustment is made to the expiry timetable currently set by the Act, many exemptions will have to be granted over the next two years. The Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation has also raised concern over this aspect of the program.

Exemption from expiry is achieved by prescribing in regulation those regulations to which the expiry provisions do not apply. As there are no provisions to the contrary, all exemptions from expiry have to date been granted for no specific period.

This Bill proposes that rather than the term 'exemption', which conveys the impression that the regulation is in some way outside the provisions of the Act, the process should be referred to as a 'postponement' of expiry. In addition, to ensure that the deregulation processes are sufficient and effective, the Bill provides that postponement be for a period of up to two years with provision for further such postponements up to a total of four years.

The effect of disallowance of a regulation under the Subordinate Legislation Act exempting a regulation from expiry (or postponing a regulation) is also not clear. The Bill proposes that disallowance of a regulation granting postponement has the effect of revoking the regulations as from the date of the resolution of disallowance.

Finally, the Bill provides for a new expiry timetable to be set to provide that regulations falling within the ongoing review program expire on 1 September in the year following the year in which they have their tenth anniversary. It is estimated that over 250 sets of regulations will have to be reviewed and either have to be redrafted or let lapse before the first stage of the Automatic Revocation Program is completed. (That is, the complete review of all regulations made prior to 1 January 1986.) This includes the regulations that have to date been exempted from the program.

The Subordinate Legislation Act currently provides that this is to be achieved by 1 January 1993. The 'rolling' expiries [that is, those regulations made after 1 January 1986] are scheduled to commence on 1 January 1993. Under the current program reviews of the 1986 regulations are due to be completed in 1992. The Bill provides that the program be extended to enable the backlog of regulations to be dealt with before starting out on the 'rolling' expiries.

To achieve this regulations falling within the ongoing review program are to be given a longer life. Such an extension would not detract from the value of the expiry program. Regulations made after 1986 have been drafted by Parliamentary Counsel cognisant of one of the main aims of the expiry program that is to simplify, consolidate and rationalise all subordinate legislation. Once regulations have been subjected to this kind of review a first time, the second, third and so on reviews are not of the same value.

The Bill therefore also provides that the catch-up program be extended so that all regulations made before 1987 be dealt with by 1 September 1996.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 16a which sets out the regulations to which Part IIIA (the expiry program) applies. It removes paragraph (f) which provides that the regulations may exempt regulations or a class of regulations from the program. The Bill provides instead for the expiry of regulations to be postponed: see clause 4. Paragraph (f) is replaced with one that provides that regulations made by a person, body or authority other than the Governor are excluded from the expiry program. Paragraphs (b) and (e) are deleted since the work of these paragraphs is taken over by that of the new paragraph (f).

Clause 3 substitutes subsection (1) of section 16b which sets out the expiry program. The program is amended so that regulations expire on 1 September following the 10th anniversary of their publication in the *Gazette*. The catch-up program is consequently extended as follows:

- (a) a regulation made before 1 January 1976, and all subsequent regulations amending that regulation, will expire on 1 September 1992;
- (b) a regulation made on or after 1 January 1976 but before 1 January 1980, and all subsequent regulations amending that regulation, will expire on 1 September 1993;
- (c) a regulation made on or after 1 January 1980 but before 1 June 1982, and all subsequent regulations amending that regulation, will expire on 1 September 1994;

- (d) a regulation made on or after 1 June 1982 but before 1 April 1984, and all subsequent regulations amending that regulation, will expire on 1 September 1995;
- (e) a regulation made on or after 1 April 1984 but before 1 June 1985, and all subsequent regulations amending that regulation, will expire on 1 September 1996;
- (f) a regulation made on or after 1 June 1985 but before 1 January 1987, and all subsequent regulations amending that regulation, will expire on 1 September 1997.

The regulations referred to in paragraphs (a) and (b) have previously been exempted from expiry. Clause 4 inserts a new section 16c which allows for the postponement of expiry of any regulation for periods not exceeding two years at a time or an aggregate of four. It also provides that disallowance of a regulation postponing the expiry of another regulation means that the other regulation ceases to have effect from the date on which the notice of disallowance is published in the *Gazette* (if this is before the date of expiry as set out in section 16b, the regulations will continue to have effect until the date of expiry).

Mr S.J. BAKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SENTENCING) BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill seeks to make amendment to the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988 'the Act' in a number of areas which have been identified as requiring clarification or amendment. The Bill also makes a number of consequential amendments to the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act 1979 and the Correctional Services Act 1982.

The Bill was introduced into Parliament on 21 March 1991. Due to pressure of business at that time an agreement was reached to pass only the provisions in the Bill which allowed a court to order a sentence of community service without recording a conviction. It was indicated at that time that the remainder of the Bill would be reintroduced in the August session of Parliament. Since that time a number of new provisions have been added to the Bill as a result of further suggestions for amendment. The new provisions include the following:

- allowing a court convicting a person of multiple offences against the same provision of an Act to impose one penalty in respect of all of the offences;
- increasing the options available to a sentencing court where the person is subject to an existing non-parole period but where the sentence is to be followed by a Commonwealth minimum term;
- grant a court the discretion, where a person is in default of payment of a fine arising from an offence involving the use of a motor vehicle, to disqualify the person from holding or obtaining a driver's licence until the fine has been paid. These amendments will also apply to children who do not pay fines imposed by the Children's Court;
- allow the court to issue a warrant immediately for imprisonment if it suspects that the person may abscond without paying a fine imposed by the court;
- an amendment to the Correctional Services Act 1982 to allow remission credited to a prisoner who is serving a non-parole period to be credited against both the non-parole period and the head sentence.

The Bill has been amended to follow the provision contained in section 4K (4) of the Commonwealth Crimes Act 1914 which empowers a court convicting a person of multiple offences against the same provision of a law of the Commonwealth to impose one penalty in respect of all of those offences. This provision was originally raised by the Senior Judge for consideration as providing a useful sentencing tool, especially in cases involving multiple acts of dishonesty. The amendment has been approved by the Chief Justice and the Department of Correctional Services. The amendment will simplify the task of the sentencer in establishing an appropriate penalty and the setting of a non-parole period.

The new provision will also eliminate the risk of miscalculation and errors in complex sentence calculations and avail prisoners of a clear picture of the penalty imposed by the court.

The amendment in clause 7 of the Bill deals with a particular set of circumstances such as arose in *The Queen v Ditroia* heard before the Court of Criminal Appeal in July 1990. In this case the accused was already serving nine years, with a non-parole period of eight years, for an existing State offence, for a subsequent Commonwealth offence he was sentenced to six years with a minimum of four years to commence at the expiration of the non-parole period for the State offence. He was also convicted of a later State offence for which he was sentenced to a further two and a half years with a two year non-parole period. The head sentence was to commence at the end of the minimum term for the Commonwealth offence but due to the existing section 32 (1) (b) of the Act, the only course open was to extend the existing State non-parole period which became automatically concurrent with the Commonwealth minimum term. This resulted in a reduction in the accused's sentence and caused the Chief Justice to comment that the section had left the court unable to impose an effective penalty. The amendment to section 32 (1) allows the court in these circumstances to impose a second non-parole period for the subsequent State offence to commence, with the head sentence, at the expiration of the Commonwealth minimum term.

The Bill includes new provisions which allow courts, in the adult and the juvenile jurisdictions, in the case of fine defaults which arise from an offence involving the use of a motor vehicle, to disqualify the person from holding or obtaining a driver's licence.

There is no doubt that courts generally see the power to disqualify an offender from driving as one of the more effective, or as Bray CJ put it in *Law v Deed* one of the least ineffective weapons that they possess. Indeed, His Honour ventured the opinion that many, if not most, drivers would fear the loss of their licence for a substantial period far more than a fine and many would fear it more than a short term of imprisonment.

Similar systems have operated for some time in both New South Wales and Victoria and have proved most successful in encouraging payment of fines and reducing costs to the community of incarcerating fine defaulters. Under the amendments contained in the Bill, the court may, instead of issuing a warrant to commit a fine defaulter to prison, disqualify a person from holding or obtaining a driver's licence until the pecuniary sum has been fully satisfied. The court notifies the Registrar of Motor Vehicles and disqualification occurs 14 days after notification unless the fine is paid. Revocation of the disqualification will only occur if the court is satisfied that the fine has been reduced and that continuation of the disqualification would result in hardship, or that the person has agreed to work off the fine in community service. Finally, the court has power to issue a warrant of commitment during a period of disqualification if it believes it is appropriate to do so.

Under the Act, a person must be in default of payment of a pecuniary sum for one month before a warrant of commitment can be issued. The Department of Court Services has raised this period as a problem in cases where it is believed a person may abscond before the period has expired. Therefore, the Act has been amended in clause 21 to override the one month default period if the court is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for suspecting that the person will abscond without making payment.

As a result of legislative amendments in 1983, prisoners are released on parole at the expiry of their head sentence. In 1989, the High Court in *Hoare and Easton v The Queen* took the view that because remissions are not credited against head sentences there had been an 'incidental, undeserved and undesired' increase in the length of parole periods. Recent studies have shown that parolees are at highest risk of reoffending in the early stages of their parole and that supervision for years past this period raises administrative costs and reduces the level of resources available for those at highest risk. An amendment has been made to the Correctional Services Act 1982 to allow remission credited to a prisoner who is serving a non-parole period to be credited against both the non-parole period and the head sentence. The amendment will address the remarks made by the High Court and allow a more effective use of resources. It is essential to note that the amendments will not result in a prisoner spending less time in custody. The changes will also allow more intense supervision of parolees when they are at their highest level of risk and will reduce administrative overheads.

The matter of fine default has been a significant and growing problem. Due to unavailability of prison accommodation and operational problems for police, an administrative release procedure was established in police stations. When a warrant for fine default is executed, the offender is admitted into police custody. For default periods of five days or less, and a proportion of longer

terms, the police transmit the warrant by facsimile to a prison where the person's earliest discharge date is calculated, taking the use of administrative discharge into account. The advice of the person's release date is returned to the police by facsimile. Often, because of the short default period, the person is released immediately. Approximately 7 000 administrative release by facsimile of fine defaulters from police stations occurred in the 12 months to September 1991. The Government was not prepared to allow this situation to continue.

Accordingly, a three stage process has now been developed to address this situation. The first stage, discontinuation of administrative release by facsimile and overnight detention, was implemented on 4 December 1991. Stage two removed the use of administrative discharge for fine defaulters on 30 December 1991. There has been a noted improvement in the payment of fines since the discontinuation of these procedures. Stage three is the amendment in clause 21 of the Bill which provides that fine default periods are to be served cumulatively with each other. This amendment will ensure that the fine, which is the most common sanction issued for breaches of the law, will be restored as an effective sanction. Cabinet has approved the provision of additional capital funding to the Department of Correctional Services to acquire and upgrade suitable low security accommodation for fine defaulters.

This Bill also amends the Act to enable the Parole Board, or, in the case of a young offender, the Training Centre Review Board to take action, on their own volition, to vary or revoke the conditions of release for persons detained pursuant to section 23, or to cancel release.

Section 23 of the Act provides for the detention of offenders incapable of controlling their sexual instincts. Section 24 allows for the release of a person on licence subject to conditions specified by the appropriate board, that is, the Parole Board, or in the case of a young offender the Training Centre Review Board. Section 24 (5) allows for the Crown or the person to apply to the appropriate board for a variation or revocation of a condition of licence or the imposition of further conditions, and for the Crown to apply for cancellation of release.

The Chairperson of the Parole Board has indicated that she considers that it is a flaw in the system that the board does not have power to cancel, release, vary or impose conditions or to cancel release on its own volition. If a matter comes to the board's attention which in the board's opinion makes it desirable to change or remove a condition, the board, at the present time, is obliged to ask the Crown to apply to the board before the board can act.

The Government accepts that it is anomalous that the appropriate board can set the conditions of release but is not at liberty to vary the conditions of licence on its own motion, or to cancel release for breach of condition.

The Bill addresses the problem by enabling the appropriate board to cancel, release or vary or impose conditions, or cancel release, on its own motion. However, before doing so, the board must give reasonable notice to the person and to the Crown and consider any submissions made by the person or the Crown in relation to the matter.

The Act has also been amended to permit the Chairman of the Parole Board to apply for a non-parole period to be fixed in respect of prisoners who are liable to serve greater than one year imprisonment and where no non-parole period has been fixed.

There are currently five life sentenced prisoners without non-parole periods. Four refuse to apply for a non-parole period. Subject to the exercise of the Governor's prerogative of mercy, a prisoner serving a term of life imprisonment without a non-parole period can never be released under the current legislation. Prisoners without release dates create problems for the Department of Correctional Services. Placement, sentence plans and resocialisation programs are based on the projected release date of prisoners. The proposed amendment to section 32 (3) of the Act will enable the Parole Board to apply for a non-parole period on behalf of a prisoner.

Currently, there is no power under the Act to extend the time within which community service can be performed. The Act provides that a time limit must be set. Section 44 of the Act provides that a court may, on the application of the probationer or the Minister of Correctional Services, vary a condition of a bond which presumably would enable the time within which community service is to be performed to be varied provided it was a condition of a bond. However, under the Act, community service is not part of a bond unless a suspended sentence of imprisonment has been imposed. Clause 10 of the Bill makes clear that a court can extend the period of a bond to enable community service to be performed by a period up to six months.

An amendment to section 751 of the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act will allow a court to extend the period within which community service can be extended.

The amendment in clause 13 of the Bill will allow a court, on the application of the appropriate officer, the Minister, or the person who is liable under the terms of an order of a court, to perform community service to: vary or revoke the order; or extend the period of the order during which community service is to be performed by up to six months.

The Bill also provides for the Minister to remit unperformed hours of community service in certain circumstances. The new provision is similar to the present section 44 (2) of the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988 which deals with variation or discharge of a bond. Sometimes a person has substantially performed a community service order but because of some extraneous reason, for example, employment, or serious illness, it would not be appropriate to require him or her to continue to perform community service.

Section 47 of the Act covers the operation of community service work in particular in relation to hours and conditions of work. The provisions cover offenders undertaking community service orders or bond, and working off fines under the fine option program. The continuous growth in the number of offenders placed upon both programs provides opportunities to undertake a wider range of work projects. The numbers also pose difficulties from time to time in obtaining suitable programs. The Department of Correctional Services wishes to use opportunities, with approval, to undertake tasks where more than eight hours can be credited in one day.

There have been examples of projects where offenders would have to assemble at 7.30 a.m. to be transported to the worksite and, after a days work, arrive back in the city at 6.00 p.m. This would exceed eight hours.

Therefore to provide greater flexibility in the scheme, an amendment is proposed to section 47f of the Act to allow for community service for a period exceeding eight hours in circumstances approved by the Minister. A consequential amendment is also made to section 74aa of the Correctional Services Act 1982 which deals with the power of the Parole Board to impose a community service order for breach of a non-designated condition.

The Bill also amends the provisions relating to action on breach of a bond. Section 57 (4) of the Act provides that 'If a probationer is found guilty of an offence by a court other than the probative court, being an offence committed during the term of the bond, the court . . . if it is of an inferior jurisdiction to the probative court, must arraign the probationer to the probative court for sentence.'

The effect of this is that only the probative court can deal with the breach of the bond. It would mean that if the bond is breached by a subsequent offence the summary court dealing with that offence would be obliged to remand the offender to the higher court for sentence. Under the Offenders Probation Act, proceedings taken against a probationer for a breach of bond or to revoke a suspended sentence were referred to or commenced in the probative court leaving the inferior court to sentence on the subsequent offence.

The amendment to section 57 will return to the earlier position. Where a probationer is found guilty by a court of superior jurisdiction to that of the probative court, any proceedings for breach will continue to be taken in the court of superior jurisdiction. Problems have also arisen where the bond ordered by a court is one which could have been ordered by a court of summary jurisdiction. For example, where the Supreme Court on hearing an appeal from a Magistrates Court, orders that the appellant enter into a bond. The Supreme Court would then be the probative court. Clause 4 (c) of the Bill inserts a new provision into the Act to provide that, in the case of appeals where a substituted sentence is ordered, the bond should be deemed to be an order of the original court.

Until recently, it was the practice of courts, when enforcing payment of overdue pecuniary penalties that had been imposed on actions initiated by private complainants (for example, councils, the Taxation Department, private individuals) to seek the permission of the complainant to enforce payment, and to seek the payment into court of a fee to cover the cost of issuing the warrant.

However, it has since been decided that there is in fact no requirement to seek a complainant's permission to enforce an order of the court, and that recovery of the warrant fee may be achieved by means other than by collecting it from the complainant. This decision has given rise to a procedure now having been adopted by appropriate officers whereby warrants of commitment are issued without any contact or consultation being made with the complainant.

This has caused concern that if a pecuniary sum imposed by a court is paid direct to a complainant, and the complainant neglects to advise the court accordingly, an appropriate officer may, notwithstanding that payment has been made, issue a warrant of

commitment on the basis of court's record of default. In order to ensure that persons are not wrongfully imprisoned, the Act should be amended to provide that subject to any order of the court pecuniary sums are payable only to the court.

Clause 19 of the Bill inserts section 59a into the Act to effect such a change.

New section 59a inserts such a provision into the Act. section 61 (2) of the Act currently prohibits the issue of a warrant of commitment for imprisonment on an overdue pecuniary penalty until a period of one month has elapsed from the due date for payment. If a court orders the forthwith payment of a pecuniary penalty section 61 (2) of the Act precludes the immediate issue of a warrant of commitment. This can have the effect of delaying the issue of the warrant until after the release from custody of the defendant. The warrant must then be served and the person committed to prison.

Clause 21 of the Bill amends section 61 of the Act to provide that where a person is in default of payment of a pecuniary sum and is already serving some other term of imprisonment a warrant of commitment can be served forthwith. This prevents a person being released from prison and then having to be immediately returned once the warrant is served.

Section 71 of the Act deals with a failure to comply with a court order. The provision allows the appropriate officer to sentence the person to imprisonment, issue a warrant and if appropriate direct that the term be cumulative upon any other sentence or sentences. It does not provide an alternative where the appropriate officer is satisfied that the failure to comply with the order was trivial or that there are proper grounds upon which the failure should be excused.

Therefore, an amendment is proposed to section 71 to allow the court in such cases to:

- refrain from sentencing the person to a term of imprisonment in respect of the default;
- extend the term of the order by such period, not exceeding six months, as the court thinks fit;
- if the term of the order has expired, require the person to enter into a further order, the term of which shall not exceed six months;
- or cancel the whole or a number of the unperformed hours of community service.

Throughout the Act, appropriate officers have been given jurisdiction to deal with certain matters, for example, to issue warrants for sale of land and goods, issue warrants of commitments, etc. There has been some criticism that this power should not be vested in appropriate officers. It has been suggested that a preferable position would be for the court to be vested with the power but for the Act to make clear that certain nominated powers of the court are exercisable by appropriate officers. The amendments to section 72 provide for such a scheme in the legislation. Consequential amendments have been made to a number of sections in the Act.

Corresponding amendments have also been made to the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act 1979.

'Appropriate officer' is currently defined in section 3 (1) to mean, in the case of an order of the Supreme Court or District Court, the Sheriff and in the case of an order of a court of summary jurisdiction, a clerk of a court of summary jurisdiction. The Bill amends this provision so as to enable the Sheriff or any clerk of court to be an 'appropriate officer' for the purposes of the Act. This will facilitate procedures for the fine accounting component of the courts computerisation program. Part of the fine accounting system will provide for the payment of fines at any court throughout the State.

The amendment would also enable defendants to apply to any court in the State for assessment for community service or postponement or suspension of a warrant. Where defendants have fines imposed by different courts one assessment by the Sheriff, or clerk of court only would be required. Also country residents who have had fines imposed by the Supreme Court or District Court would have easier access to an 'appropriate officer'. The Sheriff may impose conditions on the exercise by clerks of court of powers in relation to orders of the Supreme Court or District Courts.

The amendment will enable a more efficient and equitable service to be provided to the community. This is in accordance with the Social Justice Strategy and the Court Services Department's policy of greater community access to the courts.

Finally, I refer to the amendment to section 84 of the Correctional Services Act 1982. The opportunity has been taken to make clear that a manager of a correctional institution must comply with an order or direction of an officer of court or a member of the Police Force for the purpose of not only executing process or orders of a court or justice, but also any other process or order issued pursuant to law, for example, the process of a tribunal or royal commission. I commend this Bill to members.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for commencement of the measure by proclamation. Clause 3 is formal. Clause 4 replaces the definition of 'appropriate officer'. The new definition provides that the Sheriff or a clerk of a court of summary jurisdiction is an appropriate officer (that is, for the purposes of enforcement of the orders of any court). The definition of 'court' is amplified to make it clear in the enforcement provisions that a reference to a court is a reference to the sentencing court or a court of coordinate jurisdiction. It is also provided in the definition of 'probative court' that where a bond is imposed by an appellate court, the original sentencing court will still be regarded as being the probative court.

Clause 5 empowers a court to sentence an offender to one sentence for a number of offences arising out of the one complaint or information.

Clause 6 provides that the Parole Board (or the Training Centre Review Board in the case of a child) may, of its own motion, vary or revoke a condition of a release on licence of an habitual offender or cancel such release. A board cannot take such action on its own initiative unless the Crown and the offender have had reasonable notice of the proceedings and the board has considered their submissions. The amendments to subsections (6) to (12) are consequential.

Clause 7 empowers the Parole Board to apply to a sentencing court for a non-parole period to be fixed in respect of a prisoner.

Clause 8 deletes references to 'appropriate officer' and substitutes 'court'. (Later provisions in the Bill will deal with the question of exercise of certain court powers by appropriate officers.)

Clause 9 is consequential on the amendments affected under clause 10.

Clause 10 empowers a probative court to extend (by no more than six months) the period within which a probationer is required to perform community service and, if it does so, the term of the bond is automatically extended to the necessary extent, even if it goes beyond the three year limit.

Clause 11 empowers a court to make ancillary orders accompanying a community service and supervision order.

Clause 12 empowers the Minister to approve the circumstances in which a probationer can be required to perform more than eight hours of community service on any particular day.

Clause 13 enables community service orders to be varied, or ancillary orders varied or revoked, by a sentencing court. New section 50b empowers the Minister to cancel unperformed hours of community service if there has been substantial compliance with the order or bond, there is no intention on the part of the offender to evade the obligation and there is sufficient reason for not insisting on full compliance.

Clauses 14 and 15 substitute 'court' for references to 'appropriate officer'.

Clause 16 has the effect of deleting the current requirement for courts of inferior jurisdiction to that of the probative court to remand probationers who have reoffended to be sentenced by the probative court not only for the breach of bond but also for the further offence. From now on, the lower courts will sentence for the further offence and then, if breach of bond proceedings are instituted, they will be instituted in the probative court of superior jurisdiction.

Clause 17 provides that a court dealing with a breach of bond may extend (by not more than six months) the period within which community service is to be performed, extend the term of the bond, cancel unperformed hours or make any other variation to the bond.

Clause 18 substitutes 'court' for references to 'appropriate officer'.

Clause 19 requires all pecuniary sums to be paid to the court, even though the court order may be in favour of a particular person (that is, an order for compensation).

Clause 20 empowers an appropriate officer to waive payment of reminder notice fees in appropriate cases.

Clause 21, first re-casts section 61 which provides for imprisonment on default of payment of a pecuniary sum. The liability to imprisonment is statutorily imposed at the prescribed rate if the person has been in default for more than a month. If the court believes the person is in default may abscond, or if the person is already in prison or liable to imprisonment, a warrant may be issued forthwith (notwithstanding that the default has not been for a month or more). The term to be served under the warrant will be served cumulatively on any other imprisonment to which the person is liable for default in payment of a pecuniary sum. New section 61a is inserted. This section provides that, instead of issuing a warrant of commitment for default in payment of a pecuniary sum, the court may disqualify the person in default from holding a driver's licence until the sum is paid. This power is exercisable only in relation to offences arising out of the use of a motor vehicle. The disqualification will take effect 14

days after the person has been notified by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles of the disqualification. The court may revoke a disqualification if the person has reduced the sum and would suffer undue hardship if the disqualification were to continue. If the person enters into an undertaking to work the unpaid amount off with community service, the disqualification will be revoked. The court can issue a warrant of commitment during a period of disqualification if it thinks it appropriate to do so.

Clauses 22 to 24 substitutes 'court' for references to 'appropriate officer'.

Clause 25 clarifies that the issue of warrants of commitment and the ordering of disqualification will be done *ex parte* unless the court directs otherwise. Other orders (for example, warrants for distress or sale of land) may be *ex parte* if the court so decides.

Clauses 26 to 28 are all consequential amendments.

Clause 29 recasts the provisions dealing with default in performance of community service orders and other non-pecuniary orders. As with pecuniary sums, the liability to imprisonment for default in performance of community service is statutorily imposed at the prescribed rate. The court may either summon a person in default to appear before it to show cause why a warrant should not be issued or may issue a warrant for arrest. The court may direct that the imprisonment be served cumulatively. The court may, if the default was trivial, refrain from issuing a warrant and may extend the order (by not more than six months) or cancel unperformed hours. In the case of any other non-pecuniary order the court can sentence up to six months imprisonment for default.

Clause 30 repeals the provision that provided that no right of appeal exists against orders of appropriate officers and replaces it with a provision that states that appropriate officers may exercise certain powers on behalf of courts. Any appropriate officer may exercise those powers on behalf of any court (subject to any provision to the contrary in rules of court or the regulations, and subject to restrictions laid down by the Sheriff in respect of clerks of summary courts). Subclause (5) gives a right of review of decisions made by appropriate officers. This right can be abrogated by rules of court or the regulations.

Part III amends the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act.

Clause 31 is formal.

Clause 32 provides that the Minister can approve the circumstances in which a child may be required to perform more than eight hours of community service on any particular day.

Clause 33 is a statute law revision amendment substituting 'guarantor' for references to 'surety'.

Clause 34 makes similar amendments to section 61 and also gives the court power, when dealing with a child for breach of bond, to cancel unperformed hours of community service.

Clause 35 substitutes a reference to Children's Court for a reference to 'appropriate clerk'.

Clause 36 inserts a provision requiring all fines, orders for compensation, etc., to be paid into the court notwithstanding that the order may have been made in favour of a third party.

Clause 37 recasts section 75b and inserts a new section 75ba, both modelled along the lines of the equivalent provisions in the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act (see clause 21). As with adults, the Children's Court may disqualify a child from holding a driver's licence until the sum in default is paid.

Clauses 38 and 39 are consequential amendments.

Clause 40 transfers the power to postpone or suspend warrants back to the Children's Court, but provides that, unless rules of court provide to the contrary, this power may be exercised by a clerk of the court. If a person is aggrieved by a decision made by a clerk, the decision may be reviewed by the Children's Court (unless rules of court provide to the contrary).

Clause 41 clarifies (similarly to the adult provisions) that issuing mandates for detention for default in payment of a pecuniary sum or disqualifying a child from holding a driver's licence are powers that will be exercised *ex parte* unless the court determines otherwise.

Clause 42 removes references to 'appropriate clerk'.

Clause 43 recasts the provision dealing with breaches of community service orders. The Children's Court may, if it refrains from issuing a mandate for detention, extend the order or impose a further order for no more than two months so that the child can complete the community service, or may cancel any unperformed hours. If a mandate is issued, the court may order that the detention be cumulative on any other period of detention. New section 75/a deals with the enforcement of other non-pecuniary orders.

Part 4 amends the Correctional Services Act.

Clause 44 is formal.

Clause 45 provides that references in the Act to the expiry of a sentence, or the unexpired balance of a sentence, means the original term imposed by the court as reduced by remission credited to the prisoner.

Clause 46 provides that the power of the Chief Executive Officer to release prisoners up to 30 days early is not exercisable in relation to a prisoner who is serving a term of imprisonment for default in payment of a pecuniary sum (that is, a fine) within the meaning of the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act.

Clause 47 provides that the Minister may approve the circumstances in which a person can be required to perform more than eight hours of community service on any particular day, where the Parole Board has imposed the community service.

Clause 48 inserts a new provision that requires remission to be credited against both the 'head sentence' and the non-parole period if there is one.

Clause 49 makes it clear that the duty of a prison manager to comply with the execution of process of a court or court officer extends to the process of other bodies such as tribunals, royal commissions, etc.

Mr S.J. BAKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (CHILD PORNOGRAPHY) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill amends section 33 of the Summary Offences Act 1953 ('the Act') to prohibit the possession of child pornography. The Bill makes the possession of child pornography an offence punishable by imprisonment for a year or a \$4 000 fine. Further, the Bill provides that a person who produces, sells or exhibits child pornography may be imprisoned for two years for a first offence and four years for a second or subsequent offence. The latter offence attracts a high penalty because it is the first link in the chain of sexual exploitation of children and is often done for commercial gain.

These amendments are based on recommendations of the Australian Law Reform Commission (ALRC) in its Report No. 55 entitled 'Censorship Procedure' which, among other things, recommends the adoption of a national legislative scheme in the censorship area.

In examining the reference from the Federal Attorney-General, the ALRC considered the issue of child pornography. The ALRC considered Australia's obligations as a result of ratification of the United Nations Convention of the Rights of the Child, particularly Article 34 which undertakes to protect all children from all forms of sexual exploitation and sexual abuse. The production of child pornography is likely to involve child sex abuse and is often associated with child sex offenders. As a result of extensive consultation, the ALRC has recommended that the possession and production of child pornography, regardless of its intended use, be made an offence.

Currently, child pornography has been deemed unsuitable for commercial distribution and is classified 'Refused Classification' by the Chief Censor. Under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 there are various provisions which make it an offence to have sexual intercourse with persons below a certain age. Section 58a of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act makes it an offence if a person for prurient purposes incites or procures the commission by a child of an indecent act. However, as the law stands at present, before this amendment, the mere possession of child pornography is not an offence.

The Government believes that children, who are amongst the most vulnerable in our society, must be protected from adults who seek to abuse and exploit them. This amendment will work to eliminate the sexual exploitation of children in our society. The Bureau of Criminal Intelligence, which investigates the problem of child pornography, fully supports the amendment.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 amends section 33 of the Act to create an offence of possession of child pornography. Paragraph (a) inserts a definition of child pornography. The definition covers indecent and offensive material in which a child is depicted or described in a

way that is likely to cause offence to reasonable adult members of the community.

'Indecent', 'offensive' and 'material' are already defined terms.

The definition covers indecent or offensive material which depicting a 'whether or not the child is engaged in sexual activity'. These words are included, in keeping with the ALRC report, to deal with indecent activities but is rather the witness of indecent activity.

