HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 26 August 1992

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

PRISONER ASSAULT

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Correctional Services): Yesterday during Question Time and the grievance debate the member for Goyder made serious allegations that the son of a constituent claimed that in Yatala he had been repeatedly raped by a convicted murderer with a known history of violent sexual behaviour. The member for Goyder also stated:

> . . . apparently, some of the officers of the prison get a kick out of throwing so-called 'young meat' into the cells of hardened criminals: again, thoroughly sickening and something which, if it is known by the people concerned with this case, would be known by the prison officers and by the prison administration; yet, it has happened.

The facts are as follows: on 16 July 1992 the prisoner concerned alleged to Yatala authorities that he had been forced by his cell mate against his will to engage in an act of oral intercourse. The Yatala authorities immediately called on the police to investigate the allegation. The prisoner was transferred to the Yatala infirmary where he received medical support and trauma counselling in case the alleged offence had occurred. No medical or forensic evidence of any assault was found.

Following this, the prisoner agreed to be transferred to Cadell Training Centre where he was placed in single accommodation. When the prisoner was returned to Yatala Labour Prison approximately one week ago he confirmed in writing that he did not have any problems with anyone at Cadell. The prisoner was not returned to Yatala for protection. Since returning to Yatala, the prisoner has not been placed on the same floor as the alleged offender. The alleged offender is currently accommodated in a different part of the prison. In relation to the alleged offender, he is neither a convicted murderer nor has a known history of sexual violence.

Authorities at Yatala Labour Prison take great care in the placement of prisoners. Such placement decisions are made by the Unit Supervisor and Divisional Manager, not by base grade officers, as the member for Goyder claims. Every prisoner placed in shared accommodation is asked each day by the Unit Supervisor whether they are experiencing any problems. To date, the prisoner concerned has been unwilling to cooperate with Yatala authorities and the South Australian Police Department in investigating the allegations.

The member for Goyder's statement about prison officers referring to young prisoners as 'meat' and getting kicks out of throwing them into the cells of hardened criminals is as disgraceful a statement that I have heard in many years of listening to this kind of slander against prison officers. I would appreciate the member for Goyder going to Yatala Labour Prison and confronting the prison officers with his statement or, better still, apologising.

In summary, the prisoner concerned will not cooperate with Yatala authorities or the police in investigating his allegations. Given there is also no medical evidence to substantiate the allegations, there is little further that the police or the prison authorities can do. Finally, whilst not wishing in any way to prevent the airing of any problems in our prisons, it would have been preferable had the member for Goyder asked me for information about this alleged incident prior to his question and subsequent grievance debate yesterday. I urge all members in fairness to our prison officers to please make some rudimentary checks before slandering our prison staff in this way.

QUESTION TIME

TANDANYA PROJECT

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Premier agree that the Minister of Consumer Affairs misled Parliament quite specifically with regard to her knowledge and participation in the sale of Tandanya to System One? In reply to a question I asked in another place on 1 April 1992, she said:

> I took no part whatsoever in that process. I had no knowledge of it until after it had occurred.

Page 160 of the Worthington report states:

> The Minister played a part in facilitating the sale by Paradise Development and Geographic Holdings to System One, in that she met with representatives in September 1990, two days prior to the signing of the Heads of Agreement, to reassure them of Government support for the project.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call on the Premier, did the Leader say that he was quoting from a speech in the other House?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: No, I quoted from the Worthington report, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I quoted from the reply to a question in another place, and then I quoted from the Worthington report.

The SPEAKER: I rule that question out of order, because reference to debate in the other place is not allowed. I ask the Leader to rephrase his question without reference to debate in the other House. The question is clearly out of order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, it is not a debate in the other House: it is simply a reply to a question in another place.

The SPEAKER: All contributions in the House are considered to be debate, whether they be an answer to a question, a question or debate on a Bill. It is all considered debate.

Dr ARMITAGE: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, Standing Order 118 indicates that debates of the same session may not be referred to. It provides:

> A member may not refer to a debate on a question or Bill of the same session unless that question or Bill is presently being discussed.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the member for Adelaide's attention to the fact that that is a different principle altogether. If all members refer to Standing Order 120, they will see that it clearly provides, in reference to debate in the other House:

> A member may not refer to any debate in the other House of Parliament or to any measure impending in that House.

It is clear to the Chair that that part of the Leader's question is out of order. If the Leader wishes to rephrase the question, by all means he should do so.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The question stands. I will simply delete from my explanation that part that referred to debate in the other House.

The SPEAKER: I ask the Leader to repeat the question.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Does the Premier agree that the Minister of Consumer Affairs misled Parliament quite specifically with regard to her knowledge and participation in the sale of Tandanya to System One? By way of explanation, page 160 of the Worthington report states:

> The Minister played a part in facilitating the sale by Paradise Development and Geographic Holdings to System One, in that she met with representatives in September 1990, two days prior to the signing of the Heads of Agreement, to reassure them of Government support for the project.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair must draw the Leader's attention to the fact that, when he referred to the Minister's misleading Parliament, he referred to the debate in the other House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not this House; it is the other House. If the Leader wishes to rephrase his question, by all means, he may do so. However, all references to debate in the other House are clearly out of order.

Mr Lewis: That is outrageous drivel.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Murray-Mallee. If he has a dispute with the ruling of the Chair, he well knows the procedure. The Leader.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I seek your clarification, Sir, on this Standing Order because, under the interpretation you have placed upon it, no member in this House could refer in any way to any substance of any matter raised in the other House by another member.

The SPEAKER: That is absolutely correct. That is the correct interpretation and it is absolutely clear in my mind. If there is a dispute, it can be referred to the Standing Orders Committee. My interpretation of the Standing Order is that no reference to any debate in the other House may be allowed.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: On a point of order, Sir, if your ruling is applied in the way you have just described, it would mean that no member of this House could ever question a Minister about anything a Minister may have said to either House of Parliament and it would deny the Parliament the capacity to question whether a Minister misled Parliament. I do not believe that that is the intent of the Standing Order and, therefore, I ask whether Standing Order 120 is not equally applicable in this and other cases.

The SPEAKER: Standing Order 120 states clearly that no reference to debate is allowed.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Sir, in the debate last night, the *Hansard* will show that members opposite referred constantly to what might have happened, what had happened or what was happening in another place. I ask you to reconsider your ruling in view of the usages and customs of this House which are clearly demonstrated from the *Hansard* record.

The SPEAKER: I am not aware of those references. As the member for Hayward well knows, I cannot sit in this Chair for the total period of the session. It may have been referred to, but I am not aware of it. If I missed it, I will make sure that I do not miss it in future. My interpretation of Standing Order 120 is that no reference to debate may be allowed. It is not my Standing Order; it is the Standing Order of this Parliament, agreed to by both sides through their representatives on the Standing Orders Committee.

Dr ARMITAGE: Mr Speaker, I again seek your clarification. As you have defined Standing Order 120, does that mean that we are unable to ask questions in this House of matters mentioned by Ministers of the Crown in another place on a previous day's sitting?

The SPEAKER: There is a ministerial collective responsibility and representatives of Ministers in the other House are there for that purpose, that is, to clear up any points like that. Debate or response to debate is not allowed.

Dr ARMITAGE: Sir, you just indicated to us that, according to your interpretation of Standing Order 120, we may not refer to those matters.

The SPEAKER: If there is an allegation that the Minister misled her House—and I use that word most specifically—not this House, it is for that House to make that decision, not this House. The member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I have two points of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We will deal with them one at a time.

Mr S.J. BAKER: My first point of order is that the question relates to whether the Minister misled her own House, whether she misled the people of South Australia and whether we as a Parliament have a right to question that matter.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold that point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. If the member misled the House in which she is a member, that is a matter for that House, not this House.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The second point of order that I ask you to reflect upon is that it has been the custom of this House to allow matters and statements that have been canvassed in another House—for example, the situation facing Dr Cornwall—to be actively canvassed within these premises, and I refer you, Mr Speaker, to a number of comments that have been made in your presence since Parliament resumed on statements that have been made in another place.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr S.J. BAKER: The point of order is that a custom has developed in this Parliament that has allowed reference to material from another place, and it has not been prevented by the Chair.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. The Leader.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: In view of your ruling, Mr Speaker, and as there is obviously considerable concern about the changed nature of that in terms of what is permitted within this House on what appears to be practice—

The SPEAKER: Order! I would point out to the Leader that there is no change in the application of—

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader will resume his seat. I have spoken to the member for Murray-Mallee once today; I do not want to do it again, or I shall take some action. I have not changed the interpretation; the Standing Order is an old one. It has lain in the books for as long as I have been in this House, and that is 13 years. I do not believe that there has been a change. There may be occasions when members make references and get away with interjections, which are out of order, or make a statement that is out of order, because it is not possible to control every word in this House. If there is a dispute with the ruling, if there is a belief that I have misinterpreted a Standing Order, there are procedures to be taken, and all members have access to those procedures. If the Leader wishes to ask the question, by all means; if it is coined correctly, the Chair will allow it. The Leader.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I will take it up at another time, Mr Speaker.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Is the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs able to confirm whether Mr Ian Duncan, the head of Roxby Downs, has accepted the position of Chairman of the Business Advisory Panel of the Aboriginal Lands Trust? Mr Duncan was offered the position so that his expertise—

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair cannot hear the question. The member for Murray-Mallee is out of order. The member for Stuart.

Mrs HUTCHISON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Mr Duncan was offered the position so that his expertise could be used to give critical business advice to Aboriginal communities in South Australia.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I can confirm that Mr Ian Duncan, who is the General Manager of Olympic Dam Operations, Western Mining Corporation, has accepted the position of Chair of the Business Advisory Panel of the Aboriginal Lands Trust, and we are delighted with that appointment. Indeed, Mr Duncan has been assisting me and Aboriginal communities for the past year in the development of Aboriginal enterprises and businesses. I know that this has the support of all members of this House because it got unanimous support in terms of changes to the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act to establish this Business Advisory Panel. Mr Speaker, it is very hard to reply to this question, because there seem to be a number of people writing the Leader's question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is out of order in that he may not debate or comment in response to a question.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The members of the Business Advisory Panel, in addition to Mr Ian Duncan, General Manager of Olympic Dam Operations, include Mr Don Blesing, a farmer from Caltowie, who is Chairperson of the Grains Research and Development Corporation; Mr Peter Brokensha, Managing Director, Corporate Concern, Deputy Chairperson of Community Aid Abroad Trading; and a former Director of Operations for Caltex Oil; Michael Schulz, former Chairperson of the South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission, who is an accountant with a high level of expertise in accountancy in the South Australian Treasury; Kaye Schofield, Chief Executive Officer, Department of Employment, Technical and Further Education; and Mr Garnet Wilson, the Chairperson of the Aboriginal Lands Trust. We are very pleased that those individuals have volunteered, at no fee, to assist Aboriginal communities under the Aboriginal Lands Trust. There is strong evidence from interstate and Aboriginal enterprises in South Australia that, once businesses are established, a major factor in the success of those businesses is access to management advice at critical stages of the development. I congratulate Mr Ian Duncan on accepting that invitation.

TANDANYA PROJECT

Mr INGERSON (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Why did Cabinet find that the Minister of Consumer Affairs did not have any direct or indirect pecuniary interest in the Tandanya project? In the Worthington report tabled yesterday, it is disclosed that an agreement was reached between Geographic Holdings and Mr Stitt to pay $20 000 for assistance on the Tandanya project. The report states:

> . . . On 11 March 1991 Mr Stitt gave a cheque to the Minister and asked her to deposit it in the Nadine account of the State Bank as a contribution by him. The Minister asked Mr Stitt why he had received the money. He told her Geographic Holdings had not been in a position to pay him earlier, but the money was now available from settlement on the sale of Tandanya land to System One . . . at about that time, the Minister and Mr Stitt had decided to make some improvements to their house at Semaphore. They decided that the $20 000 would be earmarked towards paying for these improvements. On 28 April 1991, cheque no. 84923 was drawn on the Nadine account in the sum of $20 000 payable to Natwest Bank.

These quotes are all from the Worthington report.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This has really been quite an extraordinary exercise on the part of Opposition members, and the Deputy Leader's question indicates just what their attitude to this issue is, namely, to ignore the findings of the report, to ignore the statement that the Government has made, and simply to proceed with their preconceived—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —plan of hounding the Minister to the greatest extent possible, irrespective of the finding of fact. From day one—

Mr Ingerson: This is a fact.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader is out of order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —members here and in another place, and others as well, presuming guilt, have proceeded to peddle scuttlebutt and all sorts of other allegations which have been comprehensively dealt with, and the Minister has emerged with her reputation—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader is out of order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —and her integrity intact. They are simply ignoring that, brushing it aside and saying that the 230-odd pages of Mr Worthington's report matter not a wit. They are determined to continue this vendetta—this sexist vendetta—against the Minister. First, obviously we have a series of questions from the

Opposition which are plainly out of order. That extraordinary flurry and stream of—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Well, it is only because the blue pencil went through —

Mr Ingerson: No blue pencil!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Well, the Deputy Leader was lucky. He secured himself. What about all the other members who have been making tracks around there?

Mr Ingerson: Why don't you answer the question?

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader is out of order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Deputy Leader knows very well—

The SPEAKER: Order! We have a point of order. The Premier will resume his seat.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, the Premier is clearly debating the answer to the question. I ask you to rule accordingly.

Mr Ferguson: What about the question?

The SPEAKER: The member for Henley Beach is out of order. I would ask the Premier to come to the substance of the response and not to debate.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The fact is that the question has no substance at all if the honourable member had any regard whatsoever to the report and the statement made yesterday by the Government. I would draw the attention of the House to the statement that was made in which that issue was clearly and directly dealt with. Cabinet determined there was no conflict of interest in respect of the moneys paid to Mr Stitt by Geographic Holdings and Paradise Development. The reason why there was no conflict of interest was also spelt out in the statement. At the time the Minister made any decisions and took any actions in respect of that matter, she was unaware that money would be paid by those companies.

In addition, the money was not for services in connection with the sale, which is the whole basis of the allegation that the honourable member is making: it was, in fact, payment for services provided previously which terminated at the end of 1989. That is all there in the report. The finding of Cabinet, therefore, directly takes Mr Worthington's investigation and conclusions and applies them to the case. So, it was all spelt out. The Deputy Leader, in wishing to raise this question, is simply asking me to repeat what I said yesterday when I answered that question comprehensively. I suggest that he should be more honest.

In another place there is a motion of no confidence against the Minister, and the Minister will be able to reply and deal with those matters—about misleading the House and so on—that members of the Opposition want to deal with down here. That is her prerogative up there, and that is that House's prerogative to consider. But, if they want to canvass those matters, they do not have to draw on debates in another place—they can have the debate there and, instead of asking spurious questions that ignore what was said, they can call on the debates—

Mr S.J. BAKER: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Premier is referring to debate in another place.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! That is clearly out of order. The Premier will not refer to debate in another place.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I conclude by saying that the question simply asked me to repeat what had already been said clearly yesterday. The matter has been dealt with in the report and in the statement, and all the confabs in the world between members of the discomfited and disastrous Opposition over its tactics will not change that. The only one sitting member unscathed by it, apparently is the member for Kavel, his question is okay, and he is sitting back quietly watching this flurry of agitation around him. This line of questioning is absolutely bogus.

AGRICULTURE CONSULTANCIES

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Will the Minister of Agriculture say what benefits farmers will receive from the organisational development review being undertaken into the development of agriculture, a review that was announced by the Minister on 10 June 1992 when he advised that the Department of Agriculture had contracted McKinsey and Company to undertake a major organisational review of the department's activities at a cost of $865 000?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I appreciate the opportunity to canvass some of the points that have been raised in a number of quarters. I note that the member for Custance, when he heard the figure of $865 000 quoted, said, 'Wow!', and he repeats—

The SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am sorry, Mr Speaker. I have had correspondence from, among others, a sub-branch of the Liberal Party, which put to me a series of questions which it would be worth detailing here because it is within the content of the very question itself. Referring to the McKinsey study, they asked me the following questions:

1. Is this information correct, and if so:
2. For what reason does the department necessitate such an expensive review?
3. Cannot this work be done within the department by the seven senior staff?
4. Is this exorbitantly expensive report vitally necessary at this time of financial stress?
5. Will the report findings be made public, and for that matter will the calling for this report be made public before it commences?

The answer to Nos 1 and 5 of those questions was 'Yes' in each case. The answer to Nos 2, 3 and 4 is that it is very important at this time that, as agriculture changes, with the demands put upon it in the 1990s, and as we are determined to see that South Australian agriculture keeps its place in the national economy, as well as trading in the international economy, we undertake a proper review of the whole situation. It is important that a comprehensive review take place.

As to the question whether or not the department could have done it itself, given the size, the fundamental nature of the review and the complexity of the issues involved, very significant gains can be made by the use of stategic management consultants with a proven track record. While undoubtedly the department will bring its own expertise to that review process, it is important that that be done under the aegis of the terms of reference and the use of the consultants who have been appointed. As to whether or not it is exorbitantly—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Victoria challenges the ODR consultancy, too, does he?

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will certainly make available the terms of reference to members in this place, and I shall be interested to know whether or not the member for Victoria himself supports this consultancy taking place. The cost involved, $865 000, is certainly an extensive figure. I accept that, but it is a serious set of issues that have to be faced. We had to go through a number of consultancy firms to find the best possible company to be involved.

I am a little bemused by the fact that some members opposite do not seem to want a consultancy review done in this instance. They will cite back to their tirade against consultancies just a couple of weeks ago when, in fact, one of the firms that felt aggrieved that it did not get the consultancy was a firm associated with the Leader himself before he became a member of this place. It wanted to do the consultancy because it could see the importance of this work.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is now debating the response.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am sorry, Mr Speaker; I apologise. I am sorry for transgressing Standing Orders. This is an important review. I am looking forward to what McKinsey will bring up, and I certainly note the point about conflicts of interest. I will certainly make public the McKinsey report when it is finished and give the member for Victoria and any other member who wishes to have them a copy of the terms of reference.

TANDANYA PROJECT

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Has the Minister of Consumer Affairs made misleading public statements with regard to her knowledge of and participation in the sale of Tandanya to System One? On 1 April 1992, the Minister said:

> I took no part whatsoever in that process. I had no knowledge of it until after it had occurred.

On page 160 of the Worthington report, it is stated:

> The Minister played a part in facilitating the sale by Paradise Development and Geographic Holdings to System One in that she met with representatives in September 1990, two days prior to signing the heads of agreement, to reassure them of Government support for the project.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Again, this is a matter that I am sure the Minister will address comprehensively in the motion that will be moved and debated in another place.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I think the Premier is trying to refer to another place, and that is clearly out of order.

The SPEAKER: Do not be frivolous. The Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am certainly not bringing into issue, commenting or suggesting details of debate in another place. We have already had that discussion, and clearly it would be out of order. I am simply drawing the House's attention to the fact that a comprehensive motion is being debated in another place. These issues could have been explored in the way in which the Leader suggests, but this matter has been dealt with. I refer again not just to that particular extract of the Worthington report but to the statement to which I drew the attention of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There is considerable doubt as to whether those statements quoted by the Leader are inconsistent with what has been said here, because one has to know precisely what the Minister was addressing in this instance. If by the question to which she was responding it was suggested that she had somehow arranged these actions or in any way had been a principal player, quite clearly that was not the case. It seems to me considerable technicality to talk about two days prior to signing heads of agreement. Quite clearly, a basis for an agreement had been arrived at and an arrangement had been made. It is quite in order for the System One party to have an interview with the Minister and to understand the Government's position on that. That is the role of the Minister in properly discharging her duties as Minister of Tourism. There is nothing in that or in the quotation that the Leader has given me to suggest *prima facie* that there is a conflict, so I reject the Leader' question.

ENVIRONMENTAL INDUSTRIES

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Planning. Does the Arthur D. Little report suggest there are opportunities for South Australia to develop export environmental industries as the world moves towards economically sustainable development and countries meet their commitments under the agreements signed at Rio?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest in this whole concept of ecologically sustainable development. It is important to note that the Arthur D. Little report picks up and highlights the decisions from the world conference on environment and development and, I believe, translates those decisions taken into action for South Australia. The Arthur D. Little report not only suggests that we are moving in the right direction but acknowledges that some of the projects and programs announced by this Government are ones in which we should be moving in the future.

I refer members to volume 2 of the Arthur D. Little report under the heading 'New Directions—South Australian Economy': this section looks at the whole question of environmental industry. Under section 5.7, which asks the question, 'Is there a shortfall in the South Australian environmental industry for it to compete overseas?' the report notes that, as we move to implement the Commonwealth Commissioned national strategies in a whole range of environmental areas and industries, South Australia with its ESD procedures already in use will, in fact, be put at the forefront of the environmental industry and make it demonstrably ahead of others in Australia.

In its conclusions on the environmental standards which are needed to benefit and attract industries and the South Australian environmental industry, the report states:

> From the above, it is clear that environmental standards needed in South Australia should be world class and international

standard, as publicised by the South Australian Government for the MFP Australia.

It is important to note that not only are we in line with what is happening in the rest of the world but, according to the Arthur D. Little report, we are ahead.

Under the heading 'Benefits that can be gained for South Australian environmental industry from world class standards,' would be a whole range of opportunities from developing industry based and specific engineering services and technology through to the best practice in things such as cleaning up our degraded land areas, but also enabling South Australia to compete internationally in countries that have adopted the principles of sustainable development or ecologically sustainable development upon encouragement by the United Nations. That is where I would like to pick up the point of the honourable member's question. The United Nations, through its international conference, has given us clear and specific guidelines in terms of the world and in terms of our own economy.

It goes on to highlight the fact that it will now mean that South Australia can compete to provide goods and services for projects funded by the Australian International Development Assistance Bureau, which we all commonly refer to as AIDAB. Not only does the Arthur D. Little report highlight opportunities in the whole area of environmental industry for this State but also it carefully highlights that what we are proposing and doing with MFP Australia is totally in line with international standards and trends and is, indeed, something of which we can be proud. Of course, we must move forward. As the report clearly indicates, we cannot leave it at that: we must look at specific management policies for our environmental industries.

WORTHINGTON INQUIRY

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): Will the Premier now withdraw the commission of the Minister of Consumer Affairs on the grounds that the information she gave to Mr Worthington about Mr Stitt's involvement in the Glenelg ferry terminal conflicts directly with her previous public statements on this matter? On 31 March and 1 April this year, it was publicly reported that Ms Wiese claimed that Mr Stitt had no involvement whatsoever in the Glenelg ferry terminal. Pages 182 and 185 of the Worthington report state:

Mr Stitt's role was to introduce Foremost as a potential ferry operator, and his brief included developing strategies to achieve that.

Further, the document states:

IBD assisted in putting together the team that was working on the project, organised media releases and facilitates contact with the Glenelg council. The agreed retainer (for Stitt) was a lump sum of $30 000 to cover all services during the period of his involvement, but it was paid to him during the first three months.

On page 199, the report states:

Although the Minister did not know the details, she was aware in general terms of the nature of the services which Mr Stitt rendered.

Yet the Minister had previously denied Mr Stitt's involvement.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Again the honourable member is putting together a series of statements, the context of which I am not aware, and relating them to—

An honourable member: Pretty damning.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Pretty damning the honourable member interjects. As I have said, I think there is a real presumption of damnation when this whole business started on the part of the Opposition. I know it is somewhat of a setback to its plans that, in fact, the report does confirm the integrity and propriety of the Minister. As I understand it, I do not see that the question that has been posed directs itself to the integrity and propriety of the Minister in this matter. As to the nature, context and all the other elements that relate to statements—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not allowed to respond to interjections, but one must look at the circumstances in which statements are made and to what they directly refer before one draws the damning inference that the Opposition is so determined to draw. I am not prepared to approach it from that point of view. The Government looked very closely at this report, applied what it believed were the appropriate principles that would have governed the Minister's actions at the time they took place and came out with the conclusion. The conclusion was not some sort of whitewash and said that there was absolutely no problem. The conclusion recognised that there were conflicts of interest and that should be sufficient for the Opposition.

Opposition members wanted to bray about a conflict of interest and it has been recognised and acknowledged. However, they want to go further. It is consequences and punishment that they are interested in. It is trying to destable and denigrate the Minister and her role that they are interested in. That is the only conclusion one can draw from the way in which this report has been received and is being questioned. I go back to Mr Worthington and I say, 'We have examined all these matters and we have made some appropriate findings.' In terms of punishment, I would have thought the Minister had suffered comprehensively enough through this business.

STERILINE MANUFACTURING

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I direct my question to the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Corporate Affairs in another place. Will the Minister request the Australian Securities Commission to investigate whether there has been any breach of the Companies Code in regard to Steriline Manufacturing, a company that was recently put into liquidation? In the *Murray Valley Standard* of 28 April and in the *Advertiser*, articles appeared concerning the closure of the Steriline group of companies. In those articles, Mr Tony Simms, Director of Steriline, was quoted as saying that the failure to secure a key export contract to China had been a major factor in the company's closure resulting in the loss of 35 jobs.

I have been contacted by sources that claim that the contract that had been awarded to Steriline by a company named H & R Marketing was subsequently taken from Steriline shortly before the receiver was appointed. It was later given to a company at Mount Barker and Mr Tony Simms was appointed as a consultant to that company. It has also been claimed by those sources that there is a close personal relationship between the directors of the three companies involved.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question. He can supply me with that information and I will ensure that it is passed on to the Attorney in another place for reference to the Australian Securities Commission. If the facts are as the honourable member has indicated to the House, there may well be justification for a full and proper inquiry into this matter.

TANDANYA PROJECT

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Does the Premier agree that the Minister of Consumer Affairs quite specifically misled Parliament about her knowledge of payments to Mr Stitt from the sale of the Tandanya project?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Newland will resume her seat. I have to rule that question out of order because of the way it is phrased. The Minister of Tourism, to whom the honourable member referred, is a member of the other House. Therefore, all comments, statements and debate in that House are out of order. Under Standing Order 120, the honourable member may not refer to debate in the other place. Does the member want to rephrase her question?

Mrs KOTZ: I apologise, Sir. I am afraid it was a slip of the tongue in one aspect. I would like to rephrase my question to the Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs KOTZ: Does the Premier agree that the Minister of Consumer Affairs quite specifically misled the public about her knowledge of payments to Mr Stitt from the sale of the Tandanya project to System One? The Minister was publicly reported this year as denying any knowledge of financial benefit gained by Mr Stitt on behalf of any companies with which he had association or direct or indirect financial benefit to Mr Stitt from the sale of the project to System One. On page 145 of the Worthington report the following is stated:

> She was aware (on 11 March 1991) that although Mr Stitt had nothing to do with the sale to System One, the payment (of $20 000) was related to the sale in the sense that it was the means by which the money had become available. Mr Stitt told her that.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the Premier, I point out that we are getting very close to repetition in questions, and that is also out of order. I will allow the question, but I ask members to be careful about repetition in questions as well.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member talks about statements publicly reported by the Minister without quoting them or putting them in any sort of context. If, as I understand, these comments publicly reported are simply a reproduction of the material that the Leader was trying to put in, quoting from *Hansard*—

An honourable member: They aren't; they are quite different.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: They are quite different. It can be a slip of the tongue that introduces the words 'stated in Parliament ' and transposes 'publicly reported.' I find that a very large slip of the tongue.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: A public comment. No detail and no context were given. The quote from the Worthington report talked about payment related to the sale in the sense that it was a particular type of payment. Whether or not that was what the Minister was talking about and in that sense she was using it, we have absolutely no information. I suggest that the question makes no sense because it does not provide the information on which one can base any sort of answer.

AWARD RATES

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Is the Minister of Labour aware of planned changes to the Victorian system of award coverage for that State's work force, and does the Government plan to introduce similar changes in South Australia?

The SPEAKER: I will call on the Minister, but I ask him to be aware of access to ministerial statements and to keep the answer brief. The Minister of Labour.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Mr Speaker, I am aware of the announcement of the industrial relations policy of the Liberal Party in New South Wales and also that the shadow Minister in this State said that if his Party were in Government it would basically—

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the member for Victoria for his assistance in this matter. The member for Bragg has publicly indicated that the Liberal Party in this State intends to go down that route as well. If we were to abolish State Awards, as the Liberal Party in Victoria intends to do and as the member for Bragg has indicated his Party will do in this State, we will disfranchise a considerable number of people. It will be female workers principally who will be disfranchised—135 000 of them. It will also mean that the unskilled, the young and the aged will be placed at an enormous disadvantage. We will also find an absolute reduction in the proportion of the female wage compared with the male wage. This is borne out by what has happened in New South Wales in the past few quarters.

In November 1991 48.9 per cent was the average female wage in comparison with the male wage. It dropped to 43.8 per cent in the February 1992 quarter and to 43.5 per cent in May 1992. In Japan, where there is only enterprise bargaining, female wages are 44.3 per cent less than those of men. The plan by the Liberals in Victoria, to be copied by the Liberals in South Australia, is to place the employment of women in jeopardy and ensure that they are exploited. What they are really about is introducing low wages into our State without admitting it.

GAMING MACHINES

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): Does the Premier agree that the Minister of Consumer Affairs quite specifically misled the public about the role of Mr Stitt in the gaming machine legislation? The Minister has said on a number of occasions that Mr. Stitt's role in this legislation was confined to public relations work. However, the Worthington report has revealed:

1. Mr Stitt took part in discussions which led to the eventual formation of the Independent Gaming Corporation (pages 61 and 62).

2. He engaged International Casino Services to provide technical and gaming expertise (page 59). The Minister subsequently had a meeting with this company despite her denial of knowledge of the role it played in the legislation (page 80).

3. Mr Stitt had a meeting with the Premier's Executive Assistant to lobby against the involvement of the Lotteries Commission in the legislation at the time of the hotel and club industry's submission to the Premier urging the adoption of the Independent Gaming Corporation model.

4. He assisted in the preparation of material for an industry submission to a special ALP Caucus meeting on 14 August 1991.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Worthington report covers these matters fairly comprehensively and in fact draws conclusions quite the opposite of those which the honourable member has drawn. If he wants to put himself above Worthington QC in relation to these matters, well and good. If he wants to ignore—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —the findings of Mr Worthington and the evidence that was put before him—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C BANNON: I quote just one example, because it related to my Executive Assistant. He purports to quote from page 67, but it is said specifically there:

> Mr Anderson confirmed he did not get the impression he was being lobbied by Mr Stitt during their discussion at lunch. He told him there would be no point in lobbying him. Mr Stitt was not engaged in a lobbying exercise.

