

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY****Tuesday 19 March 1996**

The **SPEAKER (Hon. G.M. Gunn)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

**ASSENT TO BILLS**

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated her assent to the following Bills:

Local Government Finance Authority (Review) Amendment,

Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation (SGIC) Amendment.

**AMBULANCE SERVICE**

A petition from one resident of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to investigate if the call-out charges of the South Australian Ambulance Service are in breach of the Fair Trading Act was presented by the Hon. Frank Blevins.

Petition received.

A petition from one resident of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to remove the ambulance charges for Health Care cardholders was presented by Mr Brindal.

Petition received.

A petition from one resident of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to investigate and recover any monies wrongfully paid by the South Australian Ambulance Service to its former manager was presented by Mr Brindal.

Petition received.

**TEACHERS SALARIES**

A petition from one resident of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to investigate if an agreement existed between the former Government and the South Australian Institute of Teachers to breach the teachers salaries award was presented by Mr Brindal.

Petition received.

**MUSIC BRANCH POSITIONS**

A petition from 123 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to restore the instrumental music branch positions in Lameroo and Pinnaroo Area Schools was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

**PAPERS TABLED**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

Judges of the Supreme Court—Report, 1995.

Summary Offences Act—Regulations—Recording of Interview Fees.

Magistrates Court Act—Rules—Building Works Contractors.

South Australian State Electoral Office—Statistical Returns for General Election 11 December 1993 and By-elections.

By the Treasurer (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

IOOF Friendly Society (SA)—Rules—General.

By the Minister for Industrial Affairs (Hon. G.A. Ingerson)—

Regulations under the following Acts—

WorkCover Corporation—Statutory Reserve and Insurance Assistance Funds.

Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation—Claims and Registration.

By the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development (Hon. J.W. Olsen)—

Regulations under the following Acts—

Harbors and Navigation—Restricted Areas—Thistle Island.

Passenger Transport Prescribed Licences—Fares.

Passenger Transport Conduct of Passengers—Disability Provisions.

Road Traffic—Clearways and Bus Lanes.

By the Minister for Health (Hon. M.H. Armitage)—

Regulations under the following Acts—

Food—Amendment to Code.

Occupational Therapists—Fees.

South Australian Health Commission—Fees for Medicare Patients.

By the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources (Hon. D.C. Wotton)—

Outback Areas Community Development Trust—Report, 1994-95.

By the Minister for Family and Community Services (Hon. D.C. Wotton)—

Family and Community Services Act—Regulations Principal.

By the Minister for Primary Industries (Hon. R.G. Kerin)—

Meat Hygiene Act—Regulations—Marking of Meat.

By the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations (Hon. E.S. Ashenden)—

City of Henley and Grange 'Heritage Plan Amendment Report'—Report, March 1996.

Regulations under the following Acts—

Development—Variations.

South Australian Co-operative and Community Housing—

Electoral Procedures.

General Amendments.

Housing Associations.

Corporation By-laws—

Brighton—No. 2—Foreshore.

Murray Bridge—

No. 4—Moveable Signs.

No. 5—Garbage Disposal.

District Council By-laws—

Elliston—No. 4—Moveable Signs.

Willunga—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties.

No. 2—Streets and Public Places.

No. 3—Street Traders.

No. 4—Moveable Signs.

No. 5—Waste Management.

No. 6—Height—Fences, Hedges etc.

No. 7—Parklands.

No. 8—Caravans, Tents and Camping.

No. 9—Animals, Birds and Poultry.

No. 10—Bees.

No. 11—Nuisances.

No. 12—Dogs.

No. 13—Foreshore.

No. 14—Vehicles Kept or Let for Hire.

No. 15—STED Schemes.

No. 16—Driving Cattle/Horses through Streets.

No. 17—Dug-outs, Caves, etc.

## KOALAS

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I would like to take this opportunity to clarify the Government's position over Kangaroo Island's koala population. As Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, I do not support the option of culling koalas on Kangaroo Island and no formal recommendation has come before me seeking my endorsement for such a cull. Any decision taken will not only need to address the enormous public interest but must also address the issues of conservation of the species, animal welfare implications, the need to protect Kangaroo Island's unique environment, as well as preserving Kangaroo Island's international reputation in ecotourism. Subsequently, I have taken two key steps to address the issue.

Yesterday, I launched an immediate investigation into the relocation of Kangaroo Island's koalas to the mainland. It is a move that is already paying dividends with informal offers from sanctuaries both here and interstate wanting to take koalas. Further, the management of Kangaroo Island Fast Ferries has offered to transport the animals free of charge to the mainland to help in the relocation. The company has also offered free transportation for people involved in the project. I have also received offers of support from specialists both here and interstate wanting to help in any translocation effort. Additionally, I am holding talks with environmental ministers in other States seeking their interest and assistance in these attempts.

Already, offers of support have come from the New South Wales Environment Minister, and talks have begun between the National Parks and Wildlife Service here and in New South Wales over the possibility of relocating koalas to New South Wales. I am delighted at this wave of community assistance that I believe can be the start of a major conservation rescue program to bring koala numbers on the island to a sustainable level, helping to prevent further destruction of native vegetation and starvation of the species.

As a second step, I have established a task force of departmental, conservation, scientific and local government interests to investigate the Kangaroo Island situation. The task force will be charged with exploring all options in this debate, including translocation, protection of gums and possible fertility control. The problem facing Kangaroo Island and its koalas is critical. Koalas were introduced to the island in the 1920s and have thrived. The koalas are free of disease that reduces their fertility and, unlike those on the mainland, they are largely untroubled by bushfires, dogs, foxes and road accidents. However, in many areas on the island, including Cygnet River, the browsing of koalas is killing trees, endangering the native manna gums and causing severe river bank erosion.

While recognising that this is a population management issue, it raises the need to provide sustainable long-term habitats for koalas. With this in mind, we are investigating opportunities for community plantings of suitable species of eucalypts to assist the future of the koala over the longer term. In closing, I find interesting and somewhat hypocritical some of the lines being run by the Opposition on this issue. The House will be interested to learn that the matter of over-population of Kangaroo Island koalas was raised well and truly during the life of the previous Labor Government. It is

this Government that is investigating all alternatives to preserve not only Kangaroo Island's unique environment but the future of the species as well.

Further, mischievous comments by the Leader of the Opposition suggest that this Government is moving to harvest native species in our national parks. On several occasions I have made it blatantly clear that this is not the case. Consequently, further amendments will be moved to clear up this matter once and for all, to ensure that the Opposition cannot twist or distort the intent of the legislation.

## QUESTION TIME

**The SPEAKER:** Before calling the Leader of the Opposition, I point out that there has been a tendency with members to take points of order not only in Question Time but during grievance debates. It is the view of the Chair that many of these points of order are frivolous and designed purely to interrupt the person on his or her feet. Any member who in the view of the Chair carries on in this manner will be taken off the question list or any other speaking list for the remainder of the day.

## QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Premier intervene as a matter of urgency in the funding crisis at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to reverse major cuts to services at that hospital? The Opposition has a copy of a memorandum dated 14 March, headed 'Critical budget position at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital', from the Chief Executive Officer of the North-western Adelaide Health Service. This memo says that the hospital still faces an overrun of \$4 million after having its budget cut by \$13 million. The memo states that, while activity at the hospital has already been cut by 6 per cent and staff have been cut by 250 since last June, the following cuts are to be enforced immediately as severe emergency measures:

1. The cessation of elective surgery in May-June.
2. Extended Easter closure of wards to the end of April.
3. The suspension of minor works and maintenance.
4. The continuation of an absolute staff freeze.
5. Advanced program of TSPs and hotel services administration.
6. The cessation of temporary contract staff from now.

Will the Minister intervene?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** The Leader of the Opposition raises a number of matters about the Queen Elizabeth Hospital which, quite frankly, I would have thought he would rather not raise or would have been wise not to raise. One in particular which he says we are attempting to fix up and which the Chief Executive Officer of the hospital has quite appropriately identified is minor works and maintenance—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I said it was quite appropriately identified. It is a fact that this Government has done a lot for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, which the previous Government refused to address. Let me remind members of the House that, about 12 months prior to the last election, when I was the shadow Minister I highlighted that, under the previous Government, whom one might have expected would have been looking after people in electorates—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Elizabeth.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:**—which in those days were held by members of the Labor Party, the state of the walls of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital were so poor that bird droppings on the outside of the wall were being infected by maggots and the maggots were crawling through the holes in the walls and then dropping down through the ceiling onto the patients. That is the basis from which the hypocritical king of this Parliament asks us questions about what we are doing. What we are doing is addressing those issues. I would ask that, given that the Opposition is clearly so intent on fixing some of these problems, it immediately support our plans to re-engineer completely the health care in the western suburbs by the provision of \$130 million of new infrastructure so that those sorts of problems can be fixed. I would ask that, when this Government replaces cardiology equipment which is 10 or 15 years old—not in the life of this Government, but far past its use-by date—we get credit for it from the Opposition.

The bottom line is that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital was simply ignored; it was run down and ignored. The Audit Commission, which indicated the devastating state of the finances left to us by the previous Government, suggested that we should make the Queen Elizabeth Hospital a community hospital, remove a lot of its infrastructure and not make it a teaching hospital. What did we do? We rejected that; we said 'No, the people of the western suburbs deserve better.' Everything we have done since then has been designed to make good the scandalous neglect of 10 years by the previous Government.

### FEDERAL ELECTION

**Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurana):** My question is directed to the Premier. Does the State Government intend to review any of its policy directions following the Federal election result?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The Federal election result was very interesting indeed; in fact, the entire Federal election campaign was very interesting, because it was the Labor Party that tried to turn the Federal election into a referendum on State Government issues. What was the outcome of that election campaign? The Liberal Party won. It took 10 of the 12 seats in South Australia and, on a two Party preferred vote basis, it received 57.5 per cent of the vote in this State—the highest vote ever obtained by any Party in South Australia at a Federal election. Quite clearly, the attempts by the Labor Party to run a campaign against me, against the Brown Government and against a couple of our key issues, such as the contracting out of water processing and data processing, failed.

I refer to some of the letters sent out during the Federal election campaign. There was a letter from Peter Duncan, the former member for Makin.

**The Hon. S.J. Baker:** They tell me he is coming in to take over the number one spot.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I saw him walking around the corridors earlier. He came in and asked, 'Do you know where Mike Rann's office is?' The letter from Peter Duncan states:

Say "non" to Dean Brown and the French!

It goes on to talk about how the Brown Government is about to sell our water supply to the highest bidder and get a fast buck. What happened to Peter Duncan? He went down the

drain. Then there was a letter by the former member for Kingston, Gordon Bilney, who ran a major campaign in the seat of Kingston by saying that the Brown Liberal Government in South Australia had cut funds here, had cut funds there and was closing hospitals. What happened to Gordon Bilney? He was a casualty of Labor's lies.

There was an open letter sent out by the Labor Party in the seat of Grey. It talked about how the Brown Government, and Dean Brown in particular, was selling off everything it possibly could, 'our water, our hospitals, our buses, without even caring to ask us. What's even worse, our vital State services which used to return money to people of South Australia are being sold to foreign companies.' What happened in the seat of Grey? We had a 6 per cent swing to the Liberal Party.

Then there was the material put out by Senator Rosemary Crowley, a former Labor Minister, who today has failed to make even the shadow ministry. She was urging people to vote for the Labor Party and, in particular, to say 'No' to what Dean Brown has done in South Australia. The people of South Australia passed judgment on the Labor Party and its attempts to turn State issues into a referendum at the last Federal poll. They rejected Labor. They gave the biggest vote ever to the Liberal Party in South Australia: they gave it 10 of the 12 seats. Members know what should happen to this material: it should be torn up like the Labor Party and tossed in the bin.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If the Minister for Tourism and the Deputy Leader continue in this vein, they will continue discussion outside.

### FOSTER CHILDREN

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** My question is directed to the Minister for Family and Community Services. Has the Government adopted a new policy of returning foster children to institutionalised care instead of care by foster parents, and why did the Minister fail to consult the community before giving FACS approval to support the establishment of a village for 40 foster children at Seaford Rise? Last night a public meeting attended by 100 people at Seaford Rise expressed outrage at the establishment of a foster children's village without community consultation and moved for a full inquiry into the sale of the land and planning approval by the council. The meeting was told that SOS Children's Villages had the full support of the Department for Family and Community Services and the Government and that FACS had helped it to become incorporated in South Australia.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** The member for Elizabeth put out a release last Friday, I think, trying to drum up support for what she is putting out on this issue. First of all, SOS Kinderdorf is a private organisation. It is not a Government organisation: it is nothing to do with this Government.

When SOS Kinderdorf first came to see me—and about 12 months ago it first made representations to me—it made me aware of its activities in other countries around the world. I do not know the exact figures, but I believe that in some 112 countries around the world this organisation is involved in caring for children who are in need of care and under the care of the Minister. I recognised that what SOS Kinderdorf was providing could be a very worthwhile option for South Australia. I say that because that is exactly what is: it is only one option relating to child-care in this State, only one option that is available for children who otherwise might be placed

in foster care. Often there are situations where two or three children from one family might need care, might need to be fostered out and, in the past, it has always been difficult to keep those children together as one family.

I have said in this House on numerous occasions that my first priority as Minister for Family and Community Services is to keep families together, and keeping the children of families together is a very high priority. SOS Children's Villages is an option that will help us to provide that. It is an international charity organisation which has established children's villages around the world in order to provide alternative care for children who cannot live with their own families for reasons of abuse or neglect.

While the department's approach is to work with families to assist children to remain in their own home or family network, inevitably there are times when the department must place children outside their home. In these instances, the department calls upon the established network or foster parents to provide care, but there are some situations, as I have already said, where foster care may not meet the needs of particular children, for instance, where siblings need to be placed together in a long-term care option. SOS Children's Villages is therefore just one option that may be appropriate in these situations.

I understand that there is some concern in the local community, but it is not for Government to be carrying out consultation in the local area when it is not a Government but a private organisation. I certainly support the work that this organisation is doing. As I say, it is able to provide a very real option that is needed in this State.

There has been close consultation between the organisation, SOS Kinderdorf in South Australia, and the Department for Family and Community Services. That negotiation and consultation has been happening over a long period. As far as local consultation is concerned, I understand that the member for the local area organised a meeting last night to provide more information to the local community. I commend the honourable member for that: it was a very sensible thing to do. It will help those people who live adjacent to the facility to understand more about the work that is being carried on by SOS Children's Villages. I support what they are doing. It is not a return to institutionalised care in any way, shape or form, but it is an important option and one that I welcome in South Australia.

#### SAMCOR OUTSOURCING

**Mr VENNING (Custance):** Will the Treasurer inform the House of the progress being made by the Asset Management Task Force involving the sale of the abattoirs and the saleyards at Gepps Cross, currently being operated by the South Australian Meat Corporation?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I am well aware of the interest of the member for Custance and many of his constituents in the future of Samcor, which is a very important facility for the farming community. I remind members that, in the last financial year, 96 439 cattle, 556 359 sheep and 138 987 pigs were processed or slaughtered at that facility, so it is a very important component of meat processing here in South Australia. The Government made a decision some time ago that it was inappropriate for Government to continue in this particular enterprise. The Asset Management Task Force, under the guidance of Roger Sexton, has gone through a scoping exercise on Samcor, and the result is that we should indeed go ahead with the sale of that establishment. Import-

antly, the issue of the sale is a matter of great relevance to the farming community.

I remind members also that Samcor has not had one of the strongest histories in this State. For example, in 1992-93 it lost \$2.5 million; in 1993-94, \$500 000; and in 1994-95, \$3.3 million. So, I will be introducing a Bill tomorrow to enable the disposal of Samcor. It must be clearly understood that what we are looking for is a capacity for those meatworks to operate at world's best practice, to deliver the product in terms of quality, timeliness and efficiency that we believe is appropriate in the marketplace. We are looking for an offer, and expressions of interest are being processed at the moment. The Bill to be introduced tomorrow merely facilitates the disposal of Samcor.

#### FOSTER CHILDREN

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** My question is directed to the Minister for Family and Community Services. What agreements exist between the Government and SOS Children's Villages; what undertakings have been given by the Government to refer foster children to this organisation; and will the level of financial support paid to SOS be the same as that paid to foster parents? SOS Children's Villages is spending \$2 million on eight homes at Seaford Rise to house up to 40 foster children under the age of 10. SOS will employ a single woman carer for each house, and a male coordinator will manage the village. On 6 March the Minister was reported as welcoming the village and saying that children who were unable to live with their families would be referred to the village by FACS.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** As I said earlier, I do welcome this initiative. I think it is a very good initiative for South Australia, and I am surprised that the shadow Minister is not supporting it as well. I would have thought that the most important thing about all of this was what was best for the children themselves.

**Ms Stevens:** That's why we're asking the questions.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I would refer to the press release that was put out by the member for Elizabeth which was far from being positive on this issue. Can I just say again that this organisation has not been funded by the department in any way. The same licensing and approval procedures will apply to the children's village as with any other foster care agency or children's facility. As I said earlier, it is an important option that we can use for providing appropriate homes for children who need to be fostered out. So, I do not see anything cynical about the situation, and it is one that I strongly support.

#### WORLD BOWLS CHAMPIONSHIP

**Mr BECKER (Peake):** Will the Minister for Tourism inform the House of the expected economic benefits for South Australia as a result of hosting the 13-day Sensational Adelaide 1996 World Bowls Championship, and will he also indicate the likely benefits from South Australia's hosting the international harness racing event early next year?

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** The Sensational Adelaide World Championship Bowls is currently being held at Lockleys. We stand to gain \$7.5 million in economic value out of this event. It is a huge international event, with some 200 players coming from 30 different countries and a total of 2 000 to 3 000 people coming from interstate and overseas. It is the first time since the Grand Prix last year that—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable Deputy Leader will have plenty of time to go to Kangaroo Island if he keeps interjecting.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** It is the first time since the Grand Prix last year that beds are scarce in all the hotels in Adelaide. It is the biggest event that we have had in Adelaide, in an accommodation sense, since the Grand Prix, totalling some 28 000 bed nights for this event. This championship is equivalent to the Olympic Games in bowls, because every winner will obviously get a gold medal.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** It is interesting that the Deputy Leader should be making some comments: I point out to members opposite that 14 parliamentary secretaries happens to be three more than their total membership.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** You do not have enough even to make the lance corporal level. Some 700 million people around the world will be watching this event over the next two weeks, so it really has huge status. Those who sat up last night to watch the championship on television could not have missed seeing the Sensational Adelaide sponsorship banner displayed everywhere, including on the shirts of all competitors. The people are coming from the UK, Europe, Africa, Israel, China, India, Japan, Philippines and New Zealand. I have been told that there has been a very significant sponsorship from ETSA, which undergrounded special powerlines so that they did not interfere—

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** No visual impairment!