The currently vague concept of indecency is supplemented by the test, recommended by the ALRC, that the material must be reasonably likely to cause offence to reasonable adult members of the community. All offensive material comes within this test by definition. Paragraph (b) transfers the penalties currently found in subsection (3) to the end of subsection (2) and applies increased penalties (two years imprisonment for a first offence and four years for a second or subsequent offence) in relation to production, sale or exhibition of all child pornography rather than only in relation to pornography the production of which physically involved child. Paragraph (c) repeals the old subsection (3) and inserts a new offence of possession of child pornography punishable by a penalty of one year imprisonment or a \$4 000 fine.

Mr S.J. BAKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

TECHNICAL AND FURTHER EDUCATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendment:

Page 13—After line 31 insert new clause as follows:

'Insertion of schedule

32. The following schedule is inserted at the end of the principal Act:

SCHEDULE

Interpretation of other Acts and instruments

References to officers of the teaching service

1. A reference in an Act or in any other instrument (whether the instrument is of a legislative character or not) to an officer of the teaching service under this Act will be construed as a reference to an officer.'

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I am pleased to support the amendment which was moved by my colleague in the other place.

Motion carried.

GAMING MACHINES BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 March. Page 3468.)

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I oppose this legislation and I feel very strongly about it. I hope I will be able to make that clear through my contribution today. I am strongly of the opinion that the community does not want this legislation. I am personally of the opinion that we do not need it. As I say, I feel very strongly about that, and the strength of my argument has come about as a result of a considerable amount of representation I have received and a very strong feeling that I have personally. I welcome the opportunity that is given in this debate for this matter to be dealt with by way of a conscience vote. Members in this place would realise that I opposed the introduction of the Casino into South Australia. I do not back away from that at all. I feel as strongly about that issue now as I did at the time that legislation was before the House. For that reason, I do not support—

Mr Quirke: Were you at the opening?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: No, I was not at the opening.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will direct his remarks through the Chair. Interjections will cease.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Henley Beach is out of order.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Because I do not support the Casino, it is only natural that I do not believe that poker machines or whatever they are called—but I will call them poker machines because that is what they are and that is what everybody recognises them as—should be in the Casino. I certainly do not believe that they should be in hotels and clubs throughout South Australia.

As I said earlier, I have received a lot of representation from the electorate. I have to say in fairness that some of that representation—a small amount—has been in support of the legislation and the introduction of poker machines into hotels and clubs. By far the majority of the representation that I have received has been very much against their introduction. I was disappointed to read in the *News* this afternoon the comments attributed to the Executive Director of the Hotel and Hospitality Industry Association, an association for which I have considerable respect. I know of the workings of that association and I believe that it has the respect of the majority of the community. I was concerned to read the comments attributed to Mr Horne, who indicated that, if an MP did not like the Bill, it could be amended or, if MPs were unsure, they should educate themselves, but they should not use what has been an honest and thorough proposal by the industry as a political football. Mr Horne was referring, I presume, to the unfortunate circumstances surrounding the Minister of Tourism.

The Opposition has made very clear where it stands on this matter and I feel even more strongly about it now, having heard the replies from the Premier today in which he admitted that there was a conflict of interest on the part of the Minister. It is all very well for us to stand up and say that, in hindsight, we should have done something, but I would have thought it was blatantly obvious to the Premier, who is responsible for such measures, and for his colleagues in Cabinet to recognise that this was a conflict of interest and to have taken the necessary measures under those circumstances. The Opposition has made it perfectly clear that it expects the Premier to establish an independent legal inquiry, and I believe that the community expects that as well. Certainly the representation from people in my electorate and outside it suggests that is the case.

I am very concerned at the phenomenal increase in gambling in this State, and much of that has come about as a result of the legislation passed in Parliament in the past few years. For example, let us look at the legislation relating to the TAB. Approximately 26 years ago we were promised that there would be no appreciable increase in gambling, that the police would be better able to deal with illegal gambling, that illegal gambling would be channelled and controlled, that illegal SP bookmaking would be stamped out and that the TAB would not advertise gambling. I do not believe that any of these issues has been taken into account; rather, we have become involved in something of a gambling spree in this State and in other States as well, and we have read about the possibility of a gambling-led recovery. I suggest that if we have reached the stage at which we have to rely on gambling to give us a strong economy, we have real problems. We learn that the State Government—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The honourable member will have his opportunity to say where he stands on this legis-

lation. I for one will look forward to listening to what he has to say. He can just wait and take advantage of the opportunity that will be provided to him. We are told that the State Government will gain \$55 million a year from the installation of gaming machines in hotels and clubs and that the average per capita outlay by South Australians will jump an extra \$168 a year. Those two points are made in an options paper prepared by the State Government on the introduction of gaming machines in hotels and licensed clubs.

In that same report, it warns that there is a danger of criminal activity unless strict security is built into the system, adding, 'It is therefore essential that the introduction of gambling machines in South Australia be accomplished only in an environment of the most stringent controls.' It goes on to estimate that existing gambling outlets such as lotteries and the Totalizer Agency Board would lose \$23 million. Funds to charities and community groups would drop \$3.5 million, which is of particular concern to me, and I will refer to that later. Racing clubs would lose \$3.5 million because of the introduction of gaming machines, and the problem of the rehabilitation of gamblers would cost about \$4 million. From talking to a number of agencies that have that responsibility, I would say that that estimate is well short of the funding that would be required for such rehabilitation.

When that is all taken into account, we learn that the Government is left with \$134 million. The options paper says that the introduction of gaming machines would alter the spending habits of South Australians on gambling. The average per capita amount now spent with the Lotteries Commission is \$74 a year, but that would fall to \$49. Small lotteries and bingo spending would fall from \$39 a head to \$10 a head. Spending at the Adelaide Casino would fall from \$78 to \$70 per capita, whilst an extra \$230 a head would be spent on poker machines. That represents an extra gambling outlay per capita of \$168, lifting the average annual outlay from \$191 to \$359 per person. I find that staggering. The likely revenue lost from all forms of lotteries would be \$27 million, the Casino \$2 million, and all forms of racing \$4 million. So it goes on.

I want to refer briefly to some of the representation that I have received, because it has come from individuals and organisations that I respect. I refer first to the correspondence from the Adelaide Central Mission, an organisation that does a magnificent job in this State. I hope that all members realise that. If they do not, I suggest that they make time to talk to the people who have the responsibility of looking after that organisation. The Adelaide Central Mission informed me that a conference that was held last year expressed grave concern about recent developments in gambling in South Australia. The mission went on to list the action that it would like to see as a matter of urgency, as follows:

1. That the South Australian Government abandon legislation permitting the introduction of gambling machines into hotels and clubs.
2. That an age limit be introduced to prevent gambling by minors particularly in the play of Club Keno, Instant Money and other games available both at the Lotteries Commission and other agency outlets, for example, newsagents.
3. That funding be made available to establish a community education program which should incorporate the . . . placement of notices in all gambling venues, advising of the help available (including Gamblers Anonymous).
4. That research be conducted on the social impact of gambling, its causes and effects, as promised by the Premier in Parliament in May 1983 when the Casino Bill was debated.

I will refer again to the promise that was made by the Premier at that time a little later. The Adelaide Central Mission went on to say that it believes it is only just

beginning to identify a problem of major proportions, stating:

Evidence of a substantial gambling problem in South Australia is beginning to mount. This is borne out by strong anecdotal evidence from pawnbrokers such as Robin Tredrea, who spoke to the conference. It is our belief that strong preventative measures should be in place.

The Adelaide Central Mission goes on to say:

You will no doubt have read the editorial in the *Advertiser* on 15 May [and I certainly recall that]. It presented the case for the South Australian community to seriously question the impact of any extension of gambling. The Adelaide Central Mission would endorse this view, in the belief that it would be supported by all responsible members of the South Australian community.

I also refer to the editorial of 15 July 1991, as follows:

The majority of members of Parliament, in supporting a motion that clubs and hotels should be authorised to install and operate the machines, will surely now rubber stamp the legislation. But inevitability does not make the move right. There are serious dangers in broadening the scope and availability of gambling in South Australia. The Government is reluctant to say it has been forced to turn every hotel and club into a mini-casino to pay for the \$1 billion State Bank rescue package, but in the end that is the reason.

The Government is desperate for revenue, but at what cost? Under the scheme every tiny community will have access to gambling machines. This will include the young, susceptible, the unsuspecting, the bored and people who simply cannot afford to gamble away hard-earned cash which could be more usefully channelled into other areas of the economy. At a more sinister level is the danger of criminal activities infiltrating the system from the purchase of machines to their operation and the distribution of profits. As the report warns: 'It is therefore essential that the introduction of gaming machines into South Australia be accomplished only in an environment of the most stringent controls.' Those controls—

referring of course to the report that I brought to the notice of the House earlier in this contribution—

can be achieved by full Government or partial Government ownership and control.

And so it goes on, and concludes:

If Parliament decides that we must have a network of gaming machines in every hotel and club across the State, then surely some control in the operation of the scheme should rest with private management and not another Government authority.

The same applies to the *Sunday Mail* of 23 February, where it states:

If legalised, the machines will mushroom into one of the State's biggest industries, a powerful octopus sucking in who knows how many many millions of dollars . . . We, too, have had the lobbyists knock on our door. We have heard all the questionable arguments about remaining competitive with Victoria and New South Wales. Yes, we know hotels and clubs have been pounded by the recession and introduction of .05 limits for drivers. But we also know that a recession is not the time to make available another form of gambling which exposes people on the breadline to a one-more-coin carrot of hope.

The public has a right to know the agendas of those who appear to be supporting gaming machines—and pressing for certain parties to get the nod to govern their purchase and performance. If ever there was a time for our members of Parliament to illustrate that they indeed have a public conscience, this is the week. We say discard all suggestions of a parliamentary select committee of inquiry, ignore calls for a statewide referendum, simply say an emphatic no to poker machines.

I would support that very strongly indeed. I quote a letter which states:

I believe this current legislation to be a most ruthless form of indirect taxation, which will only benefit the Government, hotels and clubs, at the expense of low income families, those who can least afford it.

That is part of correspondence I have received from a gentleman who, for 25 years, was in the entertainment industry, and he goes on to state:

I have personally seen many people, predominantly low income earners, who have been obsessed with low-level gambling of one sort or another (bingo, pokies, etc.). To witness the suffering caused by these obsessions, which are not isolated cases by the way, but very prevalent among the lower socioeconomic groups,

is heart-wrenching to say the least. Most people who use these machines are obsessed by two ideas. First and most obvious is the hope for that 'marvellous jackpot', which rarely comes, and is never enough. Secondly, they are frightened to death that, if they leave the particular machine they are playing, another person will come along and strike the jackpot with their very first coin. These are very real fears to the people concerned, but I have very grave doubts as to whether these issues have been given any consideration or credibility by the Government when formulating the current legislation. I suspect very strongly that the almighty dollar is much much more important than peoples' lives.

Again, I support that very strongly. The Salvation Army, an organisation for which I have tremendous respect and with which I have had some dealings—as I am sure have other members in this House—has indicated to me very strong feelings about this issue. I have been contacted by local people who are involved in that organisation, one of whom indicates the following:

As a person who is often dealing with people who are disadvantaged through life circumstances, addiction or detrimental activity, I view with deep concern the possibility of the introduction of poker machines into South Australia. The Salvation Army's commitment (and, I might add, my own) is to the physical, psychological and spiritual development of all people, and the goal is to develop a society where the desire to care for each other is the highest priority.

It is no wonder that the Salvation Army emphasises the point that it is frequently brought face-to-face with the deprivation experienced by people in direct consequence of gambling: innocent victims as well as distraught participants. The writer goes on to say:

I believe that past experience shows us that many families who are already under threat due to emotional and sociological factors will experience an increase in tension and stress if the mindless activity of poker machines is added to their lot. On behalf of those people already struggling, or already trapped within the gambling environment, and those who will unwittingly join them.

I urge you to consider the decision to introduce poker machines, and consider the cause of those already hurting through such activity. There is no doubt that our State has economic problems at present, but our contention is that the encouragement of striving for savings to provide for family, and the development of the work ethic would provide a more efficient, well-balanced and long-term solution.

I can only agree wholeheartedly with those comments. I could refer to page after page of other organisations that have made contact with me and individuals who have made the strongest representation to me on this matter.

Finally, as this is a conscience matter, I am opposed to this legislation for the reasons that I have suggested—because of the representation that I have received—but also as a father of four. The discussions that I have had with my family around the table would suggest that they see no need for this legislation, and I believe that far too much hurt is already being felt by the community generally. I oppose this legislation very strongly, and I can only hope that the majority of members in this House will oppose it also.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I make it clear, as I have from day one, that I am totally opposed to this legislation, and no argument in this place or elsewhere will make me resile one inch from that position. I have watched with some amusement the actions of the various people who have an interest in this Bill, as I do some of these measures, as they try every trick in the book to get their views accepted and to see the successful passage of legislation. I do not intend to bore the House with a recital of all the things I have received in the weeks and months past, but the latest came today from the Independent Gaming Corporation Ltd, and I found it equally interesting. It is a fairly short missive, the penultimate sentence of which states:

We must again reiterate that the hospitality industry believes that the Bill before Parliament deserves consideration on its merit.

My position there is quite clear: the Bill has no merit as far as I am concerned. The last sentence of the letter states:

The hotel, hospitality and club industry watches with great interest the behaviour and conduct of members of Parliament in relation to this Bill.

I just wonder what is implied in that last sentence. I do not think one needs to have a vivid imagination to suggest that there is an implied threat in that sentence.

The Hon. H. Allison: It threatens a member in the course of his duty.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It smacks to me of an implied threat. The industry will watch our behaviour with great interest. The implied threat is that, if we do not toe the line, there will be some sanctions. I do not know what they will be, but perhaps they will use influence in the electorate to try to defeat members. That does not worry me because I am about to quit the place and, in any event, an implied threat of that nature would not have the slightest impact or influence on me. It seems that two groups want the Bill. Most of the Government members, including the Minister of Finance and the Treasurer, want the Bill. The reason they want the Bill is perfectly clear: they have made such an appalling mess of the finances of this State, to the point that we are bankrupt, and they desperately need money through taxation revenue.

It came as no surprise to me that the Government had done a complete about-face about poker machines from the days going right back to when Premier Dunstan sought to increase gaming facilities. Never would they ever contemplate installing poker machines in this fair State. They were adamant, vehement and quite excited in their condemnation of this form of gambling. That has been the stance of the Labor Party up until the past year or so when the member for Davenport, unfortunately in my view, brought a resolution into this House because he did not believe that the clubs were having a fair go because the Government had sneaked gaming machines into the Casino through the back door.

The member for Davenport moved the motion and the Government grabbed at it as if at a life raft floating past a sinking ship to the point where the vast majority of Government members want poker machines, and the Premier and the Minister of Finance see it as another source of Government revenue. That is the first group that wants the Bill, but not for any real reason or noble sentiment—just the desperate need for money. I feel a bit sorry for the Minister of Finance, as I have some regard for his qualities. He has been given all the dirty work to do by this lame duck Premier, and he is the one who has to make all the tough financial decisions. We have known throughout his whole career that the Premier of South Australia has ducked for cover whenever any controversial issue arises or whenever he has to make any tough decisions—it is handed down the line.

The Hon. H. Allison: He sneaks away.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, off he creeps. He has crept away from all the tough financial measures that have been instituted and has handed them over to the Minister of Finance, who at least has the gumption to be reasonably honest with the public and go about his difficult task of being the hatchet man for the budget for this lame duck Premier. That is the first group. The second group, and it is the only other group of any significance who want the legislation, is comprised of hotelkeepers and club proprietors or their committees. The reason they want the Bill is also their desperate need for money. The reason hotel proprietors want gaming machines is the same reason the Premier and the Minister of Finance want them: they desperately need money.

The State is bankrupt and we are told in publicity surrounding this legislation that about 30 or 40 hotels (I forget how many exactly) are insolvent or have gone bankrupt and that this legislation is needed to prop them up. To my mind that is not a convincing argument, because hundreds of other businesses around this State are going bankrupt as a result of certain actions, particularly those of Prime Minister Keating, and particularly as a result of the policies and activities of the Premier of this State. We have had record bankruptcies in South Australia and no poker machine or similar legislation is floating past for them to grasp in their hour of need or hour of bankruptcy. The two groups who want this legislation are the Government, which has bankrupted this State, and the hotel industry, which desperately wants to raise more money to keep some of its members viable. I reject both of those propositions totally as I do not believe that, by inflicting poker machines on the public for those reasons, we are justified in supporting this Bill. They are the ones who I detect want the legislation fairly desperately.

We now look at those who do not want the legislation. If we are to believe the polling done by the *Advertiser*—I believe it was a reasonable poll—the vast majority of South Australians do not want it. Several hundred people were contacted and it seemed to me that that poll could be taken as being reasonably indicative of the views of the people of this State. The majority of South Australians do not want poker machines. Who else does not want them? That question is of significance to me in respect of my support or otherwise of this legislation. Hundreds of people in my electorate do not want them. I have had petitions and letters, but I have not had one approach from anyone in my electorate supporting the introduction of this legislation. Some of the hotels and clubs might be in favour of it, but they have not contacted me as individual hotel proprietors or as club management.

If I correctly assess the mood of my electorate, I would have to conclude that overwhelmingly they are rather more heavily opposed to this legislation than the *Advertiser* poll indicated. People in my electorate do not want it. The second indicator of just how much support this legislation has so far as I am concerned involves the churches—and for once all the churches have lined up. I will not labour the moral aspects of gambling, but I do point out that, for the first time, the whole 11 denominations that join together to make statements from time to time do not want this legislation.

The churches are all over the shop on some social issues, but on this one they are unanimous, and the people who are most opposed to this in those organisations are the people who have to do the welfare work of those churches and deal not only with the social dropouts but those who are socially disadvantaged as a result of the deprivations of facilities like poker machines. They are totally opposed to the introduction of this legislation. Social workers, welfare workers and churches involved in this sort of work reject totally that this legislation will do anything but cause damage in our community.

So, lined up for the legislation we have the Government, which desperately needs money and the hotel industry, which desperately wants to save some of its members from going broke and enhance the profits of those who are going to stay in the business. Opposed to the legislation we have the majority of South Australians—certainly the majority of people in my electorate, which is pertinent to the way I vote—discussing the legislation on its merits, as I have been enjoined to do by the Independent Gaming Corporation as

late as today, and all of the churches—bar none—and their social arms.

When I put all this on the scales and weigh the balance to tip my vote one way or the other, there is no argument at all. It simply confirms my long held view that the increase in gambling facilities, which have dramatically escalated during the years of Labor Governments, has done nothing but give them a bit of hidden and painless taxation to swell their fast emptying coffers, and they have done nothing to improve the lot of the general citizenry of this State. Before concluding the point on social implications, I wish to quote briefly from a publication that came into this place this week. The article, quoting the heads of all the churches, concluded:

'Our concern in particular is for families and individuals who are most at risk in the present economic climate,' the letter said.

'We find it difficult to understand how the Government of this State would permit a situation where devastating, long-term social problems would be added to the difficulties already being faced by so many in South Australia.'

It came more pungently from the Adelaide Central Mission, when Mr Bailey said:

The main reason the Government is pushing this Bill is as a source of revenue—

the point I made earlier—

and that is shortsighted. The Government has to produce real wealth, not just recycle the pension money of those who can ill afford it... The Bill... proposed to exclude minors. This is unrealistic. If the Government is unable to prevent under-age drinking, what hope is there of controlling under-age gambling?

All those groups to whom I and a majority of South Australians would listen are opposed to the Bill. As I said earlier, video gaming machines, which are really poker machines, were sneaked into the Casino when we were told that they were deliberately and specifically excluded in the Casino legislation. That was at the stage when the majority of members of the Labor Party would not have a bar of pokies.

I have been lobbied, as I guess most members of this House have been, by the Casino authorities, to try to get me to support the introduction of pokies into the Casino. I was wined and dined; I had quite a pleasant luncheon down there and looked at the facilities. I was wined and dined by the Casino authorities in their attempt to get the pokies into the Casino. Their attempt failed. I told them bluntly at lunch, 'You're wasting your time on me', although, nonetheless, I enjoyed the lunch.

However, they managed to sneak them in by the back door in contravention of the precise and deliberate exclusion of those pokies from the Casino. In 1983, when the Labor Party, on gaining government, suddenly had some new found enthusiasm for the Casino, the Premier promised that he would hold an inquiry into the social effects of gambling. Of course, he is too craven to do that, because he knows what an inquiry into the social effects of gambling would indicate—that the pawnbrokers have done wonderful business. Pawnbrokers have done record business since the Casino has been in full flight. Of course, he would find that.

He would find that retail sales in Rundle Mall went down by a significant amount as a result of the money going through the Casino. He would find out all these things. If the Premier talked to the welfare groups who deal with the people adversely affected by this sort of legislation, he would find that there has been a dramatically adverse impact on a significant proportion of the population as a result of what happens at the Casino. Of course, the promise in 1983 to have an inquiry has been quietly forgotten.

I point out again the craven attitude of the Premier to all these difficult questions. As I said earlier, the Minister of

Finance now has to do the dirty work. The Premier slinks off behind closed doors somewhere or other, trying to help the public forget that he has lost \$3 billion, and the poor old Minister of Finance is charged with trying to implement the tough decisions and trying to balance the books—and I take my hat off to him. He has his work cut out for him. All in all, there is nothing whatsoever to commend this Bill to me, and I give it no support whatever.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I rise to speak very strongly against this Bill. My comments today will be brief, because my voice is not as strong as it usually is. It must have been from interjecting last week. This is a conscience vote, and I appreciate that: there ought to be many more conscience votes in this House. As you would be aware, Sir, members of this House basically take a conscience vote all the time. Neither I nor any of my colleagues are held by our Party to toe the line. We often have a conscience vote, and I appreciate that.

I have actively sought views and been given a clear message in my electorate of Custance not to support this Bill. I have difficulty in differentiating between the Casino on the one hand and the licensed pubs and clubs on the other. I have difficulty in trying to be consistent. I would have to vote for the removal of the poker machines from the Casino, and I support the member for Davenport in his intention to do just that. If there was any doubt that this Bill ought not to pass at this time, the conflict of interest at the moment—the fiasco involving Minister Wiese and Mr Jim Stitt—should dissolve that doubt.

At the very least, the Minister ought to stand aside—for the sake of this legislation alone. We all know that the victim of this fiasco will be this legislation. If the Minister were fair dinkum, she would stand aside. It is not only in our interests or in the interests of Parliament but in the interests of the public. I always assume that in this place we cannot go along with double standards. In this instance, I can see quite clearly that there is, certainly, a shadow of doubt over the dealings that have been going on not only in the setting up of this legislation but in the lobbying that went on afterwards.

I do not think that the Minister did this deliberately. In fact, I have enjoyed the Minister's company many times, particularly when she has journeyed to the country. I must say that I think she is one of the better Ministers of this Government, and I am genuinely sad to see this situation. However, for the sake of the public record and of public accountability, irrespective of who the Minister is, whether or not the Minister knew about this situation, it is only fair and reasonable that she should stand aside so that a full debate can be carried on without anyone being accused of having an unfair influence.

In my opinion, gambling is a privilege that the public at large does not want. People who play—and they are the ones who lose—will be those who cannot afford it. That is always the case. I am speaking very generally, I know, and the Minister would smile, but it is usually the case that the people who cannot afford it are those who lose the most.

To make it worse, as the member for Kavel just stated, the many charities who pick up the threads for these people will also be affected, since many of these organisations are funded by various means in pubs and clubs, whether with ticket machines in bars, raffles, lotteries or whatever. They will be seriously affected by this legislation, so it is a compounding problem. Not only will they be losing money but they will have more work to do. Where will all the charities, small and large, collect their funds when these machines, whether ticket machines or otherwise, push them out?

I had difficulty comprehending who will control and oversee these poker machines, whether it be the Lotteries Commission or the Independent Gaming Corporation. Obviously, a large amount of money is involved. We hear of various commissions payable—2.5 per cent to some people—on all machines sold. That would amount to a large sum of money, and that also concerns me. With the legislation we are discussing, we will control and redirect a large amount of money in this State.

Pubs and clubs in my electorate have lobbied me in support of this legislation. They feel that pokies will help them to survive. I have some support for that idea but, when we really look at the rationale behind it, we see that the hotels will benefit initially, but when the clubs get their machines—and they will obviously get extended hours—I can see great competition, and I do not think that any of them will be better off in the long run.

The legislation should not be used to fill gaps caused by our State's faltering economy. Are we in this State to be propped up by gambling? As my colleague the member for Kavel so capably said a few minutes ago—and I always appreciate his wise counsel and will miss it in a few weeks—this Government seized the lifeboat as it went rushing past in the flood. I see it as sitting on this gambling life raft, but we will all starve to death because we will not get anywhere with it.

As a new member, I appreciate the intense lobbying on this legislation. It is my first experience of that and I was quite daunted by it. In most cases it was done very professionally. However, I did not appreciate a letter I received today which I thought without any shadow of a doubt contained an implied threat. I give this House and my electors this pledge: I shall never react to letters like that. I am here to represent my electorate and will not take any notice of a letter which implies, 'If you don't do this, we will be watching your performance and act accordingly.'

We cannot please everyone. I congratulate the lobbyists for the work that has been done in this matter. However, this issue is either 'Yes' or 'No': it is open or closed, and that is it. As the member for Custance I will always consider the point of view of my electorate. To do anything else would be suicidal. In this case my electorate strongly urges me to oppose the legislation. I support the setting up of a select committee to study the effect and influence of gambling in South Australia and to ascertain whether there was a conflict of interest by the Minister of Tourism.

South Australia has enough problems with the state of the economy, and people are hurting everywhere. Our social workers are stretched to the limit trying to keep up with it. I think it would be most unwise to support this legislation. I thank all those people who have contacted me. I oppose the Bill, and I urge all members to do likewise.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): As the member for Kavel mentioned a few minutes ago when he was addressing himself to this Bill, all members will have received a tremendous volume of material not only on the Bill that is presently before us but also on the establishment of the Casino, the introduction of electronic gaming machines into the Casino (about which I will say more in a few moments) and the introduction of electronic gaming machines generally into clubs and hotels across South Australia.

The latest correspondence to which the member for Kavel adverted was the belated letter received only today from the Independent Gaming Corporation. Like the member for Kavel, I, too, took exception to what I considered to be a veiled threat in the final paragraph, which states:

The hotel, hospitality and club industry watches with great interest the behaviour and conduct of members of Parliament in relation to this Bill.

Having been bombed during the Second World War and not having been softened in any way by that, I consider veiled threats of this nature to be fairly shallow. If people want to say that they will get members of the industry to vote against me at the next election should I not do as they wish, I would much sooner they came out openly and said so, in which case I would still make exactly the same comments as I am going to make now.

I simply reiterate that my opinion is unchanged regarding the proliferation of electronic gaming machines into hotels and clubs in South Australia. Last year, in the presence of the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Murray-Mallee, I spoke at a hotel and hospitality industry meeting at Keith, expressing the reasons for my long held opinion and advising of a number of other things that I thought were relevant to the industry. As a former hotelier in Victoria, I have experience in the industry and I also have relatives who have run hotels. They did not rely on gaming machines for their success; rather, they relied on the quality of service they provided 25 hours a day. As all hoteliers will know, it is one of the hardest industries in which to satisfy customers because you have to work such long hours simply to keep the hotel viable. When I was in that industry I always maintained that I would succeed by the quality of the service that I provided.

I remind all people who think that electronic gaming machines might be the salvation for an ailing establishment—a club or hotel—that, if everybody has access to these gaming machines, if everybody has the right to lease or purchase them, it will still depend upon the quality of service offered if people are to be persuaded that they should spend their money in one establishment rather than another establishment.

In a few moments I would like to put other facts before the industry. However, I remind members that it was the Premier himself who supported my contention when, a few years ago, he told us all that poker machines would never be allowed into the Adelaide Casino let alone into the wider industry. In fact, such machines were operating in the Casino even before State legislation had been enacted. That situation led the member for Davenport to defend the plight of clubs and hotels by way of introducing a private member's Bill which passed the House of Assembly and which was then seized upon by the Premier as being an additional source of gambling revenue. He said, 'If this Bill passes I will see that we introduce a Bill into the House of Assembly before Christmas', and that was Christmas last year. My concerns about the possible social outcomes, that is, the disadvantages of expanding the availability of electronic gaming machines, have been in no way diminished by the correspondence that has been addressed to all members from the Christian churches, which have been united on this issue against the introduction of gaming machines into South Australian hotels and clubs, their letters expressing strong opposition to the legislation.

Neither have my views been changed by the recently released report of the South Australian Police Commissioner: in fact, they have been reinforced by Commissioner Hunt's report. After all, he drew attention to the increased potential for criminal activity arising from the installation and control of gaming machines by an independent authority, and he gave a very reasoned comment in that report. I believe that the down side of gambling generally is beyond dispute, and it has to be when people such as a prominent South Australian pawnbroker are critical of the adverse social impact of gambling: at the same, he has opened a

pawnbroking establishment within the precincts of the Casino.

As the member for Heysen said, he is one of those people who spoke at a convention last year and drew to the attention of the Government and the public generally the fact that he could attest to family and personal suffering arising from the misuse of gambling facilities. I am not denying that there are plenty of people in South Australia who can use gambling facilities with reason and control and who do not finish up destitute; they simply go to an establishment such as the Casino for controlled entertainment, and the control comes from within themselves. The vastly increased availability of gambling machines can only add to social problems, which society has to pay for: the Government will pay for the down side of gambling from part of the profits that it gleans from the gaming machines. One way or another, society will pay.

I now turn to the speed and efficiency with which electronic gaming machines absorb the gamblers' cash. I went to Wentworth on one occasion to see how that establishment operated, and I saw the machines almost siphoning money from the gamblers; it was like having a vacuum cleaner in the wallet, the cash went so quickly. The efficiency of these machines as money-makers was certainly evident—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: That was the impression I had when I left. I thought I had been cleaned out. Their efficiency as money-makers is evidenced by the strength of the lobby that is seeking their installation. No doubt there are substantial commissions to be had also upon the sale of the machines, and I realise that in the letter I received today there was a denial that a whole range of people involved would receive anything by way of commission, but surely somewhere along the line there has to be a salesman who will benefit.

After doing some quick mathematics, the Government itself is anticipating approximately \$55 million in revenue to offset that huge \$6.3 billion debt with which we are all confronted, and that is \$55 million income per year. The manufacturers of a \$10 000 to \$15 000 machine will gain somewhere between \$50 million and \$70 million in sales. If there is only a small commission on those sales of, say, 2.5 per cent, between \$1.5 million and \$2 million will go to the salesmen. I refer there to legitimate salesmen: I am not implying anything improper in selling a machine. The operators themselves, in the hotels, clubs and the Casino, will receive continuing profits each year from the literally hundreds of millions of dollars in annual turnover.