Dr Armitage interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: One could go through all those references. I say again, on a fair minded reading of a fairly clear report, that is not a correct conclusion to draw.

PASTORAL LEASES

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning indicate whether the pastoral lease assessment program is proceeding on schedule and whether the assessment process for all leases in South Australia will be completed by the deadline date of 1998?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: It is important to highlight the enormity of the task facing the assessment teams in the pastoral management branch. I can inform the House that they have now completed the assessments of the Kingoonya soil conservation district, and appropriate offers of tenure and land management conditions following this process have been made to lessees in that area by the Pastoral Board. The assessment teams are now working on pastoral leases within the Gawler Ranges soil conservation district and this process is on schedule. There are some 54 leases within this area, and it is anticipated that this process will be completed by March 1993.

When the Gawler Ranges assessments are completed, the program will move to the north-east soil conservation district and will also assess those leases that lie between this district and the River Murray to the south, at this stage this latter area not having been proclaimed as a soil conservation district.

I have to inform the honourable member—and I know that she is really interested in these matters—that on the basis of this progress there is no reason to believe that the March 1998 statutory deadline, which was set by this House and another place, for the assessment of all leases in South Australia will not be met.

I pay tribute to the assessment teams, because they have worked very constructively with the leaseholders in the pastoral lands. When one considers that approximately 50 per cent of the land mass of South Australia is covered by pastoral leases and the pastoral legislation, one sees that it is an enormous task by these very small teams. I also pay tribute to the lessees who have worked very positively and who believe very much in what the legislation provides for—that is, for the first time in the history of this State, we are having an objective assessment of the capability of the land, determining what the land is like at this point while it is being assessed. Never before have we seen this level of objective scientific assessment applied to any land in South Australia, and I am delighted to inform the honourable member that I believe we will meet the statutory requirement of completing these assessments by 1998.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I direct my question to the Premier. Is his refusal, even to reprimand the Minister of Consumer Affairs, due to his own failure to require the Minister to declare a conflict of interest with the gaming machines legislation when he was given quite specific evidence of this conflict in May 1991? The Worthing report reveals that in May 1991 Mr Stitt lobbied the Premier's Executive Assistant, Mr Anderson, about the problems that the hotel and club industry had with the possible involvement of the Lotteries Commission in the gaming machines legislation. Mr Anderson reported this discussion to the Premier. However, I understand that the Premier took no subsequent action to require the Minister to declare a conflict of interest because of Mr Stitt's involvement, even though the Attorney-General's report, tabled yesterday, refers to an onus imposed on the Premier in such circumstances and it was the Premier who introduced the guidelines on such matters in 1988.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: These matters were canvassed some time ago, because it is on this particular question, as I think the honourable member's explanation indicates, that discussion was addressed in March/April

when this matter first arose and at that time it was conceded that a conflict of interest should have been declared. One of the reasons why it was not specifically declared was that it was in the knowledge of certain members, and I have conceded that, by the means the honourable member has mentioned, but not in the form he has mentioned, I had become aware of it.

In fact, as is pointed out—because this is dealt with comprehensively by Mr Worthington—Mr Stitt's role was, in fact, not a lobbying role because it was rejected as such and, indeed, what he was seeking to do, apparently, was to suggest that it would be appropriate for me to see the submission of the hotels and licensed clubs.

In fact, independently, the executive of that group had written requesting a meeting, to which request I had acceded, and they came and presented their submission. There was really no point in Mr Stitt doing that or being involved. In that sense, I was aware that he had had some vague involvement, but the extent to which that was requiring a declaration by the Minister has been dealt with comprehensively. I come back to the point: he is asking why I did not reprimand the Minister. I am saying that the Minister has had punishment enough. If the honourable member wants blood, he has had a bit and that ought to satisfy him. I do not believe it is appropriate that he should continue to persist and pursue this matter in the way he is.

HINDMARSH STADIUM

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport advise the House of the progress of improvements to Hindmarsh Stadium?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Spence for his question, particularly given that the upgrading is for the purpose of hosting the 1993 World Soccer Youth Cup, which will be held at Hindmarsh Stadium between 5 March and 21 March. In order to attract such a prominent international sporting event, we had to give certain assurances about the upgrading of Hindmarsh Stadium—which is in the honourable member's electorate—and about the time frame, and we also had to prepare a running schedule for FIFA, the world body.

A full upgrade of floodlighting facilities at Hindmarsh Stadium has occurred at a cost of over $900 000. The end of November saw the completion of the upgrade of the changerooms, and rooms for players, coaches, referees, media and VIP facilities, plus the race that leads onto Hindmarsh. The Federal Government has already designated funds to assist in the replacement of the turf, and we have proceeded with the upgrading of the terraces involving the installation of about 3 000 seats for spectators. In view of the honourable member's campaign, I hope that we also see the residents of North Adelaide, via Barton Terrace, having access to and egress from Hindmarsh Stadium, because I am sure that they, as the main users of that street, would appreciate that quick access to such an international event.

I wish the member success in his endeavours in that area. It is an important global event that will focus international attention on Adelaide, and over that period we will enjoy some of the best international soccer that we have ever seen in this city. So, I encourage members and the community to support the event, because it is important to indicate to the world body and, indeed, the rest of the world that we are prepared to support these events when they are held in our city. I look forward to attending the event, and I want to thank those who have been involved, including the Soccer Federation, in assisting in the upgrading of Hindmarsh stadium.

PRISONER PROTECTION

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): What guarantees can the Minister of Correctional Services give that prisoners wishing to report an offence occurring in a prison will receive protection, and what specific protection will be provided to the young man referred to in the Minister's statement today? Prisoner representative organisations advise me that numerous crimes ranging from petty theft through to assault, drug taking and dealing, and rape occur in prison, but go unreported because prisoners fear reprisals. The Minister's statement in this House today, in response to yesterday's question from the member for Goyder, highlights the victim's reluctance to talk to police. The member for Goyder stated yesterday that the prisoner feared for his safety and that of his infant son, girlfriend and mother.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The procedures in the prison are very clear. I note in passing that the member for Goyder has the grace to look a little ashamed of himself today, and so he should. I can advise the member for Bright that the procedure is very simple. If any prisoner for any reason wishes to be put on protection, all that prisoner has to do is ask. There are no criteria: the prisoner only has to ask. To my knowledge, a prisoner on protection in this State has never suffered any consequences from that. It does not require us to observe someone who may be in danger. If that were the case, we would certainly take some action. Any prisoner, anywhere in the system, all 1 250 of them, need only approach a prison officer and say that they feel they require protection, and it is instantly given.

LITHOTRIPSY

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): My question is directed to the Minister of Health. What opportunity is there for South Australians who need a form of treatment known as lithotripsy to have the procedure in this State rather than having to travel to Melbourne?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: There is every chance, because I am delighted to be able to tell the honourable member that the service will be available from October this year. Lithotripsy is the use of shock waves to break up and dissolve kidney stones. As such, it is a far less invasive procedure than that which has previously been used for the treatment and removal of kidney stones. What is of interest and rather historic in this arrangement is that the unit will be located at the Calvary Private Hospital but nonetheless will be available for public patients. This is something to be applauded, because it would have been very easy for us to go down the route

that, unfortunately, the health system in this State has gone down for a long time. I invite members to go around and count the number of CAT scanners in this town, because everyone wants one.

It would have been very easy for the Health Commission to say, 'All right, we'll buy our unit for our patients and Calvary or someone else can buy a unit for their patients, and everyone will be happy.' It is not necessary at this stage for this town to have more than one unit, and it is perfectly appropriate that the unit should be located at Calvary Private Hospital, which is an excellent hospital with a very fine reputation. Once the equipment has been purchased—and the arrangements will be completed in about October—people who in the past have had to go to Melbourne in order to get their treatment in the public or private system will be able to get their treatment at Calvary, whether they are public or private patients.

Finally, I make the point—and I am sure that members will get the point of what I am saying—that we have done this with the full support of the AMA in this State. That is a very important aspect of the whole business, because in the past the AMA has expressed some opposition to any treatment of public patients in the private system, and that has been to our detriment.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The federal President of the AMA apparently still has some considerable concerns about what after all is a very sensible arrangement in the broad. I would certainly hope that, once this matter is drawn to his attention, we will have the support of the AMA in this State, which of course has always taken a very sensible attitude to these things, not only to the general arrangement but also to the specific aspects of this treatment. I would like to commend the AMA on its attitude here, and we look forward to similar cooperative ventures in the health field.

PRISONER ASSAULT

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr MEIER: Yesterday in this House I directed a question to the Minister of Correctional Services regarding the repeated rape of a 20-year-old first offender in Yatala Gaol, and I asked why prison administration policy allowed a young first offender to be placed in the same cell as a hardened criminal. This incident first came to my attention last week, and I made every effort to ensure that all details of the incident which I brought to the Minister's attention were true and correct.

Today, this House has heard from the Minister that the person who shared a cell with the young man was neither a convicted murderer nor a person with a known history of sexual violence. I apologise both to this House and to the person concerned for the fact that, despite my checking with various sources, this error occurred.

As for my statement that some of the prison officers get a kick out of throwing so-called 'young meat' into the cells of hardened criminals, I acknowledge that the majority—and I would hope the vast majority—of prison officers are totally divorced from such actions, and I know there are many excellent and caring officers. These officers deserve full praise and commendation. Nevertheless, the thrust of my allegations, as stated in this House yesterday, stands; and it is an indictment on the South Australian prison system that young first offenders are placed in cells with hardened criminals.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Goyder will resume his seat.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: The honourable member is now proceeding past a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order; the member was debating.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr McKEE (Gilles): I refer to an article in the *Advertiser* of Thursday 20 August last week that reports an attack by the Democrats on the Ramada Grand Hotel. In part, the article states:

> . . . the State Bank was set to appoint a receiver this week for the luxury Ramada Grand Hotel . . .

The article continues:

> Australian Democrats' State Parliamentary Leader Mr Ian Gilfillan [stated] yesterday the bank had been ready to move on Monday 'because of an estimated shortfall of $100 million'.

It has been pointed out that both the hotel management and the bank itself have issued strong denials over this article. The hotel management has pointed out that not only are the figures stated by the Democrats totally wrong and misleading but that the loans are in a performing status. Further, and equally important as a denial from the hotel, the bank has taken the unusual step of publicly discussing a client's business in emphatically denying the Democrats' claims.

This is just one more example of the Democrats and some members of the Opposition who, in trying to lay a glove on the Government, end up attacking innocent third parties, be they individuals, business houses or both. The Ramada Grand Hotel is an important tourist facility in this State and has given a much needed boost to the Glenelg area, in particular. The Ramada Grand Hotel and the Sparr group are very large employers. They employ a lot of young people and often give a start to young people seeking an entry into the hospitality industry. This is most significant when one considers the current youth unemployment level. Do the Democrats have any idea of the effect that these sort of stupid and irresponsible attacks have on the staff of the hotel, on many of the small business suppliers to the hotel and the general confidence needed to conduct that business? They obviously do not.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Sir, insofar as the remarks now being made to the House by the member for Gilles refer to statements made by the Democrats in the other place, are they in order?

The SPEAKER: I am sorry, my attention was distracted. Let me clarify the matter with the member for

Gilles. What is the source to which the honourable member is referring?

Mr McKEE: The source is an article in the *Advertiser*, of which I have a copy.

The SPEAKER: Because it is a matter of public knowledge, it is allowable. It is not a direct reference to debate in the other House. The member for Gilles.

Mr McKEE: The Democrats obviously do not understand the effect of their attacks because they have acted totally without accuracy or conscience. If the Democrats and others want to listen at keyholes and then run around attacking and undermining people without foundation, they should be exposed for what they are. It is a Party without conscience or philosophy. Because it is a Party without a philosophical base and, therefore, without policies, it seems the only way it can justify its existence is to mount scurrilous attacks on innocent individuals and business houses.

The damage that this type of wimp politics causes is not just against the people it attacks but it brings the Houses of Parliament into disrepute. The Democrats and, in particular, its Leader in this State (Hon. I. Gilfillan), are rapidly being recognised as the boys who cried wolf. These attacks show the Democrats and their leadership to be totally without credibility. The Democrats may well say that they will keep the bastards honest, but who will keep the bastards in the Democrats honest?

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): This afternoon I will refer to some specific Government charges. This Government knows no bounds in its ability to levy charges above and beyond what could be considered reasonable for its services. At the moment, business is suffering. We are in the depths of a recession, yet this Government has shown absolutely no sign of offering any support or help for small businesses and professional organisations that help to administer small business. This afternoon I will refer specifically to the charges imposed by the Lands Titles Office.

I have received representations from banks, licensed land brokers, the Land Brokers Society and the Real Estate Institute, all with a common thread running through them, that is, the difficulty being experienced with what can only be regarded as savage increases in the cost of getting searches done at the LTO. I will refer to them in detail. I have received a copy of a letter which I know has gone to the Minister of Lands and which I believe should be brought to the attention of the House. I will refer to a couple of paragraphs in it. The letter was signed by representatives of the Land Brokers Society who are four very prominent licensed land brokers in Adelaide. The letter states:

> Our problem is equating to the recent fees increase announced by the Titles Office, the 'search cost', section 90 statement cost and of course the $20 surcharge on Fridays and last day of the month. Firstly, regarding the savage increase in the cost of title searches from $7 to $12 (an increase of 71.4 per cent). As brokers using LTO lots direct from our offices we object to the increase because the service does not warrant a fee of $12. Just because other States charge higher search fees it does not mean that we have to follow them. South Australia is unique and the Titles Office here has always provided the best service, at the best cost, in Australia and we cannot see now why the public must be ripped off.
>
> Once every title is computerised we will have to pay for every search . . . and surely that in itself should bring in enough money to keep you happy.

He is there referring to the Minister. He goes on:

> We are now stuck with the $12 per search cost, so why not make some sort of Government announcement that there will only be an increase annually based on the CPI.

I remind members, to go back to the earlier paragraph, that the increase was 71 per cent—far and above what anyone could consider to be fair and reasonable in relation to the CPI. The letter continues:

> The second problem we have is the increase to $100 (17.6 per cent) for section 90 searches. The information you receive is not worth anything near $100 and, to be perfectly frank and honest, most of it is unnecessary. Yet the increase to the cost of running a business is quite significant. The third problem is in relation to the $20 surcharge.

To refresh members' memories, this relates to the surcharge on Fridays and the last day of the month because it was claimed that the brokers tended to bring all the work in to be done on those days. That has been disputed strenuously anyway. The letter goes on:

> It is universally unpopular with all people who are connected with real property settlements and regarded as the wrong way to solve the situation. It borders on restriction of trade and is discriminatory.
>
> Our job to survive is as tough as anyone's (even Governments) but the increase here to disbursements outstanding (search costs and section 90s) will be enormous and neither ourselves nor our bank managers will be pleased. Surely there should be some fairness shown by Government in relating search costs to the time and cost to provide such a search.

I think that last paragraph sums up their representations. They are the professional side of the industry which has enormous costs to absorb. It is an increase so far above the CPI as to be totally unrealistic and unacceptable. I call on the Government to review those fees, to bring them back more in line with the CPI and to make a commitment in the future that it will stick to the CPI.

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

Mr HERON (Peake): I want to talk about an issue which is of concern to me, and that is urban development. Over the past few years, especially in the inner western suburbs of Adelaide, I have seen an increasing amount of housing development coming in close to the city. I refer to homettes, units and townhouses being built on one or two blocks of land. I am not against this (in fact, I live in one in Underdale), but the trend is getting bigger and bigger. If it continues, it will mean that more people will be living in close proximity to Adelaide. I have no problem with that and I have no problem with the reasons why people want to live close to the city. However, there are other disadvantages which Governments, councils and developers should look at when the population increases close to the city.

I should like to quote a couple of sentences from the publication '2020 Vision'. Under the heading 'Housing, Land and Services' it states:

> The initiatives aim to:
>
> reduce demand for growth on the outskirts; use vacant land within the metropolitan area for housing; release of surplus and vacant public land for housing in the metropolitan area. There are about 85 vacant sites covering some 2 000 hectares; providing a wide choice of house styles and sizes in all areas to suit the needs of smaller households; encouraging medium density housing near transport routes and service centres by using land which is vacant or ready to develop.

As I said, I have no problem with that sort of idea because I think that members of the general public around Adelaide are looking for that type of housing. The older style house with maybe a large backyard and large garden is not the in thing these days. Many people are going into town houses and small units. My concern is to ensure that, when more people are put into a smaller space, more services and amenities are provided to cater for that build-up in the population.

One of the major areas of concern is the lack of green space, particularly in the inner western area. If the suburbs are to be cluttered up, people must have somewhere to go for a barbecue, to kick a football, throw a frisbee or whatever. Because more people are coming into these areas, they will have to travel a long way for those facilities. Councils enjoy this type of housing project because, if eight units are constructed on one block of land, the council can charge eight individual sets of rates.

Developers also do not want to allow much room for green space and recreation because, the more units or town houses that can be erected on one or two blocks of land, the more money they receive. My concern, especially in the inner suburbs where town houses and units are established, is that we must provide the facilities to go with them, especially open areas, otherwise the whole of the inner metropolitan area will be cluttered. I urge Governments, councils and developers to make sure that they do not go after only the dollar sign but include amenities with those building projects.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): I rise to bring forward several glaring anomalies in the Marine and Harbors Department, so outrageously administered by the Hon. Bob Gregory, known by members of his department in some quarters as 'Speedy' and by others as 'The Goose'.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: On a point of order, Sir, the honourable member knows full well that he should be referring to members by their electorate or title.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Indeed, that is correct.

Mr D.S. BAKER: The Marine and Harbors Department issued to people buying fish at the wharfside a bill—and in some cases it was up to $1 000—because they parked their vehicle for either half an hour or an hour while purchasing their fish. When the boats came in, they were able to bid for their catch and leave. In its wisdom and grasp for cash, the Department of Marine and Harbors sent licences for $1 000 to these people. This is outrageous for two reasons: first, the amount of money, and secondly, the department had no authority to do it. At least four of these requests for licence fees have been issued to people in the South-East. One was issued to Valente Seafoods, and that honourable gentleman took the case to court and it was thrown out.

Fancy the honourable Minister allowing the Department of Marine and Harbors to send out licences which are totally illegal, charging people $1 000, and then not even knowing that to send the account was not within the Act and allowing the money to be spent to go to court to defend the indefensible. Well, as I said, the magistrate threw it out. There are four or five other cases in the South-East, the outcomes of which I eagerly await, that highlight the incompetence of the honourable Minister of Marine, Bob Gregory.

The other matter represents the other side of the coin. In the Beachport boatyard people pay rent for sites and two people in the woodworking and fibreglass industries service the fishing fleet in Beachport. They put up their own sheds. They pay a rent—and they are willing to do it—of about $700 per annum. If one just parks a boat in the boatyard, it costs about the same—about $650 for a boat of a length exceeding 9.25 metres.

However, now there is someone who wants to set up a small business in the Beachport boatyard and he has been to the department and asked whether it will lease him a spot to set up a small business and employ several people in the district, offering a service to boats and fishing trawlers throughout the South-East. He has been refused. On the one hand, we have the department illegally trying to charge people $1 000 a year for parking their cars in car parks on department land—and that is rightly tossed out of court—while on the other hand, where there are already small business operators and someone requests a site, this amazing department under the honourable Minister will not allow someone to pay rent and set up a small business.

How can anyone not be ashamed of the Minister's administration of that portfolio. The position is simple. Someone wants to start a business and employ people, and other people are just using a car park for half an hour or an hour a day. This is a glaring anomaly by the management of the department, and it really shows how out of touch the Minister is with his department. No wonder blue collar workers in the department have such contempt for this Minister, who has decimated their ranks in the past 10 years from 800 to 400 while keeping the number of white collar workers at 250. No wonder they have such contempt, as has the person at Beachport.

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

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): This morning by strange happenstance I listened to ABC radio. I do not normally listen to the ABC in the morning because I do not have time, but this morning I did hear the debate on ABC radio between the current Leader of the Opposition, the Minister of Consumer Affairs and various other identities. The Leader of the Opposition said that, when he was a Minister in the Tonkin Government, a conflict of interest situation developed and it involved his father. He said that he made a decision to do the right thing and, as I understand it, it involved the payment of about $1 000 that would have flowed to his father.

I can only relate the incident as I have no knowledge of it, but what he said this morning appeared to be the right and proper thing; he made full restitution. I have no argument with that and I believe that any Minister in that situation would probably laud the Leader of the Opposition for conducting his affairs in that way. However, I was moved to think that it is unfortunate that he did not remember the Justice Millhouse episode and the episode in 1982 regarding the seat of Mitcham. It is a pity he did not remember that because, as I understand it, there are still six former Cabinet Ministers in his Party opposite, including the Leader, who had a standard in 1982 that was different from the one they seek to apply now. In that regard it is worth recalling the events.

As we all know, at that time the seat of Mitcham was held by the Australian Democrats. In fact, extensive campaigning by the then candidate Mr Robert Worth—who, I understand, has run against the Liberal Party as an Independent since that time and who must have somehow fallen out of favour with the Liberal Party—bore no fruit at all. Until 1982, the seat of Mitcham seemed to be outside the grasp of the Liberal Party, but in 1982 someone got a rush of blood, and that must have gone through the Cabinet because it was decided to offer a well paid job—in fact, a job for life or at least until the age of 70—and, in South Australia, a very important job, arguably one of the most important positions. It was offered for no other reason than to grab hold of that seat for the Liberal Party.

The same sort of thing that was done in 1982 was done in 1992 in New South Wales with disastrous consequences. The reality is that in 1982 the then member for Mitcham took up the offer of a well paid job in the judiciary in the service of the South Australian Government. His seat was vacated and, again, Mr Robert Worth was the anointed candidate. The electorate of Mitcham made pretty clear that it did not want anything to do with it. The only thing that could be said about that particular exercise was that the Liberal Party was too incompetent to capitalise on the situation that it brought about.

It is a very different matter when Liberal members come in here and seek to pillory other people. They have very short memories. The Leader of the Opposition was a leading Cabinet Minister in that Government. They have a selective memory; they choose to forget one of the more outrageous elements in South Australian political history, namely, the attempt to take the seat of Mitcham from the Australian Democrats by offering a position in the judiciary.

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I look forward to taking the opportunity on another occasion to answer the allegations which have just been made and which require answering because they are quite incorrect. However, on this occasion I want to refer to another matter of concern, that is, the policy of the Housing Trust. Since being given the responsibility for the Opposition for housing—and, in particular, for the Housing Trust—I have had a number of concerns brought to my attention, and this afternoon I want to raise just two in the brief time available to me. I want to ask the Minister of Housing and Construction—and I hope that he will respond later—what action the Government is taking to ensure that the Housing Trust gives a family priority over a single applicant for a two or three bedroom house.

I ask this question because I am concerned about the number of occasions that have been brought to my attention where single people are given two or three bedroom houses while we have an extensive list of people, many of them members of families, waiting to be housed. A specific example was brought to my attention recently when a couple from Noarlunga Downs contacted me. These people had been on the waiting list for Housing Trust accommodation for six years before they were finally given a house.

Mr Brindal: That is quite common.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It is quite common, as the member for Hayward says. I regret that is the case, but these people had waited six years before they finally got their house. Soon after being given a house, they learnt that their daughter wished to come home. For that reason, it was necessary for them to ask for a house with another bedroom. When they contacted the Housing Trust, they were told that was not possible immediately, that they would need to seek private accommodation and that they would have to go on a waiting list for probably another three or four years before a larger house could be found for them. They accepted that. They were concerned about it, but they accepted it.

Just before they moved out, they received a visit from a gentleman who informed them that the Housing Trust had told him that he was able to move into their house. It turns out that this gentleman's marriage had broken down. He had been told by the Housing Trust that, if he were to sign over to his wife the house that he, his wife and his family were living in, the Housing Trust would find accommodation for him within 10 days. That is what happened, and he was entitled to move into that house.

I am sure that all members recognise the difficulties that the Housing Trust has in providing suitable accommodation for their clients. But it is of concern to me when I hear of these things—and that is only one example that has been brought to my attention; there are so many others—that people with families have not been able to obtain two and three bedroom houses, yet single people or a couple are living in that form of accommodation, and I am sure other members in this place would know of other examples. I hope that the Minister will address this matter. I have sought through other channels to determine the policy of the Housing Trust in this regard. It is essential that the Housing Trust give families first priority over single applicants for two or three bedroom houses.

STAMP DUTIES (CONCESSIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I move:

That the Stamp Duties (Concessions) Amendment Bill 1992 be restored to the Notice Paper as a lapsed Bill, pursuant to the Constitution Act 1934.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clause 2—'Exemption from duty in respect of certain maintenance agreements, etc.'

Mr LEWIS: There are a few slight amendments to the Bill as it stands, in that we passed clause 2 in its present form, and there are amendments to the measure beyond that point, that is, from clause 3 onwards.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (INTOXICATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 August. Page 276.)

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): In speaking in this debate, I hope that what we have just witnessed is not an example of how Ministers treat the private members' business of this House in confusing members about procedure.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: On a point of order, Sir, the reference by the member for Hayward to the way in which Ministers treat private members' motions has no relevance to the Bill that is before the House.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The comment was a general one in relation to Bills and, as the member is speaking to a Bill, I am sure that he will develop forthwith the theme in relation to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act.

Mr BRINDAL: Thank you, Sir, and I will. I note that the matter before the House has been prepared by Parliamentary Counsel on your instructions, Sir, and I hope that the Government will take it seriously. It is an important measure which shows once again that you, Mr Deputy Speaker, do not live in an ivory tower and that you have your finger on the pulse of what the electors of South Australia want.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: It is to be deplored that the member for Napier should interject, albeit out of order, in the manner that he does. It has been noted by many, both inside and outside this House, that the only flair and light that appears to emanate from this Chamber comes from the Independent members or the Opposition benches. I remind members opposite that three years ago the Government promised flair and light, yet the only flair and light coming from that side of the Chamber appears to emanate under your guidance or at your instruction, Mr Deputy Speaker. I find the bleatings of the Government puerile and tame indeed.

As I said, this measure, which I note is prepared on your instruction, Sir, touches a nerve of the South Australian public and is very important. In addressing the Bill, I note also your contribution, Mr Deputy Speaker, to the illegal use of motor vehicles amendment, which amended the same principal Act, that is, the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. Through other Bills, this House has expressed the opinion that actions taken by people who are intoxicated by a drug are not to be dealt with lightly or to be condoned easily, and I point out to members that it is of comparatively recent date that we lowered the permissible blood alcohol content for drivers from .08 to .05. We have rules dealing with driving under intoxication.

This Bill is much needed and goes further than previous legislation. It is an excellent measure with which everyone to whom I have spoken in the general community is in concurrence. The measure is needed by this House and I have nothing but commendation for you, Sir, for bringing it before this House.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Members opposite can laugh about a member of the Opposition commending you, Mr Deputy Speaker, for bringing something into this House but—

Members interjecting:

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

Mr BRINDAL: However, I again put on the record that I would rather be commending the Government for a good measure, but we seem to have no good measures for which to commend the Government. Government members should not laugh about the fact that the passing of good laws in this Chamber is left to Independent members and members of the Opposition, so rarely do Government members introduce anything other than rats and mice legislation that is designed to claw a little bit more money out of the public of South Australia without any regard to their safety, health or general amenity.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: It is members like you, Sir, who address these matters.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is very prepared to listen to the comments of the member for Hayward and wishes them to be heard without too much raucous interjection.

Mr BRINDAL: Could I say that the Chair is more than prepared to listen; you always are.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is impartial in these matters. The member for Hayward.

Mr BRINDAL: It is a commendable measure. I cannot speak for all members of the Opposition on this matter but I fully intend to support the Bill and I expect and hope that many if not all my colleagues will do likewise. I support the Bill and urge others to do the same.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

WAITE CAMPUS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.H. Hemmings:

That the report be noted.

(Continued from 19 August. Page 231.)

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): It is my pleasure to speak on the first report that the Environment, Resources and Development Committee has brought before the Parliament. I am sure that all members of the committee will agree with me when I say that it was not what one might call an easy first off to deal with. In fact, one could say that the proposal was referred to the committee because things had gone off the rails in regard to the Department of Agriculture, the Mitcham council and the residents. It is perhaps opportune at this time to say that the way that the committee dealt with that proposal gives me a great deal of encouragement to believe that the committee will be able to function in future in a very bipartisan way—in fact, exactly what the Parliamentary Committees Act asked us to do when we debated the legislation.

We had extensive consultations with the public, 23 witnesses gave evidence, 121 written submissions were received, four meetings were held at different times and site inspections were carried out at Northfield and at Waite. To refresh members' memories, the proposal involved the relocation of the Department of Agriculture's research facilities from Northfield to the Waite campus at the University of Adelaide at Urrbrae. The Waite campus already houses the Waite Agricultural Research Institute, the Australian Wine Research Institute

and parts of CSIRO. The additions, which were an administration building, a plant science centre and a laboratory complex, will mean that the campus will become a centre of excellence in agricultural research. The application was recommended by the Planning Commission in April 1992.

As I said, the reference was given to the committee in an attempt to resolve a dispute between local residents, the Mitcham council and the Department of Agriculture. All the way through the committee has seen the redevelopment as an important initiative for agricultural research in South Australia centering, as it does, the main research activities in one place so that facilities and information can be shared and, more importantly, financial savings made. Quite a few concerns emerged as we were dealing with the main players, as it were, and the residents. I will deal with those concerns in the order that they appear in the report because that will make it easier for others to understand how we addressed those issues.

A great deal of concern was expressed by residents and representatives of local schools who were worried about pollution from the site. The committee was told that the agricultural chemicals to be used for field trials at the Waite Institute were to be restricted to those commercially available to all gardeners in the metropolitan area. After receiving so many written submissions, the committee sympathised with the community's concern about the adverse effects of garden chemicals. In one way the committee has gone outside its terms of reference with regard to agricultural chemicals used at Waite. We have proposed to the Minister that there be a review of regulations in regard to all garden chemicals.