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:**—or create any visual impairment for the bowlers. I thank ETSA for doing that work. It is important to note that the Deputy Prime Minister of the Cook Islands is also a competitor, so the status of the event can be seen as being significant. Last week I had the privilege of going to Perth for the Interdominion racing carnival. The promotion of this event is worth approximately \$7 million in economic activity. On the national trotting calendar, it is the biggest trotting event in Australia; in fact, it is the biggest racing event in this country. We will have the privilege of having both the trotting and the bowls under the now very well-known Sensational Adelaide sponsorship banner.

## KOALAS

**Ms WHITE (Taylor):** What advice has the Premier received from the Minister for Tourism on the effect that killing koalas on Kangaroo Island would have on international tourism to South Australia? Given the Premier's stated objection to the promise to shoot 2 000 koalas, will he now instruct the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources to withdraw the Government's amendments to the National Parks and Wildlife Act which allow the harvesting of protected native animals?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There are one or two members on my right who may be removed from the speaking list if they continue. The member for Taylor is clearly commenting. I will allow her to continue, because the she has been a well behaved member, but I suggest to her that she now round off her question, because she is clearly commenting.

**Ms WHITE:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. The Bill to amend the National Parks and Wildlife Act seeks to give the Minister power to approve the harvesting of protected native species, such as koalas, in national parks and reserves and on other land. Under the definition of 'harvesting', carcasses and the fur of animals killed in national parks or reserves could be sold for commercial gain.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I find this incredible. I just wish that members opposite would listen. I have explained in a ministerial statement exactly what the Government's position is. I have explained the importance of tourism to South Australia and the need to be seen to be doing the right thing—as well as doing the right thing—for koalas, for native vegetation, for ecotourism and for everything else that Kangaroo Island is known for.

This is all about scaremongering in regard to a piece of legislation that is currently before the Upper House. The legislation to amend the National Parks and Wildlife Act has been warmly welcomed by everyone other than the Opposition, which is determined to scaremonger about this issue. When I introduced the Bill into this place, I stated quite categorically that it was not the Government's intention to harvest wildlife in national parks. I made it quite clear then, and I have continued to make it clear. I have made it clear about four times in answer to scurrilous statements that have been made by the Opposition on this issue. I have corrected the Opposition about four times. In the statement that I made earlier this afternoon I indicated that it is the Government's intention to amend the legislation in the Upper House to make it absolutely clear that the Government does not intend to harvest wildlife in parks and reserves. I do not know how much clearer I can make it. When they were in Government, members opposite took no interest in national parks.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** They let the national parks deteriorate to the extent that they are now. They did absolutely nothing about it. If they took any interest at all, members opposite would know that culling has been taking place in national parks for the past 10 to 15 years. They would know that there has been culling of kangaroos in national parks for years in this State, and it will continue. They would also know that goat culling occurs in national parks. I have made it absolutely clear that there will not be any harvesting of wildlife in national parks and reserves. I have already indicated that the Government will be amending legislation to ensure that even the Opposition can understand that.

## WATER, OUTSOURCING

**Ms GREIG (Reynell):** Will the Minister for Infrastructure report to the House what opportunities and interest was shown in the South Australian water outsourcing contract during his recent overseas visit as the guest of the British Government?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The trip to the UK was at the invitation of the British Government, and principally at its cost. Whilst one might describe the 10 days as somewhat of an endurance test, the appointments that were put together by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office were indeed invaluable. I had the opportunity to meet three UK Ministers, principally involved in trade, small business and industry development. It is fair to say that they had picked up—as has the World Bank—the model that we put in place in South Australia to leverage up the operation and maintenance of

Adelaide to get economic development into the Asia-Pacific region.

A meeting with British Water, which coincidentally is an association of 400 small to medium enterprises involved in the water industry in the UK, has now progressed to the point that there will be trade missions from that group to South Australia to look at investment, joint venture, strategic alliance and partnerships in South Australia to underpin and meet the industry development objectives and commitments locked into the contract as a requirement of United Water International.

It is interesting to note that the economic development components are starting to flow. For example, a South Australian computing firm is one of the final two contenders for a contract to supply a billing system for one of the major water companies in Malaysia. That contract is worth just over \$1 million. I hope that the pencil is sharp enough for the South Australian company to win that billing contract in Asia. The British Water Authority, through the Agent-General and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, is now looking at the establishment of a trade link between South Australia and the UK with these business enterprises, particularly small to medium businesses.

On the return journey, I had the opportunity in Bangkok to have meetings with Thames and two of its joint venture partners—two governors of various industrial estates in Bangkok that have contracts with Thames-Asia Pacific. In both cases opportunities for South Australia were identified in supplying a whole range of equipment, surveyors, project managers, experts in the fields of leak detection and pipe maintenance, and computerised billing. There is an opportunity to add value to that contract and bring the benefits to South Australia.

Whilst in the United Kingdom I also had discussions in relation to industrial development activities in various regions of the United Kingdom and to look at defence and electronics related industries that are participating with South Australian based companies bidding for very significant defence contracts currently under negotiation by the Commonwealth Government, in addition to looking at the structure of the electricity industry in the United Kingdom.

In furthering the economic development component of the water outsourcing contract, I note today that United Water has announced that Mr Mike Terlet has accepted the role of Economic Development Manager of United Water. I welcome that appointment. I am sure that even the Opposition would acknowledge that that is a good appointment because it was the former Government that appointed Mr Terlet as chair of the then South Australian Centre for Manufacturing. Governments, both State and Federal, have recognised his industry development capability. He was involved with AWA Defence Industries and was a key player in building up that company as a defence electronics firm in South Australia. He is a strong advocate of the policy direction pursued by this Government. He sees the economic development opportunities for South Australia, and he has accepted the task, as economic development manager, to ensure that United Water International meets its contract obligations.

Those contract obligations are to ensure that a minimum \$628 million—if not a target of \$1.479 billion—worth of exports are generated for South Australia over the course of the next 10 years. I am sure Mr Terlet's performance, based on his past track record, will ensure that that occurs for the benefit of South Australians. As I have said repeatedly in this House, the benefit of that is new economic activity for South

Australia, a new water industry for this State, new job opportunities in this State, and job certainty and job security for South Australians.

### PARKS HIGH SCHOOL

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** My question is directed to the Minister representing the Minister for Education and Children's Services in another place. Why did the Minister for Education and Children's Services fail to consult the community and ignore the findings of The Parks' review before announcing that the school will close at the end of this year? Last Friday the Minister announced that The Parks High School will close at the end of this year. The Parks school council has condemned this decision and issued a media release that says:

We totally reject the decision, as it disregards the recommendations of The Parks' review.

The school council condemned the Minister for a total lack of consultation and said that it holds grave concerns for the educational future of the 500 students who use the school services and resources on a weekly basis.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** The member for Price has made various allegations and assertions regarding my colleague in another place. I will obtain a report, because I believe that they are assertions and allegations that do not have foundation.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader is warned for the first time.

### FEDERAL BUDGET

**Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell):** My question is directed to the Premier. Does the South Australian Government support new State revenue raising measures to help the Federal Government eliminate its budget deficit?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Let me make it quite clear that the South Australian Government does not support the transfer of tax raising powers from the Commonwealth to the State Government. We are not in favour of a State GST. We believe it is the responsibility of the Federal Government, having accepted the constitutional power to raise funds through the income tax taxing power for the States, to raise that money and to transfer it to the State Governments. The reason why the Federal Government has even raised this issue is entirely due to the former Labor Government.

First, after the election an \$8 billion deficit was found in the Federal budget. Throughout the election campaign the then Prime Minister and the then Treasurer told the Australian people a great big lie: that the budget was on track to be balanced. We now know that that is not the case at all. Secondly, I point out that, under the 13 years of Labor, Commonwealth Government outlays increased for Commonwealth Government purposes by 50 per cent in real terms. In exactly the same time the State Governments got absolutely no additional revenue whatsoever. In other words, Federal Government expenditure was going up at a very sharp rate and State Governments have been absolutely flat over that 13 year period.

Therefore, it is clearly now time to cut Federal Government expenditure but not in any way to cut allocations to the State Governments. I am delighted to say that, first, John Howard has given a commitment to give a fixed share of the income taxing revenue to the State Governments and to

increase that in relation to the growth of the Australian economy. Secondly, he has given an undertaking to reduce the percentage of tied grants to the States.

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** It would appear that the Leader of the Opposition does not even understand that, under Labor, the Federal Labor Government increased significantly the percentage of funds going to State Governments, which were then specifically tied to the point where something like 50 per cent of the grants to State Governments were tied grants. The States, including that of Bob Carr and the other Labor States, have been asking for the tied grants percentage to be reduced, for obvious reasons.

I am delighted to say that John Howard has given a commitment to reduce the tied grants in percentage terms to the States. I point out that the Federal Labor Government left Australia and the States in a financial mess, as we know, and the States starved of the money to carry out essential Government services such as health and education. I am delighted that there has been a change of Government so that we can start to change some of these adverse policies that have been operating for the past 13 years under the Labor Government in Canberra.

#### GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Given the Premier's statement a moment ago, what assurance has he received from his Federal Coalition colleagues that the new Howard Government will not require the States to introduce a goods and services tax? In October an Access Economics report commissioned by the WA Government advocated the introduction of a State-based GST. At the same time, Mr Costello revealed that he had had discussions with all the conservative State Governments on tax reform. Access Economics had also worked on the GST component of Dr Hewson's 'Fightback'. Press reports of last week stated that two members of the Federal Government's Audit Commission support the introduction of a State-based GST, while Geoff Carmody of Access Economics has also been appointed to the Audit Commission.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Prior to the Federal election I had a discussion with John Howard, who gave a commitment to me and to other State Premiers that he would give a guaranteed share of the total economy to the State Governments.

**The Hon. M.D. Rann:** What about the GST?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I will touch on that in a moment. You just sit there and obey the Standing Orders, and I will answer the question. I point out that John Howard also gave a commitment to increase that share to the States in relation to the growth of the total Australian economy. That is something that the State Governments, including the Labor State Governments, were trying to get out of Paul Keating as Prime Minister, and he refused to budge whatsoever on that issue. All Paul Keating would do was give an assurance that, having cut the allocation to the States over a number of years, he would increase it in relation to population growth and inflation but not to increase the allocation with the growth of the Australian economy.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I point out to members opposite that there were no discussions whatsoever about a State GST. In fact, if members bothered to pick up the

Australian Constitution they would realise that there is no constitutional power for a State Government to have a State GST. Therefore, any proposal that we should have a State GST, first, would be rejected by this Government and, secondly, there is no basis for it—

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** As I said, there is no power in the Constitution even to have a State GST. Does the honourable member not understand that?

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I point out to the Leader of the Opposition that the Chair has been very tolerant of him. The Chair is aware that the Leader has been making public statements in relation to the behaviour of members of Parliament: I suggest that he read his own press release.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier and the Leader of the Opposition can conclude their discussion in the lobby.

#### HEALTH INITIATIVES

**Mrs KOTZ (Newland):** Will the Minister for Health inform the House what evidence he has to show that the community understands the Government's initiatives in matters of health?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I thank the member for Newland for her question, because it is an important matter. I guess every member of Parliament would know that the most recent authoritative exercise and test of public opinion was the last Federal election. I do not normally agree that Federal election results carry any State message, but the Labor Party cannot get away from the fact that its Federal colleagues campaigned exclusively on State matters and, indeed, in a number of areas in South Australia, centred their attack on the Brown Government's record in health. We all know that the Labor Party in campaigning mode has developed peddling lies to an art form, but I would like to draw the attention of the House to what was the result.

In the seat of Adelaide, Labor's Gail Gago indicated that Federal Labor funding for our public hospitals had increased by nearly 50 per cent since 1988-89. The fact is that it had increased by less than 25 per cent of that amount: it was 12 per cent. Ms Gago had a 2.4 per cent swing against her under the Labor Party campaign colours, and Trish Worth was the first Liberal ever to be re-elected as the member for Adelaide.

In Hindmarsh, Labor's David Abfalter lied when he said that the Brown Government had given us longer waiting times. In fact, the number of people on the waiting list for more than 12 months has been reduced by 35 per cent. Mr Abfalter suffered a 6 per cent swing against him—the largest swing in any South Australian seat. In Kingston, Labor's Gordon Bilney lied when he said that the Brown Government had closed or sold off whole hospitals. In fact, as everyone in this House knows and as I believe the people of South Australia clearly also know given the election results, this Government has not closed or sold any hospital, in direct contrast with Minlaton, Blyth, Onkaparinga and a litany of others under the previous Government. Mr Bilney had a swing of 4 per cent against him and became the first Labor Minister to lose his seat in South Australia since at least the 1940s.

Given that the member for Newland has asked the question, I draw the attention of the House to what happened in Makin. In the seat of Makin, Labor's Peter Duncan lied when he alleged that Modbury hospital would provide poorer

quality services under the private management contract. In fact, Modbury public hospital continues a very fine tradition of quality care. Mr Duncan suffered a swing of 5 per cent against him, a swing which was much higher than the State-wide swing against Labor. So, this presents clear evidence that the community does understand exactly what the Brown Government's health initiatives are and that it said via the ballot box in the Federal election, 'Get on with the job.'

#### FEDERAL GRANTS

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** What assurances has the Premier sought and received from his Federal Coalition colleagues on the future of Commonwealth Government grants to South Australia in health, education and public housing, as well as the Better Cities program, which supports development of the multifunction polis? Recent statements in the media confirm that the new Federal Government intends to cut a further \$8 billion in spending in addition to those cuts previously announced. These reports stated that the main areas targeted for cuts include grants to the States for schools, hospitals and public housing, and the Better Cities program. On radio on 23 February, the State Treasurer was reassured by the Coalition that South Australia would not be disadvantaged by a new Federal Government.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Let us be quite clear that there would be no need for any cuts whatsoever in terms of Federal Government expenditure if Keating and Willis had not lied before the election. If they had turned in the balanced budget that they promised the people of South Australia before the Federal election, there would not now be the need to cut expenditure by \$8 billion. So, it is members of the Labor Party who should look at themselves, go off to talk to Keating and Willis and demand to know why they lied to the Australian public about the position of the Federal budget this year. We all know that they gave absolute assurances before the Federal election and, because they had been getting the same advice from Treasury officials, quite clearly they knew that they had overspent very dramatically indeed.

I pick up the next issue that has been raised—the Better Cities money. I am glad the Deputy Leader has raised this issue, because when Mr Keating came to Adelaide he said that we could be part of what was called Better Cities 2, which would involve a significant allocation of money in 1996—this year—for the improvement of infrastructure in South Australia. We set up a forum to identify what those infrastructure projects should be. In fact, funds were allocated by the Federal Labor Government for Better Cities 2. But do you know where the money went? Some \$120 million went to the Queensland Labor Government just prior to the by-election. Do you know how much South Australia got out of that allocation before the Federal budget? We got only \$350 000. The Federal Labor Government had made a bold promise of about \$50 million under Better Cities 2 program for South Australia but we got only \$350 000. Victoria got \$900 000, exactly the same sort of ratio as our allocation, but the Labor Government in New South Wales got about \$80 million or \$100 million.

So, it was quite clear that Better Cities 2 money was simply allocated to State Labor Governments around Australia, with the Liberal Governments getting absolutely nothing. For that reason, the people of South Australia rejected their having a Labor Government in Canberra. They were sick of a Government that sat in Canberra and did not

bother at any stage about the people who lived west of Canberra. All Labor worried about was its cronies in the various State Labor Governments and, of course, the people who lived in Sydney, Melbourne and Canberra, where it thought the votes of Australia would count. But the truth is that in the Federal election the rest of Australia showed Mr Keating and the Labor Party that it was about time they looked beyond Melbourne, Sydney and Canberra.

#### YOUTH ASSISTANCE

**Mr ROSSI (Lee):** Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education provide details about the new scheme to assist young unemployed people to get a start in life?

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** I thank the member for Lee for the question, because it is a very important one. I have announced a new self-starter scheme—another example of South Australia leading the way—to enable young unemployed people between the ages of 18 and 25 to get established in a business. What is good about this scheme is that there is a 10 to 12 week training program, at the end of which they produce a business plan. That is assessed by a panel of people with real world experience in business. If that business plan meets the criteria, they will be funded to help establish their business.

Importantly, as part of the program, for 12 months they will have the assistance of a mentor, a businessman or woman who is experienced and who will guide and assist them in getting established in running a business. Anyone who has had any involvement in this area would know that it is very difficult for young people to get capital to start a business. Initially, we intend to fund up to 75 young people in both the city and the country and give them the opportunity to establish a business. This is another approach to tackle the issue of unemployment amongst our young people, and another example of South Australia's showing other States exactly what we can do in terms of innovation.

#### TAXATION

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** What assurances has the Premier received from his Federal Coalition colleagues that the new Howard Government will not force South Australia to impose a State income tax by cutting the level of its grants to this State? In today's press, Professor Cliff Walsh, Executive Director of the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies and an adviser to the Premier, advocated the introduction of a State-based income tax and said that there was nothing either legally or constitutionally to prevent the State's re-entering the income tax field.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I point out that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is wrong in his assertion: in fact, it is illegal for a State Government to impose a State Government income tax. There is no legal power whatsoever for a State Government to impose an income tax in South Australia.

#### COMMUNITY SERVICE ORDERS

**Mr LEGGETT (Hanson):** Will the Minister for Correctional Services provide further information on the publication of figures this week about compliance with community service orders and explain what is being achieved by the community orders scheme?



**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** I thank the member for Hanson for his ongoing interest in correctional services matters. This gives me the opportunity, through the record of this House, to correct erroneous information that appeared on the front page of yesterday's *Advertiser* and also to detail the success that has occurred within the community service programs. Yesterday's *Advertiser* claimed that 'up to one in three offenders [almost 7 000 people a year] are failing to turn up for community service work ordered by the State's courts.' That is not the case. I pointed out to the journalist who wrote the article that the statistics provided referred to the number of community service orders, not to the number of offenders. Clearly, when offenders have multiple orders, the number of offenders must be significantly lower than the number of orders that have not been fulfilled.