Against that profitability is a down side. Tourism will profit to some extent from poker machines, although I believe there is a strong reassurance within the industry that most of the money spent within South Australia actually comes from South Australians at the Casino. The down side is mainly local. There are high social costs: there is poverty, even destitution, with family neglect and breakup, as evidenced by correspondence from our Christian churches.

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: They did not point that out to me.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will direct his remarks through the Chair.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: No doubt it is a lucrative industry, and that will apply to a great many people involved, certainly least of all the players who can only anticipate occasional substantial dividends. In passing, can I say that electronic gaming machines will not necessarily prove the salvation, as I mentioned earlier, of already ailing hotels.

It is possible that some members have been influenced by the allegations made over the past few days regarding the involvement of the Minister of Tourism with the business lobby. Whether or not that is proven has in no way affected my deliberations. As I said when I began speaking, I have an already publicly stated position in this debate. Those allegations have done nothing at all to weaken my resolve either, as members can well imagine. However, should the Bill pass, I have told members of the hotel and club industry in the South-East of South Australia that I do have a fall-back position, and I do not regard this as a position of weakness: it is simply a statement of intent once again.

My preference is that, should the Bill pass or should the Bill look like passing—and one will be able to assess that from the second reading speeches—during the Committee stage I will be pressing for control of the machines to rest either with the Liquor Licensing Commission in association with the Casino authority, or with the Lotteries Commission. Either way, I prefer their control rather than that of an independent authority. I also believe that there should be a limit to the maximum number of machines to be operated in any establishment. As far as I see in my electorate, the opening of a super gaming room with possibly hundreds of machines could well bankrupt each one of the lesser establishments—the clubs and hotels—by attracting all local business away from them. There does not seem to be any limit of the number of machines within the legislation. However, I suspect that this Bill is really a ploy to satisfy big business, the big players, rather than to look after the interests on the smaller businesses. I say once again: small business beware; it may not be your salvation—it could be your breaking.

May I say, on behalf of the clubs and hotels in the South-East, that I recognise their concerns, because there is the possibility of increased competition from hotels across the South Australia-Victoria border should the Victorian Government permit the installation of machines in licensed premises in that State. I do not believe that control of gaming machines, whether by Government or independent authority, is really much of a concern to my hoteliers and sporting clubs, especially the four major football clubs and other minor clubs in the South-East. The controlling authority is not so much of a concern to them as they simply want gaming machines to be permitted in their establishments. In that regard, I do not believe I am worrying them a great deal when I say that I will be pressing for Government control. They are more interested in having the machines than worrying about who will control them.

Certain licensed football clubs in Mount Gambier and one or two hotels contacted me several weeks ago—the situation may have changed now but they have not contacted me in the meantime—saying that they would prefer to have the ability to lease machines from the Lotteries Commission rather than to have to pay for a machine which they might not be able to finance. That is the risk I mentioned earlier: there is no guarantee. So, either way, whoever controls the machines, smaller institutions are worried and may prefer to lease with a fixed profit margin should they not be able to spare the money to make an outright purchase. However, others wealthy enough to make that outright purchase are quite indifferent to the possibilities of leasing. For them, it is an irrelevant issue. They can simply buy and cream off the profits as they would expect to do.

Balancing the demands from commercial establishments, I have also had very strong representation from the public in my electorate, as I have had continually over a very wide range of social issues in the 17 years that I have been a

member. I have also had strong representation from local and Adelaide church authorities opposing the spread of electronic gaming machines. The public polls that have been released through the media in Adelaide over recent weeks also indicate a strong antipathy on the part of the public towards electronic gaming machines being allowed to proliferate.

On that basis, I repeat what I have told the Hotels and Hospitality Industry Association in the past 12 months: I intend to oppose the Bill in principle, but should the Bill look like passing, I will support Government control rather than independent control of the machines, and I believe that, in arriving at those decisions, I am reflecting the opinions of the majority of electors in Mount Gambier. At the same time, I acknowledge that my business people have to survive, and I will act in their best interests if the Bill looks like passing.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I have followed this debate, both those who argued for it and those who argued against it, with a great deal of interest. I started this process in two minds, when the measure was introduced in this House, as to whether or not I should support the legislation. I have heard nothing on the pro side to disincite me from voting against this Bill. I do so for the reasons that I will lay down now. For centuries, all throughout the world, pubs and hotels have been an important part of all societies. Over the centuries, I presume they have gone through their vicissitudes, basically as an industry. In every country I know, what we would call a pub or hotel has survived. Apparently, we in South Australia are faced, if we are to believe many of the proponents of this Bill, with the fact that most of our pubs and many of our clubs are on the verge of bankruptcy because, if they do not get pokies, they will not be able to afford to survive.

I for one do not believe that that is the case nor should be the case. If our pubs and our clubs are in trouble, they are in trouble for a variety of reasons, and we should look to the cause of that trouble, not try to bail them out by supplying new features for them with which to try to trade their way out of difficult socioeconomic circumstances. I note in this context that the advent of Sky Channel and the TAB was to be the saving grace of many hotels. Indeed it was. Now, as my colleague the member for Morphett will say, the oncourse bookmakers at the racetrack are virtually going broke because people are sitting drinking in pubs, not going to the racecourse. While the pubs are very happy that they have got Sky Channel and the TAB, another section of a big and important industry is suffering because of it. However, Sky Channel and the TAB are not enough, we have to have poker machines as well. I do not accept that.

The nature of the English pub is such that it forms a very important part of the community, especially the rural community. They are generally small, low cost establishments. In many instances, they are a community meeting place. We have gone in a different direction in this country. We have fewer hotels, they are bigger and more luxuriously appointed. In consequence, they need a much bigger turnover to run. I suggest that is the start of the problem. The bigger the establishment, the greater are the costs of running it, the more turnover is needed, the more people the manager has to get through the door and the greater the danger of not being able to survive in difficult times.

Those times have been made more difficult by this Parliament, which recently introduced a .05 drinking rule. I do not resile from the decision of Parliament to make drink driving more difficult but I find it very hypocritical to sit here and bleed for the pubs and clubs on the one hand,

saying that they have got this, that and everything else, having considered a measure that was clearly aimed at the bread and butter of that industry. This Chamber appears to want it both ways, especially members on the Government benches, who argue one day that we should do this but on another day that we should do that, conscious that both decisions might hurt the same people. I say that advisedly because I do not support drink driving. I never have and I never will. I think it is wrong and I think that Parliament made the right decision, but it knew that the decision would hurt the hotels and licensed clubs.

Therefore, my objections to the Bill are not based on any desire to hurt pubs or clubs, nor on any desire to stop people from gambling. I have nothing against gambling although I must put on the record that I believe we have so many forms of gambling in this State at present that it is a bewildering array. One wonders why members who are so keen on this legislation want yet another form of gambling. I can think instantly of 10 forms of gambling in which one can participate in South Australia, and I do not knock any of them. However, I do not see why we must be so desperate to have an eleventh, twelfth or thirteenth form of gambling.

Mr Holloway: What about freedom of choice?

Mr BRINDAL: I am all for freedom of choice but, in the end, how many choices do you want? You can have freedom of choice to paint a room but how many times do you want to repaint it? How many choices do you want in this matter? That is my opinion. The question is whether this legislation will truly benefit pubs and clubs. I do not believe it will. Will it benefit the people? Again, I would say that my answer is that I do not believe that it will. I enjoyed taking part in a debate on 5AA with Mr Horne, of the Hotel and Hospitality Industry Association, and a number of listeners. Mr Horne said that his industry viewed this as a business opportunity. I am quite sure that that is correct: it is a business opportunity. In my discussion with Mr Horne I raised the question of for whom it is a business opportunity, and I raise it again now, because I do not believe it is a fair and equitable opportunity for all clubs and all pubs.

Let us look at the facilities in my electorate of Hayward, and this has relevance for the members for Morphett and Mitchell, both of whom are present in the Chamber. There is the SAJC at Morphettville, the Glenelg Football Club and the Sturt Sport and Recreation Club. I am reasonably confident that those three organisations have the ability, at less cost than many other clubs and pubs in the vicinity, to modify rooms and meet any requirement that this Parliament might demand in law for the setting up of those facilities. I also have every confidence that those organisations are of a size to purchase immediately the maximum number of machines that will be allowed under the law. Therefore, in my electorate, there will quickly be three principal focus places where people can go to play the pokies—the Glenelg Football Club, the SAJC at Morphettville or the Sturt Sport and Recreation Club.

What about the Somerton Surf Life Saving Club, the Cooina Elderly Citizens Centre and the Marion RSL, which is almost adjacent to the Sturt recreation complex? If they can afford it, they will install their one or two machines and people will go down to the club on a Friday afternoon or at peak time to spend their money on the machines. Because there are only one or two machines, they will find that they are crowded and they will not be able to get on them. So, the next time they want to have a fling on the pokies, they will go not to the club they have gone to for years but they go to one of the other three clubs. Patronage

of the smaller clubs, the community clubs which are essential, will drop off. I agree with Mr Horne. I believe it is a business opportunity, but it is an opportunity that, in the end, will advantage a few and disadvantage many. I honestly believe it is a business opportunity that may well spell the demise of many of the pubs and clubs in South Australia.

I am sure that the industry representatives represent their industry to the best of their ability, with the interests of all the industry in mind. However, I wonder why they are so determined that this legislation represents a good business opportunity, because I cannot see that it does, and I cannot believe that it does. As I said, it will help a few but it will disadvantage many. I draw an analogy with the advent of the supermarket. When the supermarket came into South Australia, it spelt the demise of many small groceries and many small businesses which catered for the little district around the shop. Those businesses have never reappeared and they never will reappear. The advent of poker machines will be the demise of many of our small community clubs, many important service clubs such as surf life saving clubs, and many of the small pubs that are viable businesses.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Mitchell asked whether I voted against supermarkets and the Minister for Environment and Planning said that I probably would have. I was not here at the time, and I do not know. All I can do is exercise my conscience, the same as the Minister and the member for Mitchell will. If any of us in this place had the answer, we might not need to come together and debate as we do. If we were all categorically assured that we were 100 per cent correct 100 per cent of the time, we would not need to have these debates. Unfortunately, I can only add my contribution to the wisdom of this House.

That is my principal objection to this Bill. I do not think that it will give the opportunity that its proponents claim it will. In fact I think it could damage small pubs and clubs. My other strong objection in terms of any Government Bill that comes before this place, and one to which I believe the industry should be awake, is the 'trust me' attitude of this Government when it comes to the disbursement of the profits from the machines. It is all right for any Government to say, 'Trust me, we will do it by regulation. We will give 85 per cent to the winners.' That is the percentage the public gets, and the public knows that, but what of the 15 per cent that is left? How much does it cost to operate? What are the operating costs? What percentage does the Government get? We are not told that, and in that lies the rank hypocrisy of this Bill.

I for one have been in this Chamber long enough to say to the members of the association, 'If you are silly enough to trust this Government—this Government which has lost \$2 300 million, this Government that is so broke it wants every cent it can get—you are very foolish indeed.' I can say to the industry with almost categorical assurance that, if we let them get this Bill through this House—if we let them pass this measure—we will see how much goes to the hotels and clubs. The Government will bleed them, and it will bleed them dry because the Premier does not want to come in here in August with new taxation amendments which the people can see. He would much rather collect \$55 million through the back door in taxes on people and through inadvertent taxes on clubs, and as they go to the wall he will say, 'Wasn't that bad luck? It's the free market at work, and it's the bigger places closing the smaller ones. We had no say in it.'

Well, I think he had a very real say in it, and that is the reason that he has suddenly done an about face. This Premier, who would never see poker machines in South Aus-

tralia, who is on the record as saying that, has suddenly done an about face. In this matter I find myself supported by very strange—I was addressing the Minister, so I will wait until she has finished chatting.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is addressing the Chair, not the Minister.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister's knowledge would constrain her not to interject. The member for Hayward.

Mr BRINDAL: In this matter I find there is a very strange mixture of people who share my views. I notice that Mr Lesses came out in the press not in favour of the machines, and I notice that the churches are not in favour of the machines. In that context, I received a very succinct and poignant letter from Bishop Bruce Rossier, who says that, while he is not against gambling, he is against the advent of these machines. In his letter he said that he would not deny to anybody the right to gamble, but he pleads with this Parliament, on behalf of those who have responsibility for people who find themselves in adverse financial conditions resulting from gambling, not to introduce the legislation. It is a poignant letter from an eminent churchman, and it is not based on theological grounds: it is based on compassion and the need to look carefully at this legislation and its possible consequences. Indeed, Mr Lesses from the UTLC made a similar comment in the press, so it is a strange group of people indeed, an odd assortment if you like, who oppose this Bill. But I think they oppose it for good and valid reasons.

I would like to draw the House's attention to the business that seems to have preoccupied it for the past two or three days, and that is some allegations concerning the Minister of Tourism. Whether anything happened involving the Minister, I do not want to enter into it. What worries me most is the sort of things which the Commissioner of Police said. I believe that people inside and outside this House have followed a trail and, as a result of following that trail, allegations are now being thrown backwards and forwards across this House. I do not want to enter into that matter, but I would like to ask: have any members of this House stopped to consider how that trail may have been laid?

In England it is well known that, if you go hunting, you drag a snare around and set the hounds, and the hounds merely follow the scent, and eventually they arrive at the bait. With the information which has been laid before this House, I think somebody laid a trail and knew the bait was at the end of it. I for one wonder who is laying the trails and whose scent this House, and we as individuals, may be following. I worry that, because there is so much money at stake with this Bill, there are huge interests, and I do not know which winds might be blowing us in which direction. I would say to the House that that was behind many of the comments of the Police Commissioner.

I think there is a concern about what could happen as a result of this legislation and about the forces that could be at work and could profit as a result of it. I make no allegation and do not sit in judgment on any person, but I am worried that we may be being steered down a track unwittingly and unknowingly to the deliberate profit of some people, in ways which may not always be legal. I am not advancing these as reasons against gambling or taking any high moral ground, but I do not believe that this Bill will help the community, and I do not believe that it will help the industry, which says the Bill is there to help it, I believe that this Bill could be very harmful to the good order of this State, and I oppose it.

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I support the legalisation of poker machines, and I commend the Minister for introducing this legislation into the House. The debate on poker machines has occupied this Parliament's and previous Parliaments' time almost *ad nauseam*. It really appears to be a contradiction to permit so many forms of gambling in the community and then suddenly vent one's hostility towards gambling simply on poker machines, and I suspect that that is what is occurring. Those who want to impose their morality on others use poker machines as the basis for so doing. Consequently, I want legislation legalising poker machines to pass this Chamber. I have long supported the legalisation of poker machines. In fact, I had the responsibility for seeing the Casino Bill pass this Chamber, and in 1983 I sought to remove the tie on poker machines in that legislation and legalise them at that time, simply because of the sheer absurdity of the situation to permit a casino and then to say, 'But you can't have poker machines, and no one else can.'

That move on my part was not successful, simply because I would have lost the support of a number of individuals, particularly from Opposition ranks, four of whom in the end supported the establishment of the Casino, but who would drop off supporting it if poker machines were legalised. Well, our society evolves, and you must do things in stages, so I have been quite content with that situation. But the time has come for poker machines also to take their place alongside other gaming instruments.

It is difficult to introduce legislation of this nature into the Parliament. It takes a great amount of courage on the part of the person introducing the legislation, because of the ensuing debate and the way in which legislation can be held up, frustrated or thwarted, and the manner in which opponents of it have the opportunity to make attacks. I do not think that this legislation should be sidetracked by attacks on the Minister of Tourism, for whatever reason.

I think poker machines should be dealt with on their merits. It is proper that there is debate in the community about poker machines prior to their implementation. I have always believed that poker machines could have been introduced through regulations. I think the scope was there in other legislation to enable poker machines to be introduced without the effective scrutiny of this Parliament, but it is right and proper that the issue is dealt with on its merits and that it is the subject of community debate. However, the debate should not be sidetracked by attacks on the Minister of Tourism.

Poker machines are important for the tourism and hospitality industry of this State. Of course, their introduction will benefit the hospitality and tourist industry in South Australia. Members would have to wear blinkers not to observe the number of senior citizens tours, for example, that leave South Australia and go over our borders to gamble. I have visited many senior citizens' organisations over my time as a member and there is not an occasion when the issue of poker machines does not arise, simply because the pokie tours interstate are so popular.

People will gamble and, if people want to spend their money the way they want to, that is their right. Those people who are prone to gambling will gamble in any event. Whether or not this accelerates their habit, their habit will not change and they will find an avenue for gambling. What a loss to South Australia, not only in terms of revenue but a loss to our tourist and hospitality industry, to see thousands of South Australians going over the borders simply to play the poker machines. I have seen with my own eyes the money they spend on the tourist and hospitality industry in, for example, New South Wales. Everyone knows the loss that

there is to the tourist and hospitality industry in South Australia.

Simply because I support the legalisation of poker machines does not mean that I support every aspect of this Bill. I am persuaded particularly by the Police Commissioner's report that a Government agency as a matter of preference should hold the monitor's licence. The monitor's licence is fundamental to the security and integrity of the system and I will be proposing amendments that will effectively adopt similar provisions to those in the casino legislation, that is, empowering the Casino Supervisory Authority to hold a public inquiry and, at the conclusion of that inquiry, for the monitor's licence to go to the Lotteries Commission.

This will ensure direct Government control and supervision. Gambling and organised crime have a tendency to go together and, as I indicated, I am persuaded particularly by the Police Commissioner's report and by other input that a Government agency should, as a matter of preference, hold the monitor's licence. From talks with the hospitality and tourist industry I am aware that the Lotteries Commission itself needs to lift its game and work to improve its relationships with the clubs and hotels but, in expressing this preference with regard to the commission, I would not allow this view on the commission that I have expressed to defeat the legislation.

I stress that I express this view as a matter of preference, simply because it is fundamental to security and integrity that the monitor's licence is strictly controlled, but I will not allow this view to see this legislation defeated. The legislation simply will not work without the support and involvement of the Licensed Clubs Association and the Hotels Association. Their body—the Independent Gaming Corporation—under amendments that I will move, must be given a dealer's licence. That will mean that the Independent Gaming Corporation will retain a predominant position and be an organisation of significance in the industry and, most certainly, by having a mandatory requirement, provided it satisfies all the criteria set down by the commission, it will be given a dealer's licence and its relationship with the clubs and hotels will clearly ensure that it retains and is an influential player in this industry.

I simply do not believe that legislation of this nature will work without the significant involvement and support of the licensed clubs and the Hotels Association, in this instance through the Independent Gaming Corporation. The casino legislation provides a balance between governmental control and private enterprise and I think, by giving the monitor's licence—following a public inquiry—to the Lotteries Commission, it will ensure that some of the concerns expressed by the Police Commissioner are met. In other words, a Government agency holds the monitor's licence but private enterprise is involved through the Independent Gaming Corporation's holding the dealer's licence and being a significant player and contributor to the industry.

I have also expressed the view publicly that I cannot see any reason why the legislation must tie gambling and alcohol. I cannot see any reason why an organisation, body corporate, a properly formed *bona fide* corporation that does not want to hold a liquor licence, should not at least be given the right to apply—

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I will come to that. A body corporate that does not want to hold a liquor licence should not be deprived of having a poker machine on its premises. There is simply no logic behind tying liquor with gambling in this way and preventing, for example, senior citizens organisations from applying to have a few poker machines on their premises.

It would not prevent a social club of a hospital from likewise applying to have a few poker machines on its premises. I would much rather see gambling money being directed towards the aged and infirm than see it go for other wasteful purposes. But that is not to say that they will get a licence; that is not to say that a senior citizens' club or a hospital social club without a liquor licence will get a gaming licence. My amendments simply preserve that right in legislation, and I believe it should be preserved in the legislation and that we should not have liquor tied with gambling.

I am also of the view that there should be stronger limitations in relation to the number of machines that can be on particular premises. I will be moving an amendment to tighten this requirement, that is, that the size of the proposed gaming operations on the premises should not be such that they would predominate over the undertaking ordinarily carried out on the premises.

This really means that the character of the establishment should not be changed as a consequence of there being poker machines on the premises. In other words, a club should retain its character as a licensed club and a hotel should retain its character as a hotel, and this becomes more important because of the amendment that I propose in relation to allowing any body corporate to at least have the right to have a few poker machines. We should not want to turn these establishments into *quasi* casinos. They will retain their predominant character, will be allowed to have poker machines but not in sufficient numbers to effectively have *quasi* casinos throughout South Australia.

I am aware that this is a measure of protection for the Casino and I unashamedly put this point of view now. The Casino is a significant employer in South Australia; it is a significant contributor to South Australia's revenues; it is an important attraction in so far as our tourist and hospitality industry is concerned; and this Parliament decided that there should be only one casino.

These tighter restrictions—a limitation, effectively, but with considerable discretion on the part of the Liquor Licensing Commissioner—and the limitation on the number of machines are called for to ensure that the Casino itself is not undermined by effectively passing legislation that enables *quasi* casinos to be established throughout South Australia. That would not be acceptable.

Other amendments that I propose deal with binding the Crown. The Crown should also be bound expressly by this legislation. There may be agencies of the Crown that likewise want to apply to have poker machines, and I believe that there should be tighter police controls. I propose to move amendments in a number of areas to ensure that the Police Commissioner's scrutiny and involvement is much tighter, so that people who re-enter a gaming area within 24 hours of their being required to leave or of being removed from licensed premises are guilty of an offence.

This would enable far better policing of premises upon which gaming machines are established. There also should be tighter controls over office-holders. I do not propose to delay this debate but reiterate my view that I do support poker machines. I do not, as indicated, support all the ingredients of this piece of legislation. I express my preference, based on the Police Commissioner's report and other input, that the Lotteries Commission should hold a monitoring licence, because this is fundamental to the security and integrity of the whole system, and I believe as a matter of preference the public would much rather see a Government agency in control of the monitor's licence.

I stress that I express that as a preference and will not allow the legislation to be otherwise defeated simply because I express that point of view. But I stress that, for those

people who suggest that poker machines are not going to benefit the tourism and hospitality industry, I really think that that is an absurd proposition. Of course it will benefit the tourism and hospitality industry. I can recall debates on the Casino when the Opposition and, indeed, speakers on the Government side, expressed that same view about the Casino. Amendments were moved that would have had the Casino surrounded by a moat, for example.

There were all sorts of devices to hold up the Casino, and the debate was spun out over some 26 hours, I think. We saw some of the most absurd amendments moved and some of the most absurd tactics to delay the legislation. I do urge members to be efficient in their contributions and to be realistic in so far as their tactics are concerned. Obviously, there will be debate on this Bill in this House. People should put their point of view in a very succinct way. It is an issue about which everyone has been thinking for many years.

Of course it is of benefit to the tourism and hospitality industry, in the same way as the Casino has been of great benefit to South Australia and a great attraction to South Australia, and the way in which the Casino has been run is a credit to South Australia and a credit to the participants. With those modifications that I have indicated, this legislation will do the job and will be of great benefit to South Australia. It will be of great benefit to the tourism and hospitality industry and, I say unashamedly, Mr Speaker, that will be of great benefit to the licensed clubs and the hotel industry in South Australia which are struggling against enormous economic pressures.

If people want to gamble, they will gamble. I do not think you should impose your own personal morality in this instance on this type of issue on other people. If people want to gamble, there are so many other forms of gambling that people will pursue, and I do not really think this will accelerate habits to that extent. It may mean a shift in the way in which people are gambling, but if people want to spend their money on gambling, with so many forms of gambling in our society, that is their choice.

Associated with anything we do, whether it be in relation to alcohol or to gambling, some people have difficulty containing their habits. We have seen that with the smoking debate. You could argue the same thing in relation to smokers as you can with poker machines, as you can with alcohol, and you could go on for issue after issue. The fact of the matter is that our society has come of age. The point has been reached where I suspect that the majority of South Australians really want to see poker machines. There are many South Australians now who are attached to licensed clubs, who see the club as their home base, as it were. It will allow the clubs and the hotel industry a measure of economic relief that they deserve.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): The member for Hartley in the concluding stages of his address to the House this afternoon made the statement that the Casino has assisted the tourism and hospitality industry, but I could also pose the question: at what cost? It is all very well to argue the case that these great gambling establishments are helping the hospitality and tourism industry and, no doubt, are helping certain operators in the hospitality and tourism industry, but the big question is: at what cost? That should become part of the debate.

The difficulty I have in addressing this piece of legislation is a very real one. I have been given the responsibility of being the public spokesman for the Opposition on four important areas: first, family and community services, which covers the Government and non-government welfare sector;

secondly, the area of recreation, sport and racing; thirdly, the aged; and, fourthly, Aboriginal affairs. The dilemma lies in the first two. At the end of the day, I will need to revert to my personal views on the impact of this legislation.

There is no doubt that, if I am ever to seek to represent the non-government welfare sector in this State as Minister, it makes it extremely difficult for me to stand up in this House and advocate the introduction of poker machines because, in fact, that will have a huge impact on the non-government welfare sector and its work, and a huge impact on the cost to Government of running the Department for Family and Community Services.

I see two issues here tonight: the first is for the House to decide whether it will support the introduction of poker machines and the second, having decided that, is whether the control will be under the IGC or the Lotteries Commission. I have had some very productive and fruitful discussions with the hotel and hospitality industry, and have absolute respect for the gentlemen from that organisation to whom I have been talking, and I think it is a furphy for members to argue that, because the IGC, in this case, will be involved, that is not under Government control.

As I read it, the Liquor Licensing Commission provides that Government control. It is not a question that the industry will be self-regulating, and I do not believe that the IGC ever said that it would self-regulate, nor did it suggest that the IGC would control it all. The argument put forward has always been that the Liquor Licensing Commission would provide that Government control.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: You've obviously read the Bill—it's very strange.

Mr OSWALD: I have read the Bill, as I am concerned about this legislation. I have read it very carefully because of the conflicting interests I have in making a decision, but I want to put that on record, because I do not want it thought that my discussions with the hotel and hospitality industry were in vain. When we reach the stage of passing this legislation, if it survives, and we then get down to discuss which organisation should be involved, I want it on record very clearly that I have much respect for the integrity of the gentlemen to whom I have been talking.

However, as far as my official hat as public spokesman in the area of community services is concerned, I must place on record that for me to go out and support the introduction of poker machines in this State would mean that I should resign as shadow spokesman for that area. There is no way in which I could carry on as spokesman in the public arena supporting or making out to support the cause of people who work tirelessly for the Salvation Army, the Adelaide Central Mission and a whole raft of community organisations out there working to pick up the problems created by gambling.

If I am to show my face and seek to represent them now and as Minister in 18 months, I have no option but to support them and to object to the introduction of poker machines. Everyone knows that I am a keen racegoer, so I am not anti-gambling. I am a modest punter, as everyone knows. I strenuously support the racing industry although, at the end of the day, we have a problem with welfare.

It is a fact that as a result of gambling in the Casino there has been an extraordinary rise in the number of bankruptcies. Some very prominent Adelaide families, whom everyone in this House knows about, have lost family fortunes at the Casino. Through the small amount of research I have done in the past fortnight, I could identify only 12 people who had suicided as a result of the Casino. But, if I could find 12 people, I am sure many more have taken their lives because of it. At the next budget Estimates Committees I

will ask the following questions. What are we going to do about the additional money that will be required for social workers for Debt Line? What are we going to do to support the Central Mission with parent-adolescent counselling as a result of families being in strife? If one works in the welfare sector, one knows that the majority of domestic violence situations are brought about because of a lack of money due to gambling, amongst other factors. Certainly, alcohol comes into it; drinking is escapism, but gambling is a major issue.

Some members have said that they do not want to bring in the moral side of the issue, but it is part of it. Organisations exist to pick up those people who are caught in the treadmill of gambling, yet we are going to support another form of it with this legislation. A letter from Dr Mead (and I am sure that many other members received it also) states:

As a medical practitioner working in the inner city, I have daily dealings with many people whose lives have been ruined by pathological gambling. The introduction of gambling machines into this State's hotels and clubs is certain to lead to an increase in the number of people similarly affected. There will follow an increase in the number of families broken up and suffering because of increased gambling.

The proposal to introduce these machines appears to be a cynical exercise in revenue raising which has its own economic cost to the community not as yet taken into account. I have yet to hear any proponent of the Bill consider the long-term cost to the State in terms of social welfare spending on the victims of these machines and their families.

I understand that there are some 8 000 habitual gamblers in this State and, if one multiplies that by a factor of between eight and 15, one can see that 120 000 people are affected by compulsive gamblers in this State. Members may wonder why I am labouring this side of the issue, but I am the spokesman for the welfare sector, and our concern about these 120 000 people has to be put on the record; it is something that all members have to take into account.

I am aware of a family man who has a wife and three children and who has lost two jobs over his compulsive urge to gamble. This family still owns their own home, but that man is stealing from sporting clubs and has heavy borrowings from family and friends. His wife visits the Adelaide Central Mission for food parcels, and the husband has been known to sell the children's Christmas presents. This man creates a crisis in the home to leave the house for one purpose only—to gamble. It is a classic example of what goes on, and 120 000 people are in terrible trouble because of gambling.

The State does not need another form of gambling. I am aware of the difficulties in the hotel industry. I know that many hoteliers are in diabolical trouble in balancing their books because of the recession, but another form of gambling which will take \$55 million (in fact, I believe the return to Government is estimated to be around \$55 million) out of circulation will be a huge impost on the non-government sector—the Salvation Army, the Central Mission and other organisations which have to pick up the bill.

I draw to the attention of those members who go to Morphettville, Victoria Park or Cheltenham and enjoy the races and the hospitality of the racing community the impact that this legislation will have on that industry. The TAB turnover in this State is about \$500 million. Although that sounds very impressive, the owners and trainers are finding it very difficult to make ends meet when running their businesses. The trainers are looking to go to Victoria, if they can possibly get out of this State, because of the higher stake money. In the past 12 months the SAJC has substantially reduced stake money because of the recession and the \$1 million, or so that it lost when radio station 5AA was devalued.

We are now finding that, because of the downturn and the reduced stake money and prize money, many trainers are struggling to keep racing. If we lose \$50 million in gross TAB turnover—and that is a very conservative estimate—it represents about \$5 million in profit, and by the time the TAB pays a portion of that into its reserve account there will be another substantial reduction in returns to the three codes—galloping, trotting and greyhounds. If that happens, there will be a further reduction in prize money and stake money in the country, metropolitan and provincial clubs, and that will mean a tightening of the belt and more trainers will start to fall over. The snowball effect of that will be that racing will become almost non-viable, although no-one can determine the extent because we do not have a crystal ball.

The member for Hartley said that he believed that the Casino and poker machines would assist the tourism and hospitality industry. However, there is also a down side which relates not only to the non-government welfare sector but also to racing, which as all members know is the third highest employment generator in the State and which, because of lower revenue, will move further into a non-profitable mode.