Considering the number of quarter-acre blocks and the quantities of chemicals available for public for use in home gardens—in most cases indiscriminate use by people in terms of their ignorance of what the chemicals can do—the problem involves not only 5.4 hectares at Waite. When it is magnified over the metropolitan area, it can cause quite a problem. Therefore, the committee felt that the Government should address the concerns not only at the Waite Institute but throughout metropolitan Adelaide as well. In order to ensure some degree of control, we have recommended that the 5.4 hectares set aside for field trials should not be expanded in the future. It was very important that we should make that recommendation, because the view put to us was, in effect, 'It starts at 5.4 hectares, but who knows what it will extend to in future?'

Other areas of pollution, such as radioactivity and laboratory chimney emissions, were also mentioned. Whilst I will not go into that—the report covers it—we noted that these issues are already governed by codes of practice and regulations under various Acts, such as the Clean Air Act. However, we proposed that these restrictions and codes should be applied with particular care as the area is in the middle of a residential zone.

A great deal was said to us about the use of section 7 of the Planning Act. It was put to us that section 7 was being used to bypass normal planning requirements and to proceed without the support of the local council. I will not go into all the arguments in the time allotted to me, but I point out that we have issued a warning to agencies about this. We argue, I think quite correctly, that in cases where section 7 is used preparations should be even more meticulous than they are at present and that section 7 should be used with caution and sensitivity.

I do not say that as a criticism of the correct use of section 7. I will also concede that the waters were slightly muddied—and one could argue that the Department of Agriculture was quite correctly putting forward the proposal—but, if the Waite Institute, which is an adjunct of the University of Adelaide, had been the proponent, section 7 would not have been necessary.

There was also concern about traffic and heritage trees (river red gums). Whilst we feel that our recommendations are correct, some of the evidence given to the committee was based on hearsay, and we had to unravel some of the many stories that came to the committee with respect to the age of those trees and their possible danger. The major problem with the proposed development was in the area of communication. The committee believes quite firmly, and I am sure that any speakers who follow me from either side of the House will reinforce that view, that many of the issues in the dispute could have been solved if more careful preparation had taken place.

On the one hand, we had the Department of Agriculture convinced, and quite genuinely so, that it had consulted widely with residents and organisations concerned with the project. On the other hand, the committee was struck by the amount of wrong information circulating in the community concerning the details of the proposal. I do not know if the member for Mitcham will be taking part in this debate, but I am sure that he would have picked up some of that in his capacity as the local member. May I say at this point that the committee acknowledges the assistance of the member for Mitcham in some of the problems with which we grappled regarding the proposal. We thank him for that.

As a result of this communication problem, we found in many cases that the Mitcham council was entrenched in its view, the Department of Agriculture and Waite Institute were entrenched in their views, and neither side wanted to come together to try to resolve the problems. In fact, at one time the committee offered its services as an honest broker in an attempt to bring the two sides together so that at least they could get talking, because in many cases the problems being experienced could have been resolved by a letter. Sadly, our offer was not taken up and we had to leave that matter in abeyance.

Our recommendations state that the Department of Agriculture and the Mitcham council could have worked together more constructively on this proposal. If they had worked more constructively, that degree of cooperation then could have flowed through to the community, and I do not think the fears being expressed to the committee would have actually surfaced the way they did. As a result, we have recommended the establishment of a liaison committee, with all the various groups represented on it, so that information about the campus can be discussed and freely exchanged.

Finally, in relation to the environmental impact statement, it seemed to us that all those opposed to the proposal were pinning their arguments on an independent environmental impact statement. Well, the committee has not recommended one, arguing that its investigation has

addressed most of the issues in question. However, the committee does note that other developments were taking place on the campus which are outside its jurisdiction and which may also be of concern to local residents. Therefore, the committee has endorsed the proposed campus master plan.

However, I go back to the formation of a liaison committee because, if that does not take place, I am sure that problems could arise in future which may not really have any substance but which, because of the poor relationship existing in the early stages, may cause this distrust to continue. A liaison committee is so important for the orderly extension of something which we see as an exciting area of agricultural research.

I would also go so far as to say that the in-depth way in which we discussed and investigated the proposal in effect took the place of an environmental impact statement. I am not sure whether our recommendations to this Parliament will satisfy all the parties concerned, but we did our best, and what we came up with was intended for the benefit of all concerned.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): In noting the report, I support the comments of the member for Napier, as Chairman of the committee. If ever there was a good example of what Government departments should do in the future in negotiating with the public when endeavouring to establish a new facility within a certain area, whether it is in a suburb within the metropolitan area or any other part of South Australia, it would do that Government department a lot of good to read the transcript of evidence given to the committee in relation to the Waite campus.

I believe that the Waite Institute and the Department of Agriculture believed, with the best will in the world, that they had communicated extremely well with the community in that area, but the evidence that came through clearly indicated that neither the council nor the local residents believed that really had been achieved. They really did not appreciate or understand what the Department of Agriculture and Waite were trying to achieve, and naturally they had many concerns, and the member for Napier has referred to many of those concerns.

The matter of agricultural chemicals was a major concern to the residents, and whilst they have raised that as a significant issue in resiting the Department of Agriculture's research work, it gave the committee the opportunity to look closely at the use of agricultural chemicals in the metropolitan area. I venture to state that, if the quantity of chemicals actually sold in the metropolitan area of Adelaide was accurately determined, one would probably find that usage in home gardens is far greater than on the broad acre farms of South Australia. One of the reasons for that is that, in the case of broad acre usage, the chemicals are fairly expensive, and with the quantities that have to be purchased by farmers they will not purchase any more than the bare minimum required to do the job.

In many instances, in a small-scale operation in a suburban garden careful monitoring of the quantity of the chemical, the strength of the mixture applied, would vary greatly from one home owner to the next. The actual harm that can be done to residents in the form of allergies and other problems arising from the use of chemicals can be significant. That was one of the main concerns of residents in respect of the use of chemicals on the Waite campus.

We have made a recommendation that appropriate agencies initiate a review of the regulations relating to chemicals available for use in the metropolitan area. If such a committee looks carefully at that matter, it will probably restrict some of the more toxic chemicals that are now on the market and available to people within the metropolitan area or within town boundaries. The committee considered the Waite Institute to be a research and teaching facility and, as such, we could see no reason why that resource or facility should be used as an administration centre for the Department of Agriculture.

The committee believed that the whole purpose of the institute was for research and teaching and that that side of the department could well work in and blend with the existing work of the institute. For it to be the department's administrative centre in South Australia did no more than clutter up a resource or facility that had been initially provided for quite a different purpose. Exactly where the administrative centre of the Department of Agriculture is located is a decision for the Minister and Cabinet.

Certainly, it was a very clear decision of the committee that it should not be housed in special buildings at the institute for the purpose of just straight out departmental administrative purposes. The committee made numerous recommendations, based on the representations and evidence given to it covering not only agricultural chemicals but also emissions from laboratory chimneys and radioactive waste. Consideration was given to the old river red gums that would be removed as a result of the development. The member for Napier has referred to the committee's attitude with respect to an environmental impact statement.

I have just touched on the fact that the committee decided that the siting or placing of the administration building for the department should be somewhere other than the Waite site. Consideration was given to the traffic problems and, if one includes the administrative centre of the department on that site, it considerably increases the traffic problems of that area. The disposal of stormwater was given serious consideration. We have looked closely at the need for better community liaison in the future. I believe that the report and the transcript of evidence are valuable, in as much as they will be a valuable guide to other Government departments in the future when they are looking to establish new facilities or making major alternations to existing facilities and taking into account that better communication will have to occur in the future, not only between local residents of the area concerned but also with local government in that area.

Mr De LAINE (Price): As a member of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee I would like to endorse the comments made by my colleague the member for Napier as the Chairman of the committee, and also the comments of the member for Chaffey. The committee's inquiry was a lengthy one and involved a number of site inspections and the taking of evidence from a vast array of people from the Department of Agriculture, officials, environment and

planning people, Waite Agricultural Research Institute people, local residents and the local Mitcham council.

Concerns were expressed about the aesthetics of the buildings and structures proposed for the site, and as both members who have spoken before me have said, there were concerns about the potential risk from agricultural chemical sprays in the form of drift. No evidence was found that this would be a risk to people or to a couple of nearby schools. Another area of concern involved increased activity by both people and cars. A fairly significant traffic management problem was highlighted and discussed at great length and evidence was taken. The report suggests that this be dealt with by the appropriate local authority, that is, Mitcham council.

Another issue that took some time was the debate about the saving of three river red gums, as the member for Chaffey has mentioned, although two of those trees were found to be fairly insignificant. They will have to go for other reasons, but the third river red gum will be maintained and a fair bit of trouble was gone to to make sure that that happened. Certainly, I was pleased to see that happen, as I am a tree-lover myself.

Disposal of waste was canvassed and dealt with, as was the issue of disposal of stormwater. There was a cry from local residents for an environmental impact statement about the project, but that was deemed to be unnecessary by the committee after taking evidence from environment and planning authorities, because there was no change of use envisaged for this site. Even though the site is in the metropolitan area, I can understand the concerns of local residents who were attracted to the area because it is so conveniently placed close to the city but in a rural setting.

Obviously, they wanted to retain that and I do not blame them for it, but I think the development overall has been sensitively designed and the locations have been worked out carefully. In fact, there are some benefits. The project will upgrade the area while still maintaining the rural flavour. Certain old buildings, sheds and other infrastructure that are an eyesore will be demolished and taken away. Overall, the residents have been treated fairly and they will see in time that many of their concerns have no substance whatsoever.

The only recommendation having any significant impact on the proposal is to review the location of the administration building, as both previous speakers have mentioned. This recommendation appears to be based on a misunderstanding of the role of the staff of the building. Moreover, the arguments put in the report are not new and were known to Cabinet before the decision was made to relocate the staff to the campus. Nevertheless, the issue will again be placed before Cabinet before this element of the project proceeds. I will not go into any more detail because the points have been covered adequately by other speakers. The committee has recommended that the proposed project be allowed to proceed subject to the modifications necessitated by the report.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): At the outset, I wish to congratulate the committee for the fine job it has done. It is very unusual for me to congratulate the member for Napier, but I do so on this occasion, and it should be put on the record, because it might be the first and last time. The committee did a wonderful job; in fact, it did a job that the Government should have done prior to this proposition's coming before the committee. It will be useful to refer to a little of the history in relation to this development. In 1988, the Government decided to sell the land at Northfield and shift the Department of Agriculture's facilities to other places. It was understood during the early negotiation stages that most of the agricultural activities on that site would be shifted to Roseworthy. However, that was unacceptable to a large number of employees working at the Northfield site, so other venues were sought.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: It was not unacceptable to Roseworthy.

Mr S.J. BAKER: As the member for Light quite rightly points out, Roseworthy would have welcomed the addition of those facilities to strengthen its educational offering and would have been more than pleased to have the Northfield research facilities transferred to its land. As a result of pressure that was applied, the Minister decided to utilise the land at the Waite Institute at Urrbrae to establish the facilities. At the same time, the Minister decided to bring across other facilities to augment those which were to be transferred from Northfield in order to make the site capable of supporting a wider range of research. Facilities to be relocated to the Waite campus included, in particular, the Animal and Plant Control Commission, the State Chemical Laboratories and the Central Veterinary Laboratories.

The announcement accompanying this decision was not greeted with a great deal of acclamation by the residents of Urrbrae, Springfield and Netherby and many other areas close to the Waite campus, and there were a number of reasons for this. There were those who looked at the state of the Hills and the open space and who did not want that area disturbed. Others felt this would be an intrusion on their lifestyle, and there were those who had concerns about inappropriate development in an area that was not appropriately designated or who felt that some of the activities being transferred would endanger local residents. No-one really wants change, and it is fair to say that many residents of that area were strongly opposed to the proposed move.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: The member for Spence will ruin this debate. He said, 'What about Housing Trust development?' That is an inane comment from the member for Spence, who would be well aware that that land was not zoned for Housing Trust development and could never have been used for that purpose. If he is suggesting that that is the policy of this Government, he will have a real fight on his hands. He is attempting to move the debate into areas which at this stage we do not wish to pursue.

The residents had a point when they said there should have been an EIS. Of course there should have been an EIS because of the nature of the proposed changes. If a private developer had put forward such a proposition, the Government would have insisted that an EIS be conducted. I believe that the work of the committee has been of such an outstanding nature that, in retrospect, having observed the quality of its deliberations, an EIS might not have come to the same conclusion as the worthwhile recommendations contained in the report.

As has been pointed out, I do not wish to go into the debate that has taken place, but I do wish to mention a variety of concerns that have been largely enumerated. The concerns over chemicals, rotating crops and laboratories have all been thoroughly addressed by the committee in its recommendations and, as has been pointed out, they did bring to the attention of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee the need to look at the ways in which sprays have been used across the whole metropolitan area—a noteworthy outcome in its own right. The matter of traffic congestion was considered and the placing of a commercial administration centre in that zone was totally inappropriate, and the committee so ruled. The committee recognised the value of the historic gumtrees, and that matter was noted in the report and recommendations followed.

The matter of stormwater management in the area because of the run-off that would result from such a large development was also canvassed vigorously by the committee. If this is the standard to be pursued by the Environment, Resources and Development Committee, I feel that the Parliament and the people of South Australia will be all the wiser and better for its deliberations. Whilst many members of the local community do not want any development on that site, they will still draw the conclusion that the Parliament has done a very thorough job through the Environment, Resources and Development Committee in reviewing that development and taking into consideration the real fears that they had, and they, too, would congratulate the committee for its efforts even though they may still reject the proposition of any development on that site.

One outstanding item concerns a well on the site that has been filled in by the Department of Agriculture. The committee heard evidence that certain noxious materials were disposed of in that well. We are still seeking further information and that matter will be pursued. My final comment is that the Minister of Agriculture and his department did not cover themselves with a great deal of glory. Not only did the design change on at least three or four occasions but the dimensions of the whole development were like a moveable feast.

The local residents did not know what they were dealing with. In many cases, they were told untruths; in other cases, we got no answers. I know the committee took this matter very seriously. We finally got the answers we were looking for, but that was not due to the Minister's ensuring that the committee or the Parliament had all the information at its disposal, because I put a number of questions on notice. So, there are brickbats to be handed out to the Minister of Agriculture and his department, and I trust that they will lift their game accordingly. I hope also that the Minister of Agriculture will tell the House that he agrees with the report and will adjust the development accordingly.

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

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I note the committee's report and I agree that it has put a lot of effort into it and identified some areas of concern, in particular, the administration block. I am strongly of the view that the administration block should not be placed at Waite—I agree with the committee's finding—and I would like the matter rethought. The argument put forward does not apply to other people in other areas. We can expand only by 50 per cent. In this case, the Government is selling land at Northfield to get a few bob, and then compacting all the operations into one place at Waite, in a residential area and surrounded by prime real estate—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: —which immediately destroys it. The honourable member who represents the area in the north, where there is a lot of agriculture, will no doubt get benefits from research. He could quite rightly argue that the Waite Institute was there first. The Governments of the day, including the one to which he and I belonged by philosophy, over 30 years allowed housing development around the Waite Institute. My Party agreed that housing should be there, but I am sure that the intention was not to have massive development.

The Waite Institute and the Adelaide University have not always operated fairly or responsibly. For example, over the past three years, parts of pigs' bodies used for research have been put down the sewer mains, blocking the mains. The waste flowed down the drain towards a kindergarten which, given the good grace of the Waite people, is sited on that property. I took up the matter with the Minister for Environment and Planning, who is also Minister of Water Resources, and I got an answer that showed no concern. So, I wrote back again, stating more detail, and I received more information saying that the practice had occurred but that it would not occur in the future.

Just opposite Heather Avenue, an old well has been filled in. I ask the Minister to have her department carry out an investigation of that well into which I am informed the Waite and Adelaide University people dumped empty chemical containers—some of them might not be completely empty—and, we believe, cobalt. The well was then filled in.

An honourable member: Come on, Stan!

Mr S.G. EVANS: The honourable member can say, 'Come on!' All I am asking is that tests be carried out—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: The honourable member says tests have been carried out. They have not, because the well was filled in, and we cannot pick up the readings of what it contains from the surface. The well is sitting on top of a gravel bed and any soakage out of that will go into the underground watertable. It is interesting that, when one simply asks for a test to be carried out, those who claim to have an interest in doing the right thing think it should not happen.

The community had a right to be concerned. I use sprays on my property, and I probably use them irresponsibly as far as my person is concerned because I never wear protective gear. However, I take that risk. Eventually, we will find that some areas may not be suitable for spraying, such as the metropolitan area. I have some respect for the research. Members might like to know that I went to Urrbrae, I have an interest in what happens there, and I respect what they do.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: The member for Murray-Mallee says that I have forgotten most of what I learnt. I have

probably learnt more since I have left there than when I was going there. I appreciate what I learnt there, and I remember it. I also remember the comments that have been made by people such as the member for Murray-Mallee. I am putting the point of view that the community had a genuine concern and attempted to get the Government to undertake an environmental impact statement; the Government refused to do it.

If the issue had arisen in a marginal seat or down south somewhere, that environmental impact statement would have been carried out, and every honourable member in this place knows that. But, because it happened in the area of Urrbrae, Springfield and Netherby, the Government of the day ignored that plea. Those with an interest in agriculture were not concerned either, because they wanted the research to go on regardless of whether the proper safeguards were carried out. I am saying not that it should not be there but that greater consideration should have been given to the people's concerns.

I respect that the committee considered the matter of the trees, which are very old and significant to that community. I remind members that these trees, in the main, stand away from buildings, away from any regular community activity, but there is no heritage listing on them. When a tree at Burnside puts in danger three or four households of people, a heritage listing is immediately placed on it because one or two people complain. We can see the hypocrisy of that sort of operation. The trees at the Waite campus, Springfield and Netherby are just as important as far as heritage is concerned as is the tree at Burnside.

I know a little about that tree. I express a personal interest in it, because it happens to be on my daughter's property. So, I know what went on in that racket. On that property, they are not even allowed to dig a hole in case they cut the roots of the tree. If a tree is 100 ft high, the roots can be 100 ft away from butt of the tree. They are not even allowed to dig a hole on that property because the whole of the tree is heritage listed and they might cut the roots. However, there is no concern at all—or very little—in relation to the area we are talking about, and I appreciate that the committee had a concern. The idea is that one can take down a tree of the same age and type in a similar situation in the city at the bottom of the hills face zone and it does not matter. It is the same Minister—

An honourable member: Things are different when they are not the same.

Mr S.G. EVANS: As the honourable member says, things are different when they are not the same. So, members might understand why the community were concerned. There are two trees, one being at Unley; the Minister took a keen interest in that tree because it was in his electorate, and another Minister raced out to stop it—the same Minister who had something to say in relation to the Waite environmental impact statement. The so-called member for Unley and the Minister made sure there was no damage done to the tree at Unley. Historically, as far as heritage was concerned, it was peanuts. It was of no significance at all.

I ask my colleagues to stop and think why people are concerned and accept that they are justified in being concerned. They would appreciate that the committee has gone a long way towards having some of their concerns investigated. To erect a massive administration block there as planned is totally against the character of the whole place. They did not want to take the transport off Fullarton Road onto their own properties; it would not interfere with any houses as Urrbrae High School was directly opposite. In other words, a semi-government or a government body—two of them are involved—thought the community meant nothing. I note the report, I note the community's concerns and I note the appreciation for the work of the committee. I hope commonsense will prevail as well as honesty and integrity so that there is no double-speak in the future.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I have no desire to detain the House for any length of time, but my view of the proposed developments at the Waite Institute should be put on the record as, more particularly, should be my understanding of the way it comes about. Clearly what happened was that the Government saw an opportunity to avoid meeting its reasonable obligations to the people of South Australia, particularly those engaged in rural enterprises. It saw a cheap way out of providing facilities for the Department of Agriculture staff and the work that staff does. It decided as a Government—I am talking about the Ministers, not the Public Service—to flog off the Northfield site, having built accommodation on it, and make a few million bucks. Anything from $30 million to $60 million or more was the windfall that it expected to get from that exercise.

Having done that, it recognised that it might also be able to shift the entire Department of Agriculture from within the city precincts. In consequence, it decided to put it in the location at which it chose also to put the Northfield facilities, and it focused on the Waite. It came across a few stumbling blocks, none the least of which was the trust deed into which a substantial part of the land was placed in compliance with the terms of the will of the late Peter Waite. That proved to be difficult for the Government; notwithstanding that, it decided to push on.

It made life extremely difficult for the Faculty of Agricultural Science as it was at the time and the Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Resource Sciences as it is now. Inadequate, ambiguous and inappropriate terms were used to describe the type of development that would be needed there, where that type of development relates to the buildings that would be necessary, the facilities that would be contained in those buildings and the ancillary service areas such as car parks and child-care centres to be set aside in the precincts of those buildings.

What the Government was doing was unprincipled and quite wicked in many respects with no regard whatever for the feelings of the local people, until it was insisted upon by this hung Parliament after the new committees were created, wherein some people on the other side of this Chamber compelled the Government to reform the Parliament. Since it knew that it would have the decision foisted upon it, it decided to try to own that, and the establishment of the committee that provided us with this report occurred.

However, we find on reading the report that some members of the committee pushed their political barrow. Clearly, they do not know what they are talking about, particularly a good many of the comments about dangerous chemicals and things like that. The House just

heard the member for Davenport talking about cobalt down a well. I noticed that he was wearing a blue suit and I wonder how much of the dye in his suit was cobalt. Just because a substance called cobalt exists and is used, that is no reason to presume that that in any way represents a hazard.

If there is any hazard, it comes from the radioactive isotope, not cobalt *per se*. In certain concentrations, cobalt *per se* can be a poison, but that has nothing to do with whether or not it is radioactive. It is a poison no more or less in the same way as is sodium. Indeed, sodium is more corrosive; yet sodium chloride or common salt is not a poison. Most people find significant quantities of it in their food and, if a person takes too much of it, it can cause illness. It is an emetic: it will make you vomit. That has nothing to do with whether or not the sodium is radioactive.

An attempt to discover whether there was any difference in the background radiation levels close to the well and further away from it was undertaken, but no such discovery was made. Indeed, there was no difference in the background radiation levels and there would have to be differences. You and I both know, Mr Speaker, as would other members in this Chamber who have bothered to study physical chemistry that, wherever radioactive substances occur in greater than normal concentration for that locality, it is easy to detect that they are present.

Earth itself, of the amount which would occur between where such substances might have been placed down the well and the surface of the well, would not be sufficient to stop the detection of variations in background radiation levels. It would be depicted easily. So, there is a lack of understanding of science by the committee in its report. That is my first criticism of it. It does not know what it is talking about.

I note that the report tries to give two bob each way and help the citizens feel a bit better about the complaints they were making, but to say that there is a concern, whilst in grammatical terms it is a realistic expression of what occurred, is nonetheless unscientific. That concern may be not founded on factual evidence. It is tragic that we make decisions and express opinions when they are based on prejudice and determined by ritual rather than based in fact and science and determined by reason.

Moreover, I was also surprised to find that the committee did not know the difference between what actually occurred when a merger took place as a result of legislation passed in this place, a merger between Roseworthy Agricultural College as it was and the University of Adelaide as it was. The new institution is called the University of Adelaide, but there was a merger. The committee refers to a merger between Roseworthy College and the Waite Institute. No such thing occurred. The committee does not get it straight. Whilst the report tends to point in the right direction with some of the things it says, the committee has not got it right all the time.

What the committee should have done was found that the Minister of Agriculture, in particular, the Minister's predecessor, and, indeed, the Government overall, failed to observe the due process which should have been followed and it failed to be specific. It failed to observe the due process because there was no environmental impact statement, and there jolly well should have been. There was no opportunity for local residents and other interested parties to comment on the changes that were to be made and, in consequence of which, the Government finds itself now in the embarrassing position of having to cast about to try to find someone to blame.

The Minister is blaming the public servants, the Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Resource Sciences, the faculty board, the Professor, who is Dean, and the university. Blame is being scattered around everywhere except where it belongs, which is at the Minister's feet and Cabinet's feet. They are the people who botched it up from the outset. The mess that we are in could have been avoided if they had not been so greedy and to hasty to gratify their greed. I conclude my remarks on that point. That is typical of this Government. It is greedy, irresponsible and hasty in its desire to satisfy that greed, not just for power, but for money. That is crazy. It has no commitment to principles. If it could get away with it, it would have abused the trust deed of the late Peter Waite.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Before voting on this measure, parliamentary protocol requires that I express an interest, that being that I am a member of the advisory committee to the Dean of the Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Resources Sciences, who is director of the faculty which embraces the Waite campus, part of the North Terrace campus and the Roseworthy campus in my electorate. I take the report as going a long way towards an acceptance of the proposal which has been put forward over time for a better integration of agricultural effort between the Department of Agriculture and the old Faculty of Agricultural Science, now Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences.

It is apparent in places other than the Waite campus, which is the subject of this report, that a great deal of work is now being undertaken in the faculty at its three campuses, plus the Department of Agriculture's field stations, such as Turretfield, Minnipa and Nuriootpa. There are other areas in various parts of the State, including Loxton, which are integrated, but not quite so deliberately as the ones I have just mentioned. I was pleased that the committee found it necessary to draw attention to the unsatisfactory aspects of the headquarters of the Department of Agriculture. I hope that future discussion will rationalise the need and perhaps even recognise that there is a site other than the one that was originally contemplated—indeed, a site other than on the Waite campus.

During the discussions leading up to the fulfilment of the committee's activities, there was very strong public concern about the removal of a number of gum trees. My colleague the member for Davenport, who viewed this parcel of land from the other side of Fullarton Road as a student of Urrbrae Agricultural High School as I did, will recognise that the arboretum of Waite, which is highly regarded, contains trees which have been there for over 250 years and which are an integral part of that total campus. My first call was from someone in Mount Barker wanting to know what I could do to save the trees which were to be cut down. Wiser counsel has prevailed.

I understand that there will be no serious destruction of the existing trees, that the new buildings will merge into

the existing buildings, that a master plan of the area will be developed and that all will be complementary. I look forward to the continuance of a sensible approach to this whole matter. One which is typified in another way is that, with the advent of Professor Harold Woolhouse, who is the current Dean and Director, the old Urrbrae House, which is the centre point of the Waite establishment on this parcel of land, is being restored and used extensively for community activity. Friends of Urrbrae House have been brought in. The member for Mitcham is one of its members. I lay claim, together with my wife, to being a member of it, too. I believe that that work will do more to give the community an understanding of Waite and its activities than some of the stand-alone attitudes which have existed in the past.

I recall when the Waite campus was the site of an Army camp during the 1939-45 war. The area of land onto Fullarton Road was, in the first instance, the site of a remount depot with horses being brought in from all around the State, being broken in, shod, given vaccinations and so on and then being dispatched from that point to various war zones in early 1940 and into 1941.

Subsequently, the same area was turned into a depot for the camouflaging of acquired motor vehicles. Anybody within South Australia who had a relatively new motor vehicle had that vehicle acquired. They were taken to the Army establishment on the Waite campus camouflaged and put into service not only in this State but elsewhere. That was long before the trees in the arboretum had grown to the extent that they have now and long before the existence of the kindergarten that the member for Davenport mentioned. There was an oval in that area which was used from time to time by the community. I do not know whether it was ever restored as an oval subsequent to the war. Certainly, across the road on the Urrbrae Agricultural High School area, an oval was established.

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: So did I, and I have never been back to find whether the tree is still there. That apart, I congratulate the committee on the work that it has undertaken on this matter. It has been beyond the normal course of inquiry that applies to many such buildings and activities. I want the record to show that I will vote in favour of the motion but that I have a vested interest.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): On behalf of all members of the committee I thank all members who have taken part in the debate, especially the member for Light who made some very profound comments. I make one sad observation in response to the contributions made by the members for Davenport and for Murray-Mallee. The fact that there is a standing committee of this Parliament which is charged with the responsibility of considering proposals that are referred to it by the Minister, by Parliament or of its own volition does not prevent members of Parliament as individuals from coming and putting their views. The member for Mitcham did this in letter form and also spoke to members of the committee when we were on common ground and were discussing it.

However, on behalf of my committee colleagues, I find it very hard to accept some of the rather stinging criticism in relation to radioactivity that came from the member for Murray-Mallee. In effect, he was saying that we did not know what we were doing. Apparently the member for Murray-Mallee has a deep interest in the problems of radioactive waste disposal. I assure not only the member for Murray-Mallee but the House—and I am sure that the same thing is being said in the other place—that we made every effort to get to the truth of the matter. But, like all things in this proposal—we were dealing with chemicals, the age of trees and other issues relating to pollution—the facts were very hard to ascertain. As the Chairman of the committee, I find it hard to accept that the member for Murray-Mallee dispenses his words of wisdom for the benefit not of the committee but of the House when he could have given that evidence to the committee.

Much the same applies to the member for Davenport. With due respect, I recognise what is and what is not politicking. To go into a frenzy about the gum trees and try to suggest that as a bipartisan committee of this House we would treat red river gum trees of an indeterminable age—we could not establish the age of those trees—differently in the honourble member's proximity, whereas elsewhere there would be a totally different answer, is not only an insult to his own colleagues on his side of politics but to this committee.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat.

Mr S.G. EVANS: On a point of order, I am not sure whether I am correct in raising a point of order, Sir, but never at any time did I suggest that the standing committee made that sort of decision. I said the Government did, and the Minister.

The SPEAKER: The Chair is not sure what the point of order is.

Mr S.G. EVANS: The honourable member is misleading the House by stating that I said it was the standing committee. I said it was the Government and the Minister.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The circumstances surrounding whether or not there should be an environmental impact statement did not depend on the locality; it depended entirely on the proponent, and the proponent was a Government body. In my noting of the report, I made the point that, if it had been the Waite Institute or the University of Adelaide, in all probability there would have been an environmental impact statement, and that view was put to us as a committee. The fact is that we addressed the sensitive issue of section 7 in a completely bipartisan way and, in effect, we addressed some of the criticism of the use of that section.

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

DECENTRALISATION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mrs Hutchison:

That this House urges the Government to broaden the scope of regional development policy to ensure more decentralised development and resolves that this matter be forwarded to the

Environment, Resources and Development Committee for investigation.

(Continued from 20 August. Page 283.)