Regardless of that, it is of concern to the Government that a significant number of offenders are not completing community service orders that have been handed down to them by the courts. Indeed, I identified the problem fairly early in our time in government. Some significant changes had been made to the program, but I am still not satisfied with the rate at which orders are being completed. As a consequence, a further review of the scheme was undertaken to improve the way in which the scheme administers the orders of the court. Further changes are about to be implemented, and the department will report to me within the next four weeks on the detail of the further changes that it recommends to enhance the scheme.

In the interim, however, a number of things can be said about the community services scheme. The statistics used by the *Advertiser* were taken from the Department for Correctional Services 1994-95 annual report. It needs to be remembered that the only deterrent operating during that time for non-completion of a community service order was imprisonment in the Labor Government's notorious fine default centre. The fine default centre has now been closed and the penalty for not completing a community service order is imprisonment in a section of Yatala Labour Prison. Needless to say, prisoners are opting to undertake their community service work or to pay their fine rather than face that option.

Regrettably, the statistics collected by the department have been inadequate. That is a further matter that must be resolved. For example, the department is unable to identify the exact number of offenders who have breached their community service orders and it is also unable to identify when orders have been completed through, for example, the payment of fines. Similarly, no statistics are available on offenders who deliberately breach their orders but who are later tracked down and a more severe penalty handed down to them.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** The honourable member asks why not? The simple reason is that, under his Government, the scheme that was introduced was inadequate. That will be rectified so that that information is available and the scheme can be properly administered. Despite those minor problems—and I emphasise that they are minor problems—the scheme has implemented a number of successful measures throughout the State. During 1994-95 a total of 638 696 hours of community service work was performed by 11 771 individual clients. These clients worked on 2 079 projects, 1 500 of those for Government bodies such as schools and kindergartens, 521 for voluntary organisations and 32 for pensioner projects. It is also worth mentioning that those schemes returned to the community a value of some

\$5 million in community service work, and indeed there are more than 2½ times the number of offenders now going through the program than there were two years ago. That is indeed a successful measure.

## HOUSING TRUST MAINTENANCE

**Ms HURLEY (Napier):** Will the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations review the division of the South Australian Housing Trust into a tenancy section and a property management section in view of the communication difficulties and delays being experienced by tenants in having maintenance carried out? Tenants requiring non-urgent maintenance first report problems to the housing manager, then to a technical consultant, then to property management and then to an outside project manager, who receives a consultancy fee to supervise the work. Tenants are having trouble finding their way through this red tape.

**The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN:** Obviously, the honourable member has raised an issue that she has not taken the trouble to raise with me privately to indicate that there are some problems.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN:** The problems raised by the honourable member are completely new to me—and 18 per cent of my electorate is Housing Trust. As far as the South Australian Housing Trust is concerned, we have inherited some huge problems. Because members opposite want to talk about the past, let us talk about the past. Let us talk about the fact that in 1983 the Housing Trust had a debt of \$700 million; and let us talk about the fact that in 1993 the Housing Trust had a debt of \$1.3 billion, and all that was incurred by the previous Government. In other words, throughout the 10 years—

**Mr CLARKE:** Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order relating to Standing Order 98, according to which, I understand, the answer has somehow to remotely coincide with the question that was asked.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had not interjected so much, the Chair would have been able to hear what the Minister was saying. I cannot uphold the point of order. I point out to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that he is aware of my earlier ruling.

**The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN:** I point out that the issue I am addressing is absolutely relevant. The previous Government left this Government with a \$1.3 billion debt in the Housing Trust that has created huge problems in a large number of areas. Under the previous Government, non-concessional debt blew out so that the interest repayments on non-concessional debt alone is \$29 million a year. Therefore, the Housing Trust has huge problems, which it is working through. I acknowledge that we do not have all the money that we would like to have to spend on maintenance, but I have outlined the reason for that. We have horrendous problems, which we have to work on and which I am working on. I make the point that, with 18 per cent of my electorate being Housing Trust, I certainly have not had the problems which the honourable member refers to drawn to my attention. I can only say that we will be working as hard as we can to overcome the mess that was left by the previous Government to ensure that our tenants get the sort of service that they deserve.

## URANIUM

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens):** What guarantees will the Premier and his Government give to the public of South Australia that South Australian uranium will not enter the international nuclear weapons cycle?

*Members interjecting:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** Give it a rest, boys. Give it a rest.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member may complete her question or explain it if she desires.

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** Yes, Sir, I do.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Because of unruly members—most of them on my right on this occasion—the Premier was unable to hear the question. Will the honourable member repeat it?

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** Certainly, Sir. What guarantees will the Premier and his Government give to the public of South Australia that uranium will not enter the international nuclear weapons cycle? Given that South Australia has the largest deposits of uranium currently being mined and the recent announcement to expand mining, the public of South Australia clearly demand that Australian uranium not be used for nuclear weapons.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** It is quite clear that, now that Peter Duncan does not have Federal Government responsibilities, he is sitting in the honourable member's office writing these questions for her. I would suggest to the honourable member—

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** Mr Speaker, I rise—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I take it that the honourable member for Torrens has a point of order. Before calling on her, I point out to the honourable member that because, a member does not like an answer or does not agree with it, that is not a point of order. Does the honourable member wish to proceed? The Premier.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I take that as an admission of the fact that Peter Duncan had written the question for the honourable member.

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Torrens, I take it, has a point of order.

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** Yes, Sir, I do. I ask that the Premier please withdraw those petty and foolish comments.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! In accordance with the ruling I gave earlier today, that is a frivolous point of order and I suggest the member not seek the call of the Chair.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The other thing that I suggest she does, besides waiting for Peter Duncan to write her questions to use in the State Parliament, is ask him to brief her properly, because what clearly happened—

*Mrs Geraghty interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Peter Duncan would have known only too well that it is a Federal Government responsibility in terms of the destination of any uranium from Australia: it is not a responsibility of this State Government. Therefore, I think that the question is out of order because this State Government has no constitutional power whatsoever to cover the area of the question asked by the honourable member. I would take the question back to Peter Duncan and ask, 'Why did you set me up like this in the State Parliament today?'

## FRUIT FLY

**Mr ANDREW (Chaffey):** My question is directed to the Minister for Primary Industries. What current initiatives are in place and are being considered by the Government and industry to protect the South Australian fruit and vegetable industry from fruit fly? I understand that this morning the Minister met the Tri-State Fruit Fly Committee and launched one of the initiatives in this regard.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** I thank the member for Chaffey for his question and his interest in fruit fly, a concern which he shares with his constituency. This morning I launched the latest strategy in the fight against fruit fly. It is an industry initiative led by the Riverland Horticultural Council and the Tri-State Fruit Fly Committee, and it is hoped that they will use the rear panel of up to 100 fruit carrying trucks as mobile billboards to heighten motorists' and community awareness of fruit fly. It is a terrific example of industry action to look after their own interests.

The Government, in recognition of the fruit fly threat to industry, has announced a range of initiatives including on-the-spot fines, the establishment of the sterile fruit fly rearing facility, the extension of the hours that the Oodla Wirra roadblock operates and a greater focus on the people entering South Australia by plane or train. We are also working to progress the draft national code of management for Mediterranean fruit fly, and we hope to make significant progress over the next few months to reduce the cost to industry of outbreaks.

Unfortunately, despite heightened public awareness of the importance of fruit fly, many people still attempt to bring fruit into the State. To date this year we have had 51 interceptions of fruit fly at the four roadblocks, compared with only 33 last year. As we approach Easter, the community needs to be particularly vigilant to ensure that travellers do not unwittingly or deliberately bring fruit into the State, thereby putting our vital horticultural industries at risk. I congratulate the industry, particularly the Riverland Horticultural Council, the Tri-State Fruit Fly Committee and the citrus industry, on the latest initiative.

## PUBLIC TRANSPORT REFORM

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development):** I table a ministerial statement made by the Minister for Transport.

## GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** The result on 2 March was the best dream come true for me as a member of the South Australian Liberal Government, and it was the worst nightmare becoming a reality for the Opposition. The first thing we had to achieve was to see the end of Mr Keating and see Mr Howard start to address the neglect and the debacle we had seen continuing for 13 years. What particularly delighted me, as a member in the south, was seeing the end

of Gordon Bilney. Just what Gordon Bilney really thought about the seat of Kingston was evident to me as a resident of the south when I was in Susan Jeanes' office watching that magnificent result. Anyone with an ounce of credibility would have conceded, accepted the fact that they had done a reasonable job (if they had done so) and congratulated the new member.

But not Mr Bilney. He could not take it. In fact, he had been off the rails for a week. I had noticed at a citizenship ceremony that he could not control himself. He told the South Australian Press Club that he did not really want to run again, and then he proceeded to belt the heck out of the Kingston electorate when he said that, because he had not given them Porches and allowed them to win X-Lotto, they no longer voted for him.

*Mrs Rosenberg interjecting:*

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:** Yes, and Mr Bilney also suggested that, if their sex life had not improved, that was another reason why they voted him out. The facts are that, whilst Gordon Bilney started off as a very good member of Parliament, he really forgot about the south, just like the previous State Labor Government. We also saw a strong message coming across on 2 March to the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Rann. So, what do we see in the last two weeks? We see the Leader of the Opposition trying to change his spots. But, as we saw here today in this Chamber, he will never really change his spots: one only had to look at the tie he had on today to see that.

The Leader of the Opposition has gone down the same track as Paul Keating did federally. Paul Keating today was in the Caucus in Canberra telling members why they lost the election. On election night Paul Keating was still singing the praises of what he thought were the great visions of his Government, but the fact was that Paul Keating had become so arrogant, he had so misled the people of South Australia and he had lost so much of the trust of the people of South Australia and Australia that they did the thing that all credible Australians would do—and that is vote for a change.

Now, for a little while—and I warn my constituency—we will see the Leader of the Opposition take the high moral ground, taking the bipartisan approach, making announcements about things such as Roxby Downs (which are not even in place at this stage) and trying to change his spots. But it will not last very long, because what we have in the Leader of the Opposition in this State is an exact replica of Mr Keating. The sooner the Opposition realises that and brings in the member for Playford, Mr Quirke, the better it will be for this State. Mr Quirke is an honourable gentleman; he is a man with vision; he is a man who is genuine about a bipartisan approach to get this State going again. He is not about changing like the wind, week in week out, trying to get a bit of media play.

The important thing for me, as a member for the south, is that I can work closely with Susan Jeanes, the member for Kingston, a lady who is committed to make sure that we get a fair go federally for our southern region, a lady who is committed to the environment, which is also crucial for us in the south, and who will go over to Canberra and make sure that we get something happening.

On the point of things happening, if you look closely at Mr Bilney's record over those 13 years, you will see that we had an appalling lack of real dollars and infrastructure put into the south. I know that the member for Kingston, Susan Jeanes, is well aware of that, and she has made a commitment to the electorate that she will make sure that the south gets its

fair share of infrastructure. Indeed, with all the other Ministers and members we now have from South Australia in the Federal arena, she will work towards making sure that, for a change, South Australia gets its fair share. That will be great for us because, when it comes to projects such as the recycled water project from Christies Beach to the Willunga Basin, it will mean that she will be in there fighting for real dollars to support that key initiative of our Government, to make sure that real jobs are created, that we have a sustainable future for the southern region and, at the same time, that we stop the outfall of treated effluent into the ocean and turn it into something that will benefit the people of the south.

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** Today in Question Time I asked the Minister for Family and Community Services two questions about a project to be started in the south involving the construction and operation of a children's village. The Minister's reply does nothing to allay the serious reservations I have about that project. I was concerned and interested to see that he intimated that I had no care for the future of the children concerned by asking these questions. I would like to outline to the House some of the issues that I believe the Minister has failed to understand and address in going down this path.

I was simply asking for clarification, because we as a community deserve to know what the policy is and what his intentions are. The village is being built by SOS Children's Villages, an offshoot of a multinational care operation called SOS Kinderdorf International. It will consist of a cluster of eight houses, each of which will have an SOS house mother, a single woman, caring for up to five children under the age of 10, and this person will be paid for by the Department for Family and Community Services. Those children will remain in this home under the care of this single woman, potentially for the remainder of their childhood days. The village itself will be coordinated by a male, with single women as the carers.

*Members interjecting:*

**Ms STEVENS:** I am concerned about that for a number of reasons. Recent practice in foster caring has shown that the best way to care for children—perhaps the Minister might listen—is to place them in family units that model generally the sorts of family units that we have in our community. We have moved away from the large institutions of the past. We have tried to place children in situations that model what generally happens in our communities. This is a major change of policy, and a large number of people in the community welfare sector, and in the community generally, are concerned that this considerable policy shift seems to have occurred with no consultation and no discussion whatsoever. Again, the Minister did nothing to give us information in relation to that matter.

The other issue relates to the Seaford Rise community itself where we know that there was no consultation about the impact of the village within that community. People are rightfully angry that there was no consultation, that they were not involved in any decision making about this initiative. Just for example, let us consider the issue of schooling. We have 40 children under 10 years of age who have been removed from their homes. Children are not removed from their homes unless there has been great damage done to them as individuals. So, these children will have particular needs for support and probably in their schooling, because the sort of damage that occurs to children who need to be removed from home does affect learning.

My information is that 20 of these children are expected to attend one of the local primary schools, Seaford Rise, with the other 20 attending Moana Primary School. I wonder what that will do to those two schools. I wonder whether any extra resources will be given to those two schools dealing with the issues that those particular children will have. I wonder whether that has even been considered.

*Members interjecting:*

**Ms STEVENS:** It is not a disgrace, it is a reality. Let us think about the children. Let us think about why our foster home situation is not working. Let us talk about payments to foster parents. Let us talk about the level of support to foster parents. If the Minister actually talked to foster parents who are now operating, he would know why we have a problem with fostering care—

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Becker):** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Reynell.

**Ms GREIG (Reynell):** Today I want to take this opportunity to once again welcome a company to my electorate. Over the past 18 months, I have had the opportunity to be part of an electorate that is growing in economic confidence and establishing itself as a thriving industrial base. This is all good news, not only for my electorate but for surrounding areas and for all the State. The State benefits in one way or another from increased business confidence. To me it is particularly pleasing, because I see this growth as local jobs—opportunities for those of us who live in the south. I see the spinoffs, the many benefits of increasing our broader economic base in the south and, most importantly, I see people working together in the south, sending a clear message to other industries that the southern suburbs are a good place to live, to invest and to work. With our new expressway, it will be even easier to get here.

On 1 March the Premier announced that 100 new jobs would be created in Adelaide's south as a result of an expansion by evaporative airconditioning manufacturer Seeley International. Seeley International will be investing up to \$15 million in expanding part of its manufacturing operation at Lonsdale, employing a total of 400 people. The expansion will provide a real boost to job opportunities in the south and give added impetus to the region's economic development. It is also important to note that Seeley International is not only catering for our domestic market but also producing for the international market. The company has a strong presence in the Americas and Europe, and this new operation will provide the opportunity to further build on those export markets, creating even more job opportunities for South Australians.

Seeley International will be relocating its injection moulding, die casting, electric motor manufacturing and assembly of portable and rooftop evaporative airconditioners to the new plant at Lonsdale. Its existing St Marys location will be maintained, concentrating on all other aspects of manufacture, along with global and domestic administration, warehousing and logistics. The company has taken over the former Yazaki site, and transfer of operations should begin in July. Seeley International has been looking to expand for some time, and the Lonsdale location provided the ideal opportunity. Many of the current Seeley International work force come from the southern suburbs, and the majority of the new staff will be local people. Seeley International's move to Lonsdale will significantly boost the company's efforts to increase its lead in world competitiveness due to its sophisti-

cation and highly mechanised operation capable of doubling production.

Seeley International began as Seeley Brothers in 1972, founded by Frank Seeley and his late brother Cedric. From small beginnings, it has grown into Australia's largest manufacturer of evaporative airconditioners for residential, commercial and industrial application, both fixed installation and portable varieties, and a world leader in the product and process technology of evaporative cooling.

As I touched on earlier, export markets account for almost half of Seeley International's total sales, and its highly vertically integrated facility at St Marys is supplemented by an assembly plant in the United States and a European office in the United Kingdom. Key elements in the success of Seeley International have been the driving force of the owner, Mr Frank Seeley, and his entrepreneurial skills, the innovative approach to product design, manufacturing and processes in technology, and a willingness to satisfy customer requirements all over the world.

Today the operation is still totally owned by the Seeley family, and it has professional management skills to augment those of the entrepreneur. Seeley International has a clear vision of its future, which is shared by all its people, a strategic plan of how that vision is to be realised, and a commitment to achieving world competitive manufacturing. I point out that, even though the current Seeley factory is compact, it is crammed with high technology equipment which assists Seeley International in competing with best in the world. Almost everything that goes into the product is made in-house, which enables Seeley International to carefully match all components for optimum performance, to be innovative in design of componentry, and to be flexible to meet market fluctuations.

Seeley International's policy of vertical integration has resulted in a formidable range of manufacturing skills which include die manufacture and maintenance, metal fabrication and die casting, plastic inject moulding, electric motor manufacture, powder coating and assembly including electronic sub-assemblies. Seeley International's innovation in product design is a legend in the industry and is echoed in the many design awards that have been won by the company: Permatuf polymer components, Tropic-Proof motors 'Magnadrive' pumps, one piece moulded centrifugal fans, 'Sensortouch' electronic coolers, 'Watermiser' water quality management system—the list goes on. The company has added recently to its core business of evaporative cooling by acquiring gas heating products which are now being manufactured here in Adelaide. I welcome Seeley International to the electorate of Reynell.

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

**Mr ROSSI (Lee):** Today I express my gratitude to the Minister for Transport in the other place for her excellent cooperation with me in looking after the electorate of Lee. I thank her in particular for the upgrading of the Seaton railway station, pedestrian lights at West Lakes Boulevard near the Hendon Primary School, and the annual expenditure of \$500 000 a year in upgrading the revetment steps of the West Lakes waterway. I also congratulate her on the good vision of having a bikeway all over the metropolitan area. Of course, the Minister has in her time extended the bikeways along the River Torrens, in the Adelaide Hills, and on Tapleys Hill Road and Valetta Road in the western suburbs, to mention just a few. In recent times she has had a vision of having a

bikeway along the foreshore from Sellicks Beach right through to Outer Harbor. That bikeway would go through the suburbs of Tennyson and West Lakes Shore within the electorate of Lee that I represent.