At present there is a concern at the jockey club that the \$1.5 million loss will blow out to nearer \$2 million, and I do not think that the industry can handle such losses on an annual basis. In this case we are predicting that between \$2 million and \$3 million out of the \$5 million will be creamed off the top of the stake money. It is a serious issue, and I am sure that I could cite other sports that are affected.

Not all clubs want to have poker machines, although I can understand those that do. The member for Davenport's private member's motion last year provided that, if the Casino had poker machines, so too should clubs and hotels, and at that stage that was my attitude. However, if I were to face the Government and non-government sector in the next few years as Minister, I would be put in an impossible position: if I wanted to hold my head high amongst those organisations that are working so diligently for the needy in this State, and if I supported poker machines while these agencies were coming to me weekly with their hands out for assistance, I would have no option but to tender my resignation from the portfolio.

It is a matter that I have thought through in great detail. I feel I am taking the right decision because of my portfolio responsibility which covers two converging areas. At the end of the day, any deep thinking person who had to decide between money for gambling as a source of revenue for Government and the other side of my responsibility, the welfare sector and the good of those people in this community who are in need of assistance, would be left with no option but to come down in support of the non-government and government welfare sector. With those remarks, I have no option but to oppose the second reading of the Bill.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I oppose the Bill, as I have opposed all principal gambling measures in this House ever since I was elected. The principal grounds on which I oppose the Bill are that I believe there are serious dangers for the South Australian community in broadening the scope of gambling in South Australia. At this time in South Australia we have an unemployment rate that is the highest in the nation—11.5 per cent—with more than 83 000 people being unemployed. Unemployment among young people between the ages of 15 and 19 years is in the region of 40 per cent; nearly 13 500 young South

Australians are unemployed, and that creates a very vulnerable section of the population.

As my colleague the member for Morphett has outlined, every social welfare agency in this State can testify to the vulnerability of South Australians who are either addicted to gambling or who, through the poverty of their circumstances, are inclined to squander whatever they may have to try to meet commitments that exceed their income. This Bill proposes to place in every small community in this State, not just in the metropolitan area, access to technology which stimulates gambling. The technology provided through gaming machines means that the gambling behaviour and the pace of gambling is driven to beyond the tolerable limit of what some people can stand.

Assertions have been made by those who support this Bill as to, 'Who are we to deny people the right to do what they choose with their money?' I ask those people, 'What is the purpose of the law?' The purpose of the law is to ensure the good governance of society and to reflect society's values. I do not believe that South Australian society is a 'something for nothing' society. I do not believe that South Australian society is a society that demands absolutely unlimited outlets for its appetite for gambling. I will cite the extensive outlets that we have already.

The debate on the motion to disallow video gaming machines in the Adelaide Casino revealed extensive information about the nature of gambling facilities in this State. We already have a vast number of outlets—in excess of 1 000. We have 251 Totalisator Agency Board outlets, 86 Sky network outlets and 496 Lotteries Commission agencies, totalling 833 in all. In addition, we have the Casino and various racing codes, providing in total well over 1 000 outlets for a community of 1.4 million people. That community currently spends on average \$74 per person per annum in the Lotteries Commission, \$39 per person per annum in small lotteries and bingo, and \$78 per person per annum at the Adelaide Casino. It is estimated that, whilst some of those sums will decline somewhat, \$230 per person per annum will be spent by people gambling in South Australia if poker machines are introduced.

Does the Government seriously believe that that kind of money can be spent by people without a resultant serious social impact? I do not believe that it can. If that money were spent on productive purposes, such as in the retail sector, I think there could be some benefit. If it were spent on goods and services, there could be some benefit, but I can see no real or lasting benefit coming from the expenditure of that kind of money by South Australians, particularly when we are in such dire straits economically.

No doubt the motivation behind this Bill is revenue for the Government. An estimated \$50 million will be reaped by the Government if the legislation is passed and if the Government takes its taxation from that income. Does the Government seriously believe that an additional \$50 million worth of taxation will not have a serious impact on this society? In many ways, South Australia is a deprived society. Our income levels are not such that we can afford to fling money away. When the hotel and club industries say that they need this to survive, I ask the question, 'If an estimated \$230 per person per annum (which, obviously for many people, means double or triple that sum) will be spent on gambling in hotels and clubs, where will it come from?' To some extent it must come from money which would otherwise have been spent in the bars and dining rooms. I ask myself, 'What is the purpose of the hotel industry?' To my mind, its purpose is hospitality. It has a very worthwhile social purpose, and one which I support.

Throughout my entire time in Parliament, I have worked as hard as I can when I have had the responsibility to do so to develop policies which enhance the hotel industry in a whole range of matters, because I regard the industry in this State as being the backbone of our tourism industry and one which sets an example to that in other States in terms of the quality of the services it delivers. With all due respect to the industry, I cannot see how a measure which will take money out of people's pockets and put it into the Government's pockets can possibly benefit the hotel industry. I predict a serious downturn in bar and dining room trade. A letter was sent some time ago to all members by the Liquor Trades Union urging them to support the introduction of gaming machines in hotels and the Independent Gaming Corporation.

When I received that letter, signed by Mr John Drumm, secretary of the union—it was personally addressed and personally signed, which is more than can be said for some of the representation that members have received—I was impressed. I refer particularly to what Mr Drumm said on page 2 of his letter in support of the IGC, as follows:

If the operator owns the machines, then they will be more likely to look after them. They will enhance their surroundings and inject that commercial requirement that makes the difference between success and failure. We will expect, however, that there will be restrictions on how many machines can be placed in each site to ensure that we do not turn hotels and clubs into mini casinos.

The letter did not alter my opinion of the principle of the legislation and it will not make me vote for the legislation because I am strongly opposed to it on moral grounds. However, I was impressed by the argument put by Mr Drumm in favour of the IGC. He went on to say:

The Liquor Trades Union has had a long association with the Hotels and Clubs Associations and has a very high regard for the people who occupy the responsible positions in both organisations.

So do I. I am bound to say that the events of the past week have so transformed my attitude, both to the IGC and to the Lotteries Commission, that I will be hard pressed if this Bill passes the second reading and when we come to the Committee stage to determine which of those two bodies should have control of the gaming machines operation in this State.

I have been absolutely repelled by the events of the past few days and I have been totally disgusted with the conduct of the Premier in admitting, on the one hand, that his Minister of Tourism should have vacated her chair when this matter was before Cabinet because of the interest which the Premier now admits she had in the matter and which she herself has admitted and, on the other hand, the fact that he refuses to do anything whatsoever to acknowledge that an impropriety has occurred by dismissing the Minister. To me, that is such a repudiation of the Westminster tradition of ministerial responsibility that it calls into question the whole operation of the IGC, the Government's integrity and how this Bill should be dealt with. I cannot but be wary of legislation that results in such a power struggle outside this Parliament that most of us are bound to wonder what are the forces behind that struggle. It is certainly—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: That is not dramatic.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Don't take it out on the industry.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I am not taking it out on the industry. I am saying that, if we get to the Committee stage of this Bill, for those of us who oppose this legislation the decision as to how it shall be administered will be very difficult in the light of the past few days

and the perception, the very clear perception, by the community that the Independent Gaming Corporation had a paid advocate in Cabinet. That is the perception, no matter how much the Minister and the Premier might like to deny it. The Premier has virtually acknowledged that there is some justification for that perception by admitting that the Minister of Tourism should have vacated her chair when the matter was before Cabinet.

In my opinion, there are a number of other reasons to oppose the Bill. They have been substantially outlined by some of my colleagues but I would like to add to what I said about the hotel industry losing revenue on bar and dining room trade that the clubs may well find themselves in a similar position. The *Advertiser* of 22 February this year quoted Mr Leigh Whicker of the South Australian National Football League saying:

In Sydney the leagues clubs have built these pokie palaces but the sport has not benefited. Facilities around Sydney where they play rugby are appalling. They have turned the clubs into extravaganza social clubs but our first priority must be football.

We can only base our suppositions on what we know to have occurred in other States and it does not appear to have been in the interests of sport.

As to the charity dollar, which was referred to by the member for Morphett, I have had more representation from organisations that rely on public goodwill and public funding than I have from any other source. I certainly have not had any representations other than industry representations. I have had no representations from individuals who support this legislation. In fact, the *Advertiser* undertook a survey of public opinion on this Bill and, from my recollection of that survey, it revealed that 57 per cent of South Australians are opposed to the introduction of gaming machines and only 35 per cent support them. One can hardly describe that as overwhelming endorsement for the legislation or for the Government's action in introducing it.

The charity dollar will dry up, there is no question about that. We have all had representation from organisations as diverse as the Surf Life Saving Association, Keep South Australia Beautiful and the Red Cross which fear that those hundreds of dollars that will go into gaming machines will be taken away from the voluntary donations to good causes. Everyone has a limited amount to spend; we have to determine our priorities. If the Government's assessment of its revenue from gaming machines is that it will get \$50 million in tax, we have to assume that the total revenue will be many times that. Therefore, we have to acknowledge that it is going to come from the pockets of people who will not otherwise be able to afford to contribute to good causes as they have in the past.

The one issue to which I have not referred is the question of crime. I am not an expert on this so I have to take the advice of those who are. I understand that today's version of the poker machine is not as liable to petty crime as the original poker machine used in New South Wales. In other words, it cannot be broken into and money stolen in the way that was possible in the past. However, because it is a sophisticated computer-controlled and monitored mechanism, it is vulnerable to white collar crime and, as we all know, white collar crime can occur on an infinitely larger scale than petty crime. It can be used to manipulate vast sums of money and it is extremely difficult for police to control.

The police have acknowledged that they do not have the technical expertise to investigate the kind of computer-controlled gaming machines that they would have been able to investigate under the previous, simpler system. The Australian Institute of Criminology, in a paper released in July 1990, I think, said that there was no gaming industry any-

where in the world that has not had a link at some time or other with crime. The report, which was Paper No. 24, entitled 'Gambling in Australia', stated:

Casinos, both legal and illegal have traditionally been linked with crime. British and American experience has revealed that legal casinos present authorities with problems such as hidden ownership, tax evasion, laundering of money, cheating and loan sharking. Legal casino gambling is particularly susceptible to crime.

Although we are not talking about the Casino, we are talking about gaming machines about which the same description could be made. We also know that the first conclusion of the select committee on the Casino that was established by Parliament in 1982 was that not sufficient was known about the social impact of gambling, and its first recommendation called for a national inquiry into gambling. That has never occurred and yet there is not a church in this country that is not opposed to this legislation.

It is the churches and the social welfare agencies that pick up the pieces. They are the ones to whom I give my listening ear when representations are made. They are the ones at the end of the line who see the suffering. This is not legislation that South Australia can afford. If it is passed, it will have a very serious, detrimental effect upon South Australia, and I oppose it.

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

ROAD TRAFFIC (ILLEGAL USE OF VEHICLES) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

BUILDING SOCIETIES (SHARE CAPITAL) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

GAMING MACHINES BILL

Second reading debate resumed.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I oppose the Bill. In 1986 there was an interesting headline in the *News* which read 'I'm against pokies here', says Bannon.' In that article, the man who was Premier then and who is Premier today, John Bannon, identified his personal opposition to poker machines being introduced into South Australia. In fact, it was a reinforcement of an earlier opinion which I recollect was stated in 1983 at the time of the Casino debate. The article in the *News* of 24 November 1986 stated:

He said he considered the machines as a mindless form of gambling.

I sympathise with that statement and, in fact, agree with it—'a mindless form of gambling'. How true! The writer of that article, Mr Geoff de Luca, indicated that the Premier's stance was a further blow to the Adelaide Casino and licensed clubs, which had lobbied for some time for the introduction of poker machines. At the time I thought, as I am sure others did, that the Premier could at least recognise the inherent harm and danger that poker machines can and do cause to our society. In fact, further in that article the Premier said:

A lot of MPs, including me, do not support poker machines. I am yet to be convinced they fulfil a need.

Well, those same sentiments were indicated a little earlier, on 20 November, when Mr Bob Gregory, now Minister of Labor, indicated that the Labor Caucus had decided to oppose poker machines outright. The article in the *News* on 20 November stated:

Mr Gregory said today the Caucus decision had been based on two main reasons: the potential criminal element associated with the machines; and the social effects which would result in extending gambling to more people.

Further in that article he said:

While I'm around, I will certainly be opposing any move for their introduction.

How things have changed since 1986. The Government has decided that things are in such a state that they have to have poker machines or video gaming machines (one and the same thing for all intents and purposes) in this State. In the third reading debate of the Casino Bill on 11 May 1983, I stated:

In simple terms the responsibility to care for the social welfare for 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.

I must say that my thinking has not changed with respect to the potential harm that gambling can cause to people. In fact, I would say that the establishment of a pawn shop just around the corner from the Casino but in the same building highlights the tragedies occurring to South Australian families today.

Recently I went to the drycleaners near that pawn shop and, on returning, I noticed a stereo system in the shop. I asked the proprietor the price of the system and he said that it was \$2 000. I asked what the new price of that system would be and he said that it was \$5 000. The system still had a three year warranty on it. It was as new throughout, a magnificent system, and I thought to myself that someone somewhere has had a tragic loss—they have gambled and lost.

I did not buy the system and I might regret that decision, but that situation reinforced to me that, if we introduce poker machines into South Australian hotels and clubs, it will simply accentuate the problems we are already experiencing. I well recognise that half the problem has been brought about by the Government's deciding to allow poker machines into the Casino. Therefore, it is tragic that the Premier has gone back on his word once more: he has gone back on his word of 1986 and his word of 1982-83.

In this place we have become accustomed to that, knowing that what the Premier says today will not necessarily hold tomorrow. When poker machines were to be introduced to the Casino, I had an opportunity to play them because I was a member of the Subordinate Legislation Committee and we were taken by the Casino management to view the machines and experience them first-hand. No money was required of us because the machines were programmed to operate simply by our pushing the appropriate button, but otherwise they were exactly as members of the public would use them.

I sensed within a matter of minutes that it would be a machine that I could well play beyond my financial limits. On that occasion I was not successful in getting winnings credited to my name (that could not have been possible as we did not put money in and so the Casino would not let us take any winnings) and I was losing at that time, but what went through my mind was that, if time allowed, I would have liked to get on top of the game or at least break even, but preferably to start winning.

I have seen it with other people: it can become a disease. They can be dragged into a situation that they do not want.

Some of the literature that has been quoted in the debate to date and, certainly, some of the literature I have read simply reinforces my opinion. Why do we want electronic gaming machines in hotels and clubs? The Hotel and Hospitality Industry Association, together with the Licensed Clubs Association, has undertaken a considerable amount of work in this respect, and I thank it for keeping me informed over many months now as to its feelings and for identifying the various reasons why it believes these machines should come into its establishments.

In fact, in a memo dated 1 July 1991, the association provided me with a discussion paper entitled 'A case for the location of video gaming and coin operated gaming machines in licensed clubs and hotels in South Australia'. The conclusion to that paper highlighted the fact that the decision to allow legislation to introduce gaming machines into hotels and licensed clubs in South Australia would be a timely and welcome boost to the viability of the local hospitality industry, and that the industry believed that such a move would have majority public support and could be achieved responsibly and with appropriate security and safeguards, and the association's arguments are put forward to promote that case.

There is no doubt that the hotels and licensed clubs would like these machines. I do not deny that for one moment, and I can understand the requirement; because hotels in this State are not in a very satisfactory financial situation, if one is to believe the reports that have been around for the past year or two or longer. Apparently, a record number of hotels are currently on the market. I put it to you, Mr Speaker, that the key reason for the hotels and many of the clubs being in the tenuous position they are in today is the massive costs being imposed upon them by this Government.

I refer to the Estimates of Receipts 1991-92 where, under 'Recurrent receipts'—liquor, publicans and other licences for the year 1990-91, actual—\$42 622 819 was collected in fees from publicans and other licences. That is over \$42 million this Government has bled from the hotel industry. No wonder it is in some difficulty.

I researched the issue further and found that under the jurisdiction of the liquor licensing authority the licensing of hotels and other outlets to sell liquor is governed by the Liquor Licensing Act 1985, which came into effect on 1 July that year and under which is constituted a licensing authority consisting of a Licensing Court Judge and a Liquor Licensing Commissioner. Licences are divided into two categories, namely, categories A and B. Under category A you have a hotel licence, a retail liquor merchant's licence, a wholesale liquor merchant's licence, entertainment venue licence and general facilities licence. What a phenomenal number of licences hotelkeepers are up for.

Category B includes club licence, producer's licence, residential licence, restaurant licence and limited licence. If those two groups are added together, it is little wonder that the Government is ripping off over \$42 million from the hotel and hospitality industries! I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* a purely statistical table relating to liquor industry licences and fees for 1990-91.

Leave granted.

LIQUOR INDUSTRY LICENCES 1990-91

Category of Licences	Average	Licences Operative	Assessed
	fee per licence \$'000		Annual Fees \$'000
Hotel	41.74	623	26 005
Residential	2.73	141	385
Wholesale Liquor Merchants ..	9.23	115	1 061
Retail Liquor Merchants	65.28	162	10 576
Restaurant	2.63	646	1 697
Producers	0.35	209	73
Unrestricted Clubs	4.20	326	1 369
General Facility	11.01	169	1 861

Mr MEIER: The table identifies the fact that the average fee per licence for each hotel is \$41 000. I suppose one has to consider that amount in the context of the very large hotels *versus* the very small hotels, but only yesterday I ran into a former hotel keeper in one of the small towns in my electorate. He sold his hotel some years ago and, when I asked him whether he regretted selling it when he did, he smiled and said, 'That was the best move I made, because ever since then the Government has sought more and more fees from us. It is harder and harder work to make money in hotels.' He indicated then that he remembers an occasion some 10 years ago when he thought his year was going quite well, but suddenly he received a bill for the liquor licensing fee, which at that stage was some \$20 000 for a relatively small hotel, and he said that that fee cut his profits to virtually nothing during that particular year. He also said that since that time the fees have only increased.

An article in the *Sunday Mail* of 8 March 1992 by Mike Duffy referred to certain extracts from comments made by Mr Ian Horne, Chief Executive of the Hotel and Hospitality Industry Association, as follows:

South Australia's hotel industry is in the grip of its worst financial crisis—with one pub in ten facing bankruptcy. Forty of the State's 628 hotels are expected to pull their last pint by mid year after several high-profile failures in the past few months. Many landlords and banks have taken possession of businesses after the failure of hoteliers to pay their bills.

It is small wonder that the hotels are crying out for assistance and, therefore, crying out for gaming machines but, unfortunately, I do not see the introduction of gaming machines solving all the other problems faced by this State, namely, the social problems that go with their introduction.

The other large tax faced by many hotels is payroll tax. This Government should start to decrease these taxes and give a fair go to small businesses in the form of hotels and the many clubs that do so much for charity in this State. We should not have before us a Bill that will cause so many other problems to this State.

I have received many letters and petitions both for and against this legislation. Petitions containing some 208 signatures from many different places in my electorate asked me to exercise my conscience and to vote against the Bill. I also received petitions containing some 53 signatures from people in the south-east of my electorate urging me to support the introduction of poker machines. I acknowledge that there is strong feeling in the community on this subject. I have received many letters from various organisations identifying their concerns about this legislation.

One of the classic letters was from a gentleman at Moonta who said:

After discharge from the Royal Australian Navy we lived in New South Wales for 15 years and saw firsthand the effect of poker machines on the community. Friends who had never gambled were hooked—one from a club I belonged to gambled away a farm.

I visit relatives in New South Wales each year and they are just as heavily taxed as States without these non-productive machines. We came back to South Australia in 1960 to get away

from the 'club scene' and bring our children up in a better environment.

That person is now living in my electorate and does not want to see poker machines introduced. I had hoped to refer to Commissioner Hunt's report and to various other documents, but time does not permit me to do so. I believe that, if this Parliament goes ahead with this legislation, this State will not be advancing its interests for the betterment of its citizens. I urge members to vote against the Bill.

Mr HERON (Peake): I rise tonight to raise some points that we should not run away from in this debate. First, we should all understand that Australians are gamblers: they always have been and always will be. Historically, gambling goes back a long way in Australia and we have had our own legend—that is, two-up. I would say that every member of this House at some time or other has tossed those pennies high. I would also say that every member of this House has gambled in some form, whether on horseracing, trotting, dogs, X-Lotto, scratch tickets, bingo, chook raffles, Keno—and all the other types of gambling in the Casino.

I will not be a hypocrite and tell the members of this House that they should not gamble. It is up to them if they want to spend their money on scratch tickets, X-Lotto tickets or a bet on the horses. Similarly, I will not tell the public of South Australia whether or not they should gamble on X-Lotto tickets, chook raffles, bingo tickets or poker machines, because that also is up to them. I do not accept the argument that poker machines in hotels and clubs in South Australia will bring a new breed of gamblers. As I said in my opening remarks, Australians are gamblers.

I have already mentioned some of the various gambling outlets in South Australia and, as have other members in this House, I have witnessed people standing in queues in shopping centres buying scratch tickets and bingo tickets. While they are scratching they go to the end of the queue, hopeful of winning a certain amount of money on their scratch tickets which they cash in to buy more. That is also their right. That is the money they have set aside for their own gambling, and it is up to them whether they spend that on scratch tickets, X-Lotto or poker machines.

If I want to gamble \$10 on a race horse or put \$10 on a X-Lotto ticket, that is my prerogative. If one week I decide to put \$10 in a poker machine rather than buy a X-Lotto ticket, that is also my prerogative. That right goes to every South Australian, whether or not they wish to gamble. This Bill is about stopping the flow of South Australian dollars going to New South Wales.

In the coming months, we will see the dollar flow also extending to Victoria. Late last year, the Victorian Government passed the Victorian Gaming Machine Act, which allowed for the installation of 10 000 poker machines into pubs and clubs in that State. Why did it pass that legislation? There is a very simple answer: the Victorian Government finally realised that it was losing too much money to its counterparts in New South Wales. It was estimated that \$400 million was lost from Victoria every year, as the bus loads of tourists travelled over the New South Wales border to its clubs and hotels. I am not aware of any figures relating to South Australia's loss to New South Wales clubs, but I suspect that, judging by the bus loads who leave our depots, it would be substantial.

Why did the Queensland Government pass legislation last year to introduce gaming machines into its clubs and hotels? Again, the simple answer is that they realised that they were losing millions of dollars every year over the border to New South Wales. It did not surprise me that both Victoria and Queensland passed their respective legislation on poker machines with very little fuss. There was

no fuss from the general public and nor did it come from the Opposition in both those Parliaments. The Victorians and Queenslanders wanted the same benefits that the New South Wales clubs and hotels give their clientele. In South Australia we have to realise that this is the 1990s, not the 1950s, when we were the most backward State in Australia. South Australia must stay competitive with other States, or we will slip behind once again.

The deteriorating financial position of most clubs in South Australia has been a matter of concern to us all for some years now. The lack of recreational facilities in clubs has contributed to a vast decline in patronage. This situation also extends to the hotel industry. Poker machines will not only salvage a lot of clubs and hotels in South Australia but will provide funding for recreation and sport. Poker machines will encourage the growth of tourism by the improvement of clubs and hotel entertainment facilities and services in South Australia. Poker machines will provide additional employment in South Australia. This will, of course, create extra revenue for the State. The introduction of poker machines in South Australia will be of enormous benefit to our tourism and hospitality industries, and we should not turn our back on that.

I have a small leaflet which was put out by the Queensland Government to all Queenslanders on the introduction of gaming machines into clubs and hotels in Queensland. In part, it states:

The revenue generated by clubs and hotels from the introduction of gaming machines should assist their financial stability and allow clubs to provide improved and additional sporting and recreational facilities. The increased patronage will provide a larger base from which additional social activity can be generated. These additional interests from members and patrons of clubs and hotels may take the form of social clubs which involve such activities as fishing, bridge, tennis, bowls, touch football or darts.

Besides providing a wide range of sporting and leisure activities, the additional revenue from gaming machine operations could provide the benefit of reduced prices for food, beverage and entertainment. Live entertainment, films, special occasion lunches and many other forms of recreation may soon be available from a neighbouring club or hotel.

The upgrading of clubhouse recreational facilities will probably be gradual with new tablecloths, cutlery, chairs and other improvements. However, the provision of improved dining facilities, lounge area or a children's game area, may soon be on the drawing board. In time your clubhouse or hotel may undergo expansions, renovations and modernisations, providing pleasant and attractive surroundings for the benefit of patrons.

The improvements of facilities, services and entertainment in clubs and hotels will encourage the growth of tourism in specific localities and overall—

especially in our State of South Australia. It continues:

The introduction of gaming machines to clubs and hotels will also generate a timely boost to State employment. People seeking employment in the food and beverage fields will benefit from increased job opportunities throughout the State. In addition, an industry will be established in machine manufacturing, assembly and repair. These developments, together with the extra jobs created in the construction, security, accounting, entertainment and tourism industries will provide real benefits to all Queenslanders.

That document was put out prior to the introduction of gaming machines in Queensland. As I said, it went through their Parliament with little or no fuss whatsoever. I will not take up much more of the time of the House, except to say, as members may have gathered by now, that I fully support the Bill, remembering that it does not force South Australians to play poker machines.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I rise to make some observations relative to this piece of legislation and to put into perspective the situation as it has been directed to my attention within my electorate. I say at the outset that no member in this House could say that they have been left

without a considerable degree of background information, be it from the hotels and clubs industry, the Lotteries Commission, or a number of other organisations. I respect the courtesy that has been shown to members by the hotels and clubs industry by giving them a demonstration of the equipment that is available. I appreciate also the other information which has come from a variety of sources both intra and interstate.

When we last debated the idea of poker machines or video gaming machines in this State, I voted against it. However, I said that, if it were to pass the House, I believed there was a need for consideration of the same facility to be given not only to the Casino but to other organisations in the State. In that regard I was referring to the hotels and clubs. I did not believe that a set of circumstances should be allowed to give an open monopoly to the Casino. Basically, I still accept that position. However, I would have to say that the conflicting information which is available from a variety of official sources leaves me, as I believe it leaves other members, with some concern as to which method of control or operation should receive the approbation of this House. I was interested in the proposition foreshadowed by one of my colleagues that the matter be referred to a select committee so that the pros and cons of the various methods of approach could be properly tested one against the other. I would also see in that forum the opportunity for the views of the police and other such organisations to be given proper credence and investigation.

It is clear, from the material which has been handed down—first, withheld from the Parliament and subsequently handed down in three different documents from the police—that there have been some pressures which need a great deal of explanation to members of this Parliament before they can claim to know precisely all of the information which is available from the police and which should be in the possession of individual members.

Whether this legislation is referred to a select committee of this House or, if it passes, it is considered in another place, I genuinely believe that much is yet to be learned about the control and management of these machines on a universal basis in South Australia as opposed to the one area where they operate at the present moment. I am not convinced that any of the information which has been made available to members is necessarily totally understood, one piece against the other, by any but a few members in this House. I do acknowledge that some members on both sides of the House have given a great deal of attention to the totality of the information which is available.

The other thing which is rather unique about this piece of legislation is the fact that, for the first time on a conscience issue in relation to a gambling matter, the heads of all churches of the State have come out with a single document. Generally one would expect that, under the legislation which I have addressed in this place through the years, one church would be on one side, one on another and one with a slightly varying degree of opinion. However, on this occasion, we have had a plea from the combined heads of churches of this State that the House look very seriously at the legislation. I will seek to analyse the reason for that. Every member in their own electorate would know just how flat strap each of the churches and the welfare organisations associated with those churches is in trying to meet the very genuine hurt out in the community at this time.

The churches collectively know how difficult it is to make ends meet and provide the necessary succour which is such a part of our community today. For example, the combined churches in the town in which I live, Gawler, have delegated one person, and one person only, to distribute the funds

available from the individual churches for hampers because of the difficulty of exercising some restraint on those people who, although in genuine need, have been seeking to milk the system. We recognise the difficulty that St Vincent de Paul, the Uniting Church and other crusader churches are having in providing assistance in the community for the wants of the families.

It was a rather galling experience to listen to the ABC yesterday afternoon to find out that schools in our midst are providing breakfast for children who come to the school hungry. The Principal of the Paralowie Primary School was interviewed on air yesterday afternoon and was subsequently supported by people from other sources indicating that that degree of hurt is there and that there is currently a major problem that requires all the help in the world for children. In a number of instances, that problem is exacerbated by the fact that, with a reduced income, a great number of people are turning to some form of gambling to make ends meet, with even more disastrous results.

That is not new, but it is a fact that has been reported upon by the heads of churches and by the various welfare organisations in this State and elsewhere over the past few months: there is a great deal of evidence of people trying to regain some form of dignity in a depressed economy by a throw of the dice, so to speak, or by gambling pursuits where they lose their funds. That is always there, but it is more to the fore and more a problem in the world about us at the moment. I believe that is reflected in the letter that we have all received from the heads of churches detailing their genuine knowledge of problems in the community. They say that it would be folly, in their view, to open the doors to gambling in the way that is envisaged by this Bill.

My colleagues and others have referred, and others may yet refer, to the view that, if one is going bad, one way of getting out of that—and I am now referring to hoteliers who have nominated themselves as being in a disastrous state and also a number of clubs—would be to put in the pokies and everything will be all right. It has not worked interstate. If one travels in New South Wales and asks the question of many club proprietors, one finds that many gambling clubs have gone out of existence because they were unable to match the more favoured big clubs that were creaming off all the profits. This left a large number of sporting clubs and others quite destitute compared with the position they held when poker machines were available some 25 or 30 years ago. I do not believe that these circumstances will be any different here.

I now come to the position in relation to my own electorate. There has not been a day in the past three months when the doors have been opened and the letter boxes cleared that there has not been some form of commentary relative to gaming machines. That commentary has come from church groups, schools, charities and outside organisations representing clubs and hotels, and countermending views have been expressed about the advantages of gaming machines. But I would have to say that even in the town in which I live—and have done for 40 years—and which has 10 hotels and a large number of licensed clubs, I have had one representation from a hotel and one from a club to give support to this Bill. Nine hotels and all but one club have been silent on where they stand in relation to this measure.

Disregarding Gawler, and picking up the other large provincial towns that are part of the electorate of Light, there has not been a word or a single request from any club or hotel that I give support to this measure. Dozens of individual views from young and old alike have shown that there is no support for gaming machines. I find that quite

significant, notwithstanding that the Hotels and Hospitality Industry Association and the Licensed Clubs Association have been collectively speaking on behalf of their membership, but the membership itself has not been prepared to speak individually to those who represent them and ask them to support this measure.

I am caught between two different views: that which I indicated in this House when the vote for video machines at the Adelaide Casino got up—which I did not support—and, secondly, when I subsequently supported the motion calling for consideration to be given to making the machines more available, rather than having a monopoly in the Casino. I find some difficulty even in accepting the representations and the hypocrisy of the information that is sent to members from the Casino. A letter that was delivered since 7.30 this evening, addressed individually to members and dated 24 March from the Adelaide Casino states:

4. The removal of its present video machines would have a disastrous effect on the Casino's operations.

That was obviously referring to the statement made by my colleague the member for Davenport in the past 24 hours. The letter continues:

Even if they were to remain, the introduction of 'reel' machines (commonly known as 'pokies') to hotels and clubs without also allowing the Casino to have them, would again have a massive effect on the Casino's operations.