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): This is a very important motion which needs very serious consideration.

The SPEAKER: I assume that the member for Davenport is taking the debate?

Mr S.G. EVANS: I will do that. The Environment, Resources and Development Committee has done an excellent job with respect to the subject we have just debated, and I will make some comments with respect to regional or decentralised development. This subject has been raised in this place throughout the 24 years I have been here, and Governments of both political philosophies have promised it before elections, but very little has been done.

It is difficult to give effect to this matter unless a Government is in a financial position to be able to offer incentives. There is no doubt that the rural sector in many areas will be strengthened if there were some other forms of industry in the region that may offer, if not permanent work, seasonal work so that people could be employed in rural occupations at times such as harvest time and in industries at other times. The Environment, Resources and Development Committee is the ideal committee to undertake the research required into this matter, and I commend the motion to the House.

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I thank the member for Davenport for his support for this motion. I agree with him: it is very important. If we are to have a State that will go ahead in the future, we need to look sensitively at developments across the whole of the State. One of the problems that has arisen over the years is the tendency to drift towards centralisation when it probably would be much better if we had a well planned development for the entire State. I am very happy that the motion will go to the Environment, Resources and Development Committee because that is the appropriate committee to look at the matter. I am sure it will do that job well. I look forward to its recommendations as soon as it is able to provide them.

Motion carried.

TARIFF REDUCTIONS

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I move:

That this House calls for a moratorium on tariff reductions, particularly for the motor vehicle and textile, clothing and footwear industries, until the national economy has recovered and it can be demonstrated that those industries are in a position to withstand any such reductions.

I moved a similar motion in this House on 27 February last, my speech to that motion being recorded on page 3121 of *Hansard*. Unfortunately, the House did not get an opportunity to vote on that motion, and members of the Opposition in particular did not have an opportunity to record their views on it, so I am hoping that this time that will not be the case. I look forward to hearing the views of members opposite on tariff reductions.

The history of tariffs in this country is well known. At the turn of the century, there was a great debate in this country over whether we should be free traders or protectionists. The logic of the protectionists at the time—and they eventually won the debate—was that the great wealth of this country, from minerals and agriculture, should be distributed to people living in the cities through the provision of jobs in manufacturing industries. Of course, there has been a great deal of change since then.

Unfortunately, the terms of trade have moved against agricultural goods and we see manufacturing industry now cross-subsidising agricultural industries both in Europe and in East Asia. Indeed, it is the reverse of the situation we had in Australia earlier this century. This motion asks for a moratorium on tariff reductions. I am not arguing that we should continue our industries indefinitely behind a tariff wall or that we should follow the policies of the past where, every time there was a problem in a particular industry, the solution was to increase tariffs. As I pointed out in my speech earlier this year, that is really not the solution.

At the moment we need to recognise the state of the economy. We need to ask ourselves: should we at a time of record unemployment be deliberately adopting a policy of unemployment? Reductions in tariffs are exactly that—a policy deliberately designed to create unemployment, presumably so that the resources will thereby be unlocked and jobs will be made available elsewhere. The advocates of that policy are the academic economists in Canberra who are drawing on their first-year economic textbooks on macro-economic theory.

I guess they believe that new industries will arise to take the place of the manufacturing industry that they will destroy through these policies. Presumably, if our manufacturing industries are destroyed by a reduction in tariff protection, it is supposed to be of some consolation to the people in the southern States that jobs in tourism may be created in Queensland, for example. As an illustration of the falsity of the arguments put forward, I cite the City of Whyalla. We all recall what happened to the shipbuilding industry in that city due to the policy of the Government of the day.

Have new industries emerged in Whyalla to replace the employment lost from the shipbuilding industry many years ago? Certainly, this Government has done a great deal to try to provide jobs in Whyalla. There have been some developments there which over time have improved the situation but Whyalla is a classic case of a regional economy where, if one removes the basic historical source of employment, it is nonsense to suggest that a new industry will emerge in the relatively near future to provide jobs for people in that area. It just does not happen.

Of course, the arguments of the economists are best summed up by the term 'level playing field', which is a term we have heard a great deal of in this tariff debate. I noted the other day comments in *News Weekly* relating to tariffs in a letter from Malcolm Fraser, former Prime Minister of this country, responding to a statement by the current Leader of the National Party, Mr Fischer. I will quote part of this letter, because Malcolm Fraser's comments are interesting:

I am glad Mr Fischer recognises that there is no such thing as an international level playing field, but I wish those in politics would stop trying to put Australia in the lowest corner of that unlevel playing field.

Mr Fraser then refers to the case of sugar and states:

> The world market price is heavily, substantially degraded by subsidised, dumped exports from Europe and from other parts of the world. It is also heavily influenced by US sugar policies which are gradually closing out the US market to non US sugar producers. The world traded price is borne down by these factors to very low levels, yet that is the price against which the Australian producers must compete, subject to a decreasing level of tariffs.

He concludes:

> Mr Fischer, in claiming that the dumping policy will protect sugar, is not describing real life or the reality of the commercial sugar trade.

I suggest that similar comments could be made about the Federal Opposition's policy on the removal of protection in other industries. Yesterday in the *Financial Review* there was a report that again illustrates the point that this level playing field does not exist. The report, by the Japanese Government's Ministry for International Trade and Industry, called for Japanese companies to reduce their excessive dependence on imports from Japan. The study found:

> Japanese companies abroad do indeed have a higher ratio of procurements from Japan while their American counterparts buy more parts and goods from the host country and third countries.

That is a classic illustration of the fact that we really are not operating on a level playing field and that some of the economic theories that are dreamed up in the rarified atmosphere of the Commonwealth Treasury do not always take into account what is happening in the real world. The problem with the policies of the Federal Government is that they are a mathematical formula for the reduction of tariffs.

What they are saying is that tariffs should be reduced by 2.5 per cent per annum in the motor vehicle industry, regardless of whatever conditions may be applying in that industry. It matters not whether we are in a recession, whether there is a change in the Australian currency or whether any other matter may be affecting the competitiveness of the industry: it is purely a mathematical formula, an ideologically driven formula for the reduction of tariffs.

The problem with having a formula that bears no relation to what is actually happening in the business world is that many companies are struggling to become competitive. There has been a great recognition across Australia in the past decade that companies have to compete on a world level and be more competitive. Perhaps that was not the case in the 60s and 70s, but it is certainly the case now. Small and large businesses in my electorate recognise that they must compete at a world level. Many of them are taking steps to do that.

The problem is that, it takes time, and I can give one illustration of a motor vehicle component manufacturing concern in my electorate which is trying to improve its technology. It has come to an arrangement with an overseas company to bring in new technology, but it is necessary for that company to obtain the quality approval from the motor vehicle assemblers to whom it sells its products. That process of getting the accreditation of its quality standards can take two or three years, or more. Not only does the company have to develop the new technology but it also has to spend years getting it accredited from the purchaser of its products. If we then dump upon those companies changes in tariffs, they simply do not have time to adjust to the problems they are facing, and that is why the whole thrust of this motion is saying, 'By all means, let's not keep tariffs at a stagnant level, but let's at least ensure that any reductions we do make take into account the conditions that businesses are facing.'

In my earlier speech I mentioned some of the steps the State Government was taking to foster development in South Australia and assist the textile, clothing, footwear and motor industries. Just yesterday in Question Time the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology referred to the Arthur D. Little report and pointed out just how important the tariff question is to the future of manufacturing in this State. The Minister put the challenge out to members opposite to say where they stand on tariff change and other Federal matters on which their Federal colleagues have clearly indicated their views.

Yesterday, the Minister pointed to the views of the member for Kavel, and the member for Victoria has also been outspoken on tariffs. This motion will certainly give members opposite a chance to put on the record their views on the reduction of tariffs and the future of manufacturing industry in this State. I certainly look forward to their comments on those matters. The Federal Opposition has made clear in its policies that it will phase out tariffs completely. It is talking about zero tariffs by the turn of this century.

Mrs Hutchison: Ground zero!

Mr HOLLOWAY: Ground zero, as the member for Stuart says. That is the effect it will have on many industries in this State, especially the motor, textile, footwear and clothing industries if that policy comes into effect. I challenge members opposite to say exactly what their views are on the important question of tariffs. As I spoke on these matters at some length in February I do not wish to go through all the arguments again, but I wish to conclude by saying that the question of tariffs is one of the most important that this State will face.

The Arthur D. Little report has pointed out how we have to get a more competitive manufacturing industry in South Australia and the motor vehicle, textile, clothing and footwear industries are important to our future. If those industries are to be developed into viable and world competitive industries, they will need time to adapt and any changes to tariffs should take that into account. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

GAMING MACHINES

Mr Lewis to move:

> That this House opposes any attempt the Government might make to introduce poker machines or other electronic gaming machines which could result in the people who play on them losing their family's housekeeping money and/or becoming bankrupt and/or committing suicide and thereby producing a further welfare burden on taxpayers.

The SPEAKER: Before the member for Murray-Mallee commences, I indicate that I have spoken to the honourable member about this motion, which causes me some concern, as it clearly seeks to anticipate debate on the Gaming Machines Bill which is set down for debate

later today. At the same time the motion canvasses other social issues which may result from the passage of the Bill. Ordinarily in a case such as this I would have no alternative but to rule it out of order, but I think the other issues involved indicate that a subsequent debate could stand on its own. Therefore, I rule that the motion may not be proceeded with until the Gaming Machines Bill is disposed of, but it may be set down for a another day. I suggest that the honourable member considers amending the terminology of the motion so that the 'same question' rule is not infringed when the matter is called on again.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I move:

That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to on the grounds that the motion is not in conflict with the substance of any other matter on the Notice Paper.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to bring that up in writing.

Mr LEWIS: Yes, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The member for Murray-Mallee has disagreed with a ruling by the Chair in the following terms:

That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed with on the ground that the motion is not in conflict with the substance of any other matter on the Notice Paper.

Does the honourable member wish to speak to the motion?

Mr LEWIS: Yes, Mr Speaker. The purpose of the motion is simply to allow the House to tell the Government or any Government agency what the House believes ought to be the framework within which the Government or the Government agency would allow the installation and use of poker machines or similar devices in circumstances where that would result in the loss of a family's housekeeping money, bankruptcy or possible suicide of the person playing the device.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Murray-Mallee must be very precise in this debate.

Mr LEWIS: I am trying to be precise, Mr Speaker. The point I am making is that any other such matter on the Notice Paper does not go to the question of whether the use of such devices as referred to in the motion ought to be allowed. The other matter, if there is one, is entirely silent on that point, although in your remarks, Sir, you give as a reason for your ruling that it anticipates debate. In my view it does not; it merely expresses an opinion from this Chamber. It is because of that substantial difference in interpretation that I have taken this serious step, although I am not in any way intending to derogate from the veracity of your judgment or position.

Mr Speaker, I know it is a grave step to disagree with your ruling. Therefore, I put to my fellow members that it would not cause any great embarrassment to you at all for them to agree with my view that this matter has nothing to do with the substance of the operation or anything which might flow from any other matter to be considered on the Notice Paper on this day, the next day or any other day of sitting. It simply stands alone by allowing the House to debate and decide whether or not the use of any of those machines should be allowed in circumstances where there is a risk of the people who play them losing their housekeeping money, losing all their money and becoming bankrupt or any other thing which might lead to them committing suicide. That is the gist of it.

I found it quite extraordinary, Sir, when you chose to interpret my purpose in the fashion in which you did as no other member was given the opportunity to express an opinion about the matter. As there was no consternation, it struck me as unusual that you should choose to make such an esoteric, subjective determination on the acceptability or otherwise of the proposition. If it is legitimate for you on this occasion to rule the matter out of order, it would be equally out of order if I were to attempt to move such a motion subsequent to any other matter on the Notice Paper being passed or not passed by the House, as it may ultimately determine, since that matter will have precluded debate by the passage of itself through the House. I therefore see myself as being effectively gagged—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: —from doing what I know the vast majority of South Australian people want the House to do, and that is to express the opinion of the kind contained in the substantive motion on the Notice Paper in my name and about which you have ruled we should not have debate. I draw your attention to a remark made by Speaker Lenthall some 350 years and seven months ago when he said:

. . . I have neither eyes to see, nor tongue to speak in this place, but as the House is pleased to direct me, whose servant I am here . . .

I believe that the House might well in this instance disagree with your ruling without causing offence to you or derogating from the high standing of your office.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Housing and Construction): Mr Speaker, I have no hesitation in rising to support your ruling because, from my observation and interpretation of Standing Orders, it would appear that you have adopted a very appropriate interpretation. I refer particularly to Standing Order 184 which provides:

A motion may not attempt to anticipate debate on any matter which appears on the Notice Paper.

Mr Speaker, I believe that is the Standing Order you base your concerns on as expressed to the member for Murray-Mallee in regard to your application of Standing Order 135 in this matter. My understanding as a member of this place for nearly 10 years is that it is in accordance with the directions which have been given by previous Speakers in relation to matters that are or could be anticipated to be on the Notice Paper. It should not be difficult for the member for Murray-Mallee to see quite clearly that Order of the Day: Government Business No.1 is listed—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Murray-Mallee interjects, Mr Speaker. I think you have dealt with this matter in a very honourable way. You have put out your hand in support and friendship, and I think the member for Murray-Mallee does not do himself a service by—and it is for you to rule on this—almost reflecting on the Chair by saying that he has been effectively gagged. That is a very unnecessary and unwarranted comment from the honourable member and he ought to reconsider his position. The words that you, Sir, have used in your ruling are very appropriate. I think you have given the honourable member the opportunity to consider

how he should deal with this issue. The first part of his motion is clearly a contradiction of the intention of the introduction of the Bill before the House for the House to deal with it in accordance with Government business.

That further reinforces your ruling on this matter, Mr Speaker. From my interpretation and from my position as a member of this House, having been here for almost 10 years, your ruling is very much in order with those of previous Speakers. It is an appropriate ruling, and I have no hesitation in rising to support your decision in this matter. I am sure that members of the House will find your ruling consistent and relevant in the circumstances, given the notice of motion that has been put forward by the member for Murray-Mallee. I ask members to agree with me that the ruling is the appropriate one in accordance with Standing Orders and preserves the intention of Standing Orders in this Chamber.

The SPEAKER: I draw the attention of members to my previous statement and, in relation to the comments of the member for Murray-Mallee about Speaker Lenthall, I thought today in this House I had upheld those traditions as well as anyone I have observed.

Question—'That the motion be agreed to'—declared negatived.

Mr LEWIS: Divide!

While the division was being held:

The SPEAKER: There being only one member on the side of the 'Ayes', I hereby declare the motion lost.

Motion negatived.

Mr LEWIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I move:

That this House, while recognising the important role select committees have had and will continue to have in investigating matters of relevance to the House, is of the view that the recently established standing committees provide a unique opportunity for investigations to be undertaken on an ongoing basis without unnecessarily placing strains on members' time and staff and other resources; and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting this resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

There is no intention in this motion to in any way downgrade the integral role that the select committee system plays in the life of the Parliament; nor is it a thinly disguised attempt to extract additional resources from the Government via the Parliament. Although I must say that to continue down the path we are going will necessitate additional resources being allocated to parliamentary table officers and, perhaps more importantly, to *Hansard*. The thrust of this motion is for the House—and if it is successful for the Legislative Council—to reassess its position, if the standing committee system, which we adopted in February this year, is to build on the sound basis of the Parliamentary Committees Act.

No-one now—although some reservations were expressed during the second reading stage—disputes that a change to the old standing committee system was long overdue. Again, I publicly pay tribute to the guidance that you, Mr Deputy Speaker, gave not only to the Government but to members on both sides of the House. We needed to be dragged into the twentieth century and to be accountable as a Parliament, and I know that was the thrust of the changes that you were seeking, Sir. In fact, I am encouraged by the growing tendency to refer private members' motions to a standing committee, and we dealt with one earlier today, which was moved by my colleague the member for Stuart. There is a tendency for that to happen. I also recognise that some select committees—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The conversation in the House is too loud, and I ask members to either take their seats or leave the Chamber. The member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Thank you for your protection, Sir. Some select committees were set up and have been ongoing prior to February this year, so any criticisms that I may have of those select committees would be completely unfounded and unwarranted. But, sadly, many select committees are still being set up separate from the mechanisms available under the Parliamentary Committees Act. No one will dispute that an individual member's job, if done correctly, is an onerous one. A fair amount of our time is taken up in parliamentary debates, researching legislation before the House, electorate office work and community activities. Of course, if one adds the time taken serving on a standing or select committee or any of the other committees in which we get involved, there is the danger of stress or over-work and, dare I say it, because of that over-work individual members may not be able to pay full attention to the topic with which they are dealing.

I will deal later with table officers and staff, but, first, I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* a purely statistical table which deals with the membership and staffing of the 18 standing and select committees of both Houses.

Leave granted.

MEMBERSHIP AND STAFFING OF 18 STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES

	House of Assembly Members					
	On one Committee	Two Committees	Three Committees	Four Committees	Five Committees	Total
Number of members	17	5	7	—	1	30
Number of Committee memberships	17	10	21	—	5	53

Legislative Council Members

	On one Committee	Two Committees	Three Committees	Four Committees	Five Committees	Six Committees	Total
Number of members	5	7	4	3	—	1	20
Number of Committee memberships	5	14	12	12	—	6	49

Staff

	On one Committee	Two Committees	Three Committees	Four Committees	Five Committees	Total
Number of officers	6	2	1	—	1	10
Number of Committees	6	4	3	—	5	18

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: With respect to this House, the table shows that 17 members are on one committee, five members are on two committees, seven members are on three committees and one member is on five committees. I dread to think of the workload of that honourable member and I make no apology for pointing out that it is you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I know that you have a tenacity for hard work. It is not you I am worried about but about we mere mortals. In the Legislative Council, five members are on one committee, seven members are on two committees, four members are on three committees, three members are on four committees and one member is on six committees. He even beats you, Sir. With respect to staff—and this is where we must recognise that the problems affect not only individual members but also staff—there are six staff members on one committee, two on four committees, one on three committees and one on five committees. In no way can we say that people are able to give their full attention to the committee system, whether they be select or standing committees, and carry out their other duties.

I refer now to the *Hansard* staff. In order to provide a running transcript of parliamentary committees, as members know, *Hansard* reporters have traditionally been rostered five on a team reporting for 10 minutes and transcribing for 40 minutes, that is, dictating their shorthand notes to a typist. It is common knowledge that the *Hansard* staff cannot cope with the greatly increased committee reporting workload brought about mainly by the introduction of four new standing committees. Although the number of clerical assistants—I am talking about stenos and research officers—has been increased to service the standing committees, the *Hansard* establishment remains the same. In fact, *Hansard* was not even consulted when the four standing committees were mooted. I know that was not your fault, Sir. Perhaps, as a matter of course, we tend to take for granted those who record our words.

Let me give the House an example, because I have done an analysis of this subject. Last Wednesday week the reporters had to fulfil their requirement to complete their proof reading of Tuesday's reporting of Parliament, and members will recall that the House rose at 10.17 p.m. the previous evening. The reporters on duty the following morning were expected to service five morning committees, two of which conducted their meetings at the Riverside Building, and to produce a running transcript would have been impossible to achieve. It was obviously out of the question. Assigning 12 reporters to those five committees would have prevented *Hansard* reporters from undertaking any proof reading and would have involved them in transcribing their committee notes on a subsequent day, not the following day. You and I, Sir, know that very often witnesses who appear before standing or select committees need to have their transcript sent to them as quickly as possible for correction. There is no way that the present system can do that. So it goes on.

The *Hansard* staff has attempted to bypass or overcome this problem by introducing recording, but that again creates a problem because the number of typists who are available to transcribe those tapes is inadequate. They are not trained to do that job. We have reached an impasse, a stalemate. Unless there is a recognition that we reassess our attitude to select committees, the problems that I have outlined to the House will continue for ever and a day. It may well be that, as individual members of Parliament, we do not care that we can continue to carry out our jobs, but I know that some table officers come in at weekends to try to take up the work of the previous week and to prepare for the coming week's select committees, among other things.

Mr Ferguson: Do they get paid overtime?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: As far as I know, they do not get paid overtime. One could argue that, if a person chooses to be a table officer in this Parliament, that person must be prepared to work within the ridiculous agenda and time scales that we adopt. However, let me point out to members that the table officers and *Hansard* staff are in danger of suffering from stress. When that happens, everyone will throw up their hands in shock and say, 'How did it happen?' All I am doing is giving advance notice that, because we have not realistically assessed our attitude to select committees, given that we now have four standing committees, there is every possibility that that will happen.

Any member who is on a select or standing committee will be well aware of the problems that we have in getting a quorum. That is why some of our select committees are not proceeding in an orderly fashion. For example, the Select Committee on Bushfire Protection and Suppression Measures has a common membership with respect to some members who are on the Select Committee on Rural Finance and others who are on the Aboriginal lands committee. To enable a quorum to be reached for the two select committees and to enable the Aboriginal lands committee to function properly, members had to swap from committee to committee, which is not satisfactory.

The member for Chaffey, and I am sure that he will not mind my mentioning him, did not go on an Aboriginal lands committee trip to Ceduna, which was a very important part of the committee's business, so that he could maintain a quorum elsewhere. The member for

Eyre could not go to a Liberal Party seminar because he had to stay back to be on the Select Committee on Bushfire Protection and Suppression Measures. That is what we have to do. We have to juggle things around, yet we expect the public to believe that a committee set up by Parliament to deal with a problem or an issue is able to do the job correctly and satisfactorily. I pose the question that, under the current situation, we cannot do that and we are placing extreme pressure on the table officers, the clerical staff, the research officers and, last but not least, our friends from the *Hansard* staff.

In no way is my motion a reflection on select committees. It is a recognition that the standing committees have been set in place and are correct. All I am asking is that the House supports the motion, that we send a message to the Legislative Council seeking its concurrence and that we sit down and realistically sort out our committee system so that it can work for the benefit of this Parliament and the people of South Australia.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I think that this is a ridiculous motion; it would bind the Parliament, and I ask the House to oppose it.

Debate adjourned.

STURT HIGHWAY

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. P.B. Arnold:

That this House supports the submission of the Riverland Local Government Association, the Shire of Wentworth, the Shire of Mildura and the City of Mildura for the upgrading of the Sturt Highway and its inclusion in the national road network.

(Continued from 20 August. Page 275.)

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): On behalf of the Government, I support the motion. This issue arose out of the One Nation package which the Federal Government announced earlier this year as part of its policies to relieve the unemployment problem in this country. The Federal Government, in that One Nation package, announced support for major infrastructure projects, one of which was the national highway system. In that package the Federal Government announced that it would provide some millions of dollars for the Sydney-Adelaide link, but the actual route of that Sydney-Adelaide link was not spelt out in that statement. The Commonwealth Government was looking at various alternative routes. Basically, they were Highway 20, the Sturt Highway, through the Riverland, which the member for Chaffey supports, or an alternative route such as Highway 12 through Ouyen.

The Government supports the sentiments expressed by the member for Chaffey. We believe that the Sturt Highway is the appropriate road. The Federal Government appointed consultants to assess the benefit of including in the national network either the Tailem Bend-Pinnaroo Road or the Sturt Highway. The Department of Road Transport has identified the Sturt Highway as being the most logical route for the national highway and has submitted information supporting this route to the consultants commissioned by the Federal Government.

I should like to cite the reasons why the Department of Road Transport is supporting this route. In its submission the Department of Road Transport pointed out that the Sturt Highway is the route between Sydney and Adelaide which would best be able to meet the national highway objectives of providing a safe, reliable and efficient route for the movement of people and goods. The Sturt Highway already carries a large volume of traffic and large amounts of freight and produce from the export-producing regions of the Riverland and Sunraysia to the major population centres and ports. That Highway is the corridor with the greatest potential to realise high returns on investment, especially as it is ideally placed to supplement the transport hub and multifunction polis initiatives.

The Sturt Highway is the best alternative connecting Sydney to the import and export facilities at Port Adelaide in that it has a lesser impact on urban Adelaide, having only a six-kilometre long connection to those facilities from the current national highway end point at Dry Creek. It is the route the existing condition of which most closely meets national highway standards. The industries based along the Sturt Highway route are those most likely to benefit from upgrading of the corridor and whose markets are predominantly capital city and export based and whose produce is most time sensitive. The Sturt Highway is a significant route in terms of tourism. It serves the largest population base of any alternative. Finally, it has much higher existing traffic volumes than any other alternatives.

Clearly, the Sturt Highway is the correct choice and we support the member for Chaffey in terms of this motion. The member for Chaffey went into some detail about the submissions from the councils in his region. I have not read those submissions, but I believe that the arguments in favour of the Sturt Highway are convincing.

In conclusion, I should like to congratulate the Commonwealth Government on the support that it has given to these major infrastructure transport projects. Later in private members' business we will be debating motions regarding the Commonwealth Government's support for rail. However, it is also important that we should upgrade our road network. I look forward to work beginning on the Sturt Highway to upgrade it as soon as possible. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I rise implacably, utterly, completely, totally and in any other way possible to oppose this motion. Quite simply, it is a cooked up job. The people who live along the length of the Mallee Highway have been denied access to the funds and the reasonable resources that would otherwise have ensured that the Mallee Highway was the chosen route between Adelaide and Sydney. It is a mockery of the Government here and in Canberra to say that it made an objective decision. It is as political as hell. It has no consideration whatever of the social justice of the situation as it stands or of the prospects for improving and enhancing the rate of development of Australia's existing resources and thereby providing a greater multiplier effect in the benefits to the gross national product of both the State and the nation.

Had the Mallee Highway route been chosen, it would have had spent on it an amount not as great as but

similar to the amount which has already been spent on the Sturt Highway. Notwithstanding the fact that all that money has been spent on the Sturt Highway, a further $90 million will have to be spent on it in the South Australian stretch. That road, as a State-financed highway, would be adequate for the next 50 years in its present design status to deal with the traffic travelling along it were it not chosen as the preferred route to Sydney.

It is also a sophistry to argue that we should select the route between the Port of Sydney and the Port of Adelaide as the measuring distance to determine which is the shortest of the two. Who wants to carry goods from the Port of Sydney to the Port of Adelaide? Nobody. It is crazy, it is madness even to contemplate doing that. If the goods are coming from somewhere in Australia to a port, they will travel by the shortest possible route: if the goods are going to somewhere in Australia from a port, they will take the shortest possible route. Goods are not taken from one port where they are unloaded to another port to be loaded. That is just not logical; it is daft. Indeed, if one takes the centres of the two cities, given that goods landed in Sydney might have to be freighted to Adelaide by road, one sees that distance from the wharf in Sydney or the centre of Sydney and its industrial area to the centre of Adelaide is shorter by the Mallee Highway route. Likewise, goods from the Port of Adelaide to the greater metropolitan area of Sydney would find the shortest route via the Mallee Highway, not the Sturt Highway.

This was a deliberate device chosen by people seeking to find reasons to support their argument. It is irrelevant; it is illogical; it is a *non sequitur*. It does not follow that because the distance between the Port of Adelaide and the Port of Sydney is shorter via the Sturt Highway it ought to be considered as the preferred route. It is not a logical reason. The members for Mitchell and for Chaffey have done themselves no service by using that argument in support of their claim that the best route is the Sturt Highway.

The next point that I wish to make I shall leave until after the dinner adjournment, as I see that my time is about to expire.

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

Mr LEWIS: Before dinner I had explained to the House that there were great benefits in not having the Sturt Highway as the national highway route from Adelaide to Sydney, or Sydney to Adelaide, whichever way we want to look at it. I pointed out that there were some inaccuracies—indeed, invalid illogical arguments—put by those speakers we have heard to date in this matter in support of the Sturt Highway as opposed to the Mallee Highway. Unfortunately, it is an inside job and a put-up job, and no fair and reasonable consideration was given to it.

All along the line, over the past 50 years, Governments have sought to woo voters in marginal areas. Broken Hill, in the western districts of New South Wales, was part of a seat which attracted dollars to be spent on its major roads, and the Sturt Highway was one of them in the southern part of that seat. We had a swinging seat of Chaffey 20 years ago that resulted in the Blanchetown bridge being built and promises to build the Kingston bridge. For all those things and the additional money that has been spent more recently, I must congratulate the member for Chaffey, as well as in consequence of the very effective lobbying that he has mounted for his district in making that appear to be the most logical route. However, from an economic point of view, that does not hold up.

If we were to use the route through the Mallee, we would be much better off, the reason being that it would enable us to develop the vast water resource that we have there, the annual recharge rate of which is 45 000 megalitres per year, about half the amount of water used to irrigate horticulture crops in the Riverland already. There are no soil salination problems in the Mallee. We have deep, well-drained soils on high elevations which would not salinate in the way in which they have in the Riverland, and it would enable us to develop that as a State and a nation. We could add value. We could also require the people involved in the irrigation there to consider quite sensibly the use of water twice over—double pumping it, putting it into fish ponds first to obtain from it an additional value for the gross domestic product of the State and the nation, as well as then using the water once passed through those ponds for irrigated agriculture. It would expand the GDP of the State.

It behoves us now, in the name of social justice, equity and equal opportunity, and in the name of efficiency, to re-align the Mallee Highway and to cut even further the distance one has to travel to get from Adelaide to Sydney via the Sturt Highway, running it from Peake to Lameroo along the southern side of the railway line where, with modern road construction technology, it would provide us with a safe and sound route to follow without the kinds of problems that are there. With respect to the road, I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a purely statistical table comparing the Sturt Highway and the Mallee Highway, with the estimated costs of the proposed work that would be involved in bringing them up to the national highway standard that is sought. I assure you, Mr Speaker, that it is purely statistical.

Leave granted.