In the past I have always argued the views of the Government with my electors to justify some of the actions taken by the Government. Likewise, when the electors express a strong view to me that is justified, I report back to the responsible Minister. In this case, I would like to report to the Minister for Transport that the residents of Tennyson and West Lakes Shore foreshore totally oppose the building of a bikeway through the sandhills abutting the sea. The residents strongly recommend that the Minister consider other options for a bikeway, and have suggested Military Road, which includes the western suburbs of the electorate of Lee. The residents would prefer that a bikeway be built along Military Road from Grange Road, through to Bower Road and to Outer Harbor.

At the same time, the residents also express concern in relation to the Hindmarsh-Woodville council. The Hindmarsh-Woodville council is in the process of building a new \$11 million office block, which some people call the Taj Mahal. The reason given for building the new office block is that there are 10 000 new Hindmarsh ratepayers who have made the council a bit bigger. The residents complain that no cost benefit analysis has been done. They also suggest that there should be an area for babies so that people who visit the council offices, the library etc. with babies under two can change nappies and take the children to the toilet.

An approach has been made to the Office for the Status of Women suggesting that a section of the Development Act be amended to make it compulsory that all public places provide baby changerooms. I totally support that concept, and I hope that the Hindmarsh-Woodville council will consider that when building the Taj Mahal on Woodville Road.

**Ms HURLEY (Napier):** I am prompted in this grievance debate to talk a little about Better Cities funding, which the Premier mentioned today during Question Time. As we all know, the Better Cities funding came from the Federal Government. The current Federal Liberal Government has notified everyone that it has cut off that money.

As any local member would know, the Better Cities money, which has gone to many parts of South Australia, has been instrumental in making improvements all around Adelaide and South Australia generally. I am also interested to hear the member for Reynell talk about the improvements in her area in the south. It is very interesting to look at what Better Cities money has done in the south, at what the former Federal Government was planning for the south, among other areas, and what will happen now in the south.

An evaluation report of the Better Cities funding talks about the Southern Area Strategy, as follows:

The Southern Area Strategy aims to strengthen the Noarlunga Centre as the major focus of the region. . . and is experiencing rapid suburban growth, high unemployment (especially amongst the young), increasing dependence upon car usage, and lack of access to community services.

The member for Reynell has pointed out a couple of small benefits that this Government has produced for the southern suburbs but, in many ways, it is not fooling the people down south. They know that they still have high unemployment; they know that they have lack of access to essential community services; and they know that transport is difficult for them.

What sort of strategic direction do we get from the State Government? We get none whatsoever. What strategic direction we had came from the Federal Government, and the means to implement that strategic direction came through Better Cities funding. We are no longer to have that Better Cities funding. So far we have had no sense of direction from the former State Minister or the current Minister. The State Government does have a policy of encouraging development, but all these little developments have been popping up all over the State wherever developers have wanted them and the approval has been forced through by the Minister regardless of any State Government strategy or any vision for the future. The only direction we have had recently has come from the Federal Government.

The Premier also mentioned that the new Prime Minister, John Howard, was looking at a reduction in tied grants. The Better Cities funding is an example of the grants that will be increasingly reduced. This is how it will occur: it will be a death by a thousand cuts in the little grants typified by Better Cities. In the scheme of things they might be relatively small amounts of money, but they are very important to this State because this State Government is unwilling and unable to commit funds to these projects. In other words, the people have voted in a Federal Government that will not provide crucial support to projects that have occurred under Better Cities.

Members opposite may be happy for the moment that a Federal Liberal Government has been elected, but they will find that this State Government will be cut and cut again in many of these little ways. Members opposite have found ways to bypass Parliament. They have found ways to reduce funding to non-viable groups, causing them to fold. Members opposite will see their own policies mirrored by the Federal Government, and that will cause this State to suffer. In fact, South Australia will suffer more than the eastern States. Members opposite should not think that the Federal Liberal Government will give South Australia preferential treatment. That will not happen. In fact, South Australia will suffer more from the market economy that this new Federal Liberal Government will promote.

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

**Mr BUCKBY (Light):** I refer to a publication, released by the Gawler High School, entitled *The Valiant Years, 1939 to 1945*. The Principal of Gawler High School, Sandra Lowery, the English teacher, Steve Clarke, and Gaynor McEachern of the school council produced this presentation to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the end of the Second World War. I commend and congratulate them for their work. Indeed, it gives an extremely interesting view of the Second World War through letters from ex-Gawler High School students to a Mr J.H. Bennett who was a master at Gawler High School from 1909 to 1947.

In fact, Mr Bennett formulated the Old Scholars Association of Gawler High School, and it was to him that many of the former students wrote whilst overseas at war. It is interesting to see in what high esteem he was held by the community. In the *Bunyip*, this was said after his death:

His interest in their welfare, his patience and painstaking efforts to impart to them the knowledge of the subjects in which he himself was so fully competent endeared him to them very greatly, and his passing is mourned by pupils past and present.

Mr Bennett was an extremely diligent teacher at Gawler High School and, as I said, many people wrote to him during the

war. It is interesting to look at this publication and see some of the things that men said when they were overseas, writing back to their former master. The publication states:

Some men found the pace of training daunting. One wrote:

During the past four months I have taken a course in fitting. Generally such a trade takes three years to learn and I do not hold out much hope of passing the examination next week.

Once posted, the need for further courses meant a continuation of the hectic pace set in training. Hector Trestrail wrote from Malaya in December 1941 to tell Bennett he had just completed a demanding three week gas instructor course. He ended on an ominous note tinged with optimism:

During my short stay away many changes have taken place here, additional aircraft, personnel etc. all confined to camp, extra guards whilst since my return the average working day has been approximately 18 hours. Indications are that the balloon will burst in these parts and what the future holds time alone will tell. Of the ultimate result I have no doubt, we shall win through all right.

In the early 1940s, the Gawler community experienced an exodus of young men, who either enlisted or were conscripted for military service. The Bray family—and I am pleased to say that Mr Laurie Bray was in attendance at the launching of this book last night—was one of those families, where three sons went off to war. I will quickly read what Laurie found in his ordeals in the war. The publication states:

Laurie Bray had been in the army for six months when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor. He was on final leave prior to his departure for the Middle East when news came of the Japanese action so, on 4 January 1942, he left Sydney bound for Singapore. The ship arrived in Singapore on 18 January and Laurie was attached to the 8th Division Field Workshops, a non-combat unit. On 15 February his unit was told by an officer:

It's all over. I am sorry to say Singapore has capitulated and all of you are prisoners of war.

Laurie spent the next 3½ years as a prisoner of war, and when he returned home in 1945 he weighed some 4.5 stone. That epitomises the terrible experiences that those people had to go through. The publication is available at \$5 per copy (just as a quick advertisement) from the Gawler High School. If anyone would like a copy of this, I am sure that I can obtain one for them. Again, I commend Sandra Lowery, Steven Clarke and Gaynor McEachern on their efforts in commemorating the 50th anniversary of the end of the Second World War.

#### STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (COMMON EXPIATION SCHEME) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier):** I move:

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

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

Leave granted.

This Bill contains the consequential amendments made necessary by the adoption of a common expiation scheme.

I commend this Bill to the House.

#### PART 1 PRELIMINARY

*Clause 1: Short title*

*Clause 2: Commencement*

*Clause 3: Repeal*

This clause repeals the *Expiation of Offences Act 1987*.

*Clause 4: Amendment of Acts*

This clause indicates that the relevant amendments are set out in the schedule.

*Clause 5: Transitional provision*

This clause ensures that expiation notices issued before the commencement of this Act continue to be dealt with under the law as in force before that commencement.

#### SCHEDULE

The schedule contains amendments consequent on the *Expiation of Offences Bill*.

In general terms the amendments—

- repeal the various expiation schemes scattered throughout the Statute Book with a view to all expiation notices being issued under the *Expiation of Offences Act* (e.g. traffic infringement notices, fisheries notices and local government parking notices are all to be issued as expiation notices under the *Expiation of Offences Act*);
  - retain or include power for expiation fees for offences against regulations or by-laws to be fixed by those regulations or by-laws;
  - fix expiation fees for offences against Acts in the penalty provisions for the offences (except in the case of expiation fees for offences against the *Controlled Substances Act 1984*, the *Motor Vehicles Act 1959*, the *Road Traffic Act 1961*, the *Private Parking Areas Act 1986* and the *Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986*, which continue to be fixed by regulation).
- Other substantial amendments are as follows:
- Section 13(2) of the *Criminal Injuries Compensation Act 1978* is amended to ensure that a person cannot be required to pay more than one levy in respect of the same offence (eg where the levy is paid on an expiation notice that is subsequently withdrawn for the purposes of prosecuting the person for the offence).
  - Section 789d of the *Local Government Act 1934* is substituted. The new section requires each expiation notice and each expiation reminder notice issued to the owner of a vehicle in respect of an offence against that Act to be accompanied by a "dob-in" notice (an invitation to specify the driver). Section 79B of the *Road Traffic Act 1961* is of similar effect in relation to offences against that Act detected by photographic detection devices.
  - The demerit point scheme set out in the *Motor Vehicles Act 1959* is amended to provide that where an order for relief is made under the *Expiation of Offences Act* demerit points are incurred at the time the order is made, rather than at some later point in time when all instalments are paid, or community service served, in accordance with the order.

The schedule also contains an amendment consequent on the *Summary Procedure (Time for Making Complaint) Amendment Bill*.

Section 794c of the *Local Government Act 1934* which extends the period for commencement of prosecutions for expiable offences against that Act from 6 months to 12 months is repealed. The period for prosecution set out in the amendment to the *Summary Procedure Act 1921* is to apply—6 months plus the expiation period if an expiation notice is issued.

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

#### EXPIATION OF OFFENCES BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier):** I move:

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

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

Leave granted.

In the early nineteenth century, most crimes were indictable and, therefore, serious and triable by jury. The only question was whether the crime was a felony or a misdemeanour. It had been so for centuries. But the industrial revolution demanded changes in the criminal justice system, and one of the more important changes was the need to enact new regulatory offences. These were not seen as serious, but were necessary to regulate the new urban industrial society. The technique used to this end was the creation of what we now call summary offences, triable by justices in a summary way. The regularisation of this new system of summary offences was only completed in 1848 in England, with the enactment of the *Summary*

*Jurisdiction Act*, which was duly copied in this State by the Summary Jurisdiction Ordinance, No 6 of 1850, the ancestor of the *Justices Act* and, in turn, the *Summary Procedure Act*. Honourable Members may be interested to learn that the original Ordinance was made by the Governor, with the advice and consent of the Legislative Council.

This was a revolution in the criminal law. These were criminal offences with no right to jury trial. The justices could proceed to determine the charge in the absence of the defendant. The defendant might be ordered to pay costs. The summary Courts were not bound by the tortuous and complex rules of criminal law pleading that bedevilled the trial of indictable offences. On the other hand, the penalties were minor—the justices could not, for example, order imprisonment with hard labour—and there was a statutory right to discharge an offender on a bond.

This Bill recognises and confirms that a similar revolution has been taking place over the past decade. The needs of modern social and economic regulation have produced a new class of offence. These are called expiable offences. The revolution has been and is just as significant for the criminal justice system as was the organisation and recognition of summary offences in the last century. This Bill is designed to do the same thing for expiable offences as that 1850 Ordinance did for summary offences. In the years to come, the new classification of offence will be as recognised and accepted as summary offences and the criminal jurisdiction of magistrates are recognised and accepted now.

It may surprise honourable members to learn that South Australia was the first Australian jurisdiction to introduce expiable offences. They first appeared in the *Police Act Amendment Act, 1938*. The Act allowed the expiation of offences against local government regulations and bylaws. The Act regularised a situation in which it had become the practice of the Adelaide City Council—and then others—of inviting alleged offenders to make 'voluntary payments' to avoid prosecution for minor offences.

The system of expiation was then allowed to grow, first gradually and in the past 20 years, at an increasing pace. The great majority of issued expiation notices are, of course, Traffic Infringement Notices (TINS), which were introduced in 1981. That should not be allowed to obscure that fact that there is a very large range of expiable offences indeed, from the *Adelaide Festival Centre Trust Act, 1971* to the *West Terrace Cemetery Act 1976*.

The last time that the Parliament visited the issue in general was in the passage of the *Expiation of Offences Act, 1987*. This provided, to some degree, a common scheme for expiation, but, in general, left untouched the then existing statutory schemes which had been brought into existence in an ad hoc way over the years.

In practice, the criminal justice system, considered as a whole, does not concentrate on serious crime. The latest figures available show that in 1994-1995, there were some 264 614 expiation notices issued. This can be compared with the fact that, in the calendar year 1994, there were 207 392 non-expiable offences reported or becoming known to the police. The time has come to recognise that expiable offences form a significant part of the system of criminal justice and to codify the rules which deal with them. The time has come to recognise, as happened in the middle of the last century, that, piece by piece, a revolution has been happening, and to provide a rational and fair system for this class of offences. That is the general purpose of these Bills.

Much of the debate about expiable offences focuses on TINS, because they are, by far, the largest category of expiation notices issued, and this is, therefore, the likeliest place for the general public to come into contact with the system. There can be little doubt that there is a good deal of public cynicism about expiation notices. They are seen, generally speaking, as revenue raisers. Governments of all political persuasions have told the public that the principal purpose of the system is to enforce the law. A large section of the public simply do not believe that.

The fact is that some traffic offences are and are perceived to be really criminal. These range from the obvious serious offence of causing death by dangerous driving to driving over 0.08. In general terms, the public perceive these to be "real crimes" to be enforced as such. The same probably cannot be said about speeding, or going through a yellow/red traffic light. A significant section of the public sees these offences as an infringement, they ought not to do it, but it's not a crime, and they feel outraged at being treated like criminals when they get caught at it. The time has come to recognise that there is a difference between "real crimes" and infringements, that "real crimes" should be prosecuted through the Courts in the usual way—

and that infringements will be dealt with by a different system—the expiation notice system.

The essence of this system to date has been that, if the person issued a notice pays a fixed sum, which is less than the Court fine, then that person need not go to Court, and there will not be a conviction recorded. In other words, the system offers a premium to save trouble. But there are problems with that scheme. The first is that some people can't pay the fixed sum. The second problem is that people are beginning to see the expiation fee as the fine itself, and, therefore, are demanding that sentencing options (such as community service) apply to what is not a sentence at all.

Because it is a fee charged to avoid Court, the current system is that if a person cannot pay the fee, they must go to Court. That in turn means that a person who cannot afford to pay the fee for any reason is compelled to Court to plead guilty and attempt to access an alternative way of paying the debt to the State. But at that point the fine and charges are greater, sometimes much greater, than the expiation fee. This is generally seen as unfair.

The introduction of speed and red light cameras and laser speed devices has led to a larger number of expiable offences being detected, and hence a larger number of people in the system. High unemployment and the recession has combined with this and the result has been cost implications for Courts and corrections. For example, the use of community service as an option has increased 212% in the past two years.

The system seems to be producing unacceptably high levels of imprisonment for non-payment of fines. This is of particular significance in relation to rates of imprisonment of Aboriginal people.

There are a number of problems in the rules relating to the community service option. These include the inability to aggregate fines, the perception that different standards of entry are being applied, the lack of guidance on other options most importantly payment by instalments and the fact that the genuine hardship case cannot access the option at the expiation stage.

The legislative base of the system of fine enforcement is not in one place but is partly in the *Expiation of Offences Act*, partly in the *Summary Offences Act*, partly in the *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act*, and may be in some other legislation as well.

It is plain that there are no easy solutions to many of these problems. For example, the problem of the imprisonment rate is not solely South Australian. New South Wales appears to have an even more intractable problem, despite (or because of) an avowed intention that no fine defaulter should be imprisoned. In general terms, it is plain that the agencies of government involved in fine enforcement (police, Courts, corrections, and motor registration) do not have any common statistical base from which a remotely accurate picture of the current situation and the reasons for it can be ascertained.

A Working Group, convened by the Department of Premier and Cabinet, consisting of representatives of all affected agencies was formed at the request of Cabinet in September 1993. The Working Group produced a Discussion Paper on the fines enforcement system in May 1994. That report was widely circulated. These Bills build on the recommendations of that Committee.

There is a lot of detail in the Bills, and no doubt the Parliament will explore that detail as they progress. In general terms, the legislative package is designed to achieve the following objects:

1. The Expiation of Offences Bill sets out a set of rules for the enforcement of expiation notices which is a common scheme for all expiation notices. There will, therefore, be a common set of rules which both enforcers and the public can access, and all are to be treated alike.

2. The scheme will permit those who are assessed as suffering hardship if they are compelled to pay their expiation notices to access either a payment by instalments scheme or a community service scheme in lieu of payment. Preference will be given to payment by instalments. Criteria for "hardship" will be formulated to guide the discretion of Court Registrars.

3. The scheme will permit the payment of expiation notices by credit card or debit card if the authority which issues the notice has that facility. The provision is facilitative and not mandatory. It does not compel any authority to supply the service although it would obviously be to their advantage to do so.

4. The Expiation Bill outlines a new scheme for community service which applies before the expiation matter goes to Court. This scheme has much in common with that which currently exists in the *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act*, with the most important difference being that, under the Expiation scheme, the fee is worked off at \$150

per day, and under the Sentencing scheme, a fine is worked off at \$100 per day. In short, there is a strong financial incentive for those who would suffer hardship in payment to access the law as early as possible. Those who do nothing and do not try to deal with their lawful obligations will suffer by comparison.

5. The new scheme also allows for "electronic enforcement"—that is, automatic conversion of the expiation notice to a Court order (i.e., a conviction and fine) after the period for expiation has elapsed and a reminder notice has been sent. The current legislative scheme says that, if a notice is not expiated, the matter must be the subject of a summons and a Court hearing. This is largely a waste of time. Many simply do not answer the summons. Of those who do, over 90% plead guilty. The anecdotal evidence from those in the Courts is that they simply want to access an option to pay off the fee because of financial hardship. The new scheme allows those people to do that without the formal Court hearing. There is simply no point in having a formal Court hearing for those who simply will not turn up. For those who want to contest the case, the new scheme provides for an election at any time prior to enforcement for a Court hearing, and a right of review thereafter. But again, the system is designed so as to provide significant incentives to access the Court system as soon as possible.

6. Unlike the current scheme, the new scheme makes the giving of reminder notices mandatory after the expiry of the expiation period. The right to make a late payment at any time before an enforcement order is made is preserved.

I commend this Bill to the House.

*Clause 1: Short title*

This clause is formal.

*Clause 2: Commencement*

This clause provides for commencement of the Act by proclamation.

*Clause 3: Application of Act*

This clause provides that the new Act only applies to expiation notices issued after the commencement of the Act (the *Expiation of Offences Act 1987* will continue to apply to notices issued under that Act).