I ask members to analyse that. They claim that if the machines were taken away from them it would be a disaster but they also turn around and claim that if the pokies were given to the clubs and hotels it would also be a disaster. They cannot have it both ways, yet here we have the Adelaide Casino through its Chief Executive Officer beseeching all members to heed that, amongst a number of other points in the letter that has been delivered tonight.

I am opposed to the progress of this piece of legislation, most certainly at the third reading stage. I have always held that debate is not final until it has been concluded. The Minister may laugh, but he will well recall the prostitution debate in this place at an earlier time, when I occupied the centre chair up there and gave the opportunity for the passage of the measure at the second reading so that the debate could continue. However, I would not, even with a great number of amendments, necessarily accept the passage of this at the third reading.

I return to the point made earlier that I see great merit in the pros and cons of the various methods of control being exercised before a select committee. Whether or not that will be an acceptable method of approach in this House, if it does not occur in this House I am sure it will happen in another place.

I therefore indicate my position, again drawing attention to the fact that on behalf of the people whom I represent I have a great mandate to say 'No' to any further debate on the issue. From the people who are most interested in the passage of this Bill, I have had next door to nought, and therefore I could be excused for not even considering their point of view. However, I do believe that the matter ought to be debated out.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMING (Napier): Obviously, I support the Bill. I have reservations, but it would be pretty hypocritical of me to stand up here and say that I do not support the Bill when I moved the amendment to the original motion moved by the member for Davenport, which amendment enabled the options paper to be developed and this Bill under the carriage of my very good friend, the Minister of Finance, being now before the House. I think it is fair to say that this Bill has perhaps generated more letters to us as individual members of Parliament than any

other that I have experienced in the 16 years I have had the pleasure of being in this Parliament. I personally received 27 letters against and 42 for the proposal.

Some of those in favour have also argued that the Lotteries Commission or the Independent Gaming Corporation should have a far greater say than one or the other, but I put those in the category of those who have asked for my support for the legislation. They have all given their views, some very strongly held I might add, perhaps more so by those urging a 'No' vote and imploring that I exercise my conscience in doing so, and I respect those pleas.

As I have already indicated in the *Advertiser*, subject to certain amendments upon which I will insist and vote for accordingly, knowing that this was a conscience vote, until last week I was prepared to stand up here, explain my position to the House and stand by those explanations, and that is really what a conscience vote is all about. In fact, it might have been that, whilst I supported the introduction of this Bill, I might have violently opposed my colleague the Minister in some aspects in Committee. But it is not as clear cut now, because the Liberal Party, aided and abetted by that grubby little journalist, namely Mr Chris Nicholls of ABC Radio, has clouded the issue.

Mr Nicholls has deliberately defamed and denigrated a Minister of the Crown in this Government, and the Liberal Party, based on that information, has embarked upon a shabby road of character assassination. The Liberal Party said as late as today that there is no way that it will vote for the legislation until an inquiry has been set up and the Minister steps down. It has refused to make available to the Government the documents which they claim to have in their possession. If one reads the ministerial statements made by the Minister in the other House, some of it seems to be undated, with no letterhead and could have been typed in some grubby little journalist's backroom, but they have been given a considerable amount of credence by the Opposition.

If I can believe the reports in Saturday's *Advertiser*, some documentation has been obtained from the Minister's bank, and Mr Jim Stitt's bank, by someone impersonating Mr Jim Stitt, and I understand that that is now the subject of a police investigation. As I said, it has completely clouded the issue, but I will move on to that later. I know Mr Chris Nicholls personally, and I know of his grubby reputation. In fact, I myself was libelled by him in October 1986 when he worked for the then Channel 10 television station. It pleases me to report to the House that I was very successful in my libel case against him and that television station, then known as Channel 10 but now known as Channel 7. It was proved beyond doubt that when Mr Chris Nicholls did a job about me and tried to ridicule me, he had lied about me. As I say, I won my libel case, and my bank account was considerably padded out.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Gunn): I take it that the honourable member will link his remarks to the Bill.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I will, Sir. I say this—and I usually do not like to crow about it—because the whole aspect of this legislation is that we are talking not about the pros and cons but about what the Liberal Party will do because of that grubby little article by Chris Nicholls and the follow-up that has been carried on in both this House during Question Time and in the other House.

Whilst I will link my remarks to the Bill, they are pertinent. If we read *Hansard*, we see that most members opposite have placed great emphasis and prominence on the Hon. Barbara Wiese's so called activities concerning her partner Mr Jim Stitt. As a result of those allegations against the Hon. Barbara Wiese, the Opposition has given notice

that it will defeat the Bill. If they do not defeat it here, the Opposition will defeat it in another place. We have had the Hon. Mr Robert Lucas tell the world that, so it is not a figment of my imagination.

An honourable member: They are all of the same conscience.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: So be it; if that happens, the Bill is defeated. However, this is where I do link up my remarks with the Bill: concerning the correspondence I have received, all those people and organisations, namely the churches, will heave one big collective sigh of relief at the Bill's defeat. However, I ask them publicly: 'Do the ends justify the means?' I do not believe so, but I ask those organisations whether they feel comfortable about what has happened to a respected member of the Crown as a result of these as yet unproven allegations.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Do they feel comfortable that it means the destruction of the Minister's reputation and that of her companion? That is what it is all about. This Bill is not about whether we should have pokies legislation: the contribution of the Opposition, aided by your 8c and my 8c, Sir, through our taxes to the ABC, which pays Mr Chris Nicholls' salary, is what will defeat the Bill. It is not whether it is good or bad for the people of South Australia.

Since the scurrilous claims have been made, I have been anxiously waiting, hoping and praying that some of the people who wrote so eloquently to me about the problems of the poker machine legislation would write expressing their concern about the way the ABC and the Liberal Party have acted. Where is that same sense of fair play that I know exists out there in the Christian community? For once, there has been a deafening silence: there has not been one protest, and that shames me as an Anglican.

The Deputy Leader in a passing comment in his contribution to the debate referred to petitions emanating from the churches, and the *Hansard* report of his speech, in part, is as follows:

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes, Sir. Thousands of signatures on petitions have been received by all members of Parliament—that is a fact. They have been organised by the churches—

Mr Ferguson: By the Liberal Party!

Mr S.J. BAKER: No, they have been organised by the churches.

The report then continues. I cannot speak for the Anglican Church in this State or for all the other churches representing the other denominations, but I do know that three weeks ago my own church at Elizabeth Downs received a letter from the Hon. Trevor Griffin with an enclosed petition urging all members of the parish to which I belong to sign the petition opposing poker machines and to send it back forthwith.

That gives the lie to what members opposite are saying about whether or not they organised the petitions coming from the churches. I have no objections to the Liberal Party doing exactly that. I have no objections to its methods, as long as the Liberal Party owns up to them, but that is what the Liberal Party is having a problem with. It goes down a certain track of innuendo and then tries to wash its hands like Pontius Pilate and say it did not know anything about it. It will not wash.

Perhaps this is an opportune time to go through some of the concerns of organisations and private individuals who have not only written to me but to you, Sir, and to every member of Parliament expressing their concerns and making comments. I start with the letter from the Adelaide Central Mission, of which I will read part only. It reads:

It is our understanding that when the matter comes before Parliament it will be determined by a conscience vote. We urge you to vote against the introduction of further gaming machines. Our opposition to gaming machines stems from the belief that they generate social acceptance of the principle of gain without effort. We believe it also encourages those who can least afford it to gamble with slender chance of success. When all is lost they rationalise their circumstances as being due to bad luck.

Is the Adelaide Central Mission saying 'Hard luck, the Hon. Barbara Wiese. It is your bad luck that you have fallen victim to this attack on your character by Chris Nicholls and the Liberal Party'? The Women's Christian Temperance Union of South Australia writes:

We wish to express our concern at the increasing opportunities for gambling in South Australia through the introduction of electronic gambling machines into the Casino, hotels and clubs. We feel that this move can only lead to increased family breakdowns, domestic violence and suicides.

I wonder whether that organisation has considered the possible breakdown of any relationship between the Hon. Barbara Wiese and Mr Jim Stitt. I guess, from the fact that it has said nothing, that it does not worry about that, as long as the Bill is defeated. The Australian Heads of Christian Churches, as quoted by the member for Light, write:

The South Australian Heads of Christian Churches, representing 11 denominations, unanimously express their deep concern at the proposal to permit the introduction of gaming (poker) machines to clubs and hotels in this State. We plead with members of Parliament to heed the 1991 call from the first South Australian Conference on Gambling for the South Australian Government to abandon legislation permitting the introduction of gaming machines into hotels and clubs... Our concern in particular is for families and individuals who are most at risk in the present economic climate.

I wonder whether they are considering the way in which the Liberal Party and Chris Nicholls have dealt with individuals such as Jim Stitt and the Hon. Barbara Wiese.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMING: I see that I am upsetting the member for Bragg. The Bible Presbyterian Church writes:

We write to voice our very strong opposition to the introduction of 'poker machines' into South Australia. We sincerely hope that you will vote against this measure. As elected representatives of the people of this State it is your responsibility to uphold what is truthful and good for us all. Let us put before you some valid reasons why we believe that gambling in any form is harmful to our community... Gambling violates the doctrine of good stewardship as set forth in the Bible. Gambling teaches people to put their trust in blind chance instead of in God. Gambling most powerfully fosters and advances the sin of covetousness, which is one of those sins expressly forbidden in the Ten Commandments.

I have no problem with the arguments put forward by all these people. All I say is, comparing it, do they think that the views they express, not only to me but to every member of this Parliament, still stand up when they know that there has been a deliberate attack on a Minister of the Crown, to smash her reputation? And why—because she is a competent Minister and because she is a woman. Those are the sexist overtones that have crept into the Liberals' attack on this fine lady who acts as Minister in the other House. I have one letter from the Christian Family Centre, which reads in part:

Many of our congregation have expressed their intention to contact you, as their elected representative, either with a petition or personally by letter or phone to register their desire for you to vote against this legislation... We pray for God's wisdom to guide you and your fellow parliamentarians, as you vote on a matter closely affecting personal family lives, as well as the social health of our communities.

What are they saying about the personal family life of the Hon. Barbara Wiese and Jim Stitt at the present moment? I have a letter from the Salvation Army, which reads:

It is our belief that any form of gambling is detrimental to both individual and family life causing disruption, hardship and

great sadness. It is our view that these will be increased if poker machines are introduced. We believe that this is sufficient reason to prevent the introduction of this form of gambling into South Australia.

I wonder whether the Salvation Army is now worried about the disruption, hardship and great sadness that has been experienced by the Hon. Barbara Wiese and Mr Jim Stitt.

The next letter I read is from a private individual, and you, Sir, will understand that I will not quote the name or the address. I will read this in full, because it actually says some nice things about me. It reads:

Dear Mr Hemmings, I was very disappointed to read in Saturday's *Advertiser* that you are voting for the introduction of poker machines in South Australia. As I am working in a day centre for homeless people I am aware of the good work you have done in support of people in need. So it shocks me to read that you would be affirming a decision made by Mr Bannon [although that is incorrect] that would very much undermine the lifestyle of poor people and those on welfare, not to mention even more those who have problems with gambling. Why must we make their plight harder and worry those who depend on them? Is there any way that you could possibly change your decision on this matter? I appeal to your sense of justice and concern for those who are less fortunate than you and me.

I have no problems with the letter, but I wonder whether this writer has any sense of justice and concern about the way in which the Hon. Barbara Wiese and Mr Jim Stitt have been dealt with by the Liberal Party and the grubby Chris Nicholls. Another letter that I received states:

My work has brought me in contact with many people impoverished by the recession through unexpected unemployment. These people and the families dependent on them would be further disadvantaged by the readily accessible pokies, as desperate people often feel tempted to turn to gambling.

I could pose that question to members of the Liberal Party. They were so desperate to get off the hook and not to have to make a decision on this legislation that they have now served notice on the people of South Australia and this Government that they will not let this legislation pass in the other place. Another letter that I received states:

This piece of legislation has been widely condemned as socially dangerous, morally bankrupt and as an open invitation to organised crime. Furthermore, opinion polls show clearly that the vast majority of South Australians are against the introduction of gambling machines, whatever controls are put in place.

I would suggest that what the Liberal Party and Chris Nicholls have embarked upon is socially dangerous, morally bankrupt and an open invitation to reduce further the level of responsible debate in this House.

By reading those letters into *Hansard*, and by my own comments, I have tried to place on record the fact that I share the concerns of those people. I will support the legislation but I do not need to do so. I could, in effect, appease those people and say, for various reasons, that I will oppose this legislation; but I have yet to hear one argument, perhaps with the exception of that put forward by the member for Fisher, to convince me that I should do so. I understand that the member for Fisher got himself into considerable trouble because he asked, 'Why should I be asked to decide on whether or not poker machines should be introduced?' I applaud the honourable member for making that statement. I understand that on Friday he was in real trouble in the Liberal Party room for doing so, but that is their business, not mine.

However, what the member for Fisher said is correct: what business is it of ours and why should people say that it is acceptable for the middle class to have the ability to gamble but that the lower socioeconomic groups (and that is the fashionable Liberal phrase for the poor and unemployed) do not have that right? It is a fact of life that the people whom I represent, many through no fault of their own, are not in a position to do that. If they want to gamble,

there are other avenues open to them, but they just cannot afford to do so. They cannot afford to drink; they cannot afford to smoke; they cannot afford to take their children to various places. We should all feel ashamed for them—for them, not of them. However, some people believe that we should protect this group, but you, Sir, do not need to be protected because you are a wealthy farmer and a politician.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable member is not reflecting on the Chair.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Definitely not, Sir. I do not have to be protected and nor does the member for Henley Beach.

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

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I oppose this Bill and I do so because I believe that many issues associated with this legislation have serious ramifications for the welfare of so many people of this State in the years to come. I understand that there is an argument to the effect that, because parliamentary debate allowed poker machines or electronic gaming devices to be installed in the Casino, they should be allowed to be installed in not only other clubs and hotels but also other places.

Whilst I have some sympathy with the logic of that argument, it does not address what I believe is the more serious ramification of the social consequences to a wide section of the community. I have listened to the member for Napier with a great deal of interest and, whilst he tried to quote every piece of correspondence that has been forwarded to him by social organisations, church organisations and individuals, he tried to use those letters in a roundabout way to refer to events that have occurred in the past four or five days in this State.

I am referring to the incident that has been raised by way of many questions asked in this House concerning the Minister in another place. To comment on that, one should really point to where a problem lies, that is, that there are members of the Government and those who are drafting the legislation who believe that it is almost corruption proof. Yet, we have seen a person in a high place either accidentally or deliberately—and I am not in a position to argue that, but for the sake of this argument let us say accidentally—get into a position where they may have been able to gain financially as a result of their activity in the very highest of positions. For any Government to suggest that it can make this piece of legislation almost corruption proof is a very unwise thing to do at this stage.

The member for Napier read into the record numerous letters which I think just about every member of Parliament has received, and I do not think it is necessary for me to repeat them. The overwhelming volume of correspondence I received in my electorate office asked me to vote against this legislation. Quite frankly, I believe that my political future would be at risk if I chose to go the other way. Most people would know that with my background I would not go that way, and I think I would be treading very dangerously if I did.

I have received representation from the hotel industry and the clubs, and I respect and thank them for their efforts. Our communications were most amicable and no undue pressure was put on me, although there was certainly a polite request to consider the industry's point of view, and I have done that. As I said previously, there is the logic of the argument that because the Casino has electronic gaming devices other clubs and hotels should be allowed to have them as well. Some of the communications I received were

from charitable organisations, which believed that their revenue source would be dried up or diminished by this legislation. They believe that it will become increasingly difficult for them to raise the funds that are necessary for their very existence. Many people who have been involved in fundraising have also contacted me saying that the shortfall in funds for those charitable organisations needs to be met, and that if it is not met in some way there will be a downgrade of these services. That is just one social cost that would be there.

We need to look at the other aspect, involving the impact on the family. Members may no doubt recall that on many occasions I have said that I believe every piece of legislation that comes before the House should involve a family impact statement to assess the impact it will have on the family structure and to see whether the legislation we pass has some merit and is not of a negative nature and against the family. I believe that this legislation will be disastrous for the family. We all say that we would like to foster the family nucleus, which we see as being an essential part of our community, yet this House tends to pass legislation that has quite a negative effect on the family.

If it is the will of the two Houses that hotels and clubs get these electronic gaming devices, I wonder how families will be affected. I was approached recently by a constituent who said that he had been in favour of these devices until he and his family made a trip through New South Wales. Being very keen yachting people they called into a yacht club on the eastern seaboard only to find that they could take their nine-month-old baby into the club but not their two-year-old child.

They saw that as an immediate retrograde step to a family activity, which most yacht clubs represent, and as a detrimental effect. That meant that the only way the family could go to that club, if they wanted to use the gaming devices, was for some members to go into a locked room on one side and for the children to be effectively left unattended or in the hands of someone elsewhere. My constituent said that the family atmosphere, which was an integral part of the yacht club, was being undermined. He said for that reason alone the Bill should be rejected. If clubs, pubs and other places are allowed to have these electronic gaming machines, what about elderly citizens' homes, nursing homes and hospitals? This matter has been discussed in the media and one could ask, 'Where do we stop?'

There is a good argument against permitting gaming machines in premises where alcohol is served but for permitting them in premises quite separate, by virtue of the fact that alcohol consumption, associated with a gaming device, could cause the gambler to become compulsive, and it could further accentuate that gambling habit and make things worse. Quite a valid argument could be raised on that matter.

As to the Government's expecting to receive \$55 million revenue by way of this Bill, in today's tight economic times \$55 million would be an appealing figure for any Government, but at what cost would that be to the community? Families will be affected by gambling. How many families will effectively become destitute as a result? To the downfall of how many families will gambling contribute in part, if not in whole? I took the trouble to seek some advice and talk with people at most levels of this debate. I also sought the advice of a financial counsellor associated with community activities in my area. I got the very clear impression that gambling already plays a damaging role in many households, and I do not wish to mention numbers because every member of this House could probably provide numbers from within their own electorates to identify people who

have had their power cut off or who do not have the basics of life because of their gambling addiction.

This issue sounds emotive, and it is emotive. I would like to think that gambling did not occur in our community. I must admit that I was quite stunned when one financial counsellor told me how many people did not have the power connected or had recently had the power disconnected because of their inability to meet their commitments purely because of gambling. I know that this Bill does not solve that problem, but we are putting into this system another form of gambling which is more readily accessible than the other forms of gambling already in existence. This Bill makes gambling readily available to so many more people.

The financial counsellor to whom I spoke was most adamant on this. I do not believe that he was strongly opposed to gambling *per se*, but his position was such that he saw the damage it was doing to some families and he believed that that was a cost that this community could not rightfully bear. Subsequently, I received a copy of a press release from the South Australian Financial Counsellors Association Inc. putting another side of the argument, and I am not sure that it has been put before this House so far.

This media release from Terry Joseph, the President of the South Australian Financial Counsellors' Association Inc., dated 14 March 1992, reads:

A meeting of financial counsellors from rural, city and suburban areas in South Australia strongly condemned moves to introduce poker machines into hotels and clubs at their quarterly meeting last night.

'Financial counsellors see the results of gambling addiction and are coming across the problem more often as more and more people try to win their way out of the recession,' the president of SAFCA, Terry Joseph, said at the meeting. 'We are particularly concerned about the introduction of pokies at the local level where they will be more accessible to people with small amounts of money to gamble. Unfortunately, many people can't stop at small amounts of money and will get themselves into horrendous debt with dire consequences for them and their families if these machines are introduced.'

Poker machines are a particularly addictive form of gambling with their electronic sounds, flashing lights and the sound of coins rattling into the tray. The psychological stimuli encourage the player to continue feeding the machine.

In New South Wales, where poker machines are a way of life for many, the Government has recently recognised that consumers need protection and help. South Australia is the only mainland State which does not have notices displayed in its betting shops and casino about the availability of help for people with a gambling problem.

'It's as though the politicians want to shut their eyes to the human casualties so they won't have to feel guilty about the 9 000 or so addicts this legislation has the potential to create', Mr Joseph said. 'The money creamed off by the Government will be more than used up by the greater need for health, welfare and legal services by the victims of addicted gamblers, so it won't really benefit the Government's coffers. It's time they took a look behind the scenes of our gambling establishments and did something to help the victims rather than create more of them.'

It goes on to give the media contacts as Terry Joseph and Margaret Galdies, their telephone numbers, and so on. Those are the sentiments that have been expressed by many people so far.

I refer now to correspondence from the Heads of Churches by the Rev. Neil Michael. That, in itself, indicates widespread support within the community, because those people are at the shop front, so to speak, of welfare in this State. I believe that many of those churches and support groups, the Salvation Army, and others of that kind do not now have the ability to meet the community and urgency needs of some people. They are having to say 'No' to food parcels and to a few dollars to enable people to eat. It is not that they want to say 'No'; it is because they do not have the financial resources. It is a slight on our community that we have allowed this to occur.

The member for Peake commented, 'It is up to them', meaning individuals, 'if they want to gamble.' I guess that we could all accept that sort of statement. It is okay provided that it is not at the expense of the taxpayer or other sections of the community in welfare payments. I do not believe that people have a right to put themselves, and more particularly their families, at the whims of the Government's welfare agencies. If a person is an addicted gambler to that extent, this House has a responsibility to set an example. Although many people would say that is not really our role, frankly I think it is our role to set an example to the community and to set some standards by which we should all be able to abide. It is a difficult question. It is not one on which I want to moralise, but I think that if we are honest we can look around the community and see the damage that has been done by gambling. We will not stop it, but we can at least be seen to be minimising it.

As a member of Parliament who probably uses taxis as much as anyone else in this House, to and from airports and so forth, the number of times that taxi drivers have voluntarily offered a comment about the damage that the Casino causes to families and other people they meet is quite disturbing. If a taxi driver offers that comment on his own volition, I obviously follow it up and ask why. Invariably, they give an explanation of the incidents they have experienced when asked to drive home a married woman, for instance, who has effectively spent every cent of the family's money. This applies to men and women of just about every social strata. These cases can be quite devastating, and I do not wish to go into the fairly gory details of some of the cases cited by taxi drivers, of their own volition.

From an individual point of view, I will quote a letter I received that probably sums it all up. This is representative of many of the other letters received, and some reference has been made to it by other members. From Dr Damian Mead, the letter states:

Dear Mr Blacker,

I am writing to request that you vote against the proposed legislation which will allow the introduction of gaming machines into South Australia.

As a medical practitioner working in the inner city, I have daily dealings with many people whose lives have been ruined by pathological gambling. The introduction of gambling machines into this State's hotels and clubs is certain to lead to an increase in the number of people similarly affected. There will follow an increase in the number of families broken up and suffering because of increased gambling.

The proposal to introduce these machines appears to be a cynical exercise in revenue raising which has its own economic cost to the community not as yet taken into account. I have yet to hear any proponent of the Bill consider the long term costs to the State in terms of social welfare spending on the victims of these machines and their families.

It is difficult to imagine a piece of legislation more likely to create social disintegration.

This piece of legislation has been widely condemned as socially dangerous, morally bankrupt and as an open invitation to organised crime. Furthermore, opinion polls show clearly that the vast majority of South Australians are against the introduction of gambling machines, whatever controls are put in place.

Please act in a responsible manner. Vote against this woeful proposal.

Yours sincerely, (signed)

Dr Damian Mead.

As I mentioned earlier, I have received numerous letters and articles. I will make one further reference to the final two lines of a letter I received only today on Independent Gaming Corporation Limited letterhead, and express some concern about it. Whilst I have already acknowledged the representation made to me by the people involved in that corporation, I am concerned at the actual wording of the final paragraph which states:

The hotel, hospitality and club industry watches with great interest the behaviour and conduct of members of Parliament in relation to this Bill.

I certainly hope that that, on my first reading of it, is not a veiled threat to members of Parliament. If it is, then it is a breach of the rules of this House. I do not think it was intended that way, but it is certainly treading on very dangerous ground. I oppose the Bill.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I will indicate from the outset that I will be supporting the Bill. In fact, during the Committee stage, should the Bill be successful at the second reading, I will be seeking to move an amendment to one part of the Bill which I will explain shortly. This has been an interesting debate, in essence. I wonder what some of those debates must have been like in the middle to late 1960s. I just wonder what the debate was like in here when 6 o'clock closing was brought to an end. I remember coming to Australia as a school kid and, with the hotels closing at 6 o'clock, seeing everyone getting off the train at 5 o'clock, dashing over to the pub with a Gladstone bag, filling themselves and their bag, and rolling down the street afterwards.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: The member for Napier is making confessions, but I can honestly say that I never partook of those things because I was far too young in those days. One had to be 21 before being allowed to drink in South Australia. We could go and get killed at 18 years of age—that was a different issue—but had to be 21 before we could have a drink. That really is what this debate comes down to: how much are we our brother's keeper? I agree with the member for Flinders and the other members who spoke about the damage caused to the fabric of our society as a result of gambling.

I saw a clear-cut example of that last night on television. I watched the Jana Wendt show and I saw some of the worst failed gamblers giving evidence against the Prime Minister and blaming him for all their losses. I saw Rene Rivkin, and I can never pronounce his name, but that is not a problem now because he has retired—the recession got rid of him. Of course, he went out there and gambled. Arguably, in his case, he gambled with a lot of other people's money. He was not alone: Bond, Skase, Spalvins and a pile of others were all in the same bag together. However, I do not hear too much about that from members opposite. The reason for that is that when gambling is done on this level it is okay; it is all right.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: The member for Bragg jumps into the debate and I can well understand that he is sensitive on this point, because what people are talking about here is the little person with a few bob being fluttered on machines, which I find are worthless. I will declare from the very beginning that I have not put even 10c into one of these machines, but I must confess that my wife has. She spent \$20 on one of these machines on one occasion. She had a wonderful time losing my \$20. I told her from the very beginning that the odds were stacked against her, that at the very best she would get 85 per cent of her money back after she had done the whole \$20. That meant she would get \$17. When she had done the \$20, which I think took about 1½ hours, she was happy, I was miserable, we went home, and that was the end of that.

A number of people have come into my electorate office to complain about the possibility of the introduction of gaming machines into South Australia. Most of them have then gone on to tell me that they do enjoy an occasional trip to Wentworth in New South Wales, that the last time they were in New South Wales they played a few machines,

or that the last time they were in New South Wales they did this, that and the other thing. At the end of the day, what they are really saying is that they do not care too much for the machines and that they have some fears about the damage that they could do in the community.

I respect those wishes, but I think the question really comes down to how much we want to tell other people how to run their life. I do not think we can do that. I do not think it is our role as members of Parliament to select one form of gambling and to say that if people lose a week's wages on that then that is okay. I have heard that here today. I have heard people say today that if we bring in this form of gambling it might be more popular than the other forms of gambling that we legalised a few years ago, and they might get hurt in the exercise. I do not care a great deal about that. If the stock market bleeds because people want to put money into poker machines, that does not bother me greatly. It does not bother me too much about the racing industry, or other areas for that matter. I am not a gambler; I do not believe in gambling. As far as I am concerned, I am broadminded enough to respect other citizens who want to put money on a horse, in a poker machine or into something else. I do not think it is our role to pass paternalistic legislation and to tell people how to live their life. I do not believe that any argument has yet been advanced that shakes me from that point of view.

Maybe I am too much of a 1960s man. I even think that Fat Cat got a very unfair deal. I must say that I was pleased to see that the committee that assassinated Fat Cat got the chop because, from my point of view and from the point of view of my 20 month old child, we much preferred Fat Cat to Book Worm. He was not impressed at all with the arguments that came up at the time that Fat Cat had an ill defined character whereas Book Worm, a one metre long worm that took his place afterwards, was a clearly defined character with a much better script.

The issue here is simply this: how much should we be telling our fellow citizens out there how to run their lives? Okay, some of them will make mistakes, some of them will gamble too much and some of them will get hurt. They are getting hurt every day in a whole range of other ways. If this is a consistent argument, I want to see the members who are advancing it come in here and move against horse racing, lotteries and all those instant money games out there which we see in the pubs now where the tickets are ripped open and thrown all over the floor. Maybe they should even move against some of the more institutionalised forms of gambling that some of the members opposite get into, but they will not do that for one very good reason—because they are established forms of gambling. This one is new; in some respects it may be a hurtful exercise for some members of the community but, at the end of the day, the innovation proposed in this Bill has been occurring in the Casino for the past 12 months and we have not seen all of those dire predictions come true.

In the debate here tonight I indicated that I would move an amendment when and if the Bill becomes successful and goes into the Committee stage. I am concerned at one aspect of this Bill, and there is another area of concern which I will come to in just a moment and which I believe this Bill has rectified, although I note some of my colleagues are dallying with the idea of bringing back what I consider to be a potential evil that could go into this Bill.

My first area of concern is that in my electorate there are a number of pubs and clubs, some of which are in close proximity to each other. The question has come up to me from these clubs and pubs, 'What happens if one gets machines? Does that mean the others cannot have them?'

In fact, the amendment that I will move at the Committee stage I believe will guarantee the right of duly licensed clubs and pubs to make their case to the Liquor Licensing Commissioner and not to fear the fact that perhaps just a few hundred metres down the road an establishment already has machines.

That leads me into the next part of this whole exercise, which I have found very distasteful. I must say that, with the exception of the Hotels and Clubs Association, I have seen them all. I have had all the lobbyists; I have seen the manufacturers, the church groups, the individuals and all of these—

An honourable member: Have you seen Jim Stitt?

Mr QUIRKE: No, I have not seen him. In fact, I have not seen the people who reputedly employed him, either, and I must remonstrate with them that they seem to be taking my support for granted, because I have not seen them yet. No doubt I will after this speech but, at the end of the day, all the groups have come to me and made out their case. I have had the pleasure of seeing some of the firms manufacturing these machines interstate and I am satisfied that the electronic integrity of these machines is such that the arguments about corruption are non-existent. I think it is one thing to argue that these machines are in themselves a social evil. I have some respect for that argument—I do not accept it—but to try to piggy-back that onto baseless allegations of corruption, particularly on the operating of these machines, in my view has not helped this debate in the past so many months.