SUMMARY OF ANTICIPATED WORKS TO ACHIEVE NATIONAL HIGHWAY STANDARD

Corridor	Section	Length	Proposed Work	Estimated Cost	Desired Timing
				($m.)	(Years)
Sturt Highway	Montague road extension Stage 2	2	New highway	10	0-5
	Main North Road	11	Additional 2 lanes	25	0-5
	Gawler-Greenock turnoff	12	Rehabilitation/overtaking lanes	12	0-2
	Truro Hills	15	New alignment/town bypass	12	5-10
	Truro Hills-Waikerie	80	Overtaking lanes/minor alignment improvements	4	0-5
	Blanchetown bridge	—	Strengthening	5	0-5
	Barmera-Renmark	30	Overtaking lanes/upgrade Berri bypass	4	0-5
	Renmark bypass	20	New river crossing/new alignment	18	10+
Total				90	
Mallee Highway	Glen Osmond-Crafers	10	New alignment	130	0-5
	Swanport Bridge	—	Duplication	20	0-5
	Dukes/Mallee Highway I/S	—	Grade separation	3	5-10
	Dukes Highway-Lameroo	98	Upgrade alignment/widening	30	0-2
	Jabuk	—	Rail overpass	3	5-10
	Lameroo bypass	8	New alignment	5	5-10
	Yappara	—	Rail overpass	3	5-10
	Lameroo-Pinnaroo	46	Strengthen/upgrade alignment	12	0-5
	Pinnaroo bypass	—	New alignment	5	10+
	Pinnaroo-Victorian border	4	Upgrade alignment	2	5-10
	South Australian-Victorian	—	Rail overpass	3	5-10
Total				216	

Note: Approved works—Sturt Highway corridor: Montague Road extension Stage 1 $2.5 million.
Mallee Highway corridor: Pinnaroo-Yappara $1 million.

Mr LEWIS: Members will notice that $90 million is to be further spent on the Sturt Highway, although already a lot of money has been spent on it but it is still not up to standard. It is claimed that $216 million is needed to be spent on the Mallee Highway, but that is a furphy, because the $130 million to be spent on the road from Glen Osmond to Crafers will have to be spent on the Mallee Highway because that is the Princes Highway and the Duke's Highway, anyway. It has nothing to do with determining the national route. That brings us down to a cost of only $86 million involved in using the national route from Adelaide to Sydney on the Mallee Highway.

Clearly, that is cheaper than the cost of going through the Murray Valley and the Riverland. Not only is it cheaper but it is also shorter. Not only is it shorter but it is also more energy efficient because, incorporated in that proposal, is the proposition of turning Murray Bridge into a freight forwarding centre and breaking the freight down from large packaged lots for dispatch radially from that point to the northern, eastern, central and southern metropolitan areas. Altogether it makes sense from more than one point of view to reconsider this position and adopt the Mallee Highway as the desired route from Adelaide to Sydney.

Anyone with an ounce of sense can see that it will increase productivity nationally—$86 million as against $90 million—and we can establish an irrigation industry in the Mallee in consequence of having a decent road passing through there which will use 45 000 megalitres a year to produce the additional goods for both local consumption and export. That is the important thing: horticulture. It is mentioned in the Little report and is the kind of enterprise that this House is saying we need to have more of.

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

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I would like to thank the Government for its support of the motion. Obviously, the Government has studied the situation clearly and recognises the benefits, particularly to South Australia. We are talking about an upgraded Sturt Highway servicing 200 000 people in South Australia, as compared with the 4 000 people in South Australia who would be serviced by the Mallee Highway.

I appreciate the position of the member for Murray-Mallee and realise that he has to say what he said, but the reality is that the amount of freight already carried on the Sturt Highway and the upgrading of that road will bring the traffic through from Balranald through the Riverland and down the Sturt Highway and will make a third national highway entry into metropolitan Adelaide.

At the moment we have entry only via Glen Osmond Road or Main North Road from Port Wakefield coming in at Gepps Cross. There is no doubt that the 200 000 people it will serve in South Australia, plus the investment that the Federal Government will be making in this State of $90 million, will greatly benefit South Australia. Much of the work has already been done in the area of Gawler, where a large sum of money has been spent on the bypass. Overall, the benefits will be enormous to the population of South Australia. Once again, I thank the Government for its support of the

motion and trust that, on the motion's being carried, the Minister of Transport will relay the decision of the House to the Federal Minister for Transport and Communications (Mr Brown).

Question—'That the motion be agreed to'—declared carried.

Mr LEWIS: Divide!

While the division was being held:

The SPEAKER: As there is only one vote for the Noes, the motion passes in the affirmative.

Motion carried.

OLYMPIC GAMES

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. P.B. Arnold:

That this House expresses its disappointment over the failure of South Australia's bid to win the 1998 Commonwealth Games for Adelaide and recognises the magnificent effort put in by the Games bid team and all concerned and congratulates them on a job well done.

(Continued from 20 August. Page 279.)

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): The Opposition has great pleasure in supporting the motion. One of the nice things about national and international sport is that it brings people together on a truly bipartisan basis. I am sure everyone in this country was united in their support of our team that went to Barcelona. First, I would like to congratulate the host country, Spain, on the tremendous amount of work and organisation that it put into staging the games. It was a marvellous feat, and it will go down in history that the XXVth Olympiad was one of the most successful modern Olympic games ever staged.

This motion seeks to congratulate the Australian athletes. The member for Price listed each athlete by name, but I do not intend to do that. However, I wish to associate the Opposition with the motion by indicating how much we are behind the team that went overseas and how strongly we feel about the motion of congratulations for the Australian winners. I would like to focus on the South Australians, and I will mention them by name, because, first, I think it is a significant feat to represent your country and State overseas, but it is an even greater feat to have won a gold, silver or bronze medal at the Olympics. Unfortunately, not every member of our team won gold, silver or bronze; some came fourth and some had personal bests, but not all of them were able to be successful. Overall, however, they competed and represented their country, and they will have special memories that will last for the rest of their life.

I would also like to acknowledge the administrators, those who went overseas and those who were unable to go. Every sporting function, whether it be track and field, equestrian or anything else, needs sports administrators who, over the years, stage these events. Without those sports administrators our elite athletes would not have the opportunity to compete or to practise and bring themselves up to Olympic standard.

So, full marks to those sports administrators around South Australia who every week plan events that allow our athletes to compete. Full marks to those in the school system and in the sporting clubs who give their time to junior athletes coming up through the ranks. Full marks to the Australian Sports Commission, and our own Institute of Sport here in South Australia, which have played a role in developing the prowess of our athletes and bringing them to a physical and mental condition enabling them to compete overseas.

The other point I would like to make is one that I am sure all members have observed, and it relates to the number of medals we obtained. I believe we got 27 medals. We ended up extremely high in the ranking of countries winning medals, on the basis of our population. Comparing our population to that of some of the big European countries and seeing where we ended up in the medal count, we can appreciate that it was a truly remarkable feat on the part of our medal holders. It is interesting to compare what happens at the Commonwealth Games and other international competitions where countries are scaled down and are actually competing on a population basis. On those occasions, of course, the Australian team scores as highly as any other country in the world.

I want to quickly acknowledge some of the medal winners from South Australia, of whom we are very proud. There was Simon Arkell (pole vault), Sean Carlin (hammer throw), Lisa Ondieki (marathon), Kathy Sambell (athletics), Dean Smith (decathlon), Mark Bradtke and Mike McKay (basketball), Brett Aitken, Patrick Jonker and Stuart O'Grady (cycling), Gill Rolton (equestrian), Lynda Lehmann and Ian Rowling (canoeing), Allison Peek and Juliet Haslam (women's hockey), Paul Lewis (men's hockey), John Fitzgerald (tennis), Martin Roberts and Philip Rogers (swimming), Janie Fernandez and Kate Slatter (rowing) and Carl Veart and Tony Vidmar (soccer). The officials included David MacFarlane (shooting manager), John Daly (athletics manager), Basil Scarsella (soccer manager), Charlie Walsh (cycling coach), Dr Brian Sandow (chief medical officer) and Graham Winter (sports psychologist).

Last Monday evening I sat next to Basil Scarsella from soccer and asked him a bit about the social life that the athletes were able to experience while they were over there and whether they had a chance to see any of Barcelona, and the answer was 'No'. They really did devote the whole of their time preparing for the events and at the end of that period it was time to come home. I had a most interesting discussion with Gill Rolton, the young equestrian gold medallist who went over and had to take her horse by air to England and through quarantine and then down into Spain and then compete, which she did so successfully. She then had to get the horse into quarantine ready for coming home and get herself home—a fantastic feat of organisation, of dedication to sport, and of course she is no different from any other member of the team.

In conclusion, the Opposition once again would like to reaffirm its total and absolute support for the efforts and achievements of our athletes, an incredible effort on the part of a group of people who went away to do two things: first of all, to represent their country and etch Australia onto the map again in world sport, and also to achieve personal bests and best performances for their own personal careers. We are very pleased and delighted to support the motion. We are very proud of those who went overseas—they deserve all the accolades they get. Next Wednesday, when we have the parade through the city of Adelaide and the reception for them, I hope that

the people of Adelaide turn out and give them the welcome home that they justly deserve. We support the motion.

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I will make my comments brief. I rise to support the motion. As a former sportsperson I understand the dedication required by all individual sportspeople to be able to represent their country at the Olympic Games.

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

Mrs HUTCHISON: I realise that the member for Davenport is not up to the standard. We realise that and appreciate it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs HUTCHISON: I take your ruling, Sir, and will not respond to interjections. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to support the motion and I commend the member for Price for moving it. Too often we forget about the time and effort devoted by sportspeople to get to the pinnacle of excellence in their chosen sport. I also recognise the work done by the South Australian Institute of Sport and the Australian Institute of Sport. Since we have had both institutions in place, the sporting prowess of our Australian and South Australian athletes has improved markedly, as indicated by the member for Price in speaking about the times swum by swimmers and the times that the cyclists were achieving in their quest for gold medals.

Both the member for Price and the member for Morphett stated that, in terms of population base and the people whom we have to get to the top of these sporting pinnacles, Australia has done remarkably well. I believe that we ranked tenth in the world at the recent Olympic Games. Some comments were made by sections of the media that Australia did not do as well as expected. That has been taken totally out of context and it does not look at the population base from which we have to work. It has not looked at the support on a national level that many other nations give their sporting people. In terms of sponsorship alone, the Western European and American sponsorships make it very easy for their sportspeople to pursue excellence in their chosen sports.

Given all these aspects, and looking again at Australia's record, we can be very proud of the Australian team all round. Even to those who did not win medals, I offer my congratulations, as to have gone there and competed was a feat in itself. As the member for Morphett said, I am sure they made friendships that will last them for years to come and they will feel very proud of themselves. We in South Australia, I am sure, feel very proud of our South Australian athletes. Equally we should feel very proud of our Australian athletes, and I have a great deal of pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I support the comments that have been made and the motion. I wish to respond to the comments that have been made in relation to money and sponsorship. From the little knowledge I possess, I have no doubt that the European countries in particular will reduce the amount of money that is put into sport for their elite and that there will be a change of attitude, especially as some of the political conflict has gone between East and West Germany and between Russia and America. I believe that we will see a return to more sports people competing as athletes or in team sports on ability rather than for the purpose of making money. We will see a change in the world over the next few years, particularly with developed countries,walking away from chasing huge sponsorships for individuals or teams simply for the Olympics. If that occurs it will please me immensely.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I thank members opposite for their support of this motion, especially the member for Morphett and the member for Davenport. I agree with the member for Davenport that sport brings people of all races, religions and political persuasions together. It is one of the strengths of sport that it does this, and this is particularly so of the Olympic Games, which is something special—even more special than other top international sports. The tally of 27 medals won by Australian athletes was tremendous. The member for Stuart was quite correct: Australia did finish in tenth position—only nine countries finished with more medals.

That was a great achievement by Australia bearing in mind that over 40 countries with vastly larger populations than ours finished behind us in the medal tally. The other aspect that made the whole exercise even better was the tremendous handicaps that Australian athletes had to compete under, and I will not go into detail because I did so when moving the motion. However, I reiterate that most of our athletes were competing out of season and in the northern hemisphere and had to compete thousands of miles away from their homes. In those circumstances it was a magnificent performance.

As I have said, South Australian athletes won five medals—one gold, two silver and two bronze—and that was a magnificent performance. As the member for Morphett said, many athletes performed at their personal best, and many fourth, fifth and sixth places were also achieved. Once again, I thank members opposite for their support of this motion and congratulate the Australian team, and in particular the 30 South Australian representatives who comprised 24 athletes and six managers/officials, on a marvellous effort.

Motion carried.

COMMONWEALTH GAMES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr De Laine:

That this House expresses its disappointment over the failure of South Australia's bid to win the 1998 Commonwealth Games for Adelaide and recognises the magnificent effort put in by the Games bid team and all concerned and congratulates them on a job well done.

(Continued from 20 August. Page 280.)

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Once again the Opposition is quite happy to support the motion. It is very easy to support this motion because I think that the whole South Australian community was disappointed at the final vote which was 40 to 25—a very decisive vote against Adelaide's winning the bid but one which made a lot of us think about the method of selection and the way in it should be conducted in the future. As we found out, bidding is a very expensive exercise. One does not mind supporting a bidding city provided that it knows it has a

reasonable chance of success. But, to find out after the event—in fact, it was not after the event at all but two weeks before the final vote—that we were not in the running, after being egged on by the authorities to put in a bid, was quite intolerable. I have the greatest sympathy for the bid team that was in Barcelona. When I heard the final 40 to 25 vote and found that we had lost on political grounds as much as anything else it was, to me, quite unacceptable and, I am sure quite, unacceptable to the whole sporting community.

The concept of bidding for the Commonwealth Games is something for which we must give credit to the Minister of Recreation and Sport, who came up with the idea some time back and followed it through, with support from officers in his department. The city of Adelaide got behind him, and the Opposition also got behind him and we were able to bring it to a head. We had the Lord Mayor, Steve Condous, as President of the bid committee, Sir James Hardy, OBE, Chairperson, Marjorie Nelson, AO, MBE, Deputy Chairperson, and then there was the team. A great deal of planning went into it. I was amazed, when I sat down with Heini Becker on many occasions, to find out exactly what was going on. I do not think that members of the public realise the huge amount of work that went in, only to be beaten at the end. In view of the amount of work that was put in we can perhaps understand the extreme disappointment of the bid committee.

I should like to acknowledge publicly the members of the committee. They were the Minister (Mr Mayes), Ray Godkin, Arthur Tunstall, Heini Becker, Michael Llewellyn-Smith, Peter Wylie, Lindsay Thompson from the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, David Prince from athletics, Ron O'Donnell, Glenda Bowen Pain, John Drumm, Andrea Mason, Michael Wanganeen, Dr Peter Wilenski and Merry Wickes. Within the organisation we have the staff members who made a massive contribution to the bid: George Beltchev, Chief Executive, David MacFarlane, Sheila Saville, Andrew Taylor, Julie Nykiel, Francene Connor, Cheryl Crinion, Angela Forgione, Jennie Paynter and Sandra Romeo. They made a magnificent commitment and there was great disappointment when they were not successful.

I thought that when the member for Price made his speech last week he could have been more charitable to the contribution made by the Opposition, because it was a truly bipartisan effort. As happens on trips overseas, the Minister gets all the running and holds all the press conferences. Because a great deal of confidentiality was associated with the bidding, Heini Becker was unable to get to the microphone and put his point of view. However, he was right up front the whole time. He was heavily involved in Australia, and certainly in South Australia, promoting public awareness and participation. He played a major role in the petitions which were circulated and also on the show stand involving the public in putting their names forward. I think that his effort behind the scenes was as much a matter of brilliance as was the Minister's.

We are disappointed because of a political system overseas that chose this time to go for one of the developing countries. All I say is that we should have had some indication early in the piece—and certainly before we spent so much money on our bid—of the ground plan to which some of these sports administrators were running. When we had that function at the Town Hall for all the sports administrators who enjoyed our hospitality, many of them were there for the hospitality only because at the end of the day they knew they were not going to support us. That sort of thing hurts. There is no reason why we should be put in that position again.

In hindsight, it is fairly easy to predict where the next games will go. They probably will not come to Australia. However, on a bipartisan level we shall be discussing the possibility of bidding for the next lot. Now that we know the ground plan to which others are playing, I think our best chance is two games hence. We will work that through and take wise counsel from all who are involved in the bid committee on both sides of politics and sports administration. If there is any chance at all of bidding again, we will do so.

If we cannot have these games, I think that we have to look to the future and how we can promote Adelaide for other national and international events. We have the facilities in this State to stage international events and we have the know-how. It will not be a great effort for us to put on these events. It is a matter now of looking to South-East Asia and to national and international events of a smaller nature that we can stage in Adelaide.

If we do not, of course, these facilities will go to waste. It is a financial advantage to the State to put on an international sporting event, the same as it is an advantage to put on a national or international convention. We now have the knowhow and we have some of the best facilities in the world. It is therefore up to us to market them and not be put off because of this setback over the Commonwealth Games but to look to the future and to look to other sporting organisations that we can attract here on a national and international level.

In conclusion, I congratulate the Minister and his team, the Opposition representative, the members of the City Council and the members of staff who put in what can only be considered a tremendous effort on behalf of us all. They did themselves and the State proud. Once again our name was put across the international arena, and we are pleased about that. Although they were very disappointed men and women, they can be very proud of what they did for the State. I support the motion.

Mr De LAINE (Price): Certainly, we are disappointed that we were not successful in the bid, as the honourable member said. Recently, I wrote to a friend of mine who is an MP in Malaysia and congratulated him on his country's winning the bid, expressing our disappointment but pointing out that there can be only one winner, and wishing them the best of luck for their running of the Games. Also, I should like to recognise the bipartisan support given by the Opposition, the Chamber of Commerce and the whole business sector of Adelaide.

The member for Morphett cannot have heard my speech, because I did place on record quite strongly my thanks to the Opposition and to the member for Hanson. I should like to quote from that speech as follows:

> Yes, I have not forgotten the member for Hanson. I also place on record the tremendous support given to the Minister of Recreation and Sport and the bid by the member for Hanson, Heini Becker, who represented the Opposition. I thank Heini Becker for that support. He gave some tremendous support to the

Minister and to the team, travelled many hundreds of thousands of kilometres with the Minister and committed himself fully to the task of seeking to bring the Games to Adelaide. I also thank the Opposition for its backing of this event.

I was pleased to put that on the record and, once again, I thank the Minister for his effort. I also congratulate the member for Hanson for his backing, along with the support of members opposite. In winding up, I should like to place on record my thanks and congratulations to the bid committee and staff for their efforts. It was a massive effort and no fault of theirs that we were not successful in the bid. However, Adelaide will live to fight another day.

Motion carried.

RAILWAY OPERATIONS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mrs Hutchison:

That this House congratulates both State and Federal Governments on the funding initiatives to enhance rail operations in South Australia, in particular, funding for refurbishment of the Indian Pacific passenger train and upgrading of both the Port Augusta and Islington railway workshops.

(Continued from 20 August. Page 282.)

Mr VENNING (Custance): I welcome this occasion to rise briefly in support of the motion moved by the member for Stuart and to support the acquisition of funds for the refurbishment of the Indian Pacific railway service. It was quite a thrilling moment to hear the announcement, after all the work we did with a completely bipartisan approach. It is pleasing to see that we can combine in a bipartisan way to get results, not only for the Indian Pacific train but also for the community and, in particular, the railway workshops at Port Augusta. I joined the member for Stuart and the member for Eyre in this House as well as our Federal colleagues in the push that was made in this respect. The train goes right past my door when I am home, which is not very often. I hear every rattle and bolt on it and I can assure the House that the member for Playford—

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

Mr VENNING: —would be well aware how close the train goes to my home; I appreciate it. I did journey to Port Augusta and I informed the member for Stuart some months ago and had a jolly good look at the Port Augusta workshops, and I had a most interesting day there. I was quite surprised at the size and complexity of those workshops and I was also surprised to see how low the morale of the people working there was six months ago. To see the potential that was rotting or not utilised made me quite anxious, as was the case on seeing the marvellous Laurie Wallis Apprentice Centre, a fantastic facility for training young Australians in the skills of the trades, empty. The equipment alone was worth thousands of dollars and could be used anywhere in Australia to great advantage, and I saw that great complex empty. I would hope that this is the beginning of new life for the Port Augusta workshops. Any member at any time who brings a Bill or a motion to this House supporting decentralisation on this scale will always get my support.

I have some concern that Islington Workshops were included in this as well, and I wonder how we will go over the years with two workshops as well as Dry Creek. I hope the work will be divided such that both can go ahead, but it is a little difficult. At last, a decentralised industry gets a chance to survive. Port Augusta needs the railway workshops and also regional South Australia needs Port Augusta. I know that the mayor of Port Augusta, a good friend of mine, Joy Baluch, has worked tirelessly in her most remarkable style for her town.

Mr Brindal: Unique style.

Mr VENNING: Her unique style; it is a style one does not forget when one meets the mayor of Port Augusta, and I have spent many an hour with her travelling on trains. We travelled on the inaugural train of the Iron Triangle Limited, which was a refurbished service and which perhaps was not quite the right move at the time. I was on the first train and I will be on the first train of the refurbished Indian-Pacific. So, if Madam Mayor were to hear this message, I hope she would be there too and perhaps the member for Stuart would like to join us on that historic journey.

I would like to pay tribute to the work done by the member for Eyre, Graham Gunn. He has put in many an hour on this. I have travelled on the Ghan and I was very pleasantly surprised at the quality of the Ghan and to see this promoted as one of the world's great train trips. I assure the House that it is, and I look forward to the quality of the work that was done at Port Augusta being mirrored in the Indian-Pacific. The Indian-Pacific goes right past my door. Over the past six or seven years I have seen the trains becoming shorter and less frequent; it has become a dying service. I would hope that this precedes the complete reversal of that trend. Let us hope it is the reversal of the decline of railway enterprise in Australia, because in South Australia we have ignored our rail infrastructure generally. In this day and age there must be room for rail in our total outlook; whether it be passengers, freight or tourism, rail has a part to play. Members would be aware that I have been in this House for two and a quarter years—it goes so quickly when one is having fun.

I have mentioned so often the situation of the railways, and it has made my heart bleed to see our rail infrastructure, particularly the intrastate structure, including the bridges, being closed and then sold for salvage, leaving just the remnants. Even the railway stations are being sold off. I did make a stand which was well publicised, but it has not worked all that well.

It gives me much pleasure at this time to support the member for Stuart in this initiative, and I hope she will be with us when we travel on the first of the new IPs. I do not know if they will be introduced gradually; I gather it will be a carriage at a time.

Mrs Hutchison: In four moves.

Mr VENNING: It will be done in four moves, so no doubt the new service will be introduced gradually. I look forward not only to travelling on the new Indian Pacific but to seeing it gleam. I commend the member for Stuart on this motion.

Mr HOLLOWAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

NATIONAL RAIL CORPORATION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Gunn:

That this House calls on the Government to resist signing away running rights to the National Rail Corporation until the future of Australian National and the rail industry in this State is guaranteed; calls on the Federal Government to re-examine the NRC concept and ensure that the NRC does not interfere in the continued operation and survival of AN and the rail industry in this State and in particular the rail workshops at Port Augusta and Islington and, further, calls on the Federal Government to immediately commence work on the Darwin-Alice Springs rail link and release the $17.5 million for the refurbishment of the Indian Pacific.

(Continued from 20 August. Page 283.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): This motion is designed to keep the House abreast of the importance of maintaining the rail system in South Australia. The most disturbing factor about this exercise is that the State Government, for reasons best known to itself, appears to have capitulated to the pressure applied by the Federal Government. I understand that the rail unions at Port Augusta had received an undertaking from the Minister of Transport that he and the Government would discuss this matter with them before a final decision was made. I have been advised that that has not taken place. They have rushed into accepting the Morrison Knudsen agreement; certain questions are now being raised with me in relation to the financial viability of that company. We will pursue the matter of the viability of that operation as the weeks go by.

The proposed amendment, which I understand has been circulated, does nothing in my view to stand up for South Australia, the workshops or the rail industry in this State. This Government and the members of the Labor Party in particular have failed to stand up for the people who were their traditional supporters—the people who have been their bread and butter. This sort of political trickery that they are getting up to will do them no good. They must stand up and be counted: they must have some political guts. They must stand up for the people of this State. We do not want any more of this trendy academic drivel that we have had to put up with. They should stand up for the people who built South Australia. The member for Stuart can make all the notes she wants to, but she should face reality. The reality is that, if the National Rail Corporation has its way, it will gut the workshops at Port Augusta within three or four years. If the honourable member did not understand what Mr Vince Graham had to tell the people at a meeting a few months ago, and if she has not read the corporate plan and does not understand that, no wonder she will be a temporary member of Parliament.

What will happen to the people at Cook and Tarcoola when there will be no maintenance gangs out there? Let the Government stand up and tell the people of South Australia who will do the maintenance. The Liberal Party's record in these things is far better than that of the Labor Party. I make no apology for my stance on these issues, because I see nothing wrong with any Government investing in large projects. Blind Freddy would know, if he had any experience in private enterprise, that there was a proper role for the Government to play. Private enterprise can never provide all the basic infrastructure or the facilities necessary in a large country such as Australia. I am one of those who make no apology for saying that I see nothing wrong with the Government's being involved in certain enterprises. I have always supported—

Mrs Hutchison interjecting:

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

Mr GUNN: The member for Stuart appears to have worked herself up into quite a lather over this matter. Why, I do not know. Whether or not she has read the latest edition of the *Transcontinental*, I do not know. I have only one concern in relation to this exercise and that is the welfare of the people of this State. I am one of those people who have been privileged enough to be in this place for a long time. As long as I stay here I will stand up for the welfare of the people who have been prepared to get a bit of dirt and grease on their hands out in the real world.

The problem with this country is that too many economic theorists, academics and trendies have control of the decision-making processes. It is all very well to put into effect theories that have been dreamt up in universities, but they have no concept or understanding about how those theories will affect the people of this State or this nation. We are currently suffering in this State, and the Arthur D. Little report clearly indicates that. The real industries have been allowed to run down. Too much emphasis has been placed on industries that cannot provide the basic infrastructure for this country.

It was the rail industry that helped the settlement of South Australia. As the railways were established and extended their tentacles throughout South Australia, development took place. It was difficult, but that system helped to establish Eyre Peninsula, the Murray-Mallee and all those areas. As the railways extended the services went with them, and the farming communities were then in a position to produce the wealth that made this country the wealthiest country in the world in 1900. Unfortunately, we have not built on that wealth. If we allow these basic facilities such as railway workshops and rail services to be run down there is no future.

The question that has not been answered to this day is, 'What will happen to Australian National when the National Rail Corporation is put into effect?' What role does it have? Will it be able to operate, or will it be allowed to run down? The Commonwealth Government has not told us what role it will play. We have not been told whether or not it will be financially viable to enable it to continue in that important role—to provide services, to assist the tourist industry and to provide a sound and basic opportunity for people to be employed. This motion is very clear; it does not need to be amended. It states, in part:

That this House calls on the Government to resist signing away running right to the National Rail Corporation until the future of Australian National and the rail industry in this State is guaranteed . . .

The proposal put forward by the Labor Party will do nothing about that. It represents a sell-out and a failure to understand the responsibilities of this Government. This Parliament enacted watertight legislation. When the rail transfer agreement was passed in this House, it contained watertight provisions. That matter was the subject of great debate and controversy. The people of this State expect their Government to stand up and support those

industries that have operated for decades in this State and not allow them to be run down, to be sold off or altered; that would be detrimental to regional South Australia and to the best interests of all South Australians. The Government's amendment states:

Delete all words after 'House' and insert in lieu thereof the following words:

supports the resolution by the State and Federal Governments of outstanding issues relating to the National Rail Corporation agreement, welcomes the decision of the Federal Government to refurbish the Indian Pacific passenger train and calls on the Federal Government to immediately commence work on the Darwin-Alice Springs rail link.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the member for Eyre that the amendment might have been circulated but it has not been moved, and the honourable member would do well to confine himself to the motion before the Chair.

Mr GUNN: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Hopefully, it will never be moved. If the member for Stuart wants to move it, well and good, but she will be moving people out of Port Augusta. That will be the result of her action. I seek the support of the House to stand up for those people and for South Australia's rights. We have lost too many important industries from this State and members on this side, and myself in particular, will not be party to any more direct unemployment created by isolated bureaucrats in Canberra who have as their agents the State Government.

The Minister of Transport is now acting as an agent for those people who create more unemployment and, therefore, I believe that my motion supports the continuation of that viable industry. Of course, we all support the refurbishment of the Indian Pacific. That is one of the great train journeys of the world and it is vital for the interests of the tourism industry in this State and Australia for that train to be refurbished and maintained.

It should not be necessary to have an extensive ongoing public lobby to have that decision made. If there had been an adequate and ongoing investment in those rail workshops over the years, it would not have been necessary. They have not received the support they should have received and, if the Commonwealth Government had not gone back on its solemn promise to build the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line, there would not have been those concerns that have been currently expressed. The electorate of the Minister of Transport would benefit. The member for Stuart's electorate would benefit from the supply of concrete railway sleepers. There would be a great deal of work for the construction industry in this State and nation.

Therefore, I commend my motion to the House, because it is designed to support the needs and welfare, not only of the people of South Australia but particularly the people of Port Augusta, and the railway industry in this State. It is not desirable, necessary or wise to start moving slick amendments that are designed to let the Commonwealth Government off the hook. If the Labor Party wants to wear that odium, it can, but I warn members opposite that their Party will be responsible for failing to support these important enterprises that have been part of the history of South Australia.

The railway workshops at Port Augusta and Islington have been part of the history of this State. The railway workshops at Islington played an important role during the last war and they will continue to do so if they are given a fair go. Therefore, let us have no more of this Fred Astaire action by these people trying to be quick on their feet and being involved in moving amendments that are unnecessary and unwise. Therefore, I commend the motion to the House.

Mrs HUTCHISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (CITY OF ADELAIDE WARDS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (COMMERCIAL LICENCES) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

GAMING MACHINES BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's message:

That, due to a clerical error in the schedule of amendments transmitted with the Bill returned in message No. 134 of 7 May 1992, it was necessary to forward to the House a copy of the annexed corrected schedule:

No. 1. Page 1 (clause 2)—After line 15 insert new subclause as follows:

(2) In making a proclamation for the purposes of this section, the Governor cannot fix different days for different provisions to come into operation or suspend any provision.

No. 2. Page 2 (clause 3)—After line 4 insert new definition as follows:

'the Board' means the State Supply Board.

No. 3. Page 2, line 11 (clause 3)—Leave out paragraph *(a)*.

No. 4. Page 2, line 37 (clause 3)—After 'director' insert 'or a member of the governing body.'

No. 5. Page 4, line 2 (clause 6)—After 'fine' insert 'or division 7 imprisonment'.