*Clause 4: Interpretation*

This clause provides the necessary definitions. The definitions of "Court" and "Registrar" make it clear that enforcement proceedings relating to expiation notices given to persons under 18 at the time of the alleged offence will be taken in the Youth Court. In all other cases the Magistrates Court will be the forum. The definition of "issuing authority" provides that if an expiation notice is issued by a member of the police force, then the police will thereafter be responsible for all follow up action (e.g. the issue of a reminder notice or the sending of a certificate to trigger an enforcement order). In all other cases the issuing authority is the body on whose behalf the expiation notice is issued.

*Clause 5: Certain offences may be expiated*

This clause is the primary provision that allows for the giving of expiation notices in all cases where an Act, regulation or by-law fixes an expiation fee in respect of a particular offence. Subclause (3) continues the provision in the current Act that allows expiation fees to be fixed for offences against regulations or by-laws even though the particular Act does not specifically allow for this. (This provision is of a transitional nature as the intention is for each Act to make specific provision for expiation where appropriate). Regulatory offences involving violence cannot be made expiable under this provision.

*Clause 6: Expiation notices*

This clause sets out the rules with which expiation notices must comply. Where an expiation fee (or the total of a number of fees) under an expiation notice is \$50 or less, the expiation period will be 30 days. In all other cases it will be 60 days. Subclause (1)(k) is of a particular note—all expiation notices must now be accompanied by a notice by which the alleged offender can elect to be prosecuted for any of the offences to which the expiation notices relates. (Expiation notices given for traffic or parking offences must also be accompanied by a so-called "dob in" notice by which the alleged offender can name some other person as the owner or driver of the vehicle). Any expiation notice may be given by the police. Other persons must be authorised in writing by the relevant Minister, statutory authority or council or must be authorised to do so by an Act. Subclause (4) provides that if council officers are permitted to act as inspectors under any particular Act, they are also authorised to issue expiation notices for offences against that Act and if they do so, the council becomes the issuing authority for the purposes of this Act. Subclause (5) repeats an existing provision.

*Clause 7: Payment by credit card*

This clause enables payment of expiation fees (and the Criminal Injuries Compensation levy) by credit card or debit card if credit card or debit card facilities are available at the place of payment.

*Clause 8: Alleged offender may elect to be prosecuted*

This clause enables an alleged offender to elect to be prosecuted for any of the offences specified in an expiation notice. However, an election cannot be made if the offender has applied for and been granted an order for relief (i.e. payment in instalments or community service) on the grounds of hardship. Otherwise an election can be made up to the time at which an enforcement order is made in respect of the offence.

*Clause 9: Options in cases of hardship*

This clause allows an alleged offender to apply to the Registrar of the relevant Court for an order for relief if the offender cannot pay an expiation fee. An order can be granted for payment in instalments or for community service. The outstanding fees under any number of expiation notices can be aggregated by the Registrar for the purposes of making such an order. If the amount due is less than \$50, an order for payment in instalments cannot be made. If the amount is less than \$150, an order for community service cannot be made. An order for relief cannot be made unless the levy under the *Criminal Injuries Compensation Act* has been paid. Subclause (10) preserves the operation of an order for relief despite the fact that the time for the commencement of a prosecution for the offence may have expired. Subclause (11) gives the Registrar the power to cancel an order for relief if the offender fails to comply with it. If this happens, the issuing authority will be notified. The issuing authority must also be notified if an order is fully complied with. Community service will work off the outstanding amount at the rate of \$150 for each 8 hours of service.

*Clause 10: Review of cancellation of order for relief*

This clause gives an alleged offender the right to have a decision of the Registrar to cancel an order for relief reviewed by the relevant Court. The Court's decision on such a review is not appealable.

*Clause 11: Expiation reminder notices*

This clause requires the issuing authority to give the alleged offender a reminder notice if no action has been taken by the offender by the end of the expiation period. The reminder notice fee (which will be prescribed by regulation) is added to the unpaid expiation fee.

*Clause 12: Late payment*

This clause provides that an issuing authority may accept late payment of an expiation fee at any time before an enforcement order is made.

*Clause 13: Enforcement procedures*

This clause sets out the procedures whereby an unpaid expiation notice will be converted into a conviction for the unexpiated offence with a fine equivalent to the unpaid amount. If the issuing authority forwards to the relevant Court a certificate setting out the particulars of the expiation notice and the amount outstanding, the Registrar may issue an enforcement order if the time for prosecution has not expired. The Registrar may also issue an enforcement order where he or she has cancelled an order for relief, and may do so even if the time for prosecution has expired, provided that the enforcement order is made within 30 days of cancellation. Costs will be included in an enforcement order.

*Clause 14: Enforcement orders are not subject to appeal but may be reviewed*

This clause provides that the offender may seek to have an enforcement order reviewed by the relevant Court. If the Court revokes an enforcement order on the ground that a particular notice was not received by the offender, the offender will for all purposes be deemed to have been given the relevant notice on the day on which the Court revoked the enforcement order.

*Clause 15: Effect of expiation*

This clause provides that if an offence is expiated the alleged offender is not liable to be prosecuted for the offence or any other expiable offence arising out of the same incident. However, if the offence is one arising out of the use of a motor vehicle, the offender (or another person) can still be prosecuted for unexpiated offences arising under certain sections of the *Motor Vehicles Act* even though they arose out of the same incident. This clause is virtually a repeat of the existing Act.

*Clause 16: Expiation notice may be withdrawn*

This clause provides for the withdrawal of expiation notices where the issuing authority believes that the notice should not have been given in the first place, or decides that the alleged offender should be prosecuted for the offence. A notice cannot be withdrawn on the latter ground if the offender has part performed a community service order or if 90 days from the date of the expiation notice has expired.



*Clause 17: Application of payments*

This clause provides for the application of expiation fees in the same manner as in the existing Act. Expiation fees (and reminder notice fees) go into the Consolidated Account unless the expiation notice was issued on behalf of a statutory authority or council, in which case the relevant body keeps the fees. However, if the offence was reported by the police, the fees are divided equally between the relevant council (or statutory authority) and the Consolidated Account.

*Clause 18: Giving of certain notices and certificates*

This clause allows notices given by the Registrar to an issuing authority, and certificates sent by an issuing authority to the Registrar, to be in electronic form.

*Clause 19: Non-derogation*

This clause provides that the Act does not derogate from any other Act that may make provision for expiation of offences.

*Clause 20: Regulations*

This clause is the regulation making power.

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

### SUMMARY PROCEDURE (TIME FOR MAKING COMPLAINT) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier):** I move:

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

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

Leave granted.

It is an important part of the proposed common expiation scheme that there be a distinction drawn between expiable offences and summary offences. The latter are more serious and attract tougher procedural provisions and stricter and more rigorous safeguards of civil liberty. Equally, however, there must be safeguards in the expiation system, and so there are. For example, as a general rule, the highest expiation fee is to be \$315 unless the legislation creating the expiable offence explicitly says to the contrary. This part of the legislative package proposes a clear difference between expiable and summary offences in relation to the statute of limitations. The statute of limitations for summary offences has stood at six months since 1850—but the seriousness of summary offences, their complexity and the society within which they are to be enforced have greatly changed since then. That period is far more apt for expiable offences, which now perform the same function that the summary jurisdiction once did. So it is proposed that the offence must be prosecuted within six months after the expiation period runs out. It is proposed, by way of contrast, that the statute of limitations for non-expiable summary offences ought to be expanded to two years.

I commend this Bill to the House.

*Clause 1: Short title*

This clause is formal.

*Clause 2: Commencement*

This clause provides for commencement of the Act by proclamation.

*Clause 3: Substitution of s. 52*

This clause re-enacts section 52 of the principal Act. Unless the Act by which an offence is created provides a different time limit (and quite a number do) the time limit for prosecuting a summary offence will be two years, unless the offence is expiable. If the offence is expiable, the time limit for commencing a prosecution is six months if an expiation notice has not been given to the alleged offender, but if an expiation notice has been given, the time limit is extended to six months from the end of the expiation period specified in the notice (*i.e.* 30 days or 60 days).

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

### RACING (TAB) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendment:

Clause 4, page 2, lines 2 and 3—Leave out subsection (3) and insert subsection as follows:

(3) At least two of the members of the board must be men and at least two must be women.

Consideration in Committee.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

Motion carried.

### PASTORAL LAND MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION (EXTENSION OF INTERIM BOARD) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 February. Page 1037.)

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** The Opposition has given the Bill long and deep thought and has consulted widely with the industry. There are two changes I would like to note as far as this Bill is concerned: first, it does not contain any taxes, charges, imposts or levies. In every other Bill that the Minister has put forward to this House, to my knowledge, he has never mentioned the word 'tax' but they have contained every other variety. It still means the same thing: it is money coming out of your pocket that you have not spent before. Apparently, that is not a new tax. But what has not changed is the fact that this Minister comes along with a wholesale series of amendments to his own Bill.

*The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** The Minister interjects that the Opposition would not debate it the last time we were sitting. That is quite right. Before I have the interjections from the lance corporal over there—the member for Mawson—I point out that the reason we did not debate the Bill on that occasion was simply that this Government decided to close down Parliament in the week leading up to the Federal election, because it did not want to be further embarrassed or to embarrass its Federal colleagues in the lead-up to that election. I would make another point, from some of my casual observations on this Bill.

*The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** I am pleased that the Minister is interjecting and that his lance corporal is also in the House, because I note that the announcement about the parliamentary private secretaries made by the Premier last week was on the eve of the ides of March. This Minister would do well to remember how ambitious his lance corporal actually is. If he remembers what happened to a previous lance corporal some 50 years ago, he will appreciate—

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Becker):** Order! The Deputy Leader will link his remarks to the Bill.

**Mr CLARKE:** I am linking them, Sir, very much to the point about a little lance corporal of some 50 years ago in Europe who achieved great heights, but disastrously for the whole of humanity.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker: I fail to see what this has to do with the Bill before the House.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. I remind the House of the instructions that the Speaker gave earlier this afternoon on frivolous points of order. I do understand that from time to time there is certain rhetoric across the Chamber. The Deputy Leader has already been asked to link his remarks to the Bill. I suggest that he get back to the Bill quickly and debate the issue before the House.

**Mr CLARKE:** Yes, Sir; I am just coming to that and will link in my remarks. Again, it was a very wise ruling from you, Mr Acting Speaker. I note that in the Bill the Government has continued the former Labor Government's position of naming the organisations from which the representatives on this board should be drawn. I notice that people are drawn from the Farmers Federation, formerly the United Farmers and Graziers, and from the Conservation Council. I do not have any argument with that and, indeed, I support the position, except that I find the ideology of this Government somewhat strange: in every other Bill introduced in this House by any other Minister, wherever a board was to be drawn from groups representing employees, for example, and when the former Labor Government referred to the United Trades and Labor Council in its legislation, the Government through its Ministers has sought assiduously to delete any reference to the United Trades and Labor Council and simply refer to a representative of employees on the basis that that body did not necessarily represent the whole of the work force in South Australia.

Of course, the Farmers Federation in South Australia does not represent 100 per cent of the farmers of this State. Nonetheless, I do not knock the fact that the Government wants a representative body on this board. I support it in that and I support the retention of the Farmers Federation. I just wish that this Government was not so ideologically blinkered when it came to representatives from the United Trades and Labor Council being mentioned specifically in Government legislation.

I make the further point that, when the member for MacKillop was the Minister for Primary Industries, I thought that he was a bit of a tough act to follow with respect to conservation matters. In fact, I nicknamed him Chainsaw Baker, but I must say that the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources and the dastardly deeds he wants to permit regarding the koalas on Kangaroo Island defy the imagination.

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I believe that those remarks are out of order and not in any way in context in this debate.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The point of order is on relevance and is sustained. I ask the Deputy Leader to link his remarks to the legislation.

**Mr CLARKE:** Yes, Sir. I am winding up my remarks now. I conclude by saying that the Opposition will support the passage of this Bill through the House. My colleague the shadow Minister has been briefed on this matter. He may want to put one or two questions in another place, but I think the Minister can be fairly confident, notwithstanding his brutal force on koala bears on Kangaroo Island, that on this occasion we will support—

*Mrs Rosenberg interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** The member for Kaurua is quite right. They are not koala bears: they are koalas. The Minister will shoot them anyway, but they are koalas, not bears. The Opposition supports this Bill.

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** First, I am delighted to be able to stand up in this House for the first time as the parliamentary secretary to the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources Minister to support a Bill introduced by him. I look forward to working closely with the Minister, who is absolutely committed to the environment area and also the areas of ageing and family and community services

which, when you think about it, all tie in well with the environment and natural resources.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I remind the honourable member that a few minutes ago he took a point of order on another member in relation to relevance. He will address his remarks to the legislation.

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:** Thank you, Sir. My comments are relevant because, as parliamentary secretary to the Minister, I have great pleasure in supporting this Bill. I am delighted to note that the Opposition and, in particular, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition have realised the importance of this Bill and have supported it. I congratulate the Deputy Leader. I can remember a previous Minister of Agriculture, Mr Tom Casey, who had a property at Peterborough on the fringe of Goyder's line in agricultural-pastoral country. I am sure that the Hon. Tom Casey and his son John Casey, whom I have known for some years, would also support this Bill because of the importance of representation from the pastoral areas.

As we all know, the Pastoral Board of South Australia, which has a key advisory responsibility in these range lands, has been operating successfully since about 1990. A key component to the breadth of the expertise that it brought to its considerations was the bringing in of the two pastoralists. That is relevant. Where the Deputy Leader of the Opposition missed the point was that this is not about bringing in unionists or SAFF for the sake of it: this is about bringing in pastoralists to make sure that we have a good balance on this board to protect our most important natural resources—the pastoral and arid areas.

The Deputy Leader might like to come on a trip with me. I have had the pleasure of heading north on many occasions, such as the Variety Club Bash through to Innaminka a couple of years ago. I could not believe the devastation I saw occurring as we went towards Coopers Creek: it was literally alive with rabbits. There was no undercover at all, the saltbush and bluebush were virtually completely degraded and the driver of our old army truck had a job to miss all the rabbit burrows. There were other occasions, such as last year when I took my family to the Flinders Ranges. We heard Minister Wotton talking about feral goats in the pastoral areas and the national parks. Anyone who drives from Wilpena towards Arkaroola will see the devastation that goats are causing in that area. In fact, apart from the ironstone and a few bushes along the sides of the creeks, thousands of hectares have been totally wiped out by feral goats.

This Bill is important because it will enable continuation of the provisions of the transitional clauses of the 1989 Act, under which it was established that a six person board should include two pastoralists. Members will note that the Bill extends the current six member board for a further three years, to the ninth anniversary of the commencement of the 1989 Act.

In time it is intended to expand the membership of the board even further to include Aboriginal and recreational interests. Once again, that supports the Minister's direction. I trust that the Deputy Leader has noted the significance of even further expansion to include the important areas of, first, Aboriginal history—which incorporates the general knowledge to help look after these pastoral and arid areas—and, secondly, recreational interests, particularly given the numbers of people who travel through the Simpson Desert. Those people can be accommodated but the region can still be protected. The issues facing those in the cattle country north of the State's dog fence are certainly very different from those facing the sheep pastoralists in the grazing areas

on the southern side of the dog fence. There is no way known that just one pastoralist can represent both. As my colleague and friend Mr Venning would agree—and he is very interested in agriculture in the pastoral areas—there is a great difference between management of the cattle grazing areas in the pastoral arid zone and that of the sheep area.

The board involves great expertise, its membership covering conservation, soil conservation, administration—which, clearly, is needed on any board—arid land ecology and the representation and knowledge of pastoralists. As the Minister has already pointed out, the time frame under the Bill will allow further consideration of wider legislative amendments to the existing Pastoral Act that will address board membership relative to the multiple use issues on which I touched. These amendments have been deferred pending clarification of native title issues and Aboriginal access rights as they apply to land currently held under pastoral leases.

It is an important Bill and it is one that we should pass quickly because it is an area of the State that needs to have protection, and that can be done only by a knowledgeable board looking after those interests. I support the Bill.

**Mr VENNING (Custance):** I was most amused at the remarks made by the Deputy Leader today. I often listen to the Deputy Leader's speeches with great interest because sometimes they are not only entertaining but contain facts. I am afraid that today the Deputy Leader was off the mark: clearly, he did not understand what he was talking about. However, we are grateful for the Opposition's support. When a Party is decimated, as the Labor Party has been, it does not have enough members to cover the areas adequately, but I do not hold the honourable member responsible for that. Fancy contemplating that a member of the United Trades and Labor Council ought to be on the board at the expense of a pastoralist. The previous Labor Government did that. The Opposition is irrelevant not only in the State sphere but also in the Federal sphere: it has reached the point of irrelevance. Whilst this is a simple Bill—

**Mr CLARKE:** Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The honourable member said that in my contribution I was seeking to supplant a Farmers Federation representative on the board with a UTLC representative. That is not what I said. My point of order is that the honourable member was completely inaccurate with regard to what I stated, as the record will show.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. I must remind the Deputy Leader that in making a point of order he should not engage in further debate. The member for Custance.

**Mr VENNING:** If the honourable member did not say that, I am sure he thought it. The honourable member has a long history of getting his own way. He had a long history before he came to this place of crunching the numbers and he ensured that he had adequate representation.

*Mr Quirke interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr VENNING:** This is a simple Bill to ensure the membership of two pastoralists on the six member board. It was not at all acceptable that the number of pastoralists on the board be reduced to one. The board deals with the management of 17 to 18 per cent of the total area of this State, and that does not include the Aboriginal lands in the north-west. I am pleased to note that the Bill proposes that the board should continue for another three years as a six member board

with the two pastoralist representatives. I hope it goes beyond that: I hope that the membership of the two pastoralist representatives remains for the whole time the board is constituted. One of these two board members is a sheep pastoralist and the other is a cattle pastoralist. I also understand that broader amendments will be considered.

I believe that this is a minimal position, considering that, when it was first set up in 1989, the board had membership of six pastoralists and after the first six years that number was scaled down to two. Of course, there was a Labor Government and its priorities were well and truly known: it would have liked to have none. It would have liked to substitute with a United Trades and Labor Council representative, as the Deputy Leader said. The Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act was extensively debated in the Legislative Council in August 1989, when it was introduced, and I have read the debates with interest. Certainly, I shall be keeping close watch on developments over the next three years.