In fact, I would say that one group needs to be especially singled out for this whole exercise. Indeed, the Lotteries Commission made a presentation and had discussions with me and other MPs, and it was quite clear from the beginning that their intention was not to regulate the industry. I came in here quite naively two years ago under the impression that the Lotteries Commission was interested in regulating gambling and that other organisations fulfilled their part in the scheme of things. I quickly found in this debate that the Lotteries Commission was really interested only in the marketing of the poker machines, and it concentrated all its remarks on central purchasing. One of the most potential areas for corruption is central purchasing, and I make quite clear on the public record here and now that I will not vote for central purchasing, even if it means that poker machines will go down.

The fact is that a number of clubs in my electorate, one hotel in particular, have sought my assistance in this matter, and they have made the issue clear to me. If they are going to get these machines, they want to make their own choice, whether they have bells, whistles, are painted gold or whatever they do: they want to be in a position to judge what the local market wants. On the other hand, various proposals have been put to us which, in the early days, I called the 'East European option', where the Lotteries Commission was going to own everything and then lease it. Eventually, they would sell it and, where that was concerned, they would be just the central purchasing house.

I was waiting to hear from the commission about regulating the whole exercise because, naively, I thought that that is what they would be coming to me to talk about. Well, that was not their concern. It was not raised with me; in fact, I raised it with them time and again, and we kept coming back to the issue of central purchasing, because that was really their caper. I must say that, to my mind, in relation to all the arguments which they have advanced on corruption and the rest of it, the commission has left itself wide open, because the biggest potential area for corruption in this whole exercise is central purchasing. If a club in the

middle of the metropolitan area buys 10 machines—and I am told by one manufacturer that the average price is about \$7 000—I can imagine that the potential kickback would be considerable. Even though it is illegal, the potential kickback may even be a couple of hundred dollars per machine, or a couple of thousand dollars. If somebody buys 10 000, 12 000 or 14 000 machines (or, as I have been told by other manufacturers, on a regular turnover the same number every five years), you need only have \$10 a machine, and someone will make a lot of dough out of it.

I am not saying that I have heard that that is the caper, because I have not, but I will say that central purchasing leaves it wide open to the worst possible kind of rot and the only one left in the poker machine industry. The electronic surveillance, the computer control of all these machines, the Telecom lines, the computer interrogation of every machine every day and the random interrogation will tell the life story of every coin that goes into that machine and what happens to it at the other end. If that machine is attacked by a patron or the barman with an axe or somebody illegally accesses the machine with or without a key, then there are two things to consider.

First, is that any different from attacking the till in pubs, clubs or any other industries? I think not—except for one thing, which is the second point: the machine dials up the computer which sends the police around. The reality is that the integrity of these machines is beyond doubt. If that was not the case, I would not be voting for it.

I was told that in New South Wales in the 1950s when an election took place in some of the clubs for election to the committee the successful candidates got the keys to open the machines to take out the money each day, and the runner-up got a seat in Parliament. That was the caper in New South Wales—but not any more. They now queue up for the first prize of a seat in Parliament and for the second prize of a key to the machines.

In South Australia we can learn from the mistakes that have been made in New South Wales. I was dragged kicking and screaming into this debate even to accept this central on-line monitoring as I saw it in the early days as perhaps going too far because of the electronic integrity and surveillance in these machines. I accept that now. However, the one thing I am not at all happy about is the way in which the 1950s debates have been regurgitated and recycled, particularly by the Lotteries Commission and its agents in this State, for one reason and one reason alone: they want employment in their own section. They want to control the whole show and, from my reading of some of their activities, they could not care less if the whole thing went down, because, if they do not control it, it will not happen.

I make that attack here in Parliament for one fundamental reason. This legislation can be successful only if the clubs and pubs that are to operate these machines are able to feel satisfied about the products that they install and that they are responsible to their boards of management, to their community and to their customers. I do not want any of the pubs and clubs in my electorate coming to me and saying, 'You are responsible for that crowd over there telling us what we are going to have.'

At the end of the day I do not have the faith in public servants to make those sorts of decisions, because they are not their decisions to make. Decisions need to be made out there at the point of use. I must say in this whole debate that has gone on for many months that a number of baseless allegations have clouded the central issue, which is: why not let those people who want to use these machines—that is not me but plenty of my neighbours and friends in my electorate and all the others—have the choice of using them

and let the clubs, pubs and operators make their own choice as to what machines they want? I refer to what the member for Adelaide said a moment ago, and to what my wife said: she will no doubt be the first one down to the Para Hills Community Club if it should get gaming machines to spend her \$20.

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

Mr GUNN (Eyre): We have had an interesting exercise to this stage. We have not been told where the great demand for these machines is coming from. We have had the member for Napier engage in an exercise that did not do himself or the argument in favour of poker machines a great deal of good. He resorted to an interesting array of abuse about journalists, other people and the Liberal Party and alleged certain motives. Let me put it clearly on the record that, when this Parliament considered legislation to set up the Casino, one or two of us on this side supported this legislation, and part of the undertaking that we gave to see that legislation put into effect was that there would be no poker machines in this State.

I believe that we have been doublecrossed. I have always believed that we should have legal and not illegal gambling, and that is why I supported the Casino legislation. It gave the Casino a total monopoly, but now those people are not satisfied with that monopoly and they have got even hungrier. To be given the only operating facility in this State is a licence to print gold.

I am appalled that now we have this proposition put to us, and they want to be in it, too—they have already been given some preference—again to dip their hands into the pockets of the unsuspecting public. You can count me right out this time, Mr Speaker. I did what I believed to be right in the best interests of the people of this State, as did the former member for Alexandra (Hon. Ted Chapman). We supported the Government members to see that the legislation became law, because we were aware that there were illegal operations that were questionable and that people were not paying their due fees to the Government.

Now we have this proposal served up to us. Is this the Government's answer to the economic woes facing this nation in the worst recession in the past 50 years—to bring in poker machines so that the Government can dip its greasy hands into the pockets of the long-suffering public? What benefit has this legislation for my long-suffering constituents in isolated parts of the community? Where is the demand coming from? I have not had people come up to me saying, 'We have to have poker machines'. I have not had hordes of hotel keepers in my district come up to me—and I have lots of hotels in my district and have always supported the hotel industry against the clubs when they have been under attack, because I utilise hotels on a regular basis. I have had hotel keepers say to me in the past couple of weeks that they are not in favour of these proposals.

Every dollar that goes to a poker machine is a dollar less that will go through the beer taps. People have only so much money, and most of the long-suffering public do not have sufficient funds to meet their requirements. We were told today of a real crisis in schools. Some parents do not have sufficient money to feed their children, who are going to school without any breakfast, and the schools have to provide that facility. What we are doing now is putting another temptation in the way of those people who, unfortunately, do not have control over their gambling urges.

We have been told by the members for Napier and Playford that we should not tell people how to run their lives. On almost a weekly basis this Government has been involved

in that very exercise. If that were correct, we would not have consumer legislation in this State. That is an exercise in telling people how to run their lives—putting a barrier in the way of people who may be unscrupulous in the commercial world. That particular argument is an absolute nonsense.

The role of this Parliament is to act responsibly and to have some understanding of what will take place if these jolly machines are scattered round the country. I, like the member for Playford, certainly am not interested in them and would not walk across the road for one, because we know they are set against us. Anyone who has spent an afternoon putting 10c or 20c pieces into these machines will say that it is a soul-destroying exercise. I cannot think of anything worse.

Like the member for Playford, I am not a gambler. I come from a family that has been associated with race-horses, but I am not a gambler and do not think there is much pleasure in it. I suppose that the last time I had a flutter I gave the family of the former member for Adelaide (Mr Duigan) a few dollars. It will be a long time before I walk up to a bookmaker's booth again. My real concern about this proposal is the motivation. Who will benefit from it and is it of great benefit to the community in general? Those matters have not been addressed. The major benefit will be to the State Treasury.

All sorts of figures have been bandied about, although I do not know which is correct. Someone said \$55 million, but if it is even \$25 million it is too much to take out of the pockets of the community. If the Government is so strapped for cash, there are other courses of action it could adopt.

People have only a certain amount of money in their pockets so, if the clubs take it through the poker machines, the hotel keepers will not get that money, because people cannot spend their money twice. So, who will benefit? I would say that the only real long-term beneficiary will be the State Treasury. I believe that there are other ways to ensure that sufficient funds are available to meet the responsibilities of Government, and one of those ways is through effective financial management and proper administration of the affairs of this State.

I, as have other members, have paid attention to the correspondence received. We have all received such correspondence and we have all studied it. I cannot recall receiving a letter from any of my constituents asking me to support this legislation. I have received a very large amount of correspondence and petitions calling on me to oppose this Bill, which I intend to do. I intend to oppose it at every stage of the debate, because I feel badly let down over what has happened in relation to the Casino. I gave my support to that proposal with the best faith in the world. However, if we agree to this legislation, what is next? What other area will the Government or like-minded people turn to try to get their hands into the pockets of the people of this State?

I know that things are tough out in the real world. I represent a large rural electorate and we know that things are tough. We know that we have had the worst recession in the past 50 years and that our interest rates have been higher than those of any other nation. We know all those facts. The answer is not to take more money out of people's pockets.

I know that the hotel industry is having a tough time and that a lot of hotels are on the market, but that situation has arisen as a result of the crazy economic policies that have been inflicted on us. Those problems will not be solved by the introduction of poker machines. If poker machines are

installed, I know that a competition will take place between the big clubs and the people in the club system here in Adelaide who have large egos and who want to have bigger and better clubs. They want to have the equivalent of the Sydney Leagues Clubs but, at the end of the day, how will society benefit? I have been called a troglodyte before and I make no apologies for that, but I have a clear conscience. I live in the real world and I will not have this sort of legislation imposed on my constituents without a fight.

Because one has to be a realist in this place and one cannot be a one issue person, it was my intention to support the proposal that the hotels and clubs should be responsible for the administration of this legislation. I did not intend to support the Lotteries Commission in this area because, like the member for Playford, I have not been particularly impressed. However, the questions raised over the past few days in relation to the lobbying in this area have now made me determined to reconsider my position, and it is now probable that I will support the suggestion that the Lotteries Commission have responsibility, because I am not happy with the situation.

I do not know who is right or who is wrong in the controversy that is raging and I will not enter into that debate, because I have no desire to impugn anyone's reputation and I do not intend to do so. However, I now have to say that I would have to come down on the side of the Lotteries Commission, because my confidence has been somewhat shaken. I looked at the display and obviously a great deal of care has been taken in the administration and the monitoring of these machines. I am aware of some of the alleged skulduggery that took place years ago in New South Wales, and I do not think that anyone associated with the industry in those days in New South Wales could be proud of themselves. I was concerned to ensure that that did not take place in South Australia.

In conclusion, I believe that if the Parliament, in its wisdom, supports this legislation and the Government collects \$25 million, it will have to increase the welfare budget by a considerable amount. It is as clear as day follows night that the community will spend money it can ill afford. We cannot allow people to go hungry or without the basic necessities of life, so the Government will have to step in and meet those responsibilities. I clearly understand that, once one section of an industry, such as the Casino, gets any form of gaming machine which slightly resembles poker machines, the horse has bolted and everyone else says, 'Me, too.'

I do not think the Casino should have those machines. I was so annoyed with the Casino that I would not even go across the road to look at them. I wrote a very aggressive letter a while ago, and I make no apology for that, because I was far from impressed by what I believe was the turnaround that took place. I am opposed to this proposal because there has been no lobby from my electorate to support it. I know that people can run around and get others to write letters, but it is too late for that because the decision will have to be made in the next few days as to where the Parliament stands on this legislation.

If this is the answer to the economic woes of the State then we are devoid of any real, effective policies that will benefit the people in the long term, and that is what concerns me. We are having a huge public debate about poker machines; it has attracted more attention than any other legislation for some time. There is tremendous controversy in the community, and people's attention has been diverted. It is a bit like the flag/republican debate that the Prime Minister has engendered in recent times: one could be a cynic and say that it is a good diversion. However, if this

legislation is a good diversion I do not believe that it will have any long-term benefit for the people of this State.

I am all in favour of this Parliament initiating proposals in legislation that will guarantee our children and grandchildren a society in which they can have jobs and a reasonable standard of living. We can play our role in the international community. However, I do not believe that such benefits will flow from this legislation. I make no apology for saying that I am totally opposed to the proposition and will vote accordingly at each opportunity. I am being realistic when I say that there are two decisions to be made: the first is whether we accept that in principle and the second is who will control and administer the system. I have some doubts about the two organisations that are vying for control, and I hope that some consideration will be given to another organisation that has not been involved in lobbying and in the politics of it, perhaps some group or organisation that is attached to the Government. I oppose the Bill.

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): In addressing this Bill I wish to commence by declaring an interest, unlike a Minister in another place. The interest I wish to declare is that I am a gambler. I enjoy race horses. Indeed, I have owned some, and I have to report to the House that none of the horses I have owned have gone any faster because I have been their owner.

An honourable member: Unfortunately.

Dr ARMITAGE: Unfortunately, to my detriment. I also have one ticket per week in X-Lotto and every week I spend \$1 million, I majored in cards at medical school. I have been to the Casino, where I spent a most enjoyable hour; I came away having had two beers and \$10 lighter than when I went in. I have a liberal view as to the way we as parliamentarians ought to behave on matters such as this, that is, we ought to allow people to make their own choice as to whether they will gamble. In so doing, unfortunately, I have to admit that some people will fall under the spell of gambling, and that is very sad.

However, there are enough opportunities, such as lotteries, the TABs, the Casino, and so on, for people to gamble. The fact that people may fall under the spell of these machines is no reason for opposing the legislation. When one admits that for some people these machines will become a problem because of the opportunities they provide for them to gamble, one should call for other measures once that freedom has been granted to them. These measures include the much vaunted study of gambling, which the Premier offered when the Casino Bill was under discussion. But he has not come up with that study—one more promise broken.

When one admits that people will suffer as a consequence, it is imperative that we offer support for those who are disadvantaged by any decision that the House might take. I believe that there also ought to be some charitable contribution from the money that the Government will inevitably make out of this. The Government cannot simply say that there will not be any money, as is usually the case. When I highlight Government decisions or indecisions in any of my portfolio areas, I am always told that the money is not there, and that the Government simply cannot provide for more operations, more nurses or whatever. That is not the case here and, if this Bill were to pass, the Government ought to make a commitment to make some specific contribution to charities.

There is talk of \$50 million plus. If the Government were to get this money, and if it were to use it wisely, South Australians as a whole could benefit. As I mentioned, we

could keep open some country hospitals, cut waiting lists or keep open community police stations, instead of the crazy situation that has developed in my electorate. We could even keep teachers at schools so there is no disruption to primary school students at the beginning of the year when teachers are shuffled around like pawns on a chessboard. But this, of course, is a very big if. I fear that, if this Bill were to pass, the money would probably just go to pay off the debts incurred by the State Bank, Scrimber, SGIC, WorkCover, and so on.

For all those reasons, I believe that, all things being equal, Parliament ought not to vote against this legislation, and I do not want to vote against this legislation. I made the decision to vote for it with all things being equal. However, quite clearly, decisions in relation to this Bill on the Government side have been made with muddled minds. No longer are things equal. Because of the alleged conflicts of interest that have been well aired in public and in Parliament, and because of the admission in Question Time today by the Premier that a mistake was made—and I put it to the House also that the mistake might be by not only the Minister but also the Premier, depending upon when he knew of the involvement of the Minister's partner in this lobbying process—the only conclusion is that there does not seem to be any control as to what might happen in relation to this Bill, and that is a very worrying thing for me and for my constituents.

If the Premier is happy to wash his hands of any responsibility and to say, as Pontius Pilate might, 'It is not my responsibility', I put it to the House that in such an important piece of legislation, where clearly elements of corruption are one of the main concerns in the community, for the Premier to take no responsibility means that the ship of State is sailing around like the *Marie Celeste* in a gale.

There has been a lot of lobbying in relation to the whole deal, and part of it has related to potential corruption. Make no mistake about it, the events of the last few days have emphasised the potential problems with this Bill. I mentioned that at Question Time the Premier admitted a mistake, an error, on behalf of the Minister of Tourism, but he protested loud and long about the Minister's innocence. Well, why not get this spat, as it is termed, out of the political arena?

Let us have an independent inquiry, for which we have asked. Let us have no suggestion of political input on either side. Let us have an independent inquiry as to whether there is potential corruption or potential conflict of interest, let this potential be wiped from the slate immediately and let an independent inquiry reassure the people of South Australia. If this were to occur and there were to be absolutely no doubt in the minds of the people of South Australia and in my mind that there has not been some untoward event, I would be happy to vote for the Bill because I am quite relaxed about the concept. But, if there is not a clean slate, I cannot in all conscience, representing the electorate of Adelaide, vote for this Bill.

Earlier I mentioned lobbying. I am not sure whether anyone heard on Radio National on Sunday morning at about 9.30 a program on lobbying in the United States of America. It was on either because of glorious serendipity or sensationally inspired scheduling. Many lobbyists and political academics were interviewed regarding the effects of lobbying on the United States political process. Towards the end of the program, one of the most erudite speakers, who had been quoted on a number of occasions, in effect, said that when lobbying gets to the stage that it has in America, 'it takes away the very legitimacy of government'.

In that program there were quite frightening stories of

the abuses of power and money caused by lobbying. In no circumstances do I believe that is the case in South Australia. However, there is a suggestion that decisions have been taken for reasons about which we are not certain. Unless this shadowy mess is cleared up—the error of the Minister has been admitted by the Premier—the legitimacy of this Government, as of Governments in America under pressure from lobbyists, will be called into question through its handling of this Bill. As I said, I am a gambler and I enjoy gambling. When I go to the races and see three horses—one might be at 16 to 10, another at 3 to 1 and yet another at 5 to 1—I know exactly what I am doing when I put my money on.

Members interjecting:

Dr ARMITAGE: Within reason. I know the odds that I am getting, I know that I am in control, I know exactly where I am going, and I know what I am or am not going to get back if my horses do well or not. However, in this particular instance, it is my belief that I am not in control of the situation as a member of Parliament because of the shadows that have been cast over it. I have mentioned lobbying on a number of occasions, and a number of members have quoted a letter which we received today from the Independent Gaming Corporation Ltd. The last paragraph states:

The hotel, hospitality and club industry watches with great interest the behaviour and conduct of members of Parliament in relation to this Bill.

I have to say that I am actually watching with great interest the behaviour and conduct of the hotel, hospitality and club industry members in relation to the supposed or alleged improprieties of the Minister that have been admitted by the Premier. In particular, I am looking to see how rapidly and with what vigour they lobby the Premier to clear up this mess because, as soon as the mess is cleared up, I, and many others, I am certain, will be happy to vote for this legislation. In many instances in this debate, members opposite have made a number of incorrect assumptions about the Liberal Party and its decision-making process.

Members interjecting:

Dr ARMITAGE: I note laughter opposite from the members for Henley Beach and Mitchell. I will be very interested to see how they react to the Deputy Premier when he votes against this Bill, because we have been told already that he will vote against it. Presumably the arguments that apply to us or those members who choose to vote against it will apply equally to the Deputy Premier. I wait to see whether they laugh at the Deputy Premier.

I will also be very interested to see the way the member for Ramsay votes on this issue. I remember only too well that I was one of the people who supported the introduction of the gaming machines into the Casino, for all the reasons I mentioned before. I am supportive of the concept of them, but I will not support it when there are suggestions that there have been some unusual activities that have brought this Bill to the House. I will be interested also to see if the member for Ramsay is consistent in his objection to poker machines and whether the same arguments that have been used against members of the Liberal Party will apply to the member for Ramsay. I doubt it.

As I mentioned previously, I have a liberal view as to our responsibilities as members of Parliament, and I am distressed to say that, despite wanting to support this Bill because I am in favour of the actual machines, I will not do so when there is any potential suggestion of corruption. So, I am distressed to say that I will vote against the Bill, but I look forward to vigorous lobbying by the Premier's people hopefully to clear up the mess.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): It is fair to say that it is always difficult for members of Parliament to make a decision on issues of this nature. That will never change, but each member in turn must decide the benefits and disadvantages, taking into account their own particular circumstances or the circumstances of their electorate. It is fair to say that the Riverland as such, which is in fact the electorate of Chaffey, is somewhat different to many other parts of South Australia.

We have a different hotel system up there. They are all community hotels. There are no privately-owned hotels; they all belong to the people and to the towns within the Riverland. Of course, the indication to me from the community hotels in the Riverland is that they favour the introduction of poker machines.

Once again, we have a unique situation in the Riverland in that we have gaming machines or poker machines to the west of us in the Casino and to the east of us at Wentworth across the border. In many respects, one might say that the people in the Riverland are virtually surrounded by the darn things. Of course, like all other members of the House, I have had endless correspondence from different organisations—churches and many other community groups—opposing the introduction of poker machines, and I have had some representations from clubs and hotels in the district supporting it. So, there is certainly a dilemma.

However, as I said, the people in the Riverland are virtually surrounded by these machines. It is also common knowledge that many busloads of people from the Riverland travel to Wentworth and other clubs in New South Wales. It is a comparatively short journey. Many of the people who go on these trips are elderly or retired. They seem to gain substantial enjoyment out of their day's trip. Just what it costs them, I do not know, because, unlike the member for Adelaide, I have not the slightest interest in gambling, whether it is poker machines, racehorses or anything else. However, by the same token, I do not deny anyone the right to enjoyment or satisfaction from being involved in racing, casinos or anything else. If that is how they get their enjoyment and they are able to manage their financial affairs effectively, that is fine. If I have a spare \$50 I would rather spend it on something for my sailboat than put it on a gambling table at the Casino or feed into a poker machine.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: More expensive than gambling.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: It is more expensive, but at the end of the day I still have it.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Yes, the asset is there, and a wet tail as well in many instances, and freezing cold, and in the middle of the night when one is in the middle of Investigator Strait one wonders why in hell one is out there. But I suppose there are reasons for being out there although at times it is not that enjoyable. I suppose it is the same when one is not winning on the poker machines or in the Casino or elsewhere.

It is certainly my intention at this stage to support the second reading of the Bill. Hopefully, the amendments that the Opposition is proposing will be successful. That will determine my position at the third reading. I hope that commonsense will prevail and that we will be able to reach a situation that will be acceptable from my point of view and that of some other colleagues on this side of the House. As I said, while I have absolutely no personal interest whatsoever in gaming machines, I do not believe it is necessarily my role to deny other people in my electorate who derive some enjoyment from them the right to that enjoyment.

If it were not for the fact that there were already poker machines in the Casino or in New South Wales adjoining the district, then I might have a different attitude but, as I say, we in the Riverland are virtually surrounded by them. It is a major tourist area of South Australia and I think it is fair to say that, from that point of view, the introduction of this measure will be of benefit to the Riverland area. Undoubtedly, some people in the community will suffer as a result of the introduction if it goes ahead but I suppose in this job it is a matter of how far each and every one of us should go in endeavouring to protect people from themselves. That is a decision that each and every one of us has to make and that is the dilemma we all face from time to time when it comes to issues such as this. So, I will support the second reading of this Bill.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Finance): I move:

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

Motion carried.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology): I just want to indicate that I will be voting against the legislation that is before the Chamber, and I want to make a few comments about that. I do not intend to take a lengthy time on this matter, because I have canvassed my views on a number of earlier occasions. I do want to say that, amongst the reasons that I am not putting forward for voting against the poker machines is that poker machines are boring, because I think it is everyone's right to do whatever they want. While I might find it a mindless activity, I have no doubt that many people find my activities incredibly mindless from their perspective—or boring, anyway. So, I am not about to cast onto others what I think they should be doing, because I would very much resent it if they should cast onto me their views as to what I should be doing. So, that is not the reason I am voting against them.

Nor am I voting against them because I have a mandate to vote against them from the people in my electorate. I have heard members say that they have received letters against the proposal but none in favour. In fact, I have had many letters against them too, and some in favour, but, with my substantial contact with my electorate over many years, not only the nearly 13 years I have had the good fortune and privilege to represent my electorate, but also in the years prior to that, when just living in the electorate, I have had contact with lots of local people.

I believe I can say with some degree of assurance that, if a poll were to be conducted in my electorate, the majority would support the introduction of poker machines and that I would have to regard myself as out of step with them on this issue. I have never hidden this from them; at all opportunities where appropriate I have indicated to them my views on this matter and other matters such as the casino and other types of legislation. Naturally, in a democracy it is my constituents' right to cast their decision at any subsequent poll and I have to stand by their decision. I am pleased to say that to this time they have been very forgiving with respect to my views on this matter.

Nor am I voting against poker machines because of any view I might have on recent events. I want to say that I am appalled at the behaviour of a number of people in this place and in the media over their treatment of a colleague of mine, the Minister of Tourism, with respect to the activities of her partner. I think it has been a disgraceful episode on the part of those who have handled these apparent

charges—apparent because they have not been substantiated by documents that anyone is prepared to show. Their failure to be prepared even to get copies of those documents discredits them automatically.

I would even want to say that I came very close to believing that so much damage had been done to the conscience vote in this Chamber or in this Parliament by the activities of members over that episode that I would really have to think clearly to myself whether, for my part, I should be expressing what is a strong conscience vote for me when it was being so debased by other members in this Parliament.

I will still exercise that right, but it is with a degree of discomfort that it might be interpreted in even the slightest way as reflecting upon my colleague. I want clearly to make the point that it is in no way at all reflecting upon her, because this vote that I cast tonight or tomorrow, whenever the vote takes place, is consistent with my previous votes on this matter.

I now want to come to the reasons why I am voting against this legislation. I do have a problem with the extension of a further gambling avenue. I have heard the point that people have made that it is naturally a person's right to be able to do what they wish with their time and, broadly speaking, that is something that everybody accepts. However, I also want to say that there are clearly limits to that right, and I do not believe that members in this place, who have put forward the argument that people should have the right to this extra form of gambling, would then go on to say that we should extend it even further still.

I know that a number of members will have visited various parts of the world to see what happens with poker machines and that a number will have visited the State of Nevada in the USA. As those who will have been there would know, in Nevada you can call into the local shop, the local gas station or any one of a number of outlets, including the foyers of motels, and see one-armed bandits or poker machines in those locations. One can naturally argue that it is their right to do that and, therefore, why does this legislation not seek that the local delicatessen, the local supermarket or the local petrol station have the right to install poker machines? Clearly, it does not, because I think that the feeling of the legislators of this State would be that that action would be excessive.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: It is before the House by way of amendment from Terry Groom.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Apparently, there is an amendment on this matter that may entertain the possibility of such things in gas stations, delicatessens, and so forth. I must say that that causes me concern, and I hope that members do not support that amendment. It will be interesting to observe what the members who have said that that right should be available do with that amendment.

If they were logical, they would want to support that amendment, because they would ask, 'Why should we support the fettering of people's right to gamble?' The very point I make is that we do make decisions that constrain various things we do. In this State, for better or for worse (and I have cast my own votes on this matter), we have made decisions about the times that people can drink in public drinking places. We have even made decisions about the places in which they can drink outside licensed premises in terms of having alcohol-free areas. All these measures fetter the rights of people, but it is regarded as part of the responsibility that Parliament may from time to time choose to act and, therefore, we have to decide where it is that we draw the line. I am indicating where I am drawing that line at this stage, and that is that I am not prepared to see the

introduction of poker machines extended to clubs and hotels. I am not being inconsistent by virtue of the fact that similar types of machines are already in the Casino, because I expressed my vote on that very matter also.

Why should I be concerned about the opening up of another type of gambling activity? One of the reasons is that I am concerned about the provision of an opportunity to gamble that may put a number of people in our community at unreasonable risk, that they could well find themselves becoming addicted to that form of gambling and that I do actually see some degree of difference (and I hope that I am not being simply specious in this matter, because it is a point about which I feel personally) between types of gambling where there is a distance between the time of investment and the time of result. We have heard a lot about horse racing and other forms of gambling, but inevitably what happens is that somebody makes an investment, then something happens (a horse race is won or lost, a lottery ticket is drawn, or some other activity takes place) and one knows whether one has lost the money invested or whether they have won it.

Inevitably, as is the way of these things, if the Government and promoters are to get their money and if wages are to be paid, the reality is that the money put into investments from gambling does not match the money paid out in winnings. That is just the way of the world. But there is a time gap, and at that point the person must decide whether to reinvest to seek to make good the money they have lost. But if the time gap is long enough, there is not a great impulse to keep that investment going to make good the losses. However, with poker machines—and I would say that the same applies to a number of other forms of gambling such as instant money tickets—the decision to reinvest to make good the losses can be immediate, and the temptation to make it is immediately there.

In speaking to this matter. I do not want to indicate that I have never played a poker machine, because I have. Many years ago, while on our honeymoon, my wife and I spent one night in Las Vegas and went around the casinos. In the big spending habits that I have we decided to put \$5 in dimes into the poker machines. As we started to put the money into the poker machines it reaffirmed how mindless an activity it was—that is my personal perspective, and I am not casting that on others. As always happens, we won some money, so we put our initial \$5 investment back into our pockets and said, 'We will play with our winnings' and, as always happens, we lost it. As the last dime goes in, the handle is pulled and nothing happens, there is the temptation to just go back into your pocket to take out another 10 cent piece to get on to the winning streak you were on before. I actually must say that I found it a very great temptation, and my wife would confirm the same.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Did you resist?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I resisted, yes.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: And you felt better?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Well, whether I felt better is, I suppose, a subjective thing but, certainly, I was suddenly quite acutely aware of how great a temptation there can be to go for that extra win. For me in that circumstance at that time it really was not a kind of great economic pressure, but I accept that there are people for whom that may be a very great economic pressure indeed, and it may be linked in with other economic hardships which they may be suffering which suddenly become intertwined with a desperation to make good and to seek to have the one-off win that can get them out of financial troubles which they may be facing. I do not want to be a party to the creation of an avenue such as that, given the speed of passage

between the time of investment, the knowledge as to whether that investment has succeeded and therefore the increased temptation to try again.

Another point that concerns me is that only so much money can be spent on gambling, and there is only so much money that people earn. You can seek to extend the amount that people gamble out of their available resources, which will therefore not affect the other gambling outlets that are presently illegal within this State. But if that is the case, you are taking away from a lot of other wage earners money which they would otherwise spend on other things such as food, clothing and other basic essentials. Alternatively, if that does not happen, it will come out of other gambling revenue anyway, and I cannot really see why the promoters of the activity then seek to obtain great financial benefits to themselves out of it.

I also do not see any great benefit to be gained by clubs and hotels from poker machines. My limited experience of the area—and I acknowledge that it is limited—reveals to me that in New South Wales a lot of ordinary, smaller sized clubs and hotels have not been the major beneficiaries of this type of gambling, in any event, for their own purposes. Again, only so much money can be spent and, if it is a case of money that can be spent over the bar or on other activities put on by that venue as opposed to a poker machine, I do not think that the net rate of return from poker machines would really be there.