No. 6. Page 4 (clause 7)—After line 10 insert subclauses as follows:

'(2) Subject to subsection (3), hearings before the Commissioner are open hearings.

(3) If the Commissioner of Police so requests, on the ground that information to be given in proceedings should remain confidential, the Commissioner will direct that no person other than—

(a) the parties to those proceedings and their counsel or representatives;

(b) witnesses, while giving evidence; and

(c) officers assisting the Commissioner,

be present in the room while the proceedings are being heard.

No. 7. Page 4, line 22 (clause 8)—After 'by' insert—

'—

(a)'.

No. 8. Page 4 (clause 8)—After line 22 insert—

or

(b) by counsel.

No. 9. Page 5 (clause 11)—After line 11 insert new subclause as follows:

'(3) Unless the Authority recommends that a report should remain confidential, the Minister must, within six sitting days of receiving a report under subsection (2), cause a copy of the report to be laid before each House of Parliament.'

No. 10. Page 5, line 44 (clause 12)—After 'fine' insert 'or division 7 imprisonment'.

No. 11. Page 6 (clause 12)—After line 19 insert new subclause as follows:

(5a) The Authority may sit at any time and in any place (including a place outside this State) and may adjourn its sittings from time to time and from place to place.

No. 12. Page 6, line 38 (clause 13)—After 'by' insert—

'—

(a)'.

No. 13. Page 6 (clause 13)—After line 38 insert—

'or

(b) by counsel.'

No. 14. Page 7, lines 12 and 13 (clause 14)—Leave out 'sell, supply or install' and insert 'sell or supply to the Board, or to another holder of a gaming machine dealer's licence.'

No. 15. Page 7 (clause 14)—After line 14 insert new paragraph as follows:

'*(ba)* gaming machine supplier's licence: subject to this Act and the conditions of the licence, a gaming machine supplier's licence authorizes the licensee, acting through an approved agent, to purchase from a licensed gaming machine dealer and to sell or supply to the holders of gaming machine licences, approved gaming machines, prescribed gaming machine components and gaming equipment.'

No. 16. Page 7, line 19 (clause 14)—Leave out 'technician's' and insert 'service'.

No. 17. Page 7, line 20 (clause 14)—Leave out 'technician's' and insert 'service'.

No. 18. Page 7, line 23 (clause 14)—After 'only' insert 'one gaming machine supplier's licence,'.

No. 19. Page 7, line 23 (clause 14)—After 'monitor licence' insert 'and one gaming machine service licence'.

No. 20. Page 8, line 23 (clause 16)—Leave out '100' and insert '40'.

No. 21. Page 8. Line 27 (clause 16)—Leave out '100' and insert '40'.

No. 22. Page 8. Line 30 (clause 16)—Leave out '100' and insert '40'.

No. 23. Page 9 (clause 19)—After line 33 insert new paragraph as follows:

'*(aa)* the Commissioner may cause the person's photograph and fingerprints to be taken;.'

No. 24. Page 10—After line 4 insert new clause as follows:

'Holder of monitor licence cannot hold other licence

21a. The holder of the gaming machine monitor licence cannot hold any other licence under this Act.'

No. 25. Page 10, lines 23 and 24 (clause 24)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 26. Page 10, line 25 (clause 24)—Leave out 'first'.

No. 27. Page 10—After line 29 insert new clause as follows:

The State Supply Board to hold certain licences

24a. (1) The Board will be granted—

(a) the gaming machine supplier's licence;

and

(b) the gaming machine service licence.

(2) Sections 18 and 19 do not apply to or in relation to the grant of a licence to the Board.

(3) The Board cannot appoint a person to act as its agent in the performance of its functions as a licensee unless that person has been approved by the Commissioner to act as such an agent.

(4) The Board cannot act under the gaming machine supplier's licence except through an approved agent.

No. 28. Page 11, line 26 (clause 26)—After 'Commissioner' insert 'may exercise the same powers and'.

No. 29. Page 11, line 27 (clause 26)—After 'she' insert 'may exercise, or'.

No. 30. Page 12, line 39 (clause 29)—Leave out 'a particular gaming machine licence' and insert 'the application'.

No. 31. Page 12 (clause 29)—After line 40 insert new subclause as follows:

'(2) The Commissioner of Police is a party to any proceedings in which he or she has intervened.'

No. 32. Page 14, line 8 (clause 34)—Leave out 'indictable offence' and insert 'offence punishable by imprisonment'.

No. 33. Page—After line 37 insert new clause as follows:

Commissioner may approve agents of the Board

36a (1) The Commissioner may, on application by the board approve a person to act as an agent of the Board.

(2) The Commissioner cannot approve a person to act as and agent of the Board if the person—

(a) is the holder of a gambling machine licence or a gaming machine dealer's licensee;

or

(b) is associated with the holder of a gaming machine licence or a gaming machine dealer's licence.

(3) A person is associated with the holder of a gaming machine licence or a gaming machine dealer's licence if that person is—

(a) a body corporate of which the licensee is a director or a member of the governing body;

(b) a proprietary company in which the licensee is a shareholder;

(c) a beneficiary under a trust or an object of a discretionary trust of which the licensee is a trustee;

(d) a partner of the licensee;

(e) an employer or an employee of the licensee;

or

(f) the spouse, parent or child of the licensee.

No. 34. Page 15 (clause 39)—After line 18 insert new subclause as follows:

(4a) The Commissioner cannot approve a person to act as an agent of the Board unless satisfied, by such evidence as he or she may require, that the person is a fit and proper person to act as such an agent.

No. 35. Page 15, line 19 (clause 39)—Leave out 'or (4)' and insert ', (4) or (4a)'.

No. 36. Page 15, lines 19 and 20 (clause 39)—After 'Commissioner' insert 'may cause the person's photograph and fingerprints to be taken'.

No. 37. Page 15 (clause 40)—After line 29 insert new subclause as follows:

'(2) The Commissioner of Police is a party to any proceedings in which he or she has intervened.'

No. 38. Page 16, line 9 (clause 42)—Leave out 'a gaming machine licence or' and insert 'the gaming machine supplier's licence or the holder of'.

No. 39. Page 16, line 16 (clause 42)—After 'fine' insert 'or division 5 imprisonment'.

No. 40. Page 16, line 21 (clause 43)—After 'fine' insert 'or division 4 imprisonment'.

No. 41. Page 16, line 22 (clause 43)—After 'fine' insert 'or division 5 imprisonment'.

No. 42. Page 16—After line 22 insert new clause as follows:

'Offence of breach of agency conditions

43a. An approved agent of the Board must not contravene or fail to comply with a condition on which he or she was appointed.

Penalty: Division 3 fine or division 5 imprisonment.'

No. 43. Page 16, line 30 (clause 44)—After 'fine' insert 'or division 5 imprisonment'.

No. 44. Page 16, line 33 (clause 44)—After 'fine' insert 'or division 5 imprisonment'.

No. 45. Page 16, line 41 (clause 45)—After 'fine' insert 'or division 7 imprisonment'.

No. 46. Page 17, line 15 (clause 47)—After 'fine' insert 'or division 7 imprisonment'.

No. 47. Page 17, line 21 (clause 47)—After 'fine' insert 'or division 7 imprisonment'.

No. 48. Page 17, line 26 (clause 47)—After 'fine' insert 'or division 7 imprisonment'.

No. 49. Page 17, line 30 (clause 47)—After 'fine' insert 'or division 7 imprisonment'.

No. 50. Page 17, lines 31 to 33 (clause 47)—Leave out subclause (5) and insert subclause as follows:

'(5) The following persons must not, except as is necessary for the purposes of the administration of this Act, operate a gaming machine on any licensed premises:

(a) the Commissioner;

(b) an inspector;

(c) a member of the Board.'

No. 51. Page 17, line 34 (clause 47)—After 'fine' insert 'or division 7 imprisonment'.

No. 52. Page 18, line 4 (clause 48)—After 'fine' insert 'or division 5 imprisonment'.

No. 53. Page 18—After line 4 insert new clause as follows:

'Prohibition of linked jackpots

48a. The holder of a gaming machine licence must not cause, suffer or permit any gaming machine of the licensed premises—

(a) to be fitted with linked jackpot equipment,

or

(b) to be linked in any manner that allows the winnings, or part of the winnings, from the machine to accumulate with the winnings, or part of the winnings, from any other gaming machine.

Penalty: Division 3 fine or division 5 imprisonment.'

No. 54. Page 18, line 14 (clause 50)—Leave out '7' and insert '5'.

No. 55. Page 18, line 14 (clause 50)—After 'fine' insert 'or division 7 imprisonment'.

No. 56. Page 19, line 9 (clause 52)—Leave out '7' and insert '6'.

No. 57. Page 19, line 41 (clause 54)—Leave out '7' and insert '5'.

No. 58. Page 20, line 20 (clause 57)—After 'fine' insert 'or division 4 imprisonment'.

No. 59. Page 20, line 26 (clause 58)—After 'fine' insert 'or division 4 imprisonment'.

No. 60. Page 20, line 31 (clause 59)—After 'fine' insert 'or division 8 imprisonment'.

No. 61. Page 20, line 35 (clause 60)—After 'fine' insert 'or division 8 imprisonment'.

No. 62. Page 21, line 7 (clause 61)—After 'fine' insert 'or division 6 imprisonment'.

No. 63. Page 22, line 14 (clause 63)—After 'fine' insert 'or division 6 imprisonment'.

No. 64. Page 22, lines 21 to 27 (clause 64)—Leave out the clause.

No. 65. Page 26 (clause 70)—After line 38 insert new subclause as follows:

'(2a) The Board must, no later than 30 September in each year, submit to the Minister a report on the activities carried out by the Board pursuant to the licences it holds under this Act during the financial year ending on the previous 30 June.'

No. 66. Page 27, line 18 (clause 72)—Leave out subclause (4).

No. 67. Page 27, line 21 (clause 73)—Leave out 'other person' and insert 'person other than the holder of the gaming machine supplier's licence'.

No. 68. Page 27, lines 22 and 23 (clause 73)—Leave out 'without the prior approval of the Commissioner'.

No. 69. Page 27, lines 28 to 34 (clause 73)—Leave out subclause (2) and insert subclause as follows:

'(2) An agreement entered into by an approved agent of the Board for the sale or supply of an approved gaming machine, prescribed gaming machine component or gaming equipment to the holder of a gaming machine licence—

(a) has no legal effect until it is approved by the Board;

and

(b) if any money is paid, possession is taken of any machine, component or equipment, or any other action is purported to be taken in execution of the terms of the agreement prior to the Board's approval being given the parties to the agreement are each guilty of an offence.

Penalty: Division 5 fine.'

No. 70. Page 27, line 35 (clause 73)—Leave out 'or an inspector' and insert ', an inspector or an approved agent or a member of the holder of the gaming machine supplier's licence'.

No. 71. Page 29, line 8 (clause 80)—Leave out subclause (1).

No. 72. Page 31, (schedule 1)—Leave out paragraphs *(b)* and *(c)*.

No. 73. Page 31 (schedule 1)—Leave out from paragraph *(l)* 'a gaming machine technician's licence, or gaming machine dealer's licence' and insert 'the gaming machine service licence'.

No. 74. Page 32, (schedule 2)—After 'Minister' twice occurring in paragraph *(b)* insert 'or Commissioner'.

No. 75. Page 32 (schedule 2)—Leave out from paragraph *(b)* (i) 'and by any other licence held by the licensee under this Act'.

No. 76. Page 32 (schedule 2)—Leave out from paragraph *(b)* (ii) 'or those undertakings'.

No. 77. Page 32 (schedule 2)—Leave out from paragraph *(c)* 'or by any other licence held by the licensee under this Act'.

No. 78. Page 32 (schedule 2)—Leave out from paragraph *(g)* 'reasonable'.

No. 79. Page 33 (schedule 3)—Leave out the schedule.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee had previously agreed to a schedule containing 77 amendments. There appears to be an inconsistency between this copy of the schedule which is now before the Committee and the previous one. Amendment Nos 25 and 26 are additions.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That amendments Nos 25 and 26 be agreed to.

These two amendments, which are not included on the schedule of amendments sent by the Legislative—

Mr S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Chairman, and ask for clarification. At this point, when the schedule has been resubmitted, I understand that the House can only consider the whole schedule, not part thereof.

The CHAIRMAN: No, as I understand the position, the Bill has been restored to the Notice Paper at the position at which it last was. As I have just indicated, the House has considered the schedule containing 77 of the amendments. The only inconsistency between the schedule now before the Chair and the one previously adopted by the House in the last session is that involving amendments Nos 25 and 26. Restoring the lapsed Bill under the Constitution Act, which the House itself did some weeks ago, restored the Bill to the position at which it formerly had been, which was that the remaining amendments had been considered and, as it turns out, approved by this Committee. So, the only matter before the Chair is amendments Nos 25 and 26.

Mr S.J. BAKER: By way of clarification—

The CHAIRMAN: Is this a further point of order?

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes, on a further point of order, Mr Chairman, as far as I was aware there was a package of amendments; the package was incompetent to the extent that two were missing from it and, therefore, the whole schedule should be reconsidered.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair finds itself in the position of having to repeat what it just said. The Bill was restored to the position where it last was considered by the House. That schedule of 77 amendments had already been completed and considered by the Committee. The only discrepancy, as advised by the Legislative Council, was the error in the schedule of amendments transmitted with the Gaming Machines Bill, returned in message 134 of 7 May 1992—'necessary to forward . . . a copy of the corrected schedule' which was annexed thereto. The Chair has ascertained that, by comparing the two schedules, the only distinction is amendments Nos 25 and 26. Because the Constitution Act restores the Bill to the place it formerly had, the only matters before the Chair are the remaining two amendments. The Minister of Finance.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The two amendments (Nos 25 and 26) not included on the schedule of amendments sent by the Legislative Council to the House of Assembly on Friday 8 May 1992 are indicated and explained, as follows:

No. 25. 'Page 10, lines 23 and 24 (Clause 24)—Leave out all words in these lines.'

This amendment removes the opportunity for the Independent Gaming Corporation, on application, to be granted a gaming machine dealer's licence (section 24 (1) *(a)*). This is consequential on amendment No. 24

which is a new clause (21a) stating 'The holder of the gaming machine monitor licence cannot hold any other licence under this Act.' Further:

No. 26. 'Page 10, line 25 (Clause 24)—Leave out 'first'.'

Clause 14 (2) of the Bill provides that 'there will be only one gaming machine monitor licence'. Clause 24 (1) *(b)* referred to 'first gaming machine monitor licence issued under this Act'. Removal of the word 'first' as proposed by the amendment does not alter the intention of the legislation in any way. If the IGC either does not apply for the monitor's licence under section 24 (1) of the Act or is refused the licence, another person or authority could apply for and be granted the licence under section 24 (2) which states:

Nothing in this section will be taken to prevent the grant of the gaming machine monitor licence to some other person or authority in the event of the Independent Gaming Corporation not being granted the licence or, if it is granted the licence, in the event of the licence being surrendered or revoked pursuant to this Act.

All members should understand that an error occurred in drawing up the message that came from the other place during the quite extensive sitting in the early hours of Friday 8 May. These errors, minor or otherwise, occur from time to time, and I do not think it is anything to get fussed about with all these amendments, all the typing involved and all the consideration by officers and members of both Houses. We must remember that we are all human beings and that errors do occur. I am pleased that the error was picked up as quickly as it was. The Parliament was not sitting and, as soon as Parliament resumed, we gave notice and restored the Bill to the Notice Paper, as was the proper thing to do.

At the first opportunity, which is now, what are essentially consequential amendments that were omitted from the schedule transmitted are now before us. It is merely commonsense to acknowledge that an error was made—virtually a typographical error—albeit a significant one—in typing up the schedule to be transmitted with the message. I would not expect that the consequential amendments would give members any difficulty whatsoever, conceding that irrespective of members views on the substantial issue of poker machines this is to correct the schedule of amendments carried (and they were carried) in this Chamber previously.

I understand that a Bill to repeal the legislation, once we have it, will be introduced in another place, and that is a perfectly proper thing to do, although I will not support it if it gets to this place. I have no criticism of the member who has stated that he will do that or of people who feel that they wish to repeal poker machine legislation, should such legislation be on the statute books: that it is a decision for all individual members. I would argue that members who do not agree with poker machines should use the debate on that Bill to indicate their difference of opinion with the legislation.

Whilst acknowledging that an error was made, I express my appreciation of the staff of both Houses of Parliament who work under extremely high pressure at times (not only on this Bill) and have done so for many years. In some cases they have served the Parliament for as long as 20 years or more. I would not wish my acknowledgment of the error made to be in any way critical of the staff. We all know the staff who handle these matters and they are absolutely above reproach. I thank them for the way they have handled the issue. I commend the two consequential amendments to the Committee.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: On a point of order, Mr Chairman, I would appreciate your advice on whether the schedule received on the last occasion contains 77 or 79 amendments. Leading from that, did the schedule presented to the Committee on the last occasion contain amendments Nos 25 and 26? I draw attention to the fact that, if it did, the Committee has already passed amendments Nos 25 and 26. How can it be called upon to pass further amendments 25 and 26? Should they not be considered as additional amendments to the 77 amendments, if that were the case?

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Light is correct in assuming that the numbers have simply jumped, that the previous schedule contained 77 clauses and, therefore, contained amendments 25 and 26 as the numbers were consecutive. The new schedule, described by the President as the corrected schedule, contains only differences with respect to those two lines as that is their correct sequence in the order of the schedule.

Nothing much turns on the numbers of the amendments in the schedule. The point of this is the substance of the schedule itself, and quite clearly the only distinction in substance between the two schedules is the matter of the two amendments which are now before the Chair. The other matters were clearly considered and dealt with by this Committee in the previous session, and the Bill has been restored at that point. The answer to the honourable member's point of order, which I assume is what the honourable member was raising, is that, yes, there were previously different amendments 24 and 25, but this is simply a matter of renumbering the schedule by the Legislative Council.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: On a further point of order, Mr Chairman, I accept the explanation that you have given. I take it that advice has been taken that there are no consequences, even though it be a new schedule, of passing two amendments, 24 and 25, on the previous occasion and again on this occasion. I might say that it is in an abundance of caution, but I do not want another debacle at a later stage of yet another piece of legislation being introduced to correct what is a legal monstrosity.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member can be quite assured that I am satisfied as to the nature of the document. It has been carefully examined, and the problem was not in this context previously.

Mr S.J. BAKER: In addressing the amendments tonight, it is useful to reflect on the history of these amendments and the extent to which this Parliament was held to ransom on the last day of the previous sitting. I refer members to page 4908 of *Hansard* for my contribution at 5.50 in the morning and the reflection that was made about the way in which this House had conducted itself and the role that had been played in another place by Ministers, and indeed by the Minister of Finance in this place, in the pressure that was placed on the Hon. Mario Feleppa, and that did no credit whatsoever to this House.

At the time I suggested that mistakes could be made, and put that the haste and speed with which the matter was being pressed through could rebound on the

Government. Through sheer incompetence, and because the Government pushed the staff and parliamentarians to the absolute limit, we have the debacle that these amendments now have to be brought before the Parliament to tidy up the legislation. So, the matter has rebounded, as I suggested in my contribution at 5.50 that morning. What has happened is that, through the diligence of a number of people who were not awakened to the problems of poker machines earlier in the event, we now have had considerable lobbying by many groups in the community who have made their feelings quite clear.

If I wished to reflect on what has happened, I would say that perhaps the Parliament and the Government brought this on itself because of its mismanagement of the whole Bill. I can only imagine, from the lobbying groups I have seen and heard from and the many submissions that have been made through my office, as a person who did not support the Bill and having received so many submissions, what has happened to those members who did support the Bill at the time. If that amount of community feeling had been generated well before the poker machine legislation came before the House, the Bill would never have passed. One of the great ironies is that we now have a small section of the Bill revisited, and community anger has been generated by various groups who have a very strong feeling about the adverse impact of poker machines.

In the first instance I did not take a moral stance on the issue of poker machines; I took a stance that related to the future of the State, its dependence on gambling and the extent to which we had, by our own endeavours and enterprise, to lift the State up by the bootstraps, not by the process of gambling, to fill the Treasury coffers. I made that quite clear, and I made it quite clear to all my constituents including those who came to me and asked me whether I would reject the Bill on moral grounds. I said that I was rejecting it on practical grounds.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out that while the Chair is allowing some latitude to the lead speaker for the Opposition in this matter, the honourable member is in danger of embarking on a second reading speech in relation to the Bill. The only matters before the Chair are amendments 25 and 26 which have limited application in relation to clause 24.

Mr S.J. BAKER: With due respect, I think they have a great deal to do with amendments Nos 25 and 26, but I will take note of what you, Sir, have instructed the Committee. It is quite clear that Opposition members still have a conscience vote on this issue. I believe that most, if not all, of those who still strongly believe that the legislation should never have passed and do not want it to pass will follow the path previously taken.

Of course, some may say that this is a technical amendment, that the ball game is over and that the technical tidying up of the Act should continue unimpeded. Everybody here who wishes to speak on this matter will put their own point of view. I am not of that mind. I am more strongly and firmly convinced that if this technicality causes a problem it should continue to cause a problem and that this State does not need poker machines. I was also firmly convinced that, if the State did get poker machines, the industry was the most appropriate body to involve itself in the—

The Hon. R.J. Gregory interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: I said this before. The Minister of Labour says that I have a bob each way. I made quite clear in the previous debate how the machines should be managed if they were to come to South Australia. The last thing that I wanted to see was State Supply getting involved in that process. We have seen what the Government has done to just about everything in this State in the past two or three years, and we do not need another reminder. If the Minister countenances that I am being inconsistent, I must say that I am not being inconsistent. I have been totally consistent. I have said that for the health and wellbeing of the industry it is important that the industry itself should have some say over the distribution of machines should this legislation succeed. I still hold to that view. I am not persuaded by the changes made in another place, and I reject the amendments.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: As members will know, I opposed the Bill when it was first introduced, I opposed it at all stages, and I oppose it still. Nevertheless, irrespective of my view on any piece of legislation, I would normally acknowledge that once Parliament had expressed its opinion, if there were a technical error which impeded the passage of that legislation through all stages and the assent of the Crown, I would be ready to acknowledge the will of Parliament and to vote in favour of technical amendments. However, I do not propose to do so on this occasion, for the simple reason that I believe Parliament was under duress when that Bill was pushed through this House and the other place. Therefore, the principle which would normally apply and which would normally govern my response to a Bill does not apply in this circumstance.

There is no question that there was an abuse of the parliamentary system on the night of the 7th and the morning of 8 May. For that reason I do not believe that the Government should be given its way with these amendments. At the time of the return of the schedule of amendments from another place on the morning of 8 May I drew to the attention of members that the House of Assembly had been kept waiting doing absolutely nothing from 9.30 p.m. the previous night until 5.30 on the morning of 8 May. By the time I rose to speak at approximately 7 or 7.30 am, from recollection, I and most other members of the House had been on the job for 24 hours. One can only assume that the parliamentary staff, including those who were expected to draft these extremely complex amendments, had also been on the job without a break for 24 hours. If that is not duress, I do not know duress.

I therefore believe that it is absolutely wrong for the Government to have its way still using the brute force of its numbers, which I understand it will use tonight. I believe that the ALP Caucus has determined that all conscience votes will be withdrawn and that the Caucus pledge will hold sway. If I see the members who voted against the Bill in the first place vote against these amendments, I will be very happy to withdraw that claim, but I do not believe that will occur.

This Bill has been botched from the start and is still being botched. The Minister came into the Chamber tonight and did not even know which order of the day this Bill was. He spent two or three minutes fishing

around, looking for the right material. That is not good enough. When he spoke earlier, the Minister claimed that there was an error in drawing up the message that came from another place. I ask you, Mr Chairman: is it not reasonable to suppose that there might have been an error in the drawing up of 79 amendments, a job that had to be done by people who had not slept for the better part of 24 hours?

This is quite unreasonable. It is a gross abuse of Parliament and I, for one, do not intend to let the Government off the hook and say, 'Sorry, a mistake was made. We are happy to help you fix it.' I am not happy to help the Government fix it. I believe that the Government should live with its mistakes and that the Bill should not pass, as a result of its errors. That is my opinion and I intend to stick to it. The Government stands condemned for the way it has handled this whole issue, and I particularly condemn the fact that Parliament was forced to act under duress. That is totally unacceptable. I will have no part of it, and I oppose the motion.

Mr BRINDAL: I should like to echo the sentiments expressed by my colleague the member for Coles. It is on the record that I have opposed this Bill through all stages. However, like the member for Coles, because Parliament has expressed its will, I would normally support the Parliament in passing this technical amendment. But also like the member for Coles, I believe that this Parliament was placed under considerable duress in the passage of the legislation and, therefore, could not do so. The problem with this Bill, I believe, is typical of the Government.

It has been cobbled together and, at all stages through the passage of the Bill, we saw amendment after amendment. It was legislation on the run. The Bill was one thing at one stage and then, a couple of hours later, it was another thing. There was no rational debate, in a sense, because by the time one put forward a rational argument, the argument was outdated and there was a new amendment. The Bill we had at the end of the debate bore little resemblance to what we had at the beginning. If the Government of South Australia is going to be run by people who cannot determine from one minute to the next where they are going or what they want to do, I suggest that they hand over the reins of Government.

If, every time a pressure group comes along and makes another suggestion the Government gives in, it is time that it was not governing. Every member of this House knows that this is a most important piece of legislation, yet the Government could not get it right. It comes in with amendment after amendment and expects this House and the people of South Australia to believe that it is a responsible Government—it is not. I, for one, could support this Government if I believed that it had acted responsibly over this legislation. It has not, so I will not.

Mr MATTHEW: This indeed is a monumental Bill. We have seen a lot of things occur throughout the debate on this Bill which have now manifested themselves throughout this motion. We have seen the Hotel and Hospitality Industry Association miraculously change its stance from that of a few years ago; we have seen the Liquor Trades Union miraculously change its stance from that of a few years ago; we have seen the Premier of this State miraculously change his stance from that of a few years ago; and we have seen members in another place change their stance in the space of 5½ hours after the debate on this Bill was suspended for that time, in order to apply some gentle persuasion to at least one member in particular, the Hon. Mario Feleppa, to change his stance on the Bill.

The Minister began by saying there was an error in drawing up a message from another place and that those errors are minor and occur from time to time. How ironic it is that we have the opportunity now to address those changes in stance that have occurred over time—and changes in stance that have obviously occurred for one reason and one reason only.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Bright will address the matter before the Chair, which is the amendments to clauses 25 and 26 of the Bill and to the schedule, which is clause 24 of the Bill. The stance of honourable members in relation to other matters is no longer before the Chair. The member for Bright.

Mr MATTHEW: Thank you for your direction, Mr Chairman, but the clerical error that has brought about the amendments we are considering at the moment allows members to consider the opportunity to restore the meaning of the conscience vote through the passage of these amendments. For, indeed, the disgraceful events that have brought about the amendments before us tonight have caused a change in the way in which we look at Bills before our Parliament and indeed the way in which we address these two amendments, because democracy died for the ALP in Parliament that day and I am afraid that as we discuss these amendments democracy is not likely to raise its head.

The amendments before us make some changes which are certainly minor in nature but which also provide for a significant opportunity. The amendment to clause 24 provides that there shall be one body, known as the Independent Gaming Corporation, which will have the gaming machine monitor licence issued under this legislation. Indeed, while it is a minor amendment, it creates a significant organisation that will be licensed to monitor gaming machines, and it also provides that there shall be one purchaser of those machines, that being State Supply.

The monitoring of machines is something that has been talked about the world over, and it has been the subject of a number of Government papers in many countries, and in that regard I refer members to a paper produced by the Department of Justice in Oregon on 15 October 1991. That administration looked at poker machines and ways in which those machines should be monitored, and its first finding was that the most secure system is no system at all. However, should a system have to be introduced, and bearing in mind its recommendation that the most secure system is no system at all, it stated:

> In the strongest possible terms, we recommend against the involvement of independent operators in any State-run lottery system. The commission will be subjected to intense pressure to allow independent operators to participate. But as Director Davey stated on many occasions before the Oregon legislature and elsewhere, the fewer parties involved between the player and the lottery, the more the system is secure.

Through these amendments, this Bill presents some interesting conflicts. On the one hand, the purchase will occur through the State Government, through the Department of State Supply; on the other hand, the real monitoring of the money that goes through the system will occur through the Independent Gaming Corporation. During the formation of these amendments, the Hon. Mario Feleppa in another place was given to understand that the amendments before us tonight would provide no opportunity for outside bodies to be involved in the overall scrutiny of these machines.

But here before us we have amendments that do not do that. We have an amendment that provides for a licence for just one body, an independent body, a body outside Government control, and that by itself is something about which I believe all members of this Parliament should be justifiably concerned. I have great problems with an outside organisation, an organisation completely separate from Government, being involved in the monitoring of financial transactions—the opening of machines involved in the gaming industry. That is an argument that is quite separate from the one that others might be tempted to pose tonight about whether or not we should have poker machines.

It is quite obvious that the will of the people of South Australia is that we should have no poker machines and, if this Parliament were to follow the will of the people and be a true democratic institution, it would have adhered to that will, acknowledged it and never have passed this Bill in the first place. But through the debate on these amendments, at least this Parliament has an opportunity to say that we do not like the way these proposed machines are to be monitored; we do not like the way this Bill is being put forward. If our rejecting these amendments will ensure that the operation of the Bill is difficult and that it may be subjected to some further challenge, perhaps that in itself will be the ultimate irony, the ultimate opportunity to restore democracy and the conscience vote that seems to have died in the ALP.

As a member of Parliament I could not in any conscience support any part of this Bill being passed in this Parliament, and I implore all members of Parliament to do the honourable thing—to adhere to the will of the people and to ensure that any part of this Bill that can be rejected by this Parliament be dealt with in that manner. I encourage members of the ALP to restore the conscience vote and ensure that this amendment is defeated.

Mr QUIRKE: The delusions which have just been exhibited have very little to do with the proposition before the Chair. The essence is quite simple. There are some technical corrections, and every member left this place when this matter was last debated, quite clear on one firm understanding: whether they liked it or not, whether they voted for it or against it, poker machines were coming into the clubs and pubs of South Australia, and it would be done under the auspices of the IGC. All 47 members left this House with that understanding. What has gone on here since the Minister opened this debate tonight is not only delusion but a cruel hoax. The two amendments are very small in their intent but they are very precise.