I will not go into all the issues that were debated in 1989, but there are some very important matters under the jurisdiction of the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act. Prior to the legislation being introduced in 1989, a select committee formulated and reviewed the provisions. I am informed that there was some opposition to the membership of two pastoralists on the board and the decision was made to revert to only one pastoralist after the sixth anniversary of the commencement of the Act. This was done under a Labor Government. That decision was an absolute insult. Fancy a board deciding that the representation of the pastoral areas of the State be scaled down from two, which was is not enough, to one. It was a gross insult and extremely unfair, and I am very pleased that we are changing that.

I am pleased to see that sanity will prevail and that the importance of input from a pastoralist representing the ephemeral cattle country north of the State's dog fence as well as input from a pastoralist representing the sheep area south of the dog fence has been recognised. As was said by the previous speaker, the member for Mawson, the South Australian Farmers Federation informs me that administration of the pastoral areas has been isolated from the administration and natural resource management of the rest of the State and has been tarnished by controversy over the years. There is a need to consider improved security for lessees, clearer rent setting provisions, better integration with soil conservation measures, and input from Aboriginal and tourism interest groups regarding access to the area and to the lands. The range lands have much potential for South Australia. Parliament must ensure that the Act recognises and promotes that potential. The issue has not been resolved to the extent where broader amendments to this Act can be introduced. However, it is obvious that the presence of two pastoralists on the board is beneficial to its performance and will be important as the board and the Minister prepare the broader changes envisaged.

The South Australian Farmers Federation therefore supports this Bill as an interim measure to ensure that adequate representation is maintained while the broader issues regarding the range lands are settled. I have the highest regard for the people who live in our more remote regions, particularly the pastoralists. They are great people and are wonderful contributors to the State economy and to their communities. I often refer to these people as the real people. They espouse true values. They are not demanding of Government and, without interference, generally they are

satisfied with their lot. I have much pleasure in definitely supporting this Bill.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources):** I thank my colleagues for the support they have given this legislation, and I also thank the Deputy Leader for the support that he brings from the Opposition. A couple of matters need to be clarified in regard to the contribution of the Deputy Leader. First, the fact that this House rose early is not the reason why the original Bill was not debated; rather, there was time available for it to proceed but the Opposition got its knickers in a knot and decided not to proceed with the debate, and this has meant that amendments will need to be introduced to this Bill.

The other thing that I would like to clarify again—and as the Deputy Leader was given the right to discuss the issue I presume that I will be, too—is my handling of the koala situation on Kangaroo Island. The Deputy Leader has once again suggested that I support the culling of koalas in South Australia. I have made it quite clear that that is not the case and, for the record, in this debate, I make that point again.

The legislation that we are debating today is to retain the *status quo*, that is, to have a Pastoral Board with six members. That has been the case for some time and has worked well, and I will give further explanation as to why those amendments are necessary when the time comes to move them. It is my intention, at a later stage, to again amend the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act to extend the board, but at this stage I am quite happy to maintain the *status quo* so that we have six members. However, I would very much like, at a later stage, to be able to place on this board a person representing the tourism industry. I say that because so many of the people on the pastoral lands now, in one way or another, have become involved in tourism, and I think it is appropriate that that should happen. It has also been suggested that we consider the appointment of an Aboriginal person, and that is something that I will be considering at a later stage. At this stage it is a matter of maintaining the *status quo* so that we can get back to a six person board as soon as possible.

Along with the member who has just spoken, I have enjoyed immensely over the past two years the contact that I have had with the people from the pastoral lands. I have spent a considerable amount of time in the area—I would suggest more time than Ministers from the previous Government were prepared to spend—and I have enjoyed immensely meeting a lot of the pastoralists. I admire tremendously the contribution that these people make to this State. The thing that has impressed me more than anything else is that they are, on the whole, very strongly conservation minded. They are all striving for sustainability, as are the conservationists. I think we are all working towards the same goal.

When one has the opportunity to look at some of the work that they are doing through the soil boards, for example, and the reports that have been prepared by a number of the people on those boards, one will see that they are to be commended. I would certainly wish to take this opportunity to do that, and I am sure that all members of the House will join with me in commending the pastoralists for the excellent work they do throughout South Australia.

I thank the House for its support. As I have indicated earlier, it will be necessary for me to move amendments at the appropriate time.

Bill read a second time.  
In Committee.

Clause 1—‘Short title.’

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I move:

Page 1, lines 10 and 11—Leave out ‘(Extension of Interim Board)’ and insert ‘(Board Membership)’.

For the reasons that have been indicated, it is necessary to make this amendment. However, I will be giving further explanation when I move my next amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 2—‘Commencement.’

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I move:

Page 1, leave out this clause and insert clause as follows:  
Amendment of s. 12—Establishment of the Pastoral Board  
2. Section 12 of the principal Act is amended—

- (a) by striking out from subsection (2) ‘five’ and substituting ‘6’;
- (b) by striking out from subsection (2)(b) ‘Minister of Environment and Planning’ and substituting ‘Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources’;
- (c) by striking out from subsection (2)(c) ‘Minister of Agriculture’ and substituting ‘Minister for Primary Industries’;
- (d) by striking out paragraphs (d) and (e) of subsection (2) and substituting the following paragraphs:
  - (d) one will be selected by the Minister from a list of 3 persons who produce beef cattle on pastoral land outside the dog fence, submitted by the South Australian Farmers Federation;
  - (e) one will be selected by the Minister from a list of 3 persons who produce sheep on pastoral land inside the dog fence, submitted by the South Australian Farmers Federation;
  - (f) one will be selected by the Minister from a list of 3 persons submitted by the Conservation Council of South Australia Inc.;
- (e) by striking out from subsection (6) ‘or (e)’ and substituting ‘(e) or (f)’;
- (f) by striking out from subsection (7) ‘or (e)’ and substituting ‘(e) or (f)’.

The Pastoral Board of South Australia, which has key advisory and regulatory responsibilities in the State’s extensive range lands, has operated quite successfully since 1990 when the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act, which establishes the current board, came into force. As I indicated in my second reading explanation on 14 February, a key component to the breadth of expertise the board has brought to its considerations was the membership of two pastoralists, one from the cattle country north of the dog fence and one from the sheep country inside the fence.

This membership was enabled by the provisions of the transitional clauses of the 1989 Act, which established a six person board to include two pastoralists until the sixth anniversary of the commencement of the Act. This clause expired on 6 March this year when the board’s three-year term expired. Section 12 of the Act now applies, which requires a five member board to include only one pastoralist. It is Government policy that the Pastoral Board, which has been a six member board since the operation of the 1989 Act, remain in its present configuration. There is general acceptance that the land management and sustainability issues in the northern cattle country vary significantly from those in the sheep country. It would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for one pastoralist to adequately input on all issues that affect our extensive range lands in the north of the State. This on-ground of input is a critical component of the expertise provided by the board, which also comprises membership from the areas of conservation, soil conservation, administration and arid land ecology.

This brief Bill, therefore, extends the six member board by amending section 12 to allow for the appointment of two producer members. It also corrects the legislative reference

to both my portfolio title and that of my colleague, the Minister for Primary Industries. As mentioned in the previous explanation, further consideration of wider legislative amendments to the current Pastoral Act that will address the enlarged board configuration to consider multiple use issues, more secure tenure for these issues and simplified rental assessment procedures will be provided for in the near future. Those amendments have been deferred, pending clarification of native title issues and Aboriginal access rights as they apply to land currently held under the pastoral lease. I hope that the Committee will recognise the need for these amendments, and I commend the amendments to the Committee.

Existing clause struck out; new clause inserted.

Clause 3—'Amendment of schedule.'

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I oppose this clause.

Clause negated.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### GAMING MACHINES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 February. Page 1036.)

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** This legislation has had a rather interesting gestation, to say the least. I well remember going to a very nice lunch not far from here as a guest of the AHA some three or so months ago, on a very fateful day in December. In fact, it was a day on which the Government was bringing down its response to the Hill report on the impact of gaming machines on charities in South Australia. It was a great lunch; we had a good time, and the Deputy Premier said, 'We haven't quite made up our minds yet. We'll let you know this afternoon what we're going to do. We'll go back and sort out a few small details.' At my table, one gentleman—who shall remain anonymous—said, 'If that crowd comes back and wants any more than one million bucks for charities, there'll be war.'

You can imagine how I just sat there and took it all in and did not fuel the debate at all, because even in my wildest dreams I did not think the Deputy Premier could have the cheek to go down there for lunch and come back later in the afternoon and announce the sorts of things that would be done to the gaming industry. I have to give it to the Deputy Premier. As some members here know, we have an occasion each year when we give prizes for some of the most outstanding political talents. My nominee for the academy award this year is the Deputy Premier for having the hide of at least three rhinos to go down and have that lunch and then come back and announce what really was going to be a savaging of the infant gaming industry in South Australia.

Since that time, some people have been talking to the Deputy Premier and he has been talking back. I must say that the industry and the Premier now seem to have come together with a sort of package that will solve part of the Deputy Premier's problem, namely, a shortage of funds, and some of their problems involving the two tier turnover tax proposed in December last year. I must say that I did find it rather amusing that a number of Government members told us around the corridors and out in the community at various functions, and particularly when there were any hoteliers nearby, that not necessarily everything that was announced that afternoon was universally accepted by the industry. In fact, it would appear that some people were told one thing in

the Party room and outside found out something altogether different.

The proposal in front of us is something that will give a great deal more than \$1 million to Treasury, indeed, much more than \$1 million, and it appears that the industry has now come to a reasonable compromise with the Government to provide extra funds through gaming machines in South Australia and to achieve what they feel their industry can in fact support. I refer to the rates of tax that will exist if this legislation is successful—and that is a big 'if', because I will be going through a number of issues one by one, and we will not be rolling over and letting this go through if these issues are not addressed: that needs to be made absolutely crystal clear. I do think this is taxing the goose that laid the golden egg. I must say it is wonderful to see that the Government loves gaming machines because, when Government members were in Opposition, one or two quite prominent ones did not even vote on this legislation when it went through.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**Mr QUIRKE:** Don't pick on him; we will have a go at the Premier first. Obviously the Premier hates anyone having a good time at the gaming machines. He has made that fairly clear around the place. I do not think he is too keen on horse racing and a few other things, either. Premier Brown has made it quite clear that he does not like anyone having a good time with gaming machines, but does he love the money that comes out of them! He is enraptured with that.

The Deputy Premier has the job these days of trying to find enough funds to cover all the other lines of expenditure that we see come through, and this is a measure to achieve that: let us be quite blunt about it. There are three issues which the Opposition will be raising both by way of amendment and in debate here and in the other place. The first issue is the question of the hours. I do not know how some of the Government members will vote on this. I gave some advice to the industry a few years ago that, if the gaming machine Bill were ever to re-enter this place, my view was that there would be not six but 24 consecutive hours operation of machines being turned off every day of the week, every week of the year, irrespective of whether or not it was a public holiday or otherwise.

It appears that the Deputy Premier has told his lot that it is not a conscience vote and they have to stick firm on this, and he has promised them all sorts of things in the \$24 million tart shop to which I will refer in a moment. This Bill has now come in here, and the first issue the Labor Opposition will not be supporting is the concept of the six consecutive hours. We do not have any problem with Christmas Day or Good Friday, and you can probably toss a few others in there if you wish: I think that is pandering to some religious minorities around the place, and I use the word 'minorities' advisedly because that is what they are. If that is what the Government wants to do, that is up to it.

We will not stand in the way of that. Personally, if people want to put two bob in a gaming machine on Christmas Day and get their fun out of that, that may save them from having a lonely dinner somewhere else, and that is their business. At the end of the day, we will let the Government pander to that lobby and particularly to a number of people in this Chamber who have shown a predilection for that sort of thing. However, the six hours will hurt a couple of hotels that have a shift worker clientele. There are a couple out there in the North Terrace precinct—and we all know who they are—that provide a service to those people who cannot gamble in the Casino, because they work in the Casino.

In the first raft of amendments we seek to put some flexibility into the whole system. All right, you can have your six hours. Most hotels are closed for more than six hours, but you can have your six hours. At least give those hotels and clubs that derive a good part of their income—the income that employs people, that pays their bills, that pays the bank and keeps the door open—the flexibility of dealing with it in two lots of three hours or three lots of two hours. If you want six hours, that is fine. I do not understand that: you either have a gaming machine or you do not. I find the whole thing an absolute puzzle. I say that because I have never put five cents in one of these things, and I have no intention of doing so. I actually cry when I see my money going down the drain. I am even more upset when more of it goes to the Treasurer. At the end of the day I have no love of these things. If somebody wants to do it, that is their business.

We have a proposal that pubs close for six hours. I ask members to at least allow some flexibility for those hotels that need that in their business. Do not drive them to the wall as a result of your funny ideas. Be open about it—by all means come in here and say that you do not believe in gaming machines, that you were not here or you lost the numbers years ago, but accept the fact that many people have now set their businesses in train and they need flexibility in this approach.

I now want to talk about charities and social welfare groups. I must say that I have spoken about this in the media a fair bit since December. The Hill report was excellent—I actually read it. I well remember that lovely afternoon when I had a nice lunch, courtesy of the AHA, and the report came down and I was given a copy. I could have had many more copies of the report at the end of the day, and the reason is very simple: no-one around here was reading it, let alone the Government. It was a cynical excuse to whack up the tax and pile money into the Treasury.

The Hill report has indicated that there is a problem for a number of affected organisations. They fall into two principal categories. The first group comprises those people and organisations that are absolutely on the frontline helping Gamblers Anonymous, helping all those people who really cannot control their gambling habit. Then there are other organisations that are impacted upon in all sorts of other ways—either by the downturn in other means of gambling, which is affecting the amount of money that some charitable organisations have, or indeed by driving more clients through the front door, clients who have put money in a gaming machine when it should have been used to pay a power bill or to buy food and clothing.

What the Government sought to do in this whole exercise was to excise \$25 million from the allocation that was going to Treasury. A sum of \$1 million was to go to the affected charities with no sense of how that was to be disbursed. The other \$24 million was to go into a special fund. I have already used the term ‘tart’ shop, and I will explain what a tart shop is. It is a special fund from which members opposite will access money for their electorates, surprisingly in the shadow of the next State election. That is a tart shop, and that is what is being set up here.

*Mr Rossi interjecting:*

**Mr QUIRKE:** The member for Lee, who has made a number of comments recently about the under-privileged and the poor, wants to join in this debate. He can do that later. I look forward to his response. I look forward to what he has to say about this because he has never shown much empathy

for the poor before and I do not know that he will change his spots now.

At the end of the day, the Opposition will propose an amendment to create a board which will have a defined amount of money. I will talk more about that defined amount of money in a moment, but the suggestion is \$5 million. The board will comprise persons appointed by the Treasurer. We do not seek to have parliamentary appointments to the board; we recognise that the Government ought to have the right—it is the Government—to appoint the board. We want this problem rectified. On the board we want people with financial expertise and expertise in respect of charities. We will also move the standard amendment, similar to the amendment that went through about an hour ago in relation to one of the other boards about which there was legislative debate—that the board be of even gender and that there are at least two persons of each gender.

We also believe that the board ought to deal with problems facing affected charities on a 12 month cycle. Everyone knows that charities have a number of problems, but it should not be assumed that gaming machines are their principal and, in some instances, sole source of funding. The Treasurer and I have had discussions on this, and he has indicated to me that at some stage in the future we will have to have a sensible debate about the charities in South Australia and the way in which some of them collect their money. We do not see this measure as a replacement for their important work in collecting revenue by various other means.

The second issue for us, which will be the subject of an amendment, is that we believe the funding of \$1 million is miserly. It is a meagre amount of money and it is insufficient. We would like to see the process by which that money will be disbursed. We believe that an affected charities board needs to be put in place so that the whole thing is sorted out properly.

Many groups need assistance, but one group that has been knocking on the door for some time is the sporting clubs. Certainly, in my electorate, a number of sporting clubs are surviving on just a shoestring. Members will say, ‘Where is Foundation SA?’ That is a very good question. I can tell you where it is not: it is not out in the Playford electorate. I do not think the black tie circle meets much out in Playford. I do not know whether that is an unfair assessment of the foundation or not. I have other views in respect of the foundation. If it wants to see me, I will tell it all about it. The only visible evidence of Foundation SA in my electorate is a sign at the Para Hills Soccer Club, for which it paid \$604 some years ago. That is the only sign I have seen in my electorate.

Many sporting clubs are on council land, so they are subsidised by the local council. They are transitory in the sense that, although they provide a great service and educate children, their funding is only guaranteed from one year to the next. They live a pretty hard life.

We have all listened to the SANFL clubs and what they have had to say about this. Some of them have been to see me and, unfortunately, I had to give them the bad news, and I will do it here publicly, just as I did privately. Most of those clubs now have gaming machines and they are making money hand over fist. If they are not making money hand over fist, I want to know why. If they think that the Opposition will place a wedge between the hospitality industry and the football clubs, they have another think coming. We will not be doing that. We are saying that the educative functions of sporting clubs need to be recognised, and we are proposing here that, when we go beyond \$146 million—a figure I will

come back to in a moment—that money will go into a special fund held by Treasury and disbursed by the IDC.

I have had some discussions with members, and there are two issues we need to address this afternoon. First, why \$146 million? That is the amount that the industry has guaranteed the Government, and I understand that, if that is not achieved, if that target is not met, the rate will be adjusted so that that figure is met thereafter. We are told that the Government's share will be \$146 million. Our view is that that is fine if the industry can live with that. Its members have all written to me and spoken to me privately and said, 'This is what we want.' If that is their attitude, that is fine; we will accept that. But if there is any more money than that, we believe that it ought to go to sporting clubs and it ought to be disbursed by the IDC.

The second issue is: why did I choose the IDC? I can thank the Premier for that. The Premier is pretty fond of the IDC. Last year a couple of matters were referred to the IDC: the Premier obviously thought that that was a way in which we could deal with some of the larger contractual issues that the Government managed to get itself into. I think he is right: I think the IDC is an excellent committee. It has a number of balances, which ensure that it works on a bipartisan and confidential basis. My amendments seek to ensure that, on the recommendation of the Department of Sport and Recreation, the IDC will deal with sporting clubs on the basis of grants for specific projects. This is one way in which I think we can get money into a number of sporting clubs which do a great job but which, unfortunately, live hand to mouth.

This proposal is a fair way in which all members in this place can take a case to the IDC and obtain grants for specific purposes for sporting clubs. I would be very happy to hand this over to Foundation SA, except that I know I would never see the money again. That is what has happened. Many in my electorate smoke: they smoke an awful lot, but they do not get a lot back from the tobacco sponsorship money that goes through. In fact, I have seen very little of it. If quite a large number of the Labor electorates and the Liberal electorates stopped smoking, Foundation SA would have a miserable time, but it would not make any difference at all to the sporting clubs in my patch, because they get nothing out of it.