I am conscious of the fact that a Government revenue issue is involved in this. All gambling has been used to generate Government taxes, and I do not want to be blind to that issue, but I think there are other ways of doing this. I accept the fact that there are discretionary revenue-raising methods, and taxation on gambling is, in that sense, a discretionary one. One does not have to gamble, and therefore, Governments feel more free about putting tax impositions on gambling, because it is something that people can choose not to do. Many years ago when I had not long been in this place I actually raised the proposition that we should consider having some form of accessing the international gambling market by having a X-lotto system that operated on the international market.

That certainly happens with the north-western States of Germany, the Austrian State lottery and the Canadian State lottery, and I suggested that something similar could happen with the X-lotto system in Australia. It was one of those ideas that one throws up in the air and occasionally they disappear and never get heard of again. I raised it and it was met with stunning silence. I raised it with Treasury officials after becoming a Minister but it still disappeared into the great ether.

I think that was a pity, because it offered an opportunity to access a high-spending international gambling market. People are prepared to pay very large sums of money for example, in the case of the German lottery: I see that for an 18 week ticket people are paying \$US115, yet we lost that opportunity. We have lost it because some other private operator is now advertising internationally based upon the Australian X-lotto system, selling tickets in that X-lotto system for precisely those same high prices, using the numbers drawn in Australia, anyway. Therefore, it would not be possible for a State Government to get into that international market.

That is a pity, but it might have been an option if it had been pursued when I first raised the matter. I do not want to go on at great length, as I have even gone on longer than I had intended. I repeat the point: I will not vote for the legislation. My principal concern is that the extension of gambling will not be a social good in this State. I am worried

about those who, because of the small investments required, will be put under greater economic risk by this activity, especially the temptation for this to be a more addictive form of gambling than other forms of gambling. I hope that members will not support this legislation.

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): First, I would like to say that 20 minutes is insufficient time to cover the broad spectrum of issues that justifiably need to be covered in this debate, so I will not spend time on many of the issues that may have been addressed by other members in this Parliament. Rather, I will try to address different issues in order to add a different dimension to the debate. Numerous statements have already been made in this Parliament by the Opposition about the involvement of Minister Wiese in the drafting of this Bill and, therefore, it is not my intention to restate those facts tonight.

Instead, I intend to address a number of issues, including a brief recount of the history of the Bill and an examination of new technology, consultation with the Police Commissioner and the lobbying process that has been employed by people desiring to see the implementation of this legislation or a variation of it. The history of poker machines in South Australia cannot be looked at without mentioning the Casino Bill 1983 and the select committee that preceded that Bill, namely, the Select Committee into the Casino Bill 1982 and the report tabled in this Parliament on 12 August 1982.

I wish to turn briefly to some of the statements that were recorded in the report tabled in Parliament. First, I turn to a statement on page 95 of the report which says, in part:

... the clubs are a lucrative skimming target, particularly the poker machines, where the total annual turnover and profits in this State run into many millions of dollars.

Further, on the same page under the heading 'Poker machines' the report continues:

The NSW Police Force formed a special task force in September 1981 to deal specifically with and detect crimes in relation to clubs and poker machines in NSW. However, according to Detective Sergeant L. Hanrahan of that squad, although the manipulation or rigging of poker machines is extensive and is costing the club industry between \$18 million to \$20 million per year, there is no enabling legislation to provide the police with powers of enforcement.

Another statement made in that report, on page 96, regarding evidence given by well-known journalist Mr Bob Bottom in relation to the poker machine lobby, reads:

It is a serious situation. The poker machine lobby set out with the financial backing of Ainsworth Consolidated Industries, the major suppliers of poker machines in this State, and the Bally Corporation of the United States, which has not been previously disclosed, to finance an operation to lobby Governments to legalise poker machines in Victoria and Queensland. I do not know about South Australia, but that State was not necessarily excluded. It is that type of conduct that I object to. There are grounds for grave concern about that particular operation.

So, already we saw a situation where the select committee established by this Parliament in 1982 had witnesses expressing concern over some of the lobbying processes that were employed to obtain poker machines throughout Australia. The Licensed Clubs Association made the only submission seeking the introduction of poker machines on that occasion, and the chief witness for that association was a Mr E Vibert, a poker machine consultant. Evidence presented to Parliament by the select committee reads in part:

The committee notes Mr Vibert's belligerent frankness on those matters put to him and his dedication to the cause of establishing poker machines as an alternative form of gambling.

The committee was referring to the frankness exhibited by Mr Vibert when he talked freely about moneys being paid by the industry to political candidates or to political Parties in an endeavour to procure poker machines in various States. Indeed, Mr Vibert talked at length about the backing

given to particular candidates in an attempt to remove sitting members of Parliament. Needless to say, the committee was concerned to receive such evidence. Further on page 194 of its report, it stated:

However, the committee cannot accept him as a witness of credit as there is a clear conflict of interest between the submission he presented as chief spokesman for the Licensed Clubs Association and his involvement and associations with Ainsworth Consolidated Industries, the chief poker machine company in Australia. The Licensed Clubs Association made the only submission seeking the introduction of poker machines.

The committee finds that many of the bland arguments put forward are strongly denied by Detective Sergeant L. Hanrahan of the New South Wales police task force, whom the committee accepts as a witness of truth. The committee further accepts his evidence that the rigging of poker machines in New South Wales clubs has resulted in an estimated \$20 million being skimmed from those machines.

I quote part of the committee's recommendation as follows:

... it is the committee's belief that neither the Parliament nor the people of South Australia would accept the introduction of poker machines. The committee rejects the Licensed Clubs Association submission... Therefore the committee recommends that clause 27, which prohibits the possession or control of a poker machine by a person in this State, should be retained.

Clause 27, to which the committee referred, eventually became section 25 of the Casino Act 1983, and to refresh the memory of members I will read that section. It provides:

No person shall have a poker machine in his possession or control either in the premises of a licensed casino or elsewhere. Penalty: \$20 000.

That was the section inserted into that Act and passed by the Parliament on that occasion, a section that was passed after the deliberations of a bipartisan select committee. It is interesting to postulate why 10 years later that section seems to be regarded as redundant by some members of this Parliament and why the Government has attempted to bastardise the parliamentary process by changing, through regulations, the definition of what is a poker machine so that they could be installed in the Casino.

That act in itself has made a mockery of the whole debating process in analysing poker machines and whether they should be introduced into South Australia. I submit that that act of bastardry by the Government has actually made it much more difficult for the licensed clubs and hotels to sell their case, as has, of course, that evidence presented in 1982.

Extensive evidence was also given to the select committee by the then Deputy Commissioner of Police, David Hunt, now Commissioner of Police in South Australia. He established himself as a witness of credibility, who had a detailed knowledge of corruption in the poker machine industry in this country and who also had a good knowledge of the criminal element in South Australia.

Yet for some peculiar reason the Police Commissioner was not invited to pass an opinion on the legislation before it was presented to this Parliament. As I have already said in this Parliament, it would seem that many other people had an opportunity to look at the Bill but not a gentleman who 10 years ago established himself as a knowledgeable witness before a committee of this Parliament. The fact that the commissioner was not even given the courtesy of analysing the Bill, much less the commonsense approach, is an insult to the parliamentary process and the intelligence of members of this Parliament.

When looking at history, it is also important to look at letters that were sent to members of Parliament many years ago by the Australian Hotels Association and the Liquor Trades Union. On 29 July 1987 the Australian Hotels Association sent a letter to all members of Parliament which, in part, stated:

In line with countless other community organisations, welfare bodies and concerned groups, retail traders, the leisure and entertainment industry as a whole, and the majority of South Australians, the Australian Hotels Association (SA Branch) opposes the introduction of poker machines into the South Australian community. This form of impulse gambling will only result in even more competition for the already stretched leisure dollar.

That was the view of that association at that time, and we note that the hotel lobby has done an about face. Similarly, the Liquor Trades Union wrote to all members of Parliament on 20 November 1987 and in part stated:

We believe that the South Australian Lotteries Commission has an impeccable record in conducting a variety of forms of gambling and that the community should tap into their expertise. We believe a strong case can be made out for a small games division being created within the South Australian Lotteries Commission...

That organisation also has done a complete about face and is now not supporting Lotteries Commission control but, rather, an independent body, as is proposed by the licensed clubs and hotels associations and, as I have already revealed to this Parliament, it has done that about face in exchange for an orchestrated deal so that that union will be able to add to its membership additional members associated with the introduction of poker machines.

I wish to look briefly at the issue of technology. Much has been made of technology in this Parliament, and many members in this Parliament tonight and on a previous occasion last week have assured us that the introduction of technology will help eliminate—in fact, almost completely eliminate—organised corruption in this State. It is important to have a look at just what we mean by technology. In the old days, poker machine rigging was fairly commonplace. We have all heard stories about people fiddling around with poker machines with a piece of wire to jam the reels or about an organised crime group in the United States which actually drilled holes in the side of the old machines to stop the reels so that they received pay-outs from those machines.

Those are days gone by. It is quite true that the machines of today are quite different; they have integrated circuitry, and use silicone chip operation. It is important that the Parliament is reminded that the Subordinate Legislation Committee looked at evidence that was presented by the Liquor Licensing Commissioner, Mr Pryor, who assured the members of that committee that today's poker machines are almost infallible because they have an EPROM chip—a little memory chip that records every piece of information concerning the operation of that machine. It has on it, effectively, a computerised map of exactly what that game program involves and is capable of recording all money activities which occur in that machine.

I would like to turn very briefly to some recent evidence which was presented in Queensland through a progress report of the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee and which was tabled in the Queensland Parliament on 21 August 1990. I turn first to a statement that was made by Mr Noel Hall of the Casino Control Division of that State. In part he said about the EPROM chip:

The point is you can replace it. You can just take one off and put another one on.

In other words, he is saying that, if you can get into the machine, you can rip one chip out and put another one in.

What does that mean, and how easy are these chips to obtain? Let us have a look at that issue, too. Evidence presented to the committee by Professor Caelli, who is the professor in computing science at the Queensland University of Technology, was as follows:

We are talking about the ordinary EPROM chip today which will guard one million bits of information and we are looking around the \$20 mark for that.

In other words, these chips can be purchased for \$20. They can be easily obtained, easily promulgated through the community and, for someone who knows what they are doing, easily exchanged in a machine. That is point number one. I think we also need to look at the vulnerability of the EPROM, this magic little chip that will solve crime and corruption. In relation to the type of chip that we will have in our Casino, Professor Caelli says, in part:

The cheapest is the EPROM, which is erasable under an ultraviolet light, by the way. So that is all you need to erase them. They have been erased just by holding them up against a fluorescent tube. They are absolutely unsafe; completely useless, that is the EPROM.

In other words, if someone could get to the little EPROM chip with a hand-held fluorescent tube, it is goodbye information on that chip. That is the evidence which was presented by the professor in computing to the Queensland Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee and something about which all members need to be concerned.

An honourable member: So what?

Mr MATTHEW: The honourable member opposite asks, 'So what?' It simply demonstrates that this type of technology is just as fallible as is manipulating the machine with a piece of wire or blocking up the reels by drilling into the side of the machine. Everything can be tampered with, and to simply say, 'We don't have to worry about those matters any more', is a statement of gross ignorance and one that I suggest members who are talking about this fact and that matter have a close look at.

In the time that remains, I would like to refer to what this all means in relation to the Police Commissioner's reports, Casino operations and licensed clubs. Members would be aware that the Commissioner of Police presented two reports, dated 13 and 24 February 1992, to the Minister of Emergency Services. Each of those reports was made available publicly and highlighted major issues of concern within the proposed gaming machine legislation. In part, the Commissioner focused on the topic of security controls and elimination of the potential for corruption in the industry. In his letter of 13 February, he said in part:

The level of control required at the Casino is considered adequate and should be the base standard for all machines in this State.

Many members have quoted that section and said, 'The Commissioner is saying that what's happening in the Casino is okay so, if we can do the same for the clubs and the hotels, all is right.' Not so. We need to look at exactly what the security in the Casino involves, because people know that they are able to get into the machines and replace the EPROM chip, and they know that the EPROM chip is sensitive to ultraviolet light. So, there are extra security precautions, the three main ones being: first, the existence of 200 video surveillance cameras within the Adelaide Casino, 40 of which are located in the video machine area; secondly, the presence of Government inspectors on the Casino premises at all times while the Casino is open, with up to seven officers being present at any time; and, thirdly, the existence of a 100 staff member security and surveillance department, which has the responsibility for manning the entry and exit point at the Casino. That is considerably more than any club or hotel can realistically be expected to provide and is something I would urge members to think about.

I refer now to the lobbying process, because it is important that that issue have a further airing in the Parliament. I think by now all members would be aware that a number of people are involved in that process. We have seen prominent former ALP Federal member Mr Mick Young representing Aristocrat as a lobbyist for poker machines in this

State. Much has also been said about Mr Jim Stitt, who is representing the hotel industry and who is also an advocate of the Independent Gaming Authority. On the other side of the fence, another company, International Gaming Technologies (IGT) is represented by Mr Tinson, another prominent ALP figure and a former member of the AWU.

Mr Tinson is pushing the line that the Lotteries Commission should have control of the machines, as is a former Deputy Premier of this State, Mr Jack Wright. We have two groups of ALP-associated people, two of them former members of Parliament at Federal and State level and prominent ones at that, pushing in a different direction. Some members of the Government wonder why Liberal members are taking one big step backward and saying, 'Hang on. We have ALP members all over the place lobbying in all sorts of different directions and making all sorts of allegations about each other.' The left hand does not know what the right hand is doing so far as the Government is concerned.

We have the Minister of Finance presenting a Bill representing one line and behind the scenes we have a whole lot of Labor Party members of the present Parliament asking, 'How about voting for the Lotteries Commission side?' I cannot vote for either side, and that is one of the main reasons why I shall be opposing the Bill. This Government has misled the Licensed Clubs and Hotels Associations. This Government has used those groups quite unashamedly as political pawns in its desperate bid to get \$55 million a year to help pay the State Bank debt. The Government has to do that because that debt is costing \$603 000 per day. That is the only reason why it is putting together this Bill, and it has been cobbled together so hastily to try to save the Government's bacon that it forgot about doing its numbers. But, again, the Government has not been too good at doing its numbers lately, because two of its number do not have seats at present. Perhaps counting is something that this Government cannot do too well at all lately. It has misled those organisations, and the manner in which it has done so is a disgrace.

Any organisation that threatens me or other members of this Parliament will find that we stand up for our electorates. Some of the intimidatory processes that have been used to threaten me today by implying that a candidate will be run against me faze me not. I will stand up for my electorate and for what I believe is right in this Parliament. I will not stand by and listen to idle threats. Those who make such threats can continue to make them as they wish, but they will not faze me. I remain determined in my stance against this Bill, but if it looks as though it will pass I will do my utmost to make sure that it goes through properly—

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

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I have listened with a great deal of interest to the various views and opinions that have been stated in this Parliament by the majority of members. I believe that we have heard a considerable range of comments covering a fair representation of community views. At the outset, as other members have done, I declare that I am not averse to an occasional flutter. In past years, many have, I have taken a bus trip with family and friends and visited the pokies at an interstate venue and thoroughly enjoyed the experience. Over the years I have also indulged in a Melbourne Cup sweep—of course, probably more often losing than gaining by the experience.

In the past, I had the opportunity, with my family to reside in one of the northern New South Wales towns for a couple of years where licensed clubs, including RSL and sporting clubs, were the favourite social gathering venues

for a large cross-section of the majority of the community. That area of northern New South Wales, which had a smallish but large enough population to accommodate a number of clubs in the town—probably the population ranged across 10 000 people—by all accounts would appear to have been a reasonably thriving community. Those clubs drew quite a considerable number of people. Each of those clubs had all the available poker machines. I think that each of the clubs, in almost every available space, had poker machines lined up wall to wall. The overall appearance of those venues to the casual viewer or the visiting tourist was one of social harmony and of affluence in the provision of the facilities.

The underlying effects were not quite as evident. The underlying effects of the poker machines in that area were varied but, in many instances, were quite disastrous to the individuals in those communities. In this debate we have heard also of the concerns directed to every member of this Parliament from possibly every church, religious and charitable organisation in the State, and individual members of our constituencies, all recognising and stating their concerns for the welfare of the people of this State if poker machines were to be given the legitimacy of legislation and allowed to sprout up around our neighbourhoods in every licensed club and hotel.

I spoke of the underlying effects that were not immediately obvious in that area of northern New South Wales. Those effects were in fact very disastrous for many of the families who lived in that community. In fact, they destroyed families and disadvantaged individuals and children. One of the worst effects is to see an ordinary fun loving family being turned into what appear to be rather uncaring, zombie-like nonentities. In fact, that was the case in many instances.

I recognise quite readily that not everyone who plays these machines suffers that particular fate, but 12 or 14 years ago in that New South Wales town the economy was still very buoyant and jobs were reasonably available for those who sought work. However, the amount of welfare that was constantly required to support those whose last dollar was poured into the poker machine sent several of the charities in that town to the wall. In one sense, that town was extremely lucky in that the churches had a very solid following in that area, but they battled constantly in seeking more and more financial support from their own parishioners to look after the families of those who unfortunately had fallen and could not shake off the gambling addiction.

In this State today we have over 80 000 unemployed. Already there are families who do not have sufficient income to provide even the basic food intake such as breakfast provisions for their children before they leave home to attend school. Two or three years ago that would have sounded a rather far-fetched statement to make, that families in this State did not have sufficient funds to enable their children to be supplied with basic nourishment before they left for school. It is not far-fetched today—it is factual—and there are many instances of that situation occurring right across this State. I am sure there would be few members here who could not recount some instance that had been related to them in recent weeks or months.

More and more families are applying for concessions for school fees. Charitable organisations, whose fundraising activities are already pushed to extreme limits because of the greater number of needy people emerging daily, are equally concerned that the source of income which funds the charities will dry up dramatically if and when poker machines are introduced. The question is: who will provide

the funds to back the much needed support for the growing numbers of disadvantaged and unemployed? There are many more aspects to this Bill that need to be discussed, but I will not cover them at this point. I hope to raise further issues during the Committee stage. Some of the aspects that have been canvassed have referred to the criminality that appears to be attracted to this industry and the dangers that are obviously inherent in setting up security systems.

In fact, in a parliamentary briefing note to the Minister of Emergency Services from the Commissioner of Police, the Commissioner makes a distinction that there has been an historical link between crime figures and the gambling industry. In America this is particularly true of the gaming industry. However, he goes on to state that:

This is also being found to be true in Australia, with notable instances in New South Wales and Queensland, where Sir Terence Lewis was convicted of receiving a \$25 000 bribe from a poker machine principal, Mr Jack Rooklyn. This payment was to ensure that Lewis submitted a misleading report on the introduction of poker machines.

Even if I were to consider that the introduction of poker machines had some merit—any merit at all for any of the reasons that are being promoted in this debate or for any of the reasons promoted by the vested interests in this debate—in all conscience I would have to oppose this Bill at this time of recession and economic instability. In all conscience, I do oppose it.

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I rise to place on record my views on the introduction of poker machines into South Australia. This debate was supposed to be a conscience issue, although it is rather hard to believe that, given the statements of some members of the Opposition tonight. It appears that this Bill is now to be subject to political blackmail; some members of the Opposition are saying that they will support it only if there is an investigation into the actions of the Minister of Tourism.

It seems that the members opposite have very unusual consciences, which can work only if they can score political points. I think their behaviour in relation to this issue points out why they have been in Opposition for 19 of the past 22 years. If they keep on behaving like this, may they stay there for much longer. It is tragic that the Opposition's actions have made a total farce out of the conscience vote issue. I know that within my Party—and I speak here of the Party organisation, not the parliamentary Party—there is some debate as to whether or not the conscience vote should be as wide as it now is. I know that there are some people who believe that the conscience vote should not be on such a wide range of issues. That is unfortunate because I think the concept of a conscience vote is very useful, particularly when matters like this come before the Parliament.

It is a great tragedy that the Liberal Party—the Opposition—is putting that whole process in jeopardy with its behaviour in relation to this issue. It seems that members opposite must lie awake every night tossing and turning, worrying about the great responsibility of whether or not we should have poker machines in South Australia. But, somehow or other they are able to get some peace and quiet if there is an investigation into the actions of the Minister of Tourism.

We can picture the scene at the Pearly Gates when the Leader of the Opposition and members opposite go there after they have departed this life. They would say to St Peter, 'I would like to come in.' St Peter would get out his book and say, 'I am afraid it says here that you were supporting poker machines.' But then the great clincher to determine whether or not they will get in: they would reply,

'Ah, but I only supported poker machines because there was an investigation into the actions of the Minister of Tourism.' What nonsense the members of the Opposition are giving us tonight.

We need to judge this Bill on its merits. If members opposite lack faith in their own ability, if they do not want poker machines, let them vote against this legislation. If they agree with the introduction of poker machines, let them vote yes. If they want to amend or change the Bill, then let us see their amendments. What hypocrisy we have seen from members opposite, particularly the member for Adelaide, who said he supports gambling and poker machines, but somehow or other he cannot do it unless there is an investigation into the actions of the Minister of Tourism. I would like to know exactly what defects in the Bill he objects to or is worried about. He certainly did not point them out in his speech.

I would like to place on the record that I have decided to support the introduction of poker machines into South Australia, although I will support some amendments to aspects of this Bill later. I have certainly been lobbied by many people both for and against the introduction of poker machines, as have other members of this place. Many people whom I respect have sought my views on the matter and implored me to vote against poker machines. I respect the views of those people and think that they hold genuine concerns, although I must say that most of them are concerned not for themselves but for what they fear will be the impact on the behaviour of others who they believe cannot resist temptation.

I think that is really the central issue of this matter, namely, to what extent we can or should protect others from themselves. I believe that in matters such as this it is really up to the individual to choose. Where we do have a responsibility in this Bill is to protect society at large, and we certainly must examine this Bill very carefully to ensure that the security of poker machines is preserved and that any side effects from the introduction of poker machines are minimised.

I also think that there is a question of equity in this matter. The Casino is available. Many people frequent it and, with the sort of gambling that is catered for there, it is generally the more affluent people from society who use it. Many of my constituents are less well off and their social lives centre around their local clubs and hotels, and I believe that those constituents should be entitled to have the same access to gambling as the more affluent, well off people do at the Casino. I believe that poker machines will not be for every person, but I know that there are many people within my electorate who enjoy them, and I know that a number of pensioner groups in my electorate make regular trips to Wentworth or to other places on poker trips, and I believe that those people should be able to get their enjoyment from using poker machines here in Adelaide.

On balance, I believe that those who enjoy playing poker machines (and I think the vast majority of those who use them will do so responsibly) should have the right to do so. The issue is then one of security and protection of the industry, and this is the substance of the Bill. I would like to address some of the arguments that have been put before us in this debate on poker machines. First of all, I refer to the argument that poker machines are mindless. I think one could argue that any game of chance is likely to be mindless. One advantage that poker machines have is that at least the profits from those machines go back into the facilities of the local community.

If one partakes in gambling at the Casino, certainly, the Government gets its cut, but also the operators of the Casino

do fairly well out of it. At least, if the profits go back to the clubs and hotels, the local facilities that are used by people in that area will benefit from the profits of such gambling. The argument is made that there is already too much gambling. If one were to look back at when poker machines were introduced in New South Wales in 1956, one would see that certainly they had a massive impact at that time, but if one were to look today, when there are many alternative forms of gambling—through the Casino, the TAB, Club Keno, Lotto, scratch lottery tickets and so on—one would see that there is a vastly greater array now than there was then. However, if we do have so many more alternative forms of gambling, it must also mean that the impact of the introduction of poker machines will be so much less than it was when they were introduced in New South Wales in 1956.

The argument is also made that the introduction of poker machines would be bad for racing and other codes and I think there is no doubt that that is a possibility. I should make several points here. First, I would argue that it is really not the role of parliamentarians to adjudicate between various forms of gambling. Certainly, we must set the rules by which they operate but, basically, it is up to individuals to determine in which particular form of gambling they wish to participate.

I would like to insert in *Hansard* a table that appears in an issues paper published by the Institute of Criminology in July 1990 which sets out the total real Australian per capita gambling expenditure. The table breaks it down into the total real per capita racing expenditure and the total real per capita gaming expenditure on other forms of gambling. Looking at the real expenditure on racing, it has remained virtually constant from 1972, the first year of the statistics, right through to 1988-89, whereas the total real per capita expenditure on other forms of gambling has risen. It appears from those statistics that the real expenditure on racing is fairly constant and should be fairly resilient to the introduction of poker machines.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member assure the Chair that the table is purely statistical?

Mr HOLLOWAY: Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

Table 1: Total Real Australian per capita Gambling Expenditure*

Year	Total Real per capita Racing Gam- bling Expenditure \$	Total Real per capita Gaming Expenditure \$	Total Real per capita All Gambling Expenditure \$
1972-73	25.24	26.83	52.07
1973-74	25.42	28.68	54.10
1974-75	27.62	34.31	61.92
1975-76	26.57	36.49	63.06
1976-77	25.36	35.86	61.22
1977-78	25.15	35.79	60.94
1978-79	24.35	37.08	61.44
1979-80	23.87	38.61	62.48
1980-81	23.25	39.78	63.03
1981-82	22.81	39.71	62.51
1982-83	21.49	37.95	59.45
1983-84	22.51	38.29	60.81
1984-85	23.36	39.76	63.12
1985-86	23.88	40.45	64.33
1986-87	23.00	42.74	65.74
1987-88	23.59	43.14	66.73
1988-89	24.57	47.27	71.84

* Dollar value deflated to 1972-73 dollars.

Source: Tasmanian Gaming Commission in association with Peter Bennett and Associates Pty Ltd 1990, *Australian Gambling Statistics 1972-73 to 1988-89*, Hobart.

Mr HOLLOWAY: One of the other arguments that has been made in this debate is the impact of the introduction

of poker machines into other States, and I think the Victorian example is especially relevant here. There is no doubt that the introduction of poker machines into Victoria will have a great impact on hotels and clubs in those regions near the border, particularly the South-East and the Riverland. Like other members, I have received correspondence from publicans and club owners in those areas who are very concerned indeed about the impact that the introduction of poker machines in Victoria will have on their enterprises. I think that is one factor which we should take into consideration in determining our stance on the introduction of poker machines.

The other issue that has often been raised in this debate is the social effects of the introduction of poker machines. In many ways, this is really the main concern which we should have. In particular of course, our concerns will be about gambling addiction and bankruptcy which may result from it. The Bill gives some recognition to the fact that there will be problems and, of course, there are provisions in it to exclude certain people who may not be able to cope with the introduction of poker machines. I should like to quote from the article of the Institute of Criminology to which I referred earlier:

Australian Governments, unlike governments in the United States which have initiated funded treatment centres for pathological gamblers, have failed in their social responsibilities and have given limited consideration to treatment programs and counselling services for compulsive gamblers.

I believe that that indicates an area which we need to look at in more detail.

The other matter that I would like to discuss in this debate is the allegation that poker machines are an invitation to crime, and I believe that there has been a great deal of misleading comment in the press and in many of the statements that have been made about the impact of this legislation. It must be pointed out that this gaming machine legislation follows the model of the Casino legislation, and there are various tiers of Government control over the introduction of poker machines. The top tier is the Casino Supervisory Authority. Below that, there is the Liquor Licensing Commissioner and, basically, those bodies, particularly the Liquor Licensing Commissioner, will have total control over all aspects of the operation of poker machines within this State.

Mention has also been made about the views of the Police Commissioner. I would like to quote from the statement released by the Commissioner in his letter to the Minister of Emergency Services on 4 March 1992. He made some comments in February, but I believe the final comments, which comprise his considered view must be put on the record. The Police Commissioner states:

I have had discussions with the Liquor Licensing Commissioner and I am able to say that apart from two areas, our views largely coincide. These are firstly, the desirability or otherwise of direct contact between the manufacturers or their agents with the purchasing clubs, hotels, etc. Secondly, whether the Independent Gaming Corporation or the Casino Supervisory Authority should be the monitoring or regulatory body.

Further in the report the Commissioner goes on:

In so far as the section of my previous report headed 'Concerns and Solutions' is concerned, I confirm that it is advisory in nature in an all encompassing sense and does not infer defects in the Bill. The Liquor Licensing Commissioner agrees with the majority of those safeguards and together we acknowledge that most of the solutions have already been catered for in the Bill. The remainder may easily be achieved by regulations or administrative directions.

It is unfortunate that those statements have not been given more prominence than some of the earlier remarks made by the Commissioner. Turning now to the role in this debate of the various interest groups, members have had approaches

and received much material from the hotels and clubs associations which have an obvious interest in this matter. Their material has certainly been professionally handled.

We have also received information from the Lotteries Commission, and it needs to be pointed out that the commission has a strong vested interest, because it is basically in competition with poker machines. If poker machines are introduced, they will obviously have an impact upon the revenues of the commission from its traditional activities. Without any role in poker machines the commission would stand to lose a share of the gaming market. One thing I discovered during this debate was that the Lotteries Commission is not popular with hotels and clubs, and I have heard many accusations about inflexibility, autocratic behaviour and arrogance, particularly over the running of Club Keno by the commission.

Mr Ingerson: Well, well!

Mr HOLLOWAY: The member for Bragg says, 'Well, well!' I do not know whether or not he agrees with those criticisms. In hearing the criticisms I was certainly surprised because I believed the Lotteries Commission would be a fairly efficient operation, and it certainly seems to have a good record. However, having seen the lobbying of the commission, I am afraid that its behaviour simply served to show me that the views of the hotels and clubs towards the commission are soundly based.

Certainly, I believe that the use of the commission staff to lobby MPs and the general way that they went about that, as well as their attitude toward the role of Parliament, left a lot to be desired. If nothing else, the introduction of poker machines will mean that the commission will have to put its thinking cap on, put a lot more work into its public relations and improve its attitude toward its agents and clubs concerning Club Keno and its other activities. I believe that a bit of competition will do the commission no harm whatsoever.

I agree with other members who have said that the introduction of poker machines will not necessarily be the solution to all the financial problems facing hotels and clubs. I am pleased to see that that is acknowledged by the hotel industry and the Licensed Clubs Association in their submission. If poker machines are to work properly, the clubs and hotels will have to put in much thought and effort as well as properly managing their introduction in order for them to be beneficial.

In the short time remaining I would also like to comment about the Independent Gaming Corporation, because there has also been a great deal of misunderstanding about the role of that body. Controls over the Independent Gaming Corporation are set out in the second schedule of the Bill. It is important to know that their monitoring of poker machines will involve the Liquor Licensing Commissioner at all times. The Commissioner will sit in on their operations, as is the case with the Casino.

I note from the hotels and clubs industry fact sheets that they also accept that there will be scrutiny of all members of that body and everyone involved in that industry. That is quite desirable. In fact, the IGC will not be able to breathe without a Liquor Licensing Commission officer knowing it. I believe that it will be subject to total scrutiny. The main advantage of having a body such as the IGC as opposed to any alternative proposition is that, at least, the clubs and hotels themselves will make the business decisions, subject of course to the approval of the Liquor Licensing Commission. That will determine the success or otherwise of the introduction of poker machines.