I have no problem supporting this legislation. I had no problem supporting the other 77 amendments, and these two amendments make it quite precise that the IGC is a monitoring group. It is not in the business of selling or buying poker machines. That was a position it never wanted. It got into the Bill in essence by a series of other amendments which were included; unfortunately, the situation was not corrected when it came over from the other place.

The next amendment, which is consequential on this one, takes out the word 'first' in line 25. As I see it, these two amendments clean up a situation which every member in this House knew was the game. It ought to be made quite clear that not all my colleagues on this side will support my arguments tonight. Some will vote against these measures, as I understand it, because the conscience vote is alive and well. The untruths and half truths that stem from the member for Coles need to be rebutted. As I understand it, a proposal was put by the Leader in the Liberal Caucus room that this not be a conscience issue. No such proposal was put in the ALP Caucus room. It was recognised, and recognised all the way through, that members would have individual conscience votes on this issue.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr QUIRKE: The ramblings and delusions of the member for Bright about the ALP are laughable. Members opposite make unfair and untrue allegations—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr QUIRKE: —and they pass them off as fact afterwards.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Playford will resume his seat. The members for Bright and Custance are out of order, and especially out of order are references to members in another place in this context. The member for Playford.

Mr QUIRKE: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I believe that these two technical errors need to be corrected. I support the measure to correct them and I support the intent of the provisions therein.

Mr GUNN: We have just had explained to us—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GUNN: No, I will be charitable and say that we have just had 'explained' to this Committee how the conscience vote operated when we last considered this legislation, when we sat here all night whilst the Government hatched up a strategy and kneecapped poor old Mario Feleppa.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair has already called one member to order for referring to members in another place. The member for Eyre will have to confine his remarks to the subject matter before us and not refer to members in another place. The member for Eyre.

Mr GUNN: Certainly, but we all know what went on. This House was treated with utter contempt, while pressure was being applied to get the desired result. We were told that an error was made. The first error was made when this Bill was introduced into the House without the consent of the majority of the citizens of this State. That error will be perpetuated day in and day out when these machines of evil draw money from the pockets of the unsuspecting public of South Australia. Misery will be inflicted on them because a few people think they are going to make a few quick bucks out of it

at the expense of the majority of the citizens of this State. That is the error that has been inflicted upon the Committee. These two amendments—

An honourable member interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr GUNN: If the honourable member does not like it—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I understand, Mr Chairman, that you ruled that the debate tonight was to be restricted to those two amendments—

An honourable member interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister of Labour is out of order.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: —and that it was not to be a re-enactment of the second reading stage.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Eyre's last comment related to the amendments before the Chair. I did hear him say those words and I was very pleased to hear them. I invite him to continue in that vein.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Eyre.

Mr GUNN: I was referring to the Minister's explanation when he presented this schedule of amendments to the House. If this House had been treated with the courtesy that it deserves and if the people of this State had been given the opportunity to have put before them this extensive group of amendments, which we had delivered to us at about 5.30 a.m., I believe that their reaction would have been even stronger than that which was expressed prior to the votes on that ill-fated night.

You, Mr Chairman, will recall that, when the original amendments were put to the Committee on a previous occasion, I attempted to adjourn the debate so that this House and the people of this State knew exactly what was being voted on. I was denied that opportunity, and now we are being asked again to approve these amendments which have been served up to us tonight. How do we know that there are not further impediments in the legislation? We had a very brief explanation from the Minister and we are entitled to be given an unqualified assurance, because this exercise has again kindled the great opposition in the community to this proposal.

In my judgment, these two amendments are important, because they certainly will have an effect on how these machines are monitored and on those people who are responsible for monitoring them. However, the most significant thing that we are considering this evening is whether this House gives its total support to what the Government has in mind. I believe that, if this Government took into consideration the overall needs of the people of the State, it would submit this proposal to a referendum of the people. We all know what the result would be. Therefore, I will certainly not support it. I supported a Government proposal some time ago and the undertaking was torn up. How do we know that it will not tear up some of these undertakings in the future?

Therefore, I certainly am not going to lend my name to supporting these two amendments. An error was certainly made, and the error will be perpetrated day in and day out on the long-suffering people of this State when they have these evil machines thrust upon them. They are neither desirable nor necessary, and in my view society—

The CHAIRMAN: I hope the honourable member is linking his remarks to the amendments.

Mr GUNN: Certainly, Mr Chairman. These amendments are the result of an evil grab by the Government to dip its greasy hands into the pockets of the community and I will not be party to that in any circumstances. At least those of us who are opposing these amendments are consistent and it will not be on our consciences in the future when the welfare vote has to be increased.

Mr MEIER: I certainly opposed the amendments before us and I recognise full well that they seek to grant a gaming machine monitor's licence to be issued to the Independent Gaming Corporation and to do away with the gaming machine dealer's licence in general terms. I did not have the opportunity to debate the other clauses when they were last before Parliament. I did not have the chance to debate these two, because they were not before us. As the member for Coles so aptly said, that was at a time when this Parliament was under great duress and the schedule of amendments should never have been allowed to be pushed through at that stage.

In fact, I left the House at about 2 a.m. on 8 May. *Hansard* shows it as 7 May because, when we sit through the night, it does not differentiate as to the change in date from 7 May to 8 May. However, it was with the greatest regret that I saw that the member I was paired with, namely, the Minister of Education (Hon. Greg Crafter) was not paired with me in the *Advertiser* when it did a pictorial display a day or so later. This is the first opportunity I have had in this debate to put that on record. I was totally opposed to gaming machines at that stage. I voted against the second reading and I was totally opposed to the schedule of amendments.

It is unfortunate that a newspaper like the *Advertiser* cannot get its facts right and that when it does the wrong thing it takes many days—almost a week—before an apology is accepted. It was not demanded by me, even though I wrote a letter explaining the true situation, but by the combined Whips—the Opposition and Government Whips. There is no doubt that an outrageous situation occurred in the early hours of 8 May when standover tactics were applied to the Hon. Mario Feleppa in another place. Several speakers have expressed their point of view about that and I, for one, was outraged about what occurred on that evening.

What have the people of South Australia had to say since this mix up or error in the schedule was first announced and identified? They have certainly had a lot to say. I dare say that all members have been approached by a multitude of people and would have received much correspondence. I, too, have received much of that correspondence. I hope that members will exercise their consciences and will appreciate that the people of South Australia are screaming out loudly 'No' to gaming machines in the community.

We are now dealing with the possible deletion of a gaming machine dealer's licence and the definition of a gaming machine monitor's licence, which are the key ingredients allowing gaming machines to operate, and it is interesting to see what people have had to say. The Australian Retired Persons Association, which represents about 7 500 people, is clear on this clause and the whole Bill and states:

It is considered that poker machines operating in clubs and hotels would do more harm than good in the community and that the appropriate place for such machines is confined to the Casino.

Likewise, in relation to the issuing or non-issuing of a gaming machine dealer's licence, with which we are dealing this evening, the Churches of Christ in South Australia make their view well known, and in their letter to me the writer states:

What concerns me is an ethical question that I see is related to this issue. In this recession age where people are in financial crisis, and families are hurting badly, how can we, as a State, introduce poker machines which come with the promise of a jackpot?

How can we, as a State, put into place machines that we know will absorb more money than they will ever pay out?

How can we, as a State, allow people to fall into greater financial problems than they are already in?

The letter goes on with a similar scenario. How accurately they describe it and they well recognise the harm that the issuing of the gaming machine dealer's licence or a gaming machine monitor's licence will cause to this State. Two of the staff of the Bowden and Brompton Mission Inc.—and I am sure that in that area people understand the hardship that will be caused—say in a letter to me:

. . . the passing of this legislation will bring with it the casualties associated with uncontrolled compulsive gambling. The mission seeks to see an increase in the number of individuals and families applying for emergency relief assistance and financial counselling, with gambling a masked factor in these cases.

I agree fully with their sentiments. Likewise, the St Michael's Lutheran Church, in relation to the issuing of a gaming machine dealer's licence and the whole gaming machines issue indicates, amongst other things:

The people of South Australia have many other forms of gambling available to them and I believe that the vast majority of people in South Australia do not wish to see the introduction of this form of gambling into our State.

Finally, the Chinese Alliance Church of South Australia, amongst other things, states:

We understand that we are in a great recession and the State Government is determined to boost the economy. However, we believe that there are many other viable options to bring the State economy back to the right shape than the poker machines.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair is very impressed that all these letters contain references to these clauses. It is certainly a preponderance, but I hope the honourable member is relating his debate to these clauses.

Mr MEIER: Indeed, I am pleased you reminded me of that Mr Chairman, because these two clauses before us, namely, whether we are or are not to issue a gaming machine dealer's licence or a gaming machine monitor's licence are critical to the whole Bill, to the whole debate and it is only right that the people of South Australia's views are made known on this and the whole issue of whether these licences should be issued. I have to finish the quote from the Chinese Alliance Church of South Australia, which said:

We, as Christians, will stand firm on our Christian moral ground to oppose the legislation.

I have received letters in relation to the issuing or non-issuing of a gaming machine dealer's licence from very many people throughout this State, including the Multiple Sclerosis Association, the Onkaparinga Valley Ministers Fraternal, the Uniting Church of Moonta, the Balaklava Church of Christ, the Lutheran Community Care, the Uniting Churches of Minlaton and of Moonta, the Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints Church, the Women's Christian Temperance Union—and many, many private letters. It was quite clear that, in relation to the effect of these clauses and of the whole Bill, the people of South Australia do not want gaming machines. I urge members in this House to vote against these clauses and thereby keep these machines out of this State.

Mr HAMILTON: I am cognisant of the time limitations, and I did not intend to enter this debate, but I must say that I have been astounded by the hypocrisy of members opposite, which knows no bounds in relation to this issue.

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: The Minister is constraining me due to the time situation and I will not be baited by some members opposite. I shall place on record, for my constituents, my views on this matter. I do not intend to change my vote. I have listened with a great deal of attention to the words of some members opposite and their so-called concerns about people in the community gambling. Where were these people when we had extensions of gambling right across the board?

Where were these people during the debates on racing, the Grand Prix and a whole range of areas? We heard little if anything from the hypocrites on the other side of the fence. The reality is that this Bill and these clauses, as has been indicated by my colleague, contain an error: we are all aware of that. It has been a beatup, particularly from one section of the community. It has been hyped up. I take note of what my constituent said to me prior to this error being made rather than what has occurred since the orchestrated and unprincipled approach by some sections of the community who have particular vested interests.

I do not hear very much from those sections of the community opposed to bingo ticket sales, for example. As one involved in charity work over many years, I have seen through bingo ticket sales equal amounts of money processed over the counter as have been processed through poker machines. The hypocrisy of some members opposite knows no bounds. The so-called concern for those people in the community affected by gambling is arrant nonsense and I support the amendments.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It is all very well for the honourable member opposite to be talking about hypocrisy and beatups.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It is all right for the Minister too. I reiterate the views expressed by the member for Coles and the strength with which she presented that case. I, too, support the views expressed by the member for Bright. I do not like the way that these machines, the centre of this debate, will be monitored and neither does the majority of the people in the community. That has been made very clear and not one member of the committee can deny that. Significant concern exists in the community about the monitoring of these machines.

In the time that I have been a member of this place I have never participated in a debate under the conditions experienced during the debate that took place on this subject on 8 May. Many of my colleagues on this side have referred to those conditions, to the fact that we sat all night and to the fact that there was confusion and frustration. Is there any reason to suggest that there

would be anything other than mistakes made on that night, whether by members, parliamentary staff or anybody else? Is it any wonder that mistakes were made under those conditions?

I commend all organisations and individuals who have campaigned so well to have the legislation thrown out. I only wish that all members of this place could hear, if they would listen (and I doubt that they would) to the tragic message that I am hearing as welfare spokesman on this side of the committee. I urge all members of this place to go to the mission and listen—listen for Pete's sake—to the concerns expressed out in the community at the present time. At this stage in this State we are urging people to give food parcels for those who are disadvantaged because of the extension of gambling, and here we are in this place suggesting that we should broaden gambling even further— and for what reason?

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member will have to return to the amendments before the Chair.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: In conclusion, I reiterate the statement that I have made both inside and outside this place: that if the passing of this legislation to provide for gaming machines in hotels and clubs proceeds it will show just how out of touch this Parliament is with the people of this State.

Mr BLACKER: We have heard the debate on both sides of this argument. I will restate my position, but not to the length I did previously. I make it perfectly clear that I see no reason why I should change my stance because of the way in which this Bill has come back into this Parliament. The member for Albert Park used words like 'beat up', 'orchestrated', 'unprincipled' and 'arrant nonsense'. Those are the very expressions this Chamber heard in the early hours of the last sitting day of the autumn session. Those exact words can be used to describe what this Parliament did to get this legislation through, bringing it back into this House at 5.30 in the morning.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Albert Park is out of order.

Mr BLACKER: The honourable member knows full well that the manner in which that Bill was handled by this House at that time was wrong. It was a beat up; it was arrant nonsense; it was orchestrated; and it was unprincipled. That was the behaviour of the House at the time. We deserve the consequences that we are now wearing because we allowed the House to process legislation under such duress—and 'duress' is the correct word. Any members who believe that the campaign that was launched following that particular exercise was a beat up really do not have their feet on the ground.

We know what the public opinion polls say. We know full well that the majority of the people out there do not want gaming machines because they fear for the cost in monetary terms and in terms of the lives and welfare of their families, friends and relatives. Those are the tragic consequences that will occur. The member for Heysen mentioned the tragic consequences that he is finding as shadow Minister. We all know of those consequences, as I am sure that all members on both sides of the House have had similar circumstances brought to their attention.

I have made a considerable effort to find out all sides to this matter—not just the emotive side but the practical side as well. I was told by a person in the welfare area—and I do not wish to disclose the qualification or classification of this person because that will narrow the field as to the person's identity—that he could name, among his clients, eight people who have had the power disconnected because of a gambling addiction. He came to me quite specifically and very concerned—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Flinders will need to return to the topic before the Chair.

Mr BLACKER: I acknowledge that I have drifted away a little and that I have been carried away on this aspect, but I am stressing the consequences of the legislation that went through under such tragic circumstances. I use this opportunity again to voice my opposition to it. I question that the amendment before us is grammatically correct. I suggest that it requires a further change. Be that as it may, I place on the record my total opposition to it and I will use every endeavour to oppose it. The question has been raised as to whether it is right to do that, but as the Bill was passed under duress I believe it is the right of all members to reassess their total position to the legislation. Therefore, I oppose the motion.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I would ask honourable members in their speeches not to reflect on the vote. The Deputy Premier.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Members will know that I opposed this Bill at the second and third reading votes. I will not canvass the reasons for my opposition to the Bill, because I would be out of order in doing so. I am well aware of the limited nature of this debate.

If the Bill were being resubmitted to the Parliament in such a way that there was an opportunity to vote on the second and third readings, I would again oppose those second and third readings. However, that is not the matter that is before us, nor was it the subject of the division which was so grievously misrepresented in the press, in respect of which I can recall the member for Eyre raising the matter of privilege with Mr Speaker. I also recall that the members for Davenport and for Walsh were so generous as to indicate, on behalf of all other members, exactly what our position was and how we had been misrepresented at that time.

The misrepresentation in relation to my vote related to the fact that, notwithstanding that I had opposed the Bill at the second and third readings, nonetheless I voted for accepting the amendments that came from another place. I will give my reasons for accepting those amendments. Although my viewpoint had not found favour with a majority of both Houses of Parliament, nonetheless there were still certain technical matters to be resolved.

I had to determine, as a representative of my constituents, whether, not having had my viewpoint accepted by the Parliament, I should, as it were, spit the dummy, walk away from my responsibilities or cast a responsible vote as to the mechanisms of it. I had to determine whether I was prepared to say, 'All right, it's a fair cop. I don't like the legislation, I wish that it had not been introduced, I wish I had had the numbers with me to defeat the legislation, but none of that happened. In those circumstances, should I take a responsible attitude towards these amendments?' That was my attitude at the time, that continues to be my attitude, and that is why it

is important that I explain why I shall be supporting the amendments.

Dr ARMITAGE: Many of the matters relating to the submission of the huge series of amendments into the House in May have already been canvassed, but I reiterate, as I indicated at that time, that it was an appalling disregard of the proper parliamentary procedures to introduce such a large series of amendments at such a late hour. Such a series of amendments should not have been brought in and we should not have been expected to make a rational vote at that time. Indeed, I believe that Parliament, by not expressing that view at that time more forcefully, has been hoist with its own petard.

As members know, there has been a large community reaction since the passage of this legislation. There was not a lot of interest in the Adelaide electorate prior to the original debate; there were some for and some against. However, there has been a huge interest since then and that interest has been totally against poker machines.

As the amendments will affect the total operation of poker machines so dramatically, I tried to put them against the common reaction in the community, such as, 'The effects will be devastating in the community.' I went to the inquiry conducted by Sir Laurence Street into the establishment and operation of legal casinos in New South Wales. As we all know, New South Wales has had poker machines for a very long time. Clearly Sir Laurence Street has no vested interest, but on page 58 of the report he indicates:

> These figures support an estimate of the number of current problem gamblers in Sydney, most of whom have not yet faced the reality of their problem, in the vicinity of 1 per cent of the total adult population.

That immediately presents me with a problem in that I am not certain whether we ought to legislate for 1 per cent of the people or for 99 per cent of the people. Particularly given the fact that the amendment for a certain amount of money to be given to the treatment agencies was defeated on the floor of the House, an amendment that I voted for and was disappointed to see defeated, Sir Laurence Street indicates further on in the report that the benefit to cost ratio of the treatment for gambling problems is in excess of 20:1, and the efficacy of alcohol treatment would only claim a benefit to cost ratio of 2:1. Dr Robert Politzer of Johns Hopkins is quoted in the report as saying:

> Pathological gambling not only ranks among the most expensive illnesses afflicting society, but is also the least expensive to treat and the most 'curable' when treated.

Looking at the amendments, overall it is disappointing that we have reached this stage. The vote on these amendments, as we have just debated at great length, will occur on a conscience vote. Given my support, in general terms, for gambling and for these poker machines, I did some research on conscience votes. First, I looked at *Hansard* of this place and, on the score of conscience votes, I must say that our forebears have been at best consistently inconsistent. However, while I was contemplating these amendments, I happened to be reading a book entitled *Our Age*, written by Noel Annan. I wish to quote a piece about political reality as follows:

> In political life man is faced not by one set of duties but by many: his duty to his family, the institutions and groups and calling to which he belongs, some of which are voluntary and others involuntary. In politics no-one speaks for himself; he represents his friends and the conflicting interests of numbers of groups. To love one's neighbour may be a great commandment but love is different from cooperation, trust and goodwill, which are its equivalent in politics.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope that the honourable member can relate the quotation to the clause.

Dr ARMITAGE: I indicated that I was looking at this whilst I was contemplating these amendments. The last sentence reads:

> Man the political animal operating in social groups is confronted with a different moral situation from that in face-to-face relationships.

It means—

The CHAIRMAN: In relation to the amendment?

Dr ARMITAGE: Yes—that I have no personal problem in face-to-face relationships with poker machines. However, I believe that in this place I am representing the conflicting interests of numbers of groups. I do not believe that poker machines will lead to anywhere near the extent of evils that some people would have us believe, as Sir Laurence Street tells us. I believe that my constituents, representing the conflicting interests of numbers of groups, as quoted, do not want poker machines in South Australia, and that the greatest thing that I as a member of Parliament can do is reflect the conflicting interests of the numbers of groups of people whom I represent.

I do not want any scuttlebutt in the media as to the votes of the members of the House of Assembly, and I point out specifically that, despite my personal view that poker machines are not the enormous evil many people would have us believe, in my view the conflicting interests of numbers of groups of my constituents would be best served by voting against these amendments.

Mr De LAINE: I, like my colleague the Deputy Premier, opposed the introduction of poker machines in South Australia in this place back in May this year and, if legislation were reintroduced, I would do so again. However, the amendments are purely to correct errors and are therefore machinery, in effect, and I feel that, because of that, they deserve to be supported.

The vote has been taken, and I respect the members on both sides who used their conscience vote on that occasion. I see no reason why that should be overturned now. I would also like to put on record the fact that I will exercise my conscience in the vote this evening, and no pressure whatsoever has been placed on me. As I say, if legislation were introduced again I would oppose it but, because of the machinery nature of these amendments, I will support them.

Mr VENNING: I rise very strongly against these two amendments and the Bill. As I said, the amendments are about whether a gaming machine dealer's licence will be granted or whether the first gaming machine monitor licence will be issued under this Act. I personally find it absolutely amazing that 75 per cent of South Australians do not want this Bill and the Government is dishing it up to them in these times. I am a new chum in this House; I am still wondering about the powers of the Parliament and the powers of representation. I stand here for the people of Custance, and I have no choice but to oppose this Bill strongly; 95 per cent of the people of Custance do not want this Bill. If defeating these amendments defeats this Bill, I stand against them.

The House acted in so much haste that it failed to do the job properly. I am personally disgusted at this legislation, and I am opposed to an Act such as this which brings people hardship and which feeds like a cancer on people's insatiable gambling habit. I urge people to go to Las Vegas and look at the grandiose place, the palaces and the absolute wealth there is there. Where does it come from? It comes from people's gambling dollars; it does not come from the Government or industry. It comes out of people's gambling pockets; that is where it comes from. It may be on a smaller scale here, but the principle is exactly the same. I am absolutely amazed. This Bill does not create any new jobs; it does not create any new money; it just changes the directions. Who fills the gap that this money leaves? Who picks up the tab? We all know who does: it is the many charities we have in this State which do such a fine job, and who will fund them when this legislation gets rolling?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member should be debating not the Bill but the amendments.

Mr VENNING: I refer to whether the gaming machines licence ought to be granted. These two amendments stand in the way of this Bill being passed, and I have no conscience in stating that they ought not to be supported. I was most annoyed at the proceedings on the night that this Bill was aborted—and it was aborted, because it was not properly constituted. It was an extremely late night. Fancy considering a Bill such as this at 5.30 am after all the debate we had had. We have all been very professionally lobbied—I acknowledge that—by all sides of the argument, and we finish up like this. As a new chum in the Parliament, I wonder about some of the things we do here. I appreciate the words of the member for Coles when she talked about the duress of the Parliament that night, to try to pass the Bill. Half the members had left; some had even left the State; and there we were, passing this Bill.

I was personally most annoyed at the way in which the *Advertiser* reported the incident a couple of days after the event. I was reported as being one of the group that was absent, overseas, having abstained or resigned. I was paired with the Minister of Education, who was absent at a meeting on Yorke Peninsula. I was not absent and I had not resigned or abstained. It was a most ridiculous comment. I return to these amendments. They stand in the way of the Bill being passed, and I do not think a gaming machine dealers licence should be granted.

The Parliament was under extreme duress—nobody denies that. It is an abuse of Parliament, as the member for Coles said, and I support her in everything she said. The Bill was botched, absolutely botched, and we ought to put it aside and give ourselves breathing space. If we wish to look at it again, there ought to be a clear gap so that we can clear our conscience. These amendments were to be dealt with by way of a conscience vote, but what did we see? There was some heavy work being done until 5.30 in the morning. A job was being done on a member from another place to change his mind. The whole thing was totally ridiculous. I ask the Government to restore the conscience vote, becuse we should defeat this legislation.

The member for Adelaide, a colleague of mine whose comments I always appreciate, quoted the statistic that only one per cent of the people were affected, and 99 per cent were not and, therefore, we were legislating for 99 per cent of the people. However, if you deduct the 75 per cent who do not want this Bill from the 99 per cent, we are left with 24 per cent, so it is a Bill for the minority of the people, and the member for Adelaide proves my case. Some 95 per cent of the people of Custance have urged me not to support this Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr VENNING: In my whole time in this Parliament I have not had so much mail—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will refer to the amendments and not the Bill.

Mr VENNING: —asking me to try to do all in my power, as their representative in this Parliament to stop this Bill. I will not support these amendments. I feel that all South Australians are absolutely opposed to this measure. Gambling will not get this State out of its problems. I oppose the amendments.

Mr SUCH: I support the amendments. As members would know, I am not a pro-gambling person. My gambling is very modest and very infrequent, but I see no logic in opposing these amendments because, if anything, they will increase the control over poker machines rather than diminish it. Even someone opposed to poker machines should support these amendments, in my view, because that is the logical step to take.

I have tried to explain that to people in my electorate, despite what I believe has been a misleading campaign by some sections in the community, particularly the *Advertiser*, which has chosen not to highlight this matter in a comprehensive and fair manner. That is typified in the way it has portrayed the 'Yes vote' in the final stages of the Bill and created a false impression in the community. What we were doing was limiting the number of machines in the community, restricting the prize money that could be paid, and so on. I would hope that, following tonight, the *Advertiser* seeks to portray these amendments and the handling of them by this Parliament in a more accurate and fair manner. In the past I have had a great regard for that paper, but that regard has diminished in recent times because of what has been published. I trust that we will see a better approach with respect to the reporting of these amendments to the people of South Australia.

I have spent much time looking at the evidence and contacting experts in Australia who have made submissions and carried out research on this matter. I do not believe there is evidence to support the negative claims that are being made about poker machines. Also, I accept that the benefits are not as great as the proponents would have us believe. I have seen these machines in operation in New South Wales for more than 20 years, and in all honesty I must say that I have not seen evidence which would sustain those negative interpretations with regard to the impact of these machines.

I do not intend to take up the time of the Committee much longer. With respect to the way this matter has been handled by the Committee and the situation in which we find ourselves, undoutedly it was a matter conducted in haste. I would have preferred to solicit the views of my electorate comprehensively prior to the major vote, but that was not possible, partly because of

the time factor and partly because of the cost. This legislation passed through the Parliament with considerable haste. With respect to duress, I must say that, in all honesty, history should be left to judge that.

I happen to have a view that is different from that of some members of this Committee in regard to the process by which that decision was made on that night back in May. Certainly, there was anger at the delay, but I believe that some of the interpretations in respect of duress need to be looked at more carefully. I leave that to historians rather than making a judgment at this stage.

I believe that Parliament must seek to represent the views of the people. However, collectively we must also assess issues on their merit and not simply be guided by what is represented as public opinion in one newspaper. I am quite prepared to pay the price and to stick with principle rather than seek popularity. On the basis of a total assessment of these amendments and the Bill itself, I cannot in all honesty object to these amendments and I intend to support them.

I emphasise once again that I am not pro-gambling. I believe that our society would be better off without gambling and certainly with much less gambling. However, I believe that we must be consistent and that these amendments are part of that process to treat the various forms of gambling in a consistent and logical way. I do not believe that there are good forms of gambling and bad forms of gambling; to me they are all the same in principle. I believe that the amendments introduce an element of control and therefore it is logical and consistent to support them, even though some members may have originally opposed the Bill.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

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

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

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (COMMERCIAL LICENCES) BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Transport): 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

With the support of successive governments—Labor and Liberal—the Commercial Tribunal has been established as the single occupational licensing body controlling most trades in this State. The Commercial Tribunal Act established the Tribunal in 1981 and a number of Acts were passed throughout the 1980s to give the Tribunal power to license and discipline a variety of trades.

Wherever possible a uniform scheme of licensing was adopted for each occupation or trade as jurisdiction was transferred to the Tribunal. Thus, for example, applications for licences or registration are made in the same manner and objections to the grant of a licence lodged and heard in the same way. Disciplinary proceedings are instituted in a similar manner for all occupations although the grounds may vary, for example, as between a corporate credit provider and a licensed crowd controller.

This Bill amends a number of Acts which confer jurisdiction on the Tribunal to nake uniform changes to the uniform scheme adopted for each occupation. The changes are related to the suspension of licensees. It is proposed that the requirement to advertise uspensions for non-payment of annual fees be removed and replaced with a requirement that the Commercial Registrar advertise disciplinary action taken against licensees which affects the status of their licences. The opportunity has also been taken to clarify the effect of suspension—to make clear that a suspended licensee as well s one whose licence has been cancelled may not legally trade.

Under these proposals, licensees who fail to pay their fees will continue to be suspended and must continue to be notified of their suspension—so that they can make good their defaults—in the normal way. However, the Commercial Registrar will no longer be required to advertise these routine suspensions. In place of the requirement to advertise suspensions for non-payment of fees there will be a requirement that the Registrar advertise disciplinary action taken against a person where such action consists of or includes disqualification or suspension or cancellation of the person┬s licence.

These changes will remove the unfair situation whereby persons who fail to make automatic annual payments are publicly advertised, but persons who are suspended or disqualified as a result of disciplinary action are not subjected to such public scrutiny. The experience of the Tribunal has been that very few advertised suspensions for non-payment result in redeeming payments by licensees. In fact, many licensees who wish to leave a particular trade simply allow their licences to lapse rather than notify the Tribunal that they have moved interstate or into a different field of work. It is obviously more appropriate that persons whose removal from an occupation is the result of their own misconduct be those whose names appear in the Public Notices.

The need to clarify the effect of suspension arose out of an opinion given to the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs by the Crown Solicitor. The Crown Solicitor concluded that the Commissioner could not prosecute a suspended car dealer for trading without a licence because the dealer was still the holder of a licence under the 'duration of licence' provisions of the *Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act*. Under those provisions a prosecution could only be instituted when the licence was cancelled at the conclusion of the six month period. These provisions also appear in the *Builders Licensing Act*, the *Commercial and Private Agents Act*, the Consumer Credit Act and the *Travel Agents Act*. The Crown Solicitor recommended that provisions identical to those found in the *Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act* replace the provisions in the other occupation licensing Acts.

I commend the Bill to members.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3, which is the interpretation clause, provides that a reference in this Bill to 'the principal Act' is a reference to the Act that is named in the heading to that part of the Act.

PART II of the Bill (Clauses 4-6) deals with amendments made to the *Builders Licensing Act 1986*.

Clause 4 of the Bill amends section 11 of the principal Act (dealing with licensing builders) by striking out subsection (1), (5) and (6) and substituting new subsections and by inserting a new subsection at the end of the section. The proposed subsection (1) provides that a licence remains in force (except for any period for which it is suspended) until—

- the licence is surrendered or cancelled; or
- the licensee dies or, in the case of a body corporate, is dissolved.