I hope that my remarks today are reported to the foundation. I hope that someone will take the trouble of sending a copy of my remarks to Foundation SA. If my comments upset one of its black tie dinners, that will make me feel happy, too, because at the end of the day all the foundation does is feed money into the peak bodies. I could tell members about the Royal South Australian Bowling Club: that is a peak organisation that does very nicely out of Foundation SA. It came out to my electorate, and a bloke got up in front of all those interested Para Hills bowlers who wanted a club, and he said a couple of things. The first was that he was a conservative voter, which he made quite clear, and I do not care about that. The second thing he said was that they were not going to get any money. The third thing he said was that the dough was all being used for a couple of bowling greens in the middle of the city. That was the Royal South Australian Bowling Club's response to the Para Hills bowlers, who had to approach the local council and then wait some seven or eight years to get the necessary funds to build some bowling greens. They did not even get a set of bowling balls from Foundation SA.

I can say these things because I do not smoke: I am very happy that I do not provide any money to that organisation.

I have selected the IDC because I think it is about time that members of Parliament started taking these things into their own hands. One of the things we ought to take into our own hands is looking after our electorates instead of bowing and scraping to a bunch of petty bureaucrats around the place who, in large part, think they have the whip hand over us. I think it is about time that we started taking control of some of these agenda. This IDC proposal is a clear cut example of that.

A couple of other aspects of this debate I think need to be discussed here. I said earlier that I would talk about the \$5 million for affected charities and social welfare groups. I have had people come to my office and tell me that they need \$5 million. I am not absolutely wedded to that figure. When I quizzed them about it they said that they suggested \$5 million because that is what I said in the House.

**Mr Foley:** Where did they get it from? Where did you get it from?

**Mr QUIRKE:** That is a good question. I got it from the Deputy Premier who, I think, made it up as he was coming into the Chamber. On the basis of what the Treasurer said before, I will accept the \$5 million, and after a year or two we will look at it and see exactly how that system has worked and, indeed, whether or not more money is required. I would like to point out to the House that when this Bill goes up to the other place, in whatever shape or form—and probably in the form the Deputy Premier wants—all this stuff will be debated again, except that there is a new element up there. There is another mob up there with some representation and some key votes, and I have to tell the Deputy Premier that they are four times as expensive as we are.

I spoke to the Deputy Premier earlier, and he told me that he had got the bad news. I told him that it probably would be a good idea to have a serious talk with us, and we are quite happy to do that at any stage. The Deputy Premier makes a good cup of coffee, and we will discuss the issues at his leisure. But, at the end of the day, the Opposition has a firm commitment to address some of the problems that have come out here. Those problems are, first, the question of hours and, secondly, the question of affected charities. Members opposite may disregard the Hill report: we do not. We want to do something about those sporting clubs that are also knocking on the door.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** I support the position of my learned and eloquent colleague. We have seen in this State a situation where the Hotels Association was tried to be done over in an attempted fraud on the industry, and there is no doubt about that. I strongly support the change in the hours. Let us just remember how incredibly hypocritical this Government is. Back in 1986, members—and I was one of them—stood up and advocated poker machines in this State. I was one of those, along with Terry Groom, who suffered a hailstorm of abuse. I know that the Hotels Association would not have forgotten our stand at that time. We stood up and argued the case for poker machines, and everyone said that it was the end of civilisation; that this was a disgrace; that my political career was over and I would never be a Minister. I conducted a survey in my own electorate, because over the years in politics and before—and I have been around for a long time—you get to know that, when people tell you there is mass opposition to what you are doing in your own electorate, it pays to check.

I did a survey and found that 73 per cent of people in my electorate of Salisbury agreed with my position. I was simply

asking why people in my own electorate from the Parafield Gardens Community Club were going across the border in buses and spending money in hotels in other States, providing jobs interstate. That did not make any sense to me at all.

I also remember that, in the debate on poker machines, in which the member for Giles led the charge, we heard Liberal after Liberal saying it was the end of civilisation. We remember that the now Premier of the State said that he would overturn the legislation. Following a prayer ceremony, he stood on the front steps of Parliament and said that he would come in here and overturn the legislation. I remember saying, 'No, they will not, because they will want the money.' We saw all this incredible phoneyism of the Liberals when they got their hands on the money: they forgot their tremendous moral sensibilities and objections against poker machines. Not only did they make a fortune out of poker machines but they then thought, 'Okay, let's think of another ruse: we will give charities \$1 million and we will rip off the hotel industry as well in the process.' It was a cynical move to increase taxes. I know it, they know it, and the hotel and club industry knows it. We support the change. I certainly support the change providing flexible hours; it makes commonsense.

On the issue of charities, there is absolutely no doubt in my mind that charities have found it more difficult to raise money and have found it difficult to cope with some of the problems that have resulted from poker machines. I do not pretend that there are not problems; there are problems and we must deal with them. I remember that day when the Deputy Premier stood up in here and said that the charities and welfare groups needed \$5 million to cope with the situation. Having known the Deputy Premier over many years, I am sure that he did a considerable amount of research to come up with that figure. It was well researched, well documented and well costed. He would have been on the phone with his staff for weeks, trying to ascertain the correct figure of \$5 million.

That is the figure I am signing off on, and that is the figure I will stick to because, in my view, \$5 million is about right in terms of assisting charities and welfare groups—all those groups out there that do so much to assist when the Government's safety nets do not work. Such groups include the Salvos, St Vincent de Paul, Anglican Social Services, Gamblers Anonymous and so on. So, they will get my very strong support for the \$5 million. It is the figure which I support and which I got from the Deputy Premier, so I know that it must be true.

The member for Playford has come up with an idea for the money in excess of \$146 million being allocated for the distribution of funds to sporting clubs. I strongly support that. I think that even the Deputy Premier will acknowledge my involvement with many sports in this State, including the Garville Netball Club, Salisbury United, Adelaide City and South Adelaide Football Club.

**The Hon. S.J. Baker:** Who won?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Who won, he asks? I have to concede that his team, Contax, was the only other club in this forum. Across the board I am constantly finding smaller clubs in my electorate in crisis. They do not have poker machines, they are having to compete out there in terms of getting people in and they are in difficulty. I remember very well a good scheme administered a few years ago by a former Minister for Recreation and Sport, Kym Mayes, called the Recreational Small Grants Scheme. Admittedly, it was a small pool of money, but it allocated small grants to assist

clubs. I remember that \$7 000 for the lights at the Salisbury Football Club was very much appreciated.

It is becoming increasingly difficult for clubs to attract people to the clubrooms at night after the game, to compete with the kinds of services offered by clubs and hotels in terms of entertainment and to survive. We are suggesting that the cream on the cake—anything in addition to the \$146 million—be administered by the IDC or another parliamentary committee in the process of distributing funds. That is very important. It gives the clubs an opportunity to make a submission about how those grants can assist them in what they do.

Let us remember that in working class areas those clubs perform an extraordinary task in keeping kids off the street and keeping communities intact. One of my own clubs, Salisbury United Soccer Club, has recently been recognised by an international magazine for the work it does with hundreds of juniors—the best example in Australia. But it is very hard to get sponsorship and to get people to spend money in the clubrooms. Certainly, I have been trying to help them to get sponsorship in recent times.

This idea has a great deal of merit. The cream on the cake will be allocated by a bipartisan committee which over the years has served this State very well indeed. The IDC is not set up to administer funds, but we could get advice for that committee from the department. A Treasury officer is on that committee and it has equal numbers of Government and Opposition members, so it could not be used as a pork-barrelling machine for this State Government for the next election. The distribution of those funds should be on basis of merit and of assisting clubs to prosper, do well, expand and help more young people, as we all want to see.

I am suggesting this approach rather than going through Foundation SA. I am about to say something controversial about the foundation. As a local member of Parliament, I have been disappointed with it. I remember filling in forms and assisting the Brahma Lodge Football Club in trying to get funding a few years ago. There was a very high incidence of smoking and also a demand for people running nutritional programs. It is a club which has done a great deal for the Aboriginal community in the northern suburbs. A large number of migrants, people from a non-English speaking background and long-term unemployed people are involved with that club. We pitched that application and submission to fit the clear criteria for funding under the legislation for Foundation SA. Unfortunately, it was too small to qualify for assistance from Foundation SA. It was worthy and met all the criteria, but it was not the big ticket item that Foundation SA seems to need.

We see the signs plastered all around and members of the board of Foundation SA at high profile events in the arts and sports communities, but so often the real people out there in the suburbs—the little people who need their assistance—are being cast aside. I think I speak for many members of Parliament on both sides of the House in saying that we would like to see Foundation SA get out there and mix with the little people rather than just the big players at the big end of town. That is why the IDC, with members from both sides of Parliament who represent local electorates, could be more firmly rooted in the community and more understanding of the needs of those small clubs, where a grant of \$6 000 or \$7 000 to erect lights, for example, could be of outstanding assistance.

In terms of the distribution of the \$5 million, I support the idea of a board appointed by the Government. I think that is



appropriate and relevant. I would like to hear from the charities themselves. I would also like to hear from the sporting clubs about what we are proposing today. What we are suggesting is fair, in my view. Rather than using the numbers to crunch us in the House today, the Deputy Premier should think beyond a few weeks and realise that in the Upper House the Democrats have a swag of suggestions that will cost a lot more. Here is the chance for this Government to respond to an idea from the Opposition which will assist the charities and the hotel industry, which will preserve Government finances and which will give massive assistance to small sporting clubs that are doing such great work with our kids. I support this Bill.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles):** I have some serious reservations about the Bill. I do not care very much about the taxation measures which are under it and which appear to be agreed by the industry. The Government is doing itself a disservice in increasing the rate of taxation in the way it has. First of all, it is far too early to assess fairly what the taxation rate ought to be but, because the industry realises it is to receive another hit and it has agreed to this method, it does not fuss me very much. I believe that the present taxation regime was more simple for everyone and I would have preferred to see an increase in the level rather than the more complicated formula in the Bill. But, as I say, it does not fuss me very much at all.

Apparently, the necessity for the Bill arises in part because of the enormous success of poker machines. I concede that they are at least twice as successful as I ever thought they would be, and that makes me twice as proud to have introduced this measure and got it through the Parliament. That was not easy but it was good fun. Given the number of jobs that have been created through this as well as through the Casino—one of my earlier triumphs—I feel quite proud, and justifiably so. I am a modest chap as a rule but on this occasion I cannot help myself when I see all those jobs and all those people enjoying themselves: it is tremendous. It also annoys the sourpusses of this world. They cannot stand people enjoying themselves unless they enjoy themselves in the way in which the sourpusses like, although with some of them I am not quite sure what that is. It must be something in private, because they give no public indication of ever enjoying a thing in their lives. The professional sourpusses are deeply annoyed by poker machines and that gives me a great deal of pleasure.

It is early in the debate, but I am surprised that there have been no amendments or no real debate so far about the closure of the industry. I would imagine that the numbers are there within the Parliament to shut this industry down. During the previous debate I heard from speaker after speaker how evil this industry was: it was said to be an industry that would be the ruination of South Australia and everything in it, one that would destroy our way of life. At the time I thought the people who said that were sincere. I thought, 'Well, I do not agree with them, but I do respect their sincerity that this is so evil that it ought not to be touched.' Those people who apparently believed that sincerely now have the numbers, and I look forward to the debate after their introducing Bills before the Parliament to close the industry down.

If they do not do that, I can be forgiven for suspecting that they did not necessarily believe some of the comments they made. If they sincerely believe that this industry is inherently evil, I want them to put up. I want to have that debate, because they were very quick in saying it—and at great

length—when I introduced the legislation in the Parliament. I look forward to all those people entering into this debate and showing just how sincere they were.

I do not support some clauses of the Bill. I do not support any restriction on the hours: that is nonsense. If someone wants to play a poker machine at 3 o'clock in the morning or 3 o'clock in the afternoon, as long as it is their money, what has it to do with me or anyone else, I suggest? There are people who dislike poker machines and do not want to go near them but who want to do over things at 3 o'clock in the morning. Again, if they are not making a noise, it has nothing whatsoever to do with anyone else—as long as they are doing it with their own money.

I cannot see why we should impose any restriction on people playing poker machines at any time of the night or day, or on any day of the year. Those who feel that Christmas day is special—and a number of people do—and feel that they ought not to play poker machines on that day can certainly stay at home. As far as I know, there is no compulsion in any of this. Also, I do not support any hypothecation: I think hypothecation is quite wrong. The Minister has made a big error by bringing in hypothecation under this Bill. If the principle is accepted by the Government, by the end of this debate we will have some very interesting hypothecation. I can see the Democrats slaving in terms of having some of this dough hypothecated all over the place. And, politics being the way it is, it is quite likely that members of the Labor Party in the Upper House will have to follow them.

It is the fault of members opposite that this debate on hypothecation is before the Parliament. With the support of the Opposition, hypothecation was defeated when the original Bill was before the House during a very sensible debate on whether hypothecation was either a con or, in principle, wrong. I believe that position could have been maintained. It is a very principled position: it is a sensible position. However, the Minister has introduced hypothecation and I believe that, before this debate is over, he will be sorry that he ever introduced that provision. I may be wrong, but I think there will be a great deal of fun in relation to hypothecation before the debate is over. That is a pity, because there is absolutely no need for it.

All I say to those people who believe that there is something in hypothecation for the groups they support is that, if any legislation goes through in this regard, watch the Treasurer and the Government, because they will give with one hand and take with the other. And they will have my support for doing so. It is a question of priorities. If you think that the priorities of the budget should be set through hypothecating poker machine revenue to your favourite charity or cause, if you think you can get away with that, then, first of all, I do not believe that you should be sitting in this Parliament, because you do not have the brains to think through a sensible position. However, if hypothecation is the go, I assure members that plenty in the Labor Party will be in it as well as the Democrats. Again, that is up to the Government.

Regarding the question of poker machines generally, over the past couple of years I have been listening to a lot of people complaining about poker machines and how evil they are. It really irritates me, because the hospitality industry receives not a penny from Government. It does not come anywhere near Government for its hand-out. As someone who has been a member of Government for 10½ years, I can tell members that that is unusual, because almost every industry around the place comes knocking on the door with

the begging bowl. The first thing they say is, 'We are a self-help industry, Minister', and as soon as I hear that I think, 'This will be a big bite: I wonder how much this is for.'

Few industries do not come anywhere near Governments with their hands out. The hospitality industry is one. Those sourpusses who do not like people enjoying themselves, unless they enjoy themselves in the way in which the people concerned approve, say, 'What about the problems that it causes?' Well, what about it? If this industry has caused the problems it is supposed to have caused, then this is an industry that has the financial means to solve those problems, as much as it is possible to do so.

Nobody can tell me that the damage that has been caused to individuals' being unable to control their gambling amounts to \$150 million worth of taxation. We can give those who are having some problems \$100 000 a piece and still have a fortune to spare for Treasury. So, here is an industry that not only costs the taxpayers absolutely nothing but puts in a tremendous amount through poker machines—and I forget the amount it puts in through liquor taxes. It is stupendous how much taxation this industry pays, yet it asks for nothing. If it creates any problems then the Government, with its take, has the means to solve those problems.

I anticipated a couple of million dollars being supplied by the Government to give to those charities which deal with picking up the pieces. I never anticipated anything near this amount of money—so much money that I would choke them on the amount of money I would give them, and I still would not have noticed, because such were the huge amounts that were coming in. I cite the Salvation Army, St Vincent de Paul and the other organisations that pick up the pieces: I would have given them so much money that they could not possibly have complained, and I would not have noticed it, especially not out of \$150 million. If you give those organisations a couple of million dollars a piece, it still has to give you \$140 million net and you have shut them up. So, there was no real problem in doing it. However, what I would not give is one cent to those charities that are not involved in this industry at all.

If individuals choose to put their \$10 into a poker machine as opposed to giving it to a charity that is not involved with picking up the pieces—and I do not want to name any charities in particular, but there are hundreds of them all lining up with begging bowls—as long as it is their money, that is their business. I object strongly to anybody saying, 'The decision you're taking is wrong.' If I want to give \$10 to, say, the Red Cross, Guide Dogs for the Blind or whatever, that is my business. If I chose not to do so the following week, because I want to put it on a horse or in a poker machine, that is my business. How dare people condemn me for the choice that I make. I do not put anything in poker machines, but that is not the point: the point is that it is nothing to do with them.

These charities are big business, I can tell you, with a lot of people and big dough. It is big careers for people. Not much of it filters down, in many cases, to the people whom it is supposed to be for. Personally—and maybe the Party will disagree—I would not give them a cent. They can get out in the marketplace, the same as everybody else. However, I would stuff that much money down the throats of these charities which pick up the pieces that they would be silent forever, and forever grateful.

It also makes me think that apparently the only people who gave to charities were the people who now play poker machines: the only problems that the charities have are

caused by people now playing poker machines. All those people in my electorate, the ones who are sneered at for playing poker machines, apparently were keeping all the charities in South Australia going. Well, they certainly are wonderful people, and now they have made, apparently, a different choice. To all the people who do not play poker machines all I can say is, 'If you do not play poker machines and you are not giving to charity, you ought to be doing one or the other.' I would get in there one way or the other and help either the industry or the charities. We have now found out that you are doing nothing.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Well, it must be. It just follows that the charities are now getting nothing because the constituents of members on this side apparently are playing the poker machines and sending them broke. Another thing that has irritated me is the attitude of some members of Parliament, as expressed publicly, in relation to the conscience vote. I single out the member for Colton—and he is not the only member. I heard the member for Colton on the air one day having a go at those members of Parliament who voted for poker machines. What terrible people we were! I do not think that those people who voted against poker machines were terrible people at all. It was a conscience vote. It was up to them and it is not for me to say that they are terrible people, although I do not know how they could arrive at a decision to deny people the right to spend their money as they wish.

But that is not the point. The point was that members were allowed to exercise their conscience as they thought fit without abuse from me. I object strongly to being abused, not specifically by name but collectively with those members of Parliament who supported poker machines. We can live with our conscience. We do not have to be lectured by the member for Colton or anybody else as to what our consciences ought to allow us to do. 'Conscience' means that we are responsible for our decision.