It is the hotels and clubs that must determine the venue, the style, the decor, the location, the types of machines, the

denomination and so on. It is these questions that I believe must be in the hands of the clubs if the machines are to be successfully introduced. What is important is that the premises and the monitoring system should be very strictly controlled by the Government. I believe that under this Bill that will take place.

I should like to conclude by saying that I do not believe the introduction of poker machines will necessarily lead to any great social advance in our community. However, I believe that many people will enjoy the introduction of poker machines. Certainly, some will suffer, but I believe that at the end of the day we must provide the choice to the community.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Blacker): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I am pleased to rise tonight to participate in this debate, I want to put on record very early that this is a conscience vote and that it is my intention, as with others on this side, to express that conscience vote in my presentation to the House. I was fascinated tonight to hear some absolutely hypocritical comments from members opposite, particularly the member for Napier, who went to great lengths to tell us about how this evening he had come to the decision how important it was to vote for the poker machines, yet, I know from reading his previous contribution, although I was not here at the time, that the honourable member voted very strongly against the introduction of soccer pools. It is amazing what happens in this place over a period of time. It is not only members on this side of the House who seem to do 180 degree back flips on some issues: it is very obvious that Government members seem to do likewise.

I have been known to be a gambler most of my life. Probably, growing up was the most important gamble in which I was involved, but I remember my father saying that the biggest single gamble I would make in my life would be the day I decided to get married—and he was probably right. The next gamble, of course, was when I decided to go into business—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: One of the things you wouldn't know anything about is going into business, because the next time you put your foot on the line and you put the dollars on the line will be the first time.

Mrs Hutchison interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: The member for Stuart knows what business is all about. She is one of the very few people on the Government side who have ever put their dollars on the line. When you go into business you learn a bit about gambling and learn that you must take a gamble and put it in its right perspective. When I became a parliamentarian, I know that was probably the biggest single gamble I made in my life.

I have been known to have a few bets at racing, at football and even, once or twice, I went to the trotting, until I became involved in that issue, and I do not seem to go out there as often as I did before. One thing that is important in this debate is to comment on where we stand in the whole area of gambling. I as an individual am prepared to have a few gambles and make a few decisions with my money. I do not have any objection whatsoever to other people having the right to choose to gamble or not.

I think that that is a perfect individual right, but I do not believe that I have the right to stand here and prevent those who want to and who are prepared to take the risks—the majority of people who choose to gamble and who understand what gambling is all about—from having a gamble

on the poker machines and the many other sources. I recognise clearly that there are many compulsive gamblers in this society. However, there are many people who drive on our roads like lunatics, and I do not see too many people in this place saying that we should be banning cars.

We have terrible tragedies from motor vehicle accidents, but we do not have the same sort of paranoia about the driving of vehicles as we do when people talk about poker machines. I recognise that there are problems, and as a society we need to make sure that the Government of the day has the money and the people available to look after those who need looking after. If these sorts of issues of gambling opportunities are introduced, it is the responsibility of Government to recognise the problems that are caused by them.

Tonight the member for Morphett spent considerable time putting down some very important issues on social behaviour and concerns that I believe we must all recognise. However, that does not mean that the 80 per cent to 90 per cent of people who play poker machines are compulsive gamblers, that they do not know what they are doing, and that we as a Parliament should not give them the right to go ahead in that way and gamble their money.

My constituents have written to me in significant numbers. This is probably one of the very few issues on which I have received a lot of correspondence—nobody in favour but everybody against. To put those numbers into perspective, of the 19 000 people whom I represent I received some 35 letters and five petitions. Therefore, the total number of my constituents who in some way have lobbied me—and I use that word very carefully—would represent probably less than 1 per cent. Again, in my view the silent majority have not come forward to express their view.

The churches have rightly put their point of view to me and have argued vehemently, as have others who are opposed to this form of gambling. However, when we look at ownership in the Casino, we see that one particular religious group has a significant interest in gambling in the community, and I think members opposite know whom I am talking about. The clubs and hotels in my electorate obviously have lobbied me, and that lobby has pointed out the benefits to clubs and hotels and has not pointed to all the problems which have been thrown up, as is so easy for us in this place and for anybody to do if they want merely to knock something down. The involvement and role of the Independent Gaming Corporation is a major area of concern and interest by the hotels and clubs in my electorate.

It is surprising to me that not very many members in this place have talked about the job opportunities that result from the gambling industry. When one tours western New South Wales one sees the very significant developments that have occurred in country towns because of the clubs and poker machines. Whilst I recognise that there are problems in those communities, the most important benefits to those communities are better sporting facilities, better bowling clubs and football clubs. All the facilities that we do not see in our own country towns and suburban areas are obvious to any person who travels through the country areas of New South Wales.

We ought to be looking at the positives as well as the negatives. Some 35 per cent of our young kids do not have jobs. Here is an opportunity through the hospitality industry for them to be properly trained, learn some skills and end up with long-term jobs, and perhaps in the future they may decide to put some of their dollars on the line and invest in the hotel industry in our State. It is important that, when we look at this debate, we also look at the positive side and

the opportunities that can be gained from introducing poker machines into clubs and licensed clubs.

I will talk about some of those negatives, because some things have really got up my nose in the past few weeks, in particular, the lobbying that has been going on. I will name a few of the people involved, because it is important that the public of this State know what is going, who is involved and the sorts of things that have been said behind what I would call a facade and a screen. Let us start with Jim Stitt, who is the official lobbyist in this instance for the hotel and hospitality industry in South Australia. Then there is Mr Kevin Tinson, who is a long-time member of the AWU.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr **INGERSON**: Yes, I know—a very good lobbyist and member of the AWU, and he is also a lobbyist on behalf of the Lotteries Commission. Mr Mick Young, who is a former Federal member of Parliament, is a lobbyist on behalf of Aristocrat. Mr Jack Wright, a former Deputy Premier, is now the Chairman of the Lotteries Commission and also a member of the AWU. A few of these connections are starting to work their way through. I do not know where Mr Laurie Fiorvanti fits in this whole exercise, but he has obviously done some work on behalf of the Lotteries Commission. It is fascinating that not one single Liberal member is involved in that lobbying group: every single person in that has a strong connection with the ALP. I will have to leave Mr Fiorvanti out of that, as I do not know his allegiance.

I will develop this argument. Today we heard the Premier say in this place that there really was not a conflict of interest in relation to the role of Minister Wiese in this matter. He stated:

With hindsight, a declaration should have been made.

That is an important comment when one takes note of a comment that the Premier made in 1980. He also said today:

Cabinet did not have a clear statement of interest before it and, therefore, could not take it into consideration in making any decision in relation to this conflict of interest.

What a hypocritical Premier we have in this State. Last Thursday I moved an amendment to the MFP Development Bill relating to the fact that one of the most important aspects of the legislation is the honesty of directors and the care they should take with information as board members. The Premier agreed to that amendment, which clearly provided that, if directors of the new MFP Development Corporation get any information and if they transfer it to any source for any possible gain, they will be in breach of the Bill, and that will attract a significant fine. It is amazing that, within two or three days, the Premier of this State does not see that honesty, integrity and telling it as it is are important issues when related to a Minister and her role in Cabinet but, when related to a director of the MFP Development Corporation, he agrees with my amendment regarding truth and honesty, and then those aspects are important.

In this debate, we need a bit of truth and public interest. I believe that the Minister should be sacked. There should be no question about it, and that should be based on a conflict of interest, nothing to do with any involvement with Mr Stitt or anyone else. This matter relates to a ministerial responsibility exercise, not to with whom she is involved or anything else she might be doing.

In June 1980 the then member for Price, Mr Whitten, asked the then Premier, David Tonkin, whether there was a conflict of interest in relation to a loan to the Shearer Corporation. The Premier answered:

Well, I think that the honourable member well knew before he asked this snide question that the Hon. Mr Laidlaw declared his interest and, in fact, dissociated himself from the decision made.

It is fascinating that, back in 1980, the Party which today says that conflict of interest does not matter then believed it was very important.

The next question on that day was asked by the then member for Stuart (Mr Keneally), and I know that he would only ask questions to which he knew the answer. He asked a similar question of the then Minister of Water Resources, the member for Chaffey. In reply, the member for Chaffey said:

I made a full statement to the Premier which is in writing and which is available for the Cabinet and everyone in South Australia to see.

In 1980 under a Liberal Government there was a principle in Cabinet that any declaration of interest had to be put in writing and the Premier had a copy of it. On the same day, Mr Bannon, then Leader of the Opposition, asked of the Premier whether there was any conflict of interest on the part of Mr Laidlaw and Mr Arnold, who were then Ministers. The Premier's answer was:

The Leader seems to be extraordinarily sensitive about this . . . I am able to assure the House that the interests of the Minister of Water Resources in this matter are well known and recorded in the register which I have in my office of members' financial interests.

It is fascinating that the then Leader of the Opposition (Hon. J.C. Bannon) said that the issue of conflict of interest was very important in 1980 but today, as Premier, he considers it of no concern whatsoever with respect to his own Ministers. It is about time we got a little bit of truth and integrity in this place. If as Leader of the Opposition in 1980 Mr Bannon believed that conflicts of interest should be placed before the Premier of the day, why does not the same thing happen today and why did he not sack the Minister of Tourism? The Government should not tie up the hotel industry in this facade. Let us get down to the real issue, that there was a conflict of interest between the Minister and the Premier—

The Hon. J.P. Trainer: Have you marked that bound Assembly *Hansard* with a fluorescent pen?

Mr **INGERSON**: It is my copy, I might add.

Mr **Ferguson**: It's still the Parliament's property.

Mr **INGERSON**: It belongs to me. Only a hypocrite like the member for Napier would come forward, and I mentioned him earlier. The roles of the Chairman and that of Kevin Tinson need to be put on the record. I am concerned that it is known in the public arena that Mr Jack Wright, the Chairman of the Lotteries Commission and a former Deputy Premier, has the ear of the Premier. I wonder whether that is true. I do not know whether it is true but I hear it said outside that it is. I wonder what is going on in relation to the Lotteries Commission and its lobbying. It is very important that issue be known.

A little story is running around that the Chairman of the Independent Gaming Corporation, Mr Basheer, might be getting \$100 000 for his position with the corporation. However, I know that this is incorrect. Who is running that story around? Where did that little rumour start? No-one seems to be able to trace it yet, but it is coming back in a funny little way to the Lotteries Commission. I do not know whether it is true, but rumour says it is coming back along that line.

What about the nonsense story that, if the work is done by the Lotteries Commission, it will be honest and non-corruptible, but, if the work is done by the Independent Gaming Corporation, everyone will be corruptible and everything will go wrong? That is the most disgraceful statement that I have heard in my parliamentary career. All that the people in clubs and hotels I have mentioned are concerned about is to get a better deal for themselves in the long term.

No-one in this place can prove to me that anyone in the private sector who puts his name on the line, who is prepared to stand up and be involved in the Independent Gaming Corporation, has fewer credentials than a person who is appointed Chairman of the Lotteries Commission. Anyone who believes that ought to stand outside and say it in the public arena, instead of running around all this innuendo of how the Independent Gaming Corporation will be run by the private sector and, consequently, will be open to corruption. As I said, that implication is the most disgraceful thing that I have ever heard.

It reminds me that in May 1982 a previous Deputy Premier, Mr Jack Wright, accused the Liberals of receiving \$100 000 over the introduction of the Casino Bill. It seems to me that some of these little stories are starting to be recirculated, only now using different people. I think that we need to put this sideshow off where it belongs get on with the introduction of poker machines into this State and have a decent system, very similar to what has been done by the Casino, properly managed and run with the involvement of both Government and the private sector, so that we can get a good relationship and get on with the job.

A few of these people who want to play games in this place, and in particular in South Australia, should be sat on by all of us. The whole lot of us should be sitting on top of these people. I have had a bit to do in my life with standover tactics, but a few of these people should learn that the majority of people in this State are good and honest. They do not believe in corruption, but they do believe that if, under Government control and guidelines, we provide a properly run system involving the private sector, and it can be successful. It is my intention to ask numerous questions in Committee about the control of this system, but I wanted to put on the public record that I am sick and tired of knockers and those who spread innuendo for gain instead of looking at an industry which has potential opportunities for youth in this State.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Blacker): Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Hanson.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): The licensed clubs in South Australia must think that this House of Parliament contains some of the greatest dills this Legislature has ever had elected to it. I am absolutely amazed and disgusted at the way that this debate has continued. I am disgusted with the tenor of the debate and the innuendo, as the member for Bragg has said, and the way that the whole issue has been treated.

I have forgotten how many times in the past 22 years I have raised the issue of poker machines. I first suggested that perhaps poker machines should be introduced into the Casino. The licensed clubs were critical of me at that stage, so I said, 'Well, we will bring them into the licensed clubs as well.' The Hotels Association then jumped on me saying, 'We want to be in it, too.' There has been no love lost between the Hotels Association and me over the years on certain issues. At least we now have the various organisations together looking after the interests of the people of South Australia. But what we find is that a Government authority has got into bed with all the other organisations which are opposed to any form of gambling in this State, and then we find the Government itself is strongly demanding poker machines in South Australia.

I am pleased that there are a couple of members in the House at the moment, so let us go back in history to 21 August 1986 (page 540 of *Hansard*). I moved:

That a select committee be appointed to inquire into the likely social and economic impact of electronic gaming devices (including Club Keno and poker machines) on the community.

Let us consider what the lead speaker for the Government said in reply to that motion. The member for Florey said:

I oppose the motion. I wish to refer to a couple of matters that were raised in the debate previously and to outline some of the reasons why we are opposed to this proposal. I refer to something that the member for Hanson said during the debate on 6 November.

Mr Ferguson: What year was that?

Mr BECKER: It was 1986. If I were the member for Henley Beach, I would not worry about it, because I have a couple of ripper quotes from him, too. I shall remind him of what he said. If he wants to continue, I shall remind him of what he said one day at a little tennis club at Henley Beach South. The member for Hanson was running late, as usual. The member for Henley Beach was saying a few words at the opening of the Henley South Tennis Club. He said, 'I want you to know that I am opposed to poker machines. I will not allow them.' That was the way he was going as I walked around the corner. I walked in just at the right time. I let the members of that tennis club know that there was no intention of bringing poker machines into a tennis club, but that poker machines were destined for licensed clubs.

Let us get back to the issue of whether we will have poker machines in licensed clubs, hotels and the Casino. I remind the member for Davenport of what he has been constantly saying about this matter. As I said, the public and the licensed clubs must be wondering whether we are the greatest lot of dills ever elected to any Legislature in the world. The whole debate has become a farce. Nobody is really sticking to the pros and cons of the issue. We seem to be more concerned about whether a Minister did this or that. I think it is an absolute disgrace to be attacking that Minister. I have known her for 22 years. I even asked her back in 1973 if she was interested in becoming my electorate secretary. That is how much respect I have for the woman. To accuse her of some of the things that have been done is to introduce a red herring.

In the past 22 years, I have found that people who are diametrically opposed to certain issues will drag up anything to reinforce their point because they have no argument. The whole of this issue was debated in the House of Assembly in 1986 and 1987, when statistics were brought forward and support clearly existed. The licensed clubs helped me on that occasion, through their members, to petition their members to support poker machines in South Australia, and there was clear evidence of the demand by and need of the people of South Australia. The hotels association knew it, too. It wanted to get in on the act. Well, it is in on the act now, and I hope it will be satisfied with what it gets. The point is this: if we are to be allowed to tear one another apart and rip into one another on a personal basis over a legislative issue, it is time to abolish the Parliament.

The member for Bragg has reminded the House of the same issues of which I reminded members in 1986-87. If we look at the economic impact and spreading the leisure dollars, we can create some goodwill within the community. I have a senior citizens club in my electorate at Camden. By the time the poor lady has put the four pins in the notice on the wall advertising a pokies trip to Coomealla, the notice is full. They cannot get enough bus trips to go to New South Wales on those pokies tours. The reason is that there are people who are prepared. They receive wonderful enjoyment from spending a few hours in a club atmosphere with other people.

I have had the wonderful opportunity of travelling to many countries on behalf of the Commonwealth Games bid Committee. Whenever I do, I sneak away if I can to have a look at what the licensed clubs are doing. In London recently I looked at the hotel and club situation and met a representative of the gaming board. I do not think we want what they have in England. Clubs and hotels are allowed to have two machines. There was no rush for them. The maximum that could be won on a machine at any time was £4.80 and the maximum bet was 20p. The odds were not that bad but, as I said, no-one was queuing up. One put a few pence into the machine as a bit of fun. The legislation that controls the poker machines in Great Britain is quite draconian. The manufacturers only are licensed to supply the machines. For the slightest infringement, with even the whiff of evidence of foul play, the licence is taken away and there is no appeal. I thought it was fairly tough, getting into the manufacturers of the machines. Converting it to Australian dollars, the cost of a machine was between \$1 000 and \$1 500.

In Australia, the machines cost between \$6 000 and \$10 000. So, the question we should be asking Ainsworth, or whatever his name is—Aristocrat or whoever—is why the machines cost so much here. It does not take very much technology to convert a pinball machine into a poker machine. It does not take very much technology at all, unless one wants a very fancy machine to attract people's attention. I would think that we should be looking at what the British do. After all, they are not too bad with some inventions in the manufacturing area and perhaps they have it right at last (they are not much good at cricket). But, the point is that there must be some reason for the huge mark-up in the price of the machines.

Some years ago I went to Singapore, as did the member for Davenport, to look at the licensed clubs situation, where they were paying up to \$16 000 to import second-hand machines from Australia. Perhaps that is the area of rip-off, if there is a rip-off. I am concerned when I read articles in the *News*, such as the one headed 'NCA worried on hotel control of \$1.5 billion pokie trade, stating:

The National Crime Authority has expressed concern over the possibility licensed clubs and hotels could control the proposed \$1.5 billion gaming machine industry in South Australia.

I am positive someone has the noughts wrong. The article goes on to state:

A private member's Bill to be debated this session would open the way for the introduction of gaming machines if passed by a conscience vote. NCA chief Malcolm Gray said that there were three main areas of concern. 'There's the manufacture and supply, the repair and maintenance and the dealing with the revenue,' he said. 'All these three areas offer opportunities for organised crime. The first in particular is open to corruption and the other two really relate to the process known as skimming or taking money off the top.'

If Malcolm Gray knew anything, if he had been around, if he had been to Las Vegas and had studied the industry—and we have an instant expert here who tells us that he has expertise in poker machines and computers—and if he had been to see what happens in other countries and how the manufacturers and the employees are licensed, checked and controlled, he would find it very difficult to prove that statement.

There will always be allegations that the Mafia or the criminal element is involved in gambling. However, there has been a lot of involvement in other places too. We will not look at too many police stations in this State. However, it happens. What we put in train is legislation, rules and controls to ensure that it does not happen. We do what we used to do when I was in the bank. We would sit down as a committee and look at ways of defrauding the bank. We

would then come up with the rules and regulations so that the bank could not be defrauded. What the banks have done in this country in the past few years would make one ashamed to admit to having worked in a bank.

I am concerned that the whole debate concerning poker machines in South Australia has been around a long time. Those who oppose their introduction have never changed their spots; they have never come up with any real commonsense reasons why there should not be poker machines in South Australia. I do not take lightly the scare about wanting to remove video poker machines or gaming machines from the Casino. I do not know whether or not the member for Davenport was quoted correctly, but my advice to my old friend would be that, once someone is licensed to introduce something and they have spent \$30 million, that arrangement must continue. Otherwise, the standard of the Legislature would be reduced even more. No industry or organisation could have any faith in the Parliament if it gave the authority to do something and then, 12 months later, took it away for no reason at all.

We will have poker machines in South Australia—one day. I believe that the people of South Australia are mature and sensible enough and the debate has been around long enough. The people do use them and will continue to use them. If we do not have poker machines, there will be the scratchies and all sorts of gambling. I remind the Lotteries Commission that I cannot recall it paying the 10 out of 10 jackpot on its keno since the day after it started. That is why there is a question on the Notice Paper about when the commission will pay out the next one. It must be a really good computer they have organised in there. I would not mind being an auditor there, seeing what program they have. So, let us not be cynical and pick this one or that one; for goodness sake let us get on with it. I support the second reading, and let us get on with it.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I am quite keen to talk in the debate even though I find myself locked between two principles. First of all, I want to respond to the member for Hanson because he wanted to include me and I thought that, being on the same side, I would reciprocate. He says that we cannot license something and then take it away. I know he has been away looking at Commonwealth Games matters and has had a few lucky trips lately, so perhaps he missed the debates. We had licensing of potato producers and egg producers. Egg producers paid for the licence—up to \$25 for each bird—and this Parliament just ripped it away from them just like that, so do not give me the argument that because the Casino has the machines (the only place in the State that has a monopoly over a particular form of gambling), Parliament cannot change its mind. It can; it has changed its mind within the past month without a skerrick of compensation, and there was not a word from the member for Hanson about credibility in that case. So, let nobody argue that we cannot take them away.

The Casino was established on the basis of its never having poker machines and the Casino would probably never have been established if a member of the Government had not given a guarantee on behalf of the Premier that there would never be poker machines at the Casino. Some members on this side voted for it only on that basis. That guarantee was broken. When today I and other members received a letter from the Casino which states, 'The removal of its present video machines would have a disastrous effect on the Casino's operations', it is admitting that it makes money out of it. It did not give a hang what effect it had on clubs and hotels when it got that sole right. It did not give one iota of concern. Where did the money come from?

It did not come out of the sky; it came out of the community for those people who, in the main, probably support clubs and hotels.

The Casino people wrote a letter complaining about action I intend to take under another Bill. When the reporter asked them what they thought about it, they said they would have me over for lunch—I think it was on a spit, not to dine with them! They went on to say:

Even if they were to remain, the introduction of reel machines (commonly known as 'pokies') to hotels and clubs without also allowing the casino to have them, would again have a massive effect on the Casino's operations.

I was not even suggesting that but, even if I were, they are saying that if somebody else gets a sole right of a particular form of gambling it would have a disastrous effect on them but not one ounce of concern did they express when they were given the sole rights to operate to the exclusion of others. The letter also states that they have been operating since December 1986—just over six years ago—and have not had time to settle down as have some of the others who have poker machines or video machines, as they call them, and that Burswood had them since opening and that they had a guarantee of exclusive use of them for 15 years.

Burswood knew what it was doing, and it knew that it was 15 years. The mob over the road should have known that it would never get poker or video machines if the promise had been kept. That was the deal, and they got a privilege that was never intended when Parliament passed the first legislation to create the Casino. I will say no more about that. It is in another Bill which I will attempt to amend. I hope that the Minister will give us the opportunity to move quickly with that if this other one goes to the other place, because there is an effect. I will not support the Bill which is now before the House at least until the other one has been handled the second time around, because it will go to the Upper House and come back. There is no doubt that there will be amendments there. We all know that, and we will have to think about what is added up there. If it does not come back from there, it does not matter, anyway.

I have been written to, as have other members, by some religious organisations. I was brought up in a particular church where we never had raffles, but we used to guess the length of string or the number of seeds or beans in a bottle or whatever, and it was considered to be a guessing game of estimation; it was not a gamble. I respect that. I have received some letters from people in my area who are fairly close to me and who are disappointed in the attitude which I have expressed, and I will come back to that later. I become concerned when religious organisations write to me saying that we should not be entering this field because it is a moral issue.

In the Casino Supervisory Authority Annual Report 1990-91 I find that the operator of the Adelaide Casino is AITCO Pty Ltd as trustee of AITCO Trust, and they have a small consultancy as an off-shoot. Directly below that they have listed ASER Investments Pty Ltd as trustee of the ASER Investments Unit Trust, who are the sole shareholders in AITCO. So the ASER Investments Unit Trust own AITCO. We then find that 212 units of ASER are allocated to ASER Nominees Pty Ltd as trustees of the ASER Property Trust.

Some 106 units go to Pak-Poy & Kneebone Investments Pty Ltd as trustee of the Pak-Poy & Kneebone Investment Trust. So a third of the Casino operation is tied up with Pak-Poy & Kneebone Investment Trust, and they have 100 units created within their own trust structure. One of those units goes to Summit Bend Pty Ltd as trustee of the Patrick Pak-Poy Family Trust. Ninety-nine units go to Caritas Pty Ltd on behalf of Southern Cross Homes Incorporated. I have great respect for Southern Cross Homes and the Cath-

olic Church and the work which it does for the aged and in helping disadvantaged people. I have great respect for Pak-Poy and the amount of work he put into charities and various schools in the State, but if there is something morally wrong with poker machines I find it difficult to understand why those shares have not been sold. It was left as a trust from Pak-Poy on his unfortunate death, but there is a principle involved. So, when I receive letters from religious organisations I become a little bit concerned.

My colleague the member for Morphett spoke about the social welfare problem that he must face as shadow Minister. I think he is an excellent shadow Minister, and I have great respect for the efforts he puts in and the argument that he uses, but there is another side to that argument. At the moment, Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland have poker machines in their clubs and hotels. People will go from Bordertown, Mount Gambier or the Riverland, as the member for Chaffey mentioned, to spend money and create employment there, while we in this State have a lot of unemployed who must be picked up through the social welfare system—some Federal and some State moneys. We must think about that and whether there is a benefit.

I will come back later to the two principles between which I am sandwiched. I just wanted to make that point concerning the social welfare aspects. The charities have contacted us, and I am aware of the difficulties facing charities. I did not stand in Rundle Mall last Friday evening selling badges for a charity for several hours, as I do quite often for different charities, because I believe that charities are rich.

I know charities are struggling and I know other members help charities in different ways. I am not saying that I am the only one who helps. We are conscious of the problems of charities, but I was amazed that it was mainly young people under the age of 25 who donated, because last year it was basically older people. I do not know why that is so, but that is the situation. There may be an impact on charities from poker machines, but I believe that some clubs in other places give large sums to local charities. Perhaps it is a way of putting funds back into the local area.

Many of my country colleagues—and I have great respect for the difficulties that people in country areas suffer—in the main are going to oppose the Bill. I respect their view, especially as it is a conscience issue. Generally, there is a more conservative view in the country areas than in suburban areas, and this reflects the attitudes of country electorates. However, when there is such a decline in the rural areas and regional centres, when there are so many businesses in trouble and so many unemployed and no opportunities for young people—except if they leave home and come to the city, often at great risk to themselves because they do not know the style of living in the city and can be a worry to their families—I believe the legislation would create more opportunities within hotels and clubs and could keep more of the money in those communities to be spent to create jobs outside those operations.

We should be thinking about that aspect as well. Also, the racing industry has expressed its view that it is worried about the Bill. Morphettville racecourse has Sky channel and other forms of entertainment encouraging people to gamble. If it also had poker machines, it would be better off than it is now, especially with the Casino having sole operation in respect of gambling, as at present. We have the organisations involved with Keno, the TAB and the Lotteries Commission all saying that they do not want any more gambling because they have a vested interest in the market.

That is the truth. They are not talking about any principle, whether poker machines are right or wrong: their attitude is, 'We have something and we want to keep it and no-one else will get a share of it.' When the union—and I forget the name of the group—wrote to us from the Lotteries Commission and said that we should be helping it to have control of the poker machines if they were introduced, the second last paragraph said that it hoped I would make a responsible decision. Of course, it wrote to every other member as well saying that, if we did not vote the way it thought we should vote, it would be irresponsible.

Who are they to judge what is responsible and irresponsible? That is a typical example of public servants saying, 'We know what is best for everyone and we will tell the politicians.' It is time politicians jacked up on that and we made our own decisions based on what is right. I wrote back and told that organisation accordingly. I now turn to the other issues concerning me while time permits. I am the only member in this Parliament who dedicated himself to travel over a long period to look at poker machines.

If anyone thinks it was a holiday I would ask him to ask my wife, who did most of the bookwork, because I hate writing. In 1976 we were away for 96 days in 22 countries, and you are moving to do that, if you think about how long you are in one spot. I think that I know as much about the industry as any lay person could, other than those who work in and operate in the industry. I came back convinced that poker machines are not something I would support, and I still do not support them.

I agree with the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology's comment that it is action impulse gambling and that it is the most addictive form of gambling. That is a fact. I said in 1983, although the member for Hanson is suggesting that my attitude might have changed along the way, which it has not, that if the Casino ever got poker machines I would ask for them in clubs. When the Government moved to get round the Act by calling the machines now in the Casino video machines, I moved a resolution in this House to disallow them (and a regulation, as members know, can be disallowed in either House). This and the other House, where another member moved the motion, approved of the video machines—or poker machines, as I call them—in the Casino. I said at the time I had the motion on the Notice Paper that if this Parliament gave those machines—that is, video gaming machines as defined—to the Casino I would then move that they be allowed in clubs and hotels.

An honourable member on the other side moved an amendment to my motion changing it to coin operated gaming machines. I accepted that, and this House voted overwhelmingly in favour of that and, from that point, the Government brought in the Bill that is now before us. But

if I can beat the legislation, if I could get the machines out of the Casino, I would not allow them in clubs and hotels. My attitude still stands, and that is where the conflict of two principles arises.

I oppose poker machines but also, as members know, I have always been opposed to monopolies, and the Casino is nothing more than a monopoly. This Parliament gave the Casino the sole right to a guaranteed income, which to a degree works on the weakness of human beings, although that is the case with all advertising, when we think about it. This Parliament gave it the right to have gambling and, on top of that, another form of gambling in the form of video machines.

If it is right and justified morally, businesswise or in any other way, for the Casino to have that sort of business, why should not the clubs and hotels? That is where I find my conflict of principles. I find it difficult when there are quite a few close to me who oppose this, and I understand their concerns. But the clubs and hotels in many cases are in trouble. In case members do not know, I have been President of two licensed clubs and am still President of one. When the member for Hanson moved the motion in 1986 for a select committee, both of my clubs voted against poker machines.

Mr Becker: You told them to.

Mr S.G. EVANS: The member for Hanson would not know the people involved or he would know that I could not tell them anything; they made the decision. Just for the record, one of those clubs was developed from scrubland to an oval with a clubroom worth \$750 000, mainly by the hands of community workers and one Government grant. I know the hardship of trying to build up a club, trying to run junior sport and trying to support charities. I have probably served on more charity committees than most members of the Parliament. However, all that aside and regardless of the Barbara Wiese affair—which I believe is an allegation of a conflict of interest that is separate from the Bill (I believe that she should step aside and I have told Ministers that, but that is a different argument)—I am placed in the position, as I said, whereby I will support the Bill only if certain amendments are made to it. However, if I could win the other argument—to get video machines out of the Casino—I would not support the Bill, but that depends on how the Bill is handled through the House.

Mr ATKINSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.57 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 25 March at 2 p.m.