Proposed subsection (5) provides that the Registrar must cause notice of a suspension under proposed subsection (4) to be served personally or by post on the licensee.

Proposed subsection (6) provides that where a licensee fails to comply with a notice under proposed subsection (3) within six months after service of the notice, the licence is cancelled.

Proposed subsection (8) provides that, in this section, 'Licensee' includes a licensee whose licence has been suspended otherwise than by force of this section.

Clause 5 amends section 17 of the principal Act (dealing with registering building work supervisors) in a corresponding manner to that described in clause 4 in relation to section 11 of the principal Act. The proposed subsection to be inserted is subsection (8) which provides that, in section 17, a 'registered building work supervisor' includes a building work supervisor whose registration has been suspended otherwise than by force of section 17.

Clause 6 amends the principal Act by inserting section 21a after section 21, proposed section 21a provides that where disclipinary action taken against a person by the Tribunal consists of or includes the suspension or cancellation of the person's licence or registration or disqualification of the person, the Registrar must cause notice of the action taken—

- to be served personally or by post on that person; and
- to be advertised in a newspaper circulating throughout the State.

Part III of the Bill (clauses 7 and 8) deals with amendments to the Commercial and Private Agents Act 1986.

Clause 7 of the Bill amends section 13 of the principal Act (dealing with the licensing of commercial and private agents) in a corresponding manner to that described in the explanation of clause 4. The proposed subsection to be inserted is subsection (10) which provides that, in section 13, 'holder of a licence' includes a holder of a licence whose licence has been suspended otherwise than by force of section 13.

Clause 8 amends the principal Act by inserting section 18a after section 18. Proposed section 18a corresponds to the section proposed by clause 6 for the Builders Licensing Act 1986.

Part IV of the Bill provides for amendments to the Consumer Credit Act 1972.

Clause 9 amends section 30 of the principal Act (dealing with licensing of credit providers) in a corresponding manner to that described in the explanation of clause 4. The proposed subsection to be inserted is subsection (7) which provides that, in section 30, a 'holder of a licence' includes a holder of a licence whose licence has been suspended otherwise than by force of section 30.

Clause 10 amends the principal Act by inserting section 36b after section 36a. Proposed section 36b corresponds to the section proposed by clause 6 for the Builders Licensing Act 1986.

Clause 11 amends section 17 of the principal Act (dealing with the licensing of land agents) in a manner similar to that described in the explanation for clause 4, with the difference that section 17 (1) is left unaltered as it already corresponds with the proposed subsection in each of the other Acts which are the subject of this Bill. The proposed subsection to be inserted is subsection (8) which provides that, in section 17, a 'licensed land agent' includes a licensed agent whose licence has been suspended otherwise than by force of section 17.

Clause 12, 13, 14 and 15 amend respectively sections 27, 33, 58 and 80 of the principal Act in a manner corresponding to the changes proposed in clause 11.

In clause 12, the proposed subsection to be inserted in section 27 of the principal Act is subsection (8) which provides that, in section 27, a 'registered sales representative' includes a registered sales representative whose licence has been suspended otherwise than by force of this section.

In clause 13, the proposed subsection to be inserted in section 33 of the principal Act is subsection (8) which provides that, in section 33, a 'registered manager' includes a registered manager whose registration has been suspended otherwise than by force of this section.

In clause 14, the proposed subsection to be inserted in section 58 of the principal Act is subsection (8) which provides that, in section 58, a 'licensed land broker' includes a licensed land broker whose licence has been suspended otherwise than by force of this section.

In clause 15, the proposed subsection to be inserted in section 80 of the principal Act is subsection (8) which provides that, in section 80, a 'licensed land valuer' includes a licensed land valuer whose licence has been suspended otherwise than by force of this section.

Clause 16 amends the principal Act by inserting section 85c corresponds to the section proposed by clause 6 for the Builders Licensing Act 1986.

Part VI of the Bill (clauses 17 and 18) deals with amendments to the Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act 1983.

Clause 17 amends section 11 of the principal Act (dealing with licensing of dealers) in a corresponding manner to that described in the explanation for clause 4. The proposed subsection to be inserted is subsection (9) which provides that, in section 11, a 'licensee' includes a licensee whose licence has been suspended otherwise than by force of this section.

Clause 18 amends the principal Act by inserting section 16a after section 16. Proposed section 16a corresponds to the section proposed by clause 6 for the Builders Licensing Act 1986.

Part VI of the Bill (clauses 19 and 20) deals with amendments to the Travel Agents Act 1986.

Clause 19 amends section 9 of the principal Act (dealing with the licensing of travel agents) in a corresponding manner to that described in the explanation for clause 4. The proposed subsection to be inserted is subsection (8) which provides that, in section 9, a 'licensee' includes a licensee whose licence has been suspended otherwise than by force of this section.

Clause 20 amends the principal Act by inserting section 15a after section 15. Proposed section 15a corresponds to the section proposed by clause 6 for the Builders Licensing Act 1986.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

GAMING MACHINES BILL

Adjourned debate in Committee (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 403.)

Mr LEWIS: Can I help the member for Playford a little? On the so-called 7 May—it was a Friday morning earlier this year—appearing on page 4914 of *Hansard*, are the following words:

> In my view, this hastily constructed amendment—we can see how hastily it has been put together—ought to be treated with the contempt that it deserves by this Committee. To listen to the lecture that we got about hasty amendments and then to get the likes of this amendment put before us is a disgrace. It shows what is happening within the Opposition.

There are several flaws in that statement and all of them go to the nub of the amendments currently before the Committee. The first is that the member for Playford and other members on the Government benches—and even some on this side—sought to be contemptuous of other members of this place who urge caution about eight pages of amendments at that time of day immediately introduced without prior notice of what they might contain and with no attempt being made by the Minister to explain any one of them. There was no attempt whatever.

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: The member for Albert Park can bellow as much as he wishes. I know he is a good actor; he ought to have taken up a career in Hollywood. The fact is that these amendments that we are now addressing—and the time we take to do it—arise as a direct consequence of the incompetence of the Government and the undue haste in which the amendments were rushed through this place whilst we were two members short. There was no member for Kavel and there was no member for Alexandra, yet this is a matter on which a conscience vote was to be held so that the representatives of all the electors of South Australia would be able to have a say

on their behalf. Those two members were not here: no-one was here from those two electorates.

The member for Playford poured contempt on my attempt to make the legislation fairer and more workable; he poured contempt on my opinion, shared by many other members, that the legislation as amended should not be considered after two days of debate and no sleep. He said that my amendments were hastily put together, yet we now know—we would not be standing here were it not otherwise—that the Minister's amendments were more hastily put together and more poorly thought through with no attempt made to explain the consequences.

If the Minister had taken the trouble to understand them himself and had been decent enough to take the time to explain them to us, amendment by amendment, this flaw we are now attempting to address would have been discovered. But no. Typical of the arrogance exercised by men such as that, it was rammed through with no consideration of the consequences. Well, I believe that gentlemen like Mr Basheer and other people associated with him can be trusted more than can this Minister and other members who were prepared to allow the legislation to pass in the form in which it stands. Therefore, I find myself in the position of saying to the Government, 'No; You cooked it up this way, you made it crook, you wear it crook.'

Mr OSWALD: I can assure my good friend the member for Fisher that I am not opposing these amendments tonight to be popular. When I last spoke on this Bill I spoke as the representative of the Opposition for the non-government welfare sector and also as the spokesman for recreation and sport. The member for Heysen has spoken at length on the impact on the government and non-government—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

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

Mr OSWALD:—welfare sector and the member for Goyder has had quite a bit to say about the depth of feeling amongst those various religious and charitable organisations that will be affected if these amendments pass tonight. I would remind members of the impact in the sporting area. If these amendments are passed, we will create a situation where the gambling dollar will be shifted around further. Every time we bring in a new gambling measure there is another impact on other gambling outlets. I remind members of the impact it will have on the third largest employer in this State, that is, the racing industry. Not all members in this House are interested in the racing industry as such, but I hope that some of them would be interested in the employment prospects in the racing industry and also the flow-on effect into businesses and people's general livelihoods.

If we let these amendments go through tonight, the first thing we will see in the first year is at least $50 million wiped off TAB turnover at a time when racing is on its knees. Country racing in particular is in dire straits and the TAB is having trouble with its percentage of profits. The flow back to Government has to be considered in these matters.

It is important that we start to have a look at the impact not only on the charitable side, and on the Government collection of revenue side, but also on the other codes and other organisations. It will have an enormous impact, when this legislation finally passes. Honourable members should remember that and take it into consideration when they consider these two amendments here tonight. I am generally concerned that the racing industry is extremely worried about what will happen to it. The gambling dollar will shift and businesses will be affected, although I will not canvass that part of the debate at this stage, as that was covered well during the second reading debate.

When considering these two amendments tonight I ask honourable members to have some regard for the flow-on effect. The decision to place poker machines in hotels is one for the hoteliers to make, after considering whether they will be profitable or not, and whether they want to take part in it or not, although I guess they will all have to take part, even though in some cases it will not be profitable. I am surprised why some of the hotels even want to put in these machines. However, it is a personal decision and a business judgment for them to make. However, these machines will have an enormous impact on the racing industry, the third largest employer, and at a time when State moneys are desperately short and when costs cannot be contained. An amount of $50 million would equate to several million dollars lost in State money right across the board. I can assure members who are not racing oriented that it will have an enormous impact. I ask them to take into account the general interests of this very large and important industry in this State and to vote against the amendments.

Mr INGERSON: I respond firstly to the member for Playford's putting forward a very erroneous comment to the House earlier in the evening, when he said that there was a motion put in the Liberal Party room suggesting that this was no longer a conscience vote. I want to put on record the fact that, whilst there have been a number of members on this side who have had views different from those of their colleagues, the one thing I can say on behalf of the Liberal Party is that no attempt has been made by any member to lobby or to affect any interest that an individual might have—unlike the position that occurred in another place when a member was sat upon most deliberately and most obviously. I think it most important that that point be made. These two amendments clearly enable the correction of the error that was made in changing the position of the Independent Gaming Corporation having the ability not only to purchase machines but to monitor the machines. This correction was necessary because that was not the intention of the vote in the other place, and these two amendments obviously correct that.

Because of this administrative error, I have had many people write to me, as have probably all members, and many people have come to see me. Interestingly, these people have come from almost every electorate in this State. I suspect that that is probably because of a particular comment that was made firstly in the *Sunday Mail* and then later in the *Advertiser*. One of the very interesting discussions I had was with one of the senior leaders of the Uniting Church. He made an appointment to see me to discuss his concerns, not only about how he felt that I might vote but also on how he viewed the introduction of these gaming machines into the community. It was a very interesting, very long and well argued and discussed presentation. One of the things that

was clear at the end was that the reasons that I had for previously supporting poker machines had not changed. I have spent time talking to welfare agencies in the break since this unfortunate administrative incident occurred. It has been very handy that we have been able to look again at our conscience and at the position we have taken in this matter.

One of the very interesting things is that the lobbying by those who oppose this legislation has been not only strong but in many instances misguided, and there have been many occasions on which facts have deliberately been distorted or put forward in such a way that they purely and simply promoted an argument. That is a pity, because there is no doubt that there are significant concerns in the welfare area for some people. As Professor Street said, some 99 per cent of the community are capable of handling poker machines.

One of my other concerns in this whole issue is what I think has been the most unbelievable backflip by a newspaper in this town. I find it incredible that the *Advertiser* should take on individuals who honestly have looked at this issue from a conscience viewpoint; it took on individuals from two positions 180 degrees opposite to each other. I am advised that two different people wrote the editorial. That is something that should go back to those in charge of a newspaper. I do not think one can hold a strong view in one part of the year and then decide, for other reasons, to do a 180 degree backflip and not only to expect the community to accept that change but also to go out and pillory anyone who happens to disagree with that view, particularly when it is a conscience issue.

I understand clearly the view of all my colleagues who are opposed to this legislation. I respect their views and I respect the position of many people in the community who have a view opposed to mine. My view on any of the issues that I considered before voting has not changed in the time that has elapsed since the Bill was before the House previously. I intend to support the amendments.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Like all other members of this place, I have received numerous representations by way of telephone, letter and conversation in the street. As is well known to all members of this place, I supported the second and third readings of the Bill. In reply to written representation, I refered to clause 24 of the Bill and stated in part:

> Personally I have no desire to play video gaming machines or participate in any other form of gambling and I originally opposed the introduction of a casino into South Australia. However, there is a fundamental principle that should not be overlooked and that is that a casino does exist and gaming machines are part of it. As a legislator I do not believe I have the right to deny country people their freedom of choice simply because I do not like it or I do not think it is good for them.

I said that because gaming machines as part and parcel of the Casino, are already available to residents of metropolitan Adelaide. I further stated:

> It also needs to be realised that the Gaming Machines Bill has already been passed and that a 'No' vote on the forthcoming technical amendments may actually reduce control over the machines and hence increase the possibility of undesirable behaviour and corruption.

As I understand the situation, clause 24 and amendments Nos 25 and 26 in the schedule relate precisely to the comment that I made in my letter.

As I said, I personally have no interest in gambling, and I never have. Perhaps I am unlucky in that area, and that might be part of it. I have never believed that, if a person gains great pleasure from being able to participate in one form of gambling or another, it is my place to deny them that right. Personally, I prefer to get enjoyment in other ways, and if I have a spare $10 or $50 I would spend it on my sailboat rather than go to the Casino or put it through a poker machine. That is a matter of personal choice.

Figures have been quoted in this Committee before. An article in the *Murray Pioneer* 'View Point' in relation to the social impact of these machines gives statistical data showing that, per head of population, South Australia has a 33 per cent higher divorce rate (and that source is the Institute of Family Studies) and a 78.6 per cent higher incidence of breaking, entering and stealing (and that comes from the Institute of Criminology) than has New South Wales, and a 50 per cent higher bankruptcy rate than the national average.

Much has been said by members who are opposing the amendment to clause 24, saying that it will have a massive impact on things such as divorce and criminal activity. If that is the case, why is not New South Wales much higher in the areas to which I referred. It is an interesting statistic and one that I think should be taken into account. I believe that it was necessary for me to indicate to the Committee the response that I made to constituents in my electorate.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: This legislation is a technical procedure and is not, I believe, a basis for a wide-ranging dissertation with respect to poker machines. I remain committed to vote against poker machines or gaming machines *per se*, and that is the message I get clearly from my electorate. A number of the people who initially thought that they might like them in hotels or clubs have subsequently told me that they have changed their mind, and that also will prevail when I later come to vote on a substantive motion of a different type. I believe that this measure should go forward without further delay, and I indicate that I will vote in that direction. I will most vehemently oppose any future legislation with regard to gaming machines and poker machines.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I oppose these amendments. In doing so I highlight the fact that I was not in this place when the original Bill was debated and, therefore, I have not had the opportunity at any stage to express my view on poker machines. I realise that I need to concentrate on the amendments as such, but in doing so I think it is appropriate that I should express my view in relation to those amendments.

It concerned me greatly, as an ordinary citizen at that stage, to hear of the manner in which the Bill had been passed through the Parliament. It was most undesirable for a major piece of legislation to be forced through with an all-night sitting, with pressure being applied to members in another place, and to end up with such a result. It reflects poorly upon this Parliament and the democratic process. I think that the end result reflected the circumstances in which it occurred.

On social issues such as this I believe that the community ought to express its view very strongly to members of Parliament, and I am delighted to see the response that has occurred in the past three months: it has

been an overwhelming response against the introduction of poker machines into South Australia. I believe that members of Parliament have an obligation to listen to their constituents and make sure they reflect those views, particularly where the social issue is so strongly expressed, as it has been in this instance. I estimate that for every 100 letters I have received against poker machines, I have received one for poker machines. One hundred to one is pretty good and, if I were a bettor, I would love to have odds like that, but I am not a bettor. That very strong community reaction against poker machines further endorses my view that they should not be introduced into this State.

I acknowledge that there is an argument put by some as to why they would like to see poker machines introduced into the hotel industry. I have met representatives of that industry and listened to their argument, and I respect the fact that they have an argument to put forward. I also respect the fact that the hotel industry is suffering greatly at present. It has been knocked and hammered with successive taxes, particularly by this Government. Only in the past 24 hours we have had a debate on a further tax imposed upon the hotel industry which will damage that industry and make it even harder for it to survive. I realise that the industry has gone through a period where, due to financial difficulties, a large number of hotels have had to be sold because they could not pay their licensing fees. I acknowledge that a legitimate argument has been put forward by those people, but the overriding factor is that we must consider the social impact that poker machines will have on the community and the views of the community itself.

Having covered the views of the community, I should like to deal briefly with the reason why I have always maintained a very strong personal opposition to the introduction of poker machines. Even before you came into this place, Mr Chairman, in the 1970s I expressed the view very early in the piece that I would never vote for the introduction of poker machines into South Australia. I did not want to see them here. I spent six years in New South Wales in a regional centre—Armidale—and I saw the impact that poker machines had on that community. There is no doubt that they have a major impact on the social fabric of such a community. All social life tends to revolve around the two or three clubs which have poker machines because those poker machines attract the money and allow those few clubs to provide the facilities which other places in the community cannot provide.

I saw at first hand among some of my own friends those who just could not control themselves in the use of poker machines, and it was not an uncommon practice for people who, having received a fortnightly pay, would pay their debts among other students or among various creditors around the place and then head off immediately to the club on a Friday, Saturday or Sunday night and put the rest of their fortnightly earnings through the poker machines. Then, for the rest of the fortnight, it was back to the credit system with their friends. That is unfortunate.

Also at first hand, I saw families distressed by the fact that, invariably, the mother or father, or, in some cases both, were down at one of these clubs playing the poker machines; the kids were at home, often hungry and often looking for money to buy fish and chips; and the parents just were not there to look after them. I should hate to see that sort of social problem inflicted upon South Australia. In fact, the view in New South Wales was 'If only we could turn back the clock to the years when we didn't have poker machines.' They realised that it had gone well past that point. I argue that South Australia should not even enter that era where we have poker machines.

Finally, South Australia is going through the worst economic depression for 60 years, and there can be no argument that the introduction of poker machines will severely retard South Australia's recovery from that recession. It would be unfortunate for those who are unemployed. It is fine for those who have jobs, for those who, in some cases, have two incomes per family, but the area we should be most concerned about is those people who do not have a job and who will find it extremely difficult to get a start in life because they do not have job prospects and because of the grim long-term reality of unemployment.

When we look at the national figures and realise that there were 200 000 long-term unemployed in August last year and the projection is for 500 000 by 1995, it highlights the magnitude of the problem and the extent to which that problem is still increasing rather than decreasing. For these reasons, I will vote against these amendments.

Mr S.G. EVANS: Mr Chairman, I hope that you will give me a fraction of latitude in talking to the amendments as I give a run-up to the position in which I find myself. Unfortunately, some members of Parliament, when writing to constituents, have told them that it is my Bill before the Parliament. That is inaccurate.

The intention of the two amendments is to split the control and the sale of the machines. Personally, I believe that, even though the amendments may not have been typed exactly as Parliament intended, the legislation could have operated, but it would not have operated in a satisfactory manner. The end result is that the responsibility lies with Parliament. I moved a motion to stop the machines going into the Casino. I told Parliament in 1983 that, if ever the Government broke its promise and allowed poker machines in the Casino, I believed that they should be in clubs and hotels.

When this Parliament rejected the motion to stop the machines going into the Casino, I was placed in conflict, because I oppose poker machines but had given a guarantee that I was not prepared for a monopoly to have the absolute right to gambling within this city or State. One honourable member tonight said that he wanted to stop poker machines coming to South Australia. It does not matter what he does under this motion—they are here.

I referred once before to a church organisation and an associate of the church having an interest in the Casino. The head of the church wrote a letter to my Leader, which letter the Leader distributed to his colleagues, quite rightly, pointing out that the organisation had ended up with a third share in the Casino, but that had nothing to do with the family to which I referred earlier in the debate. So, I apologise in that regard. However, it does not alter the fact that I find it difficult on moral grounds

that an organisation which is, in a way, an affiliate of a church should have a third share in the operations of the Casino. Even though it might not have derived any money from such an interest since 1988 (and most people lost money) if they have a choice, they can sell the shares. If there is a moral argument, it does not matter what they get for them.

When Mr Rex Jory, who wrote in the *Advertiser* (and he has been reporting in Parliament for about 20 years) that it was my Bill, he should have known better. It was not my Bill; I moved the two motions, the second of which was that the clubs and hotels should be entitled to the same machines as would be installed in the Casino. Subsequently an amendment moved by another member provided that that should be the full range of poker machines. That amendment was accepted and passed by the Parliament with a big majority, and to blame me for that (whether it be any of my colleagues from either side of the House writing to constituents, Mr Jory or anybody else) I believe is grossly improper. If I had my way, I would vote the machines out of the Casino now and ban them from the State, but I do not have that right. I have the right to try to do it but I do not have the right as an individual.

What hurts me, when talking about who has machines, who controls them and who sells them in the State, is the massive response I received after the *Advertiser* changed tack. After it had written an editorial 18 months ago and told the Premier he was weak-kneed because he would not accept poker machines and that he should change his attitude and bring them in, and after the Premier did that and Parliament agreed with the *Advertiser*, it changed its mind and attacked the Government and those individuals who voted for the introduction of machines.

The CHAIRMAN: We will have to come back to the machines.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I will, Sir. We are talking about who controls and sells them. I was not in the House during the third reading. I may have come to an arrangement with a colleague, and by that vote at that time Parliament agreed who should control and who should sell the machines. These amendments are attempting to put it back to that position, which is what the Parliament intended. The response to me was 54 letters with some telephone calls, most of which told me I should oppose poker machines in this State; I do.

If I can draw a comparison on another issue in my electorate, I have over 5 500 signatures from those people who support me in trying to save Craigburn. When I tried to move those amendments that had publicity in the paper to try to stop the machines going into the Casino and, indeed, when we tried to stop the Casino coming into the State, where were all those organisations and people then?

Then they attacked us later when it was too late to turn the tide. So, where do I stand at this stage? I am the Whip. I know the numbers. I have known the numbers in every vote that has gone before the House. I will please those people tonight who say that I should vote against the amendments, but it will make no difference. However, I hope every member knows that I have fought from the beginning to stop the confounded things and to stop the Casino.

Big business and those with influence have won the argument, and every member of Parliament has known that eventually poker machines would come to the Casino in this State. Those who should have been backing us at this time hid back in their shells and did nothing. They have placed us in that position. To be quite frank, that hurts and disappoints me and shows that people rise up only when one newspaper pushes an argument to win it. It is the only one in the State and has the control of the issues. It draws people out of the closets to bring out an attack.

That is where I stand, and that is where I will go, but I know deep in my heart that other people have let me down. They were out in the community when the crunch came. They also let down many others who fought to stop the Casino operating and to stop the introduction of poker machines. Because the Casino got the licence, many hotels and clubs suffered and are still suffering because people would not rise up when they had the opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the member for Bright. I advise members that those speaking a second time will need strictly to adhere to the terms of the amendments before the Chair.

Mr MATTHEW: Thank you, Mr Chairman; your advice is appreciated. This debate is about clause 24, as members are well aware. The importance of this clause is that it specifically grants the licence for gaming machine monitoring to the Independent Gaming Corporation, and it is particularly to the corporation's monitoring role that I wish to turn my attention. In so doing, it is important that all members are aware of the nature of the machines to be monitored. We will not be looking at the monitoring of machines that were introduced in New South Wales in 1956—an analogue, one-armed bandit machine that had mechanical parts, because since 1956 we have seen a change in many types of technology.

As you, Mr Chairman, and others are well aware, we have seen the introduction of black and white television move through to colour television and, ultimately, to remote control, now with stereo. Similarly, the advancement in the development of technology for the poker machine has also occurred at a rapid rate. Instead of one-armed bandits, the machines that would be monitored by the Independent Gaming Corporation are sophisticated pieces of computer hardware, monitored by central mainframe computers and, in effect, each of the machines to be monitored is, in very simplistic terms, a computer terminal. So, we are talking about a very sophisticated computer-controlled and monitored machine, and it is that monitoring process that this Parliament, through these amendments, would be placing in the hands, not of a Government body but of the Independent Gaming Corporation, which is formed outside Government. Admittedly, there will be some monitoring by Government; nonetheless, it is still a body that is formed outside Government.

This body would monitor things such as the opening and closing of any part of the machine. It would also monitor financial transactions—money going into the machine and money being paid out of it. With any level of computer sophistication, there is also the opportunity for a greater sophistication of computer criminal. I stress again that we are talking not about the old analogue

machines, where the level of crime was jemmying open the door and taking out the change, but rather about the introduction of this sort of technology, which provides the opportunity for the white-collar criminal. It is for that reason that this amendment before us becomes so important.

The whole way in which the opening and closing of doors is monitored and the impartiality with which that is done, the rigidity and the security of the software programs that control it are all of paramount importance. The way in which this operation could be done and the controls that could be put in place are of paramount concern. I offer as evidence an extract from just one of the documents in my possession. The document I refer to is a letter from the New South Wales Minister for Police and Emergency Services dated March 1991. In part, the letter reads:

> The need to properly secure logic boards to avoid tampering and tax evasion by disconnecting the meters is certainly recognised by the police and the Liquor Administration Board.

The letter goes on:

> As you are aware, police do not possess the technical expertise to detect the conversion and tampering of approved amusement devices.

That in itself is a startling admission by the New South Wales police via their Minister and a direct analogy can be made with our State. If there is any interference and if, indeed, the Independent Gaming Corporation is subjected to infiltration by organised white collar criminals, our own Police Force will not at this stage—with all due respect to them and I say that as shadow Minister—be equipped to monitor that type of crime.

As you Sir, would be well aware, as someone who is interested in things related to the computing industry, crime in the computer industry within the United States and other countries such as Germany has reached far higher and more sophisticated levels than it has in Australia to date. We have seen some horrifying examples of computer infiltration in recent years. I offer by way of example a recent article that appeared in the *Industry News* entitled 'Hackers enter NASA'. In part, the document states:

> Frankfurt, West Germany. September 16—West German youths using home computers obtained secrets about the US space program by breaking into a US space agency computer information network, the news report said...The youths gained regular access to at least 20 NASA computers between May and September through a flaw in the network's security system...The hackers—computer enthusiasts who often try to break into private computer systems for the challenge or for criminal gain—obtained NASA information on space shuttle projects, computer security studies and rocket boosters.

I put to this Committee that if it is indeed possible for hackers in Frankfurt West Germany to obtain access to NASA computers and obtain information about sophisticated projects such as space shuttle project and the rocket booster project upon which world-wide attention is focused, and members of this Parliament believe that people will not attempt to break into computer systems that would be controlled by the Independent Gaming Corporation, which will monitor poker machines in this State, then they are deceiving themselves and no-one else.

It is appropriate while talking about the nature of the machines to refer to evidence that was tendered to a committee of this Parliament. I refer to the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, which was investigating the Casino Act regulations. The evidence to which I refer was given by Mr Pryor, the Liquor Licensing Commissioner. It is interesting to note that as part of the evidence to that Committee he stated:

> Machines these days are no longer barrel machines where you just crank a handle and a barrel goes round; they all work off a computer chip. For every machine there is a chip called an EPROM, measuring about 1.5 x .5 inches. The software that would be generated from that one EPROM would probably comprise a computer printout about 1.5 inches thick. That would require engineering/computer people to go through and analyse each line of the software to ensure that there are no hidden systems that if a person plays a particular sequence of numbers it will bring out a jackpot, so we must check every line of the software to ensure its integrity.

I repeat: those were the statements made to that committee of Parliament by the Liquor Licensing Commissioner. We must be sure in assessing these amendments now before the Committee that we are providing through the Independent Gaming Corporation a body in which this Parliament will have absolute confidence—confidence beyond any doubt—that it will have the ability and that there will be legislative and regulatory processes in place to ensure that not only is every line of code associated with each EPROM chip in each gaming machine checked rigorously but that that rigorous checking is done by, to use the Liquor Licensing Commissioner's words, 'engineering/computer people,' experts in their field.

I am concerned that that expertise will not be available, that the processes are not in place to ensure the integrity of these machines and, therefore, I contend that if this Parliament allows these amendments to go through we will be unleashing in our community an opportunity for infiltration by organised crime where the expertise is not in place through a Government controlled body to make sure it does not go unchecked. For that reason, if for no other, separating all the rightful arguments put forward tonight against poker machines, I urge members to vote against these amendments because, if they pass, they will put unprecedented control into the hands of the Independent Gaming Corporation, an all powerful body that will be monitoring money going through poker machines.

It will be collecting a fee for monitoring that money. It is a corporation that could be set up as an all powerful funded body to, dare I suggest, channel money to political Parties for their own gain. I hope strongly that the ALP does not have an ulterior motive in looking at the opportunities that the Independent Gaming Corporation may provide in the form of electoral finance to fund the next or other elections. I do not want to deviate from the main point: we do not have guarantees that the expertise will be in place to monitor the EPROM chip and, therefore, I cannot in any conscience support these amendments.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (26)—P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, J.C. Bannon, F.T. Blevins (teller), G.J. Crafter, M.R. De Laine, B.C. Eastick, D.M. Ferguson, R.J. Gregory, T.R. Groom, K.C. Hamilton, T.H. Hemmings, V.S. Heron, P. Holloway, D.J. Hopgood, C.F. Hutchison, G.A. Ingerson, J.H.C. Klunder, S.M. Lenehan, C.D.T. McKee, M.K. Mayes,

N.T. Peterson, J.A. Quirke, M.D. Rann, R.B. Such, J.P. Trainer.

Noes (18)—H. Allison, M.H. Armitage, L.M.F. Arnold, S.J. Baker (teller), H. Becker, P.D. Blacker, D.C. Brown, J.L. Cashmore, S.G. Evans, G.M. Gunn, D.C. Kotz, I.P. Lewis, W.A. Matthew, E.J. Meier, J.W. Olsen, J.K.G. Oswald, I.H. Venning, D.C. Wotton.

Majority of 8 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has now agreed to all amendments proposed by the Legislative Council. The Bills agreed to by both Houses are identical.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.52 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 27 August at 10.30 a.m.