I want to comment on the way the Bill went through the Parliament. Again, the member for Colton had some critical things to say—and he has not been the only one; I just happened to hear him on the air—about the way the Hon. Mario Feleppa was treated and how terrible it was that he was leant on to pass this legislation. I point out to the member for Colton that about six present Ministers voted for poker machines, and Liberals in the Upper House also voted for poker machines. Had they had the same view as the member for Colton, the Hon. Mario Feleppa's vote would not have meant anything.

To put the record straight, the Hon. Mario Feleppa supported poker machines: he agreed with poker machines. He had some difficulty with the private sector running it in the way in which it does: under overall Government control, but the private sector actually doing the leg work. It is no secret that he preferred the Lotteries Commission to do it. So, the member for Colton, if he is abusing those of us who support poker machines, should at least get his story and the facts right. That was the difficulty that the Hon. Mario Feleppa had—not with poker machines but with the way the Bill suggested that they be operated. We introduced the safeguards that he required after some—I agree—quite vigorous debate, but the principle of poker machines was supported quite properly by the Hon. Mario Feleppa.

In conclusion, I do not think that this Bill achieves anything. I think that it is a hell of a headache for the Government. I am not sure why it bothered. I would have just

jacked up the rate, as the Minister has the right to do, pocketed the dough and why have all the fuss? Life is very short, and if you can do it hard or do it easy, I have always worked on the basis that you do it easy.

The industry body, the AHA and the LCA, are so responsible that now I am in Opposition it really annoys me that they are so responsible. When I was in Government I was pleased, but if the Minister had gone to the AHA and the LCA and said, 'I want another \$25 million, how do we do it quietly?', I have no doubt that he would have got it. That is how sensible the industry is, but it was not to be. There are a few dot points I did not get around to and a few people who did not get the mention they deserve. I look forward to continuing the debate in Committee.

**Ms HURLEY (Napier):** As usual, I very much agree with my colleague the member for Giles. When the original proposal for the two tier turnover tax was put forward by the Government, I disagreed with it and, like many other members, I was lobbied about that by hotels in my area. Eventually the Government did cave in to these objections from the AHA, hotels and clubs around the area, and no doubt from its own backbenchers. I thought this proposal for the increased tax was very interesting. In this respect, I disagree with my colleague the member for Giles when he said the Treasurer should have just jacked up the tax, although perhaps if he had gone to the AHA he would have done it more reasonably. I disagree with that, because we on this side are lectured constantly by members of the Government about how we should support business, how we do not know anything about business and how the Liberal Party is the only one who knows anything about business and will support small business.

The original proposal was to change the rules midstream for those small businesses represented by the smaller hotels. I disagree violently with the idea of jacking up the tax, because hotels in my area have no doubt made a lot of money out of gaming machines, but they have expanded their activities quite a lot. They have employed local people from the area, and on the whole it has been a good thing for the larger pubs in my area—the Smithfield Hotel and the Kariwara. On the whole, they have used the increased revenue and patronage from gaming machines in a very responsible way. They have improved their facilities and have used the profits gained from gaming machines for the benefit of their own patrons. So, to have the rules changed midstream was a very poor proposition and one which deserved the outcry it has received, and I am very pleased that the hotels and the AHA were able to persuade the Government to change the taxation proposals. I am not entirely happy with the way they were changed, but nevertheless it is a much better proposition than the original proposal and I have no real qualms about supporting it.

However, I do also support the amendments to the hours, as moved by the Opposition spokesman, again on the principle that the flexibility in hours makes things easier for small business. It makes it easier for them to operate, and gets the Government as much as possible out of running their business for them. This is another thing on which we are lectured by the Liberal Government, that the Labor Party is too often sticking its nose into small business and into places where it does not belong. I extend the same principles to the operating hours. Quite possibly—and it is not something I agree with entirely—we might need to restrict the hours in which gaming machines should operate, but the Government

should stay out of it as much as possible and allow as much flexibility as possible for the small business operators of hotels.

Likewise, I support the \$5 million going to charity groups. I support that on the basis that this is the figure the Treasurer has given to us as a reasonable figure for us to be going on with. A number of charities and welfare groups in my area have suffered not so much from the pokies but in funding cuts by this Government. I am quite keen to see that they make up that revenue in whatever way possible. If it has to come from poker machine revenue, I am quite happy for that to happen. I am quite happy for the people in my area to benefit from a restoration of at least some of that money via this means. In fact, a number of charities and welfare groups in my area are quite desperate and do not care where they get the money from. It is reflecting the desperation of a number of poorer people in my area who have suffered from measures implemented by this Government.

Thirdly, sporting clubs in my area have suffered from a slow leakage of funds to such clubs. Many of the sporting clubs in my area do a lot of good work with both young and older people. I have just seen a representative from the Central Districts Basketball Club. There are many excellent players in that club who will do very well in basketball in the future. The problem is that parents are required to pay membership fees, which is fine, but it is hard for clubs in my area to get sponsorship from local businesses and wealthy people in the area because there are very few of them. Many of these kids have trouble in covering membership fees. They are very talented but they simply cannot afford to keep on paying the membership, uniform and travelling costs involved in playing basketball, and this particularly applies in families with three or four such players. The parents are simply not in a position to afford to support their children in this sport in which they have shown a great deal of talent. That is a real shame, not only for those kids and their families, but for sport in this State and Australia, because a lot of good talent is going to waste, all for a lack of funding.

I, like other members who have mentioned this, have found that these clubs are getting no support whatsoever from Foundation SA, the Department of Recreation and Sport or any other body, because everybody gets referred to Foundation SA, which will not give any funds for these sorts of clubs. The Central Districts Rugby Club, although called the rugby club, provides facilities for not only rugby but a number of other sports in the area. That club is looking to expand. It is in the middle of the Craigmere—Blakeview area, where there are many young families. There will be a high demand for sport and better facilities to be provided. This club is ready and willing to expand its facilities, to do a lot of good work in this area and cater for this growing demand but, again, no funds are available. There is very little chance of raising those funds.

Everybody goes to the local council, but the local council has done all it can to provide support for these sorts of sporting clubs in my area, clubs such as Central Districts Rugby League and the Munno Para Bowling Club, yet the money is just not there for local government. They are on the ground, they know what sort of support these clubs need, and they provide what they can out of their limited resources, but a fund such as that proposed by the member for Playford, which would provide any extra money from gaming machines and provide a fund for those clubs to access, would be fantastic for sport and community interests all around this State, and I very strongly support this concept.

Finally, I am the fourth speaker on this Bill from the Opposition benches. So far, we have been uninterrupted from any speakers on the Government side. I look forward to contributions to this debate from speakers on the Government side. As we have heard from the member for Giles, who knows more about it than I do since I was not here at the time, there has been quite a lot of talk about members who have previously voted against gaming machines, but I would like to talk about some of the members who, like I, might be new and who did not get a chance to exercise a vote on gaming machines. I would like to see a few of them stand up and support the amendments put forward by the member for Playford, and stand up for the charities in their area and their sporting clubs.

There are areas of great disadvantage in the north that need an injection of funds in terms of social welfare, and I know that in the southern suburbs, where there are areas of great social disadvantage, there is very much the same need. I would like some of the members from the south to stand up and demand extra funding for their social welfare groups and sporting clubs. I know that they have complained in this House about the lack of facilities provided by the former Labor Government. I would like them to stand up and support the opportunity for their smaller sporting clubs to be assisted by a fund provided by this Government. I welcome support from the Government side; in fact, I welcome any contribution from the Government side, but it does not seem that that will occur. One wonders what support the Treasurer will receive from his back bench, because so far there has been a deafening silence.

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I support the comments of our lead speaker, the member for Playford, and to elaborate on a few points in respect of my own experience in some areas. I am the fourth Opposition member to contribute in the debate on this very important piece of legislation, which has created much heat in our community, including a huge backlash amongst licensed clubs and hoteliers in this State. Every MP, both in the Upper House and in this Chamber, has been lobbied by their hotel keepers and clubs, yet to date we have heard not one word in the debate from members opposite in support of the Government's Bill or the manner in which it has been handled. Like the member for Playford, I too attended the AHA luncheon last year. A number of MPs were there from both sides of the House.

I also listened with keen interest to the Deputy Premier, who gave his usual erudite conciliatory speech at that lunch but still left the hotel keepers in a state of bewilderment as to the final position of the Government on this matter. I thought it was a bit rich. I have always appreciated the fact that, in many respects, the Deputy Premier is a bit of a gladiator when it comes to contests in this House: he does not mind a bit of rough and tumble in parliamentary debate, or even mixing it outside the House. I thought that the Deputy Premier would have had the courtesy—after eating a free lunch at the AHA's expense—to be forthright and let it know at that lunch what the Government's decision would be. However, he was somewhat a coward, if I can put it that way—without putting too fine a point on it—because he did not tell the hotel keepers and the Licensed Clubs Association the Government's position.

He fobbed them off by saying that the matter was still being worked out in the Party room. However, a 12 or 15 page press statement was typed up and issued by 3 or 4

o'clock that afternoon, within an hour or so after the lunch concluded. Quite clearly, the position was known. The Deputy Premier could have announced it then and there, but he knew it would create an absolute outrage had the decision been announced before he left the hotel—and we may have had a by-election in the seat of Waite.

I hope that members of the AHA and the Licensed Clubs Association have learnt their lesson with respect to this Government. In the last list of donations to political Parties that was put out by the Australian Electoral Commission, I observed that the hotel industry and the licensed clubs industry did not donate a brass farthing to the Labor Party. Given the outstanding work done by the member for Giles in bringing poker machines into this State in the first place, and the outstanding work that is being done by the member for Playford defending the Hotels Association and the Licensed Clubs Association, I trust that those two organisations realise where their bread is buttered. In 1993, along with many of their patrons, both organisations cuddled up to their basic class enemies—those in the Liberal Party—and were screwed within two years. I trust they have learnt that lesson. They are intelligent men and women and I am sure that they have learnt who their real friends are.

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** I am not sure about that, but I know that we did not get a brass razoo. I also object to the manner in which this measure was brought in with such haste by the Government. Many hotel keepers had expended great sums of money based on certain premises, based on certain taxation regimes, and now the goalposts are to change midstream without warning, which will imperil the financial viability of a number of those organisations.

It is not only the so-called wealthy hoteliers who would have been seriously affected by the Government's original taxation proposal, because a number of sporting clubs, such as my own North Adelaide Football Club, would have made a significant loss on the poker machines. In fact, poker machines have not been an outstanding success for the North Adelaide Football Club. I am afraid that in the suburbs of Prospect and the like people do not seem to play the poker machines as often as people in other areas. I do know from discussions with the North Adelaide Football Club that, had the Government's original taxation measure proceeded, it would have been financially ruinous for that club.

Football clubs support junior youth development in sport. What we need more than anything else—other than jobs, which are of paramount importance—is to give our young people something constructive to do. Sport is one way to ensure that they participate in a team environment and are kept off the streets. Many sporting organisations perform an outstanding service in that area, and they would have been seriously affected by the Government's impost and the manner in which the new tax was to be introduced.

The Government has brought about a whole new range of definitions for tax. Because of the Premier's commitment prior to the last election that there would be no increase in taxation, there would be no new taxes, we have had to learn new jargon. We now hear of levies, imposts, charges and a whole range of other words which I am sure the Treasurer will introduce in his next two budgets. If you ask anyone in the hotel or the licensed clubs industry whether it is an impost or a tax, they will point out that, if you take money from someone's pocket that they were not previously paying to the Government, whichever way you cut it up, it is a new tax.

The Government, for its own credibility—although not that much is left—ought to stop playing games with the public. In fact, the Premier should say, ‘Yes, I made a stupid statement, a stupid promise before the last election, one that I did not need to give about no new taxes, because we were going to bolt in anyway.’ With a matter such as this the Premier should be honest about it and admit that it is a new taxation measure. Everyone knows that it is a new tax, so why not be honest about it?

When the Treasurer proposed the taxation measure, to a certain degree I had some empathy because the amount of revenue generated by the poker machines was more than most people had expected. Nonetheless, the Treasurer should not have gone about it in the manner in which he has and without proper consultation with the industry. However, I again point out to the Hotels Association that on occasions it has only itself to blame with respect to the way it conducted itself in this matter. I refer to the Port Pirie betting shops. They are now the only betting shops left in Australia. They are not as prosperous as they once were and many, if they could get out, would do so. Nonetheless, on a number of occasions past Governments have sought to do away with the betting shops in Port Pirie.

However, they always survived, because they closely identified themselves with the community. Those betting shops had on side the Catholic archdiocese, the Anglican diocese and every community welfare group in Port Pirie, because those betting shops made sure that some of the funds they generated from that local community went back to that community—and unstintingly so. I approached a number of hotels in my area that were doing quite well out of the poker machines and suggested that they could assist an organisation known as the Lutheran Community Care Centre, which was providing a number of financial counselling services to a number of regular clients of those hotels. Since the introduction of poker machines, there had been an 80 per cent increase in the number of clients seeking financial counselling, and that is largely attributable to the introduction of poker machines.

That does not necessarily mean *ipso facto* that you close down poker machines, but I would have thought that a smart hotelier would recognise that, if he was not seen to be part of the community and assisting in some meaningful way those community organisations within the area from which he drew his clientele, eventually, whichever Government (Labor or Liberal) was in office at the State level, pressure would be placed on those Governments to jack up taxation revenue measures to assist those organisations. The hotels in my electorate were very short sighted. They said that it was a great idea but declined to offer any money in that area.

That stuck in my mind and weighed on me when I came to a decision within our Caucus as to which way I should vote on these issues. However, I saw the wisdom of the points of view of the member for Playford in this area, and I believe that the Hotels Association and its members will recant and think further in these areas. Therefore, on this occasion, I am prepared to support the proposals put forward by the member for Playford. I simply say quite openly and honestly to members of this industry that, a bit like the betting shops in Port Pirie, they ought to make sure that they are part and parcel of the local community from which they draw their wealth and their source of income. In other words, when community groups within those areas seek some assistance, they should be treated a little more courteously—particularly

those outstanding organisations such as the Lutheran Community Care Centre.

I support the amendments that will be moved by the member for Playford. Without doubt charitable and welfare organisations need to be able to access a pool of money from which to assist people, and not only those directly affected by gambling, if they become compulsive gamblers, or various organisations that cannot generate the same amount of income as they did previously because people are now disposing of their discretionary income in another fashion. I agree in part with the member for Giles, although I would not go along completely with his libertine theories in terms of the discretionary dollar and how one invests it. I do not seek to interfere with a person’s right to choose whether to spend \$10 on a poker machine or to give \$10 to the Salvation Army, but all of us in the community recognise the very great worth of those organisations.

In many instances they are helped enormously by volunteer help in our community. I am also aware of very high wages paid to certain CEOs of these organisations, and they should be dealt with by those organisations. They are not hiring managing directors of BHP with private shareholders’ funds and being paid accordingly: they should recognise that they are hiring CEOs and various subordinates within welfare industries, and there are certain salary levels beyond which nobody in those sorts of industries should reasonably expect to be paid.

However, there does need to be access by those organisations to the type of work that we all know is required. There is a need for financial counselling. I know that the Enfield office of the Family and Community Services Department, for example, cannot keep pace with all the work that is now being imposed on it because of the budgetary cuts that have occurred in that area. Of course, organisations such as the Lutheran Community Care Centre provide a very valuable service to the whole community in trying to help people in need, and to control their budgets. That is for the community good. It is not good for anyone just to turn around and say, ‘I do not care about those organisations; I can choose how I spend my discretionary \$10, whether it be to a direct charity or in a poker machine.’

The fact of the matter is that, for the community’s good and for society’s health, we need these organisations to help people help themselves because, if we do not have them, our society as a whole suffers and we are all impacted upon, whether it be through homelessness, domestic violence or anything else. We are all impacted on by those sorts of social evils. So, the whole community has a responsibility to assist those organisations. I also support the hours amendment proposed by the member for Playford. It is a very sensible suggestion. Whilst under his proposed amendment there will still be a closedown of six hours in a 24 hour period, it allows for flexibility—two by three sessions, three by two, or a straight six hours.

It will be left in the hands of the public. I do not see why one particular publican, because his or her trade relies on shift workers or others to play poker machines, should be discriminated against by those hoteliers who get their trade mainly between 10 a.m. and 12 midnight. I think the member for Playford’s proposal is eminently reasonable. I adopt the same approach to the funding proposals, in terms of assisting sporting bodies. That will be of enormous help. The proposal is that any moneys over \$146 million should be paid into a fund administered by the Industries Development Committee of Parliament. It will be above board and will allow local

sporting organisations to seek direct funding. As many other speakers on this side of the House have already pointed out, there is no point in sporting bodies going along to Foundation SA and expecting a capital grant, for instance.

The foundation always give the same stock answer: 'We support the peak bodies.' I would like a bit of support to go to organisations like the Kilburn Football Club, which does an outstanding job of trying to develop local youth in a high unemployment area. It looks after a large number of Aboriginal youths and tries to help them out in terms of providing proper sporting opportunities in a deprived area. That football club chooses not to have poker machines in its environs because it is a family club. It does not want to ban kids from coming in with their mums and dads, but it does need assistance in a whole range of areas because of its financially deprived membership and the community in which it lives. It does an outstanding job and it ought to have the opportunity of putting up its hand and making direct representation to these types of bodies, with the support of its local member of Parliament, who also happens to be one of its patrons. That is just one of the examples. In conclusion, I urge Government members to support the proposals put forward by the member for Playford. They have been well thought out, they make sense and they are compassionate. I urge the Government to support the member for Playford.

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

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** I support the Opposition's amendments to this Bill and, in doing so, I should like to reflect briefly on the issue as it has been put forward by the Government. By any description, the Treasurer has handled this issue of gaming tax very poorly.

**Mr Clarke:** It is standard fare.

**Mr FOLEY:** Well, I think the Government was somewhat reactionary to various forces, but the way in which the Treasurer has handled it does not reflect well on him. Indeed, it does not leave one with a lot of confidence in terms of his handling of State finances generally. What he did was something that, for many years, Liberal and conservative politicians in this nation have argued very strongly against, namely, the issue of a progressive taxation rate. It is almost ironic that it was the Labor Party that took the position that the progressive nature of the tax increase being put forward by the Treasurer was a bad taxation measure and treated the industry unfairly.

If one looks closely at the way in which the Government consulted on this issue, one finds that, as has become the tradition of this Government, when confronted with an issue, it calls an inquiry. This is a Government that loves to fall for the old trap of calling an inquiry. Before the ink was dry on that inquiry, the Government made a stand—to increase taxation for the hotel industry, as it said, to tax the most profitable hotels and clubs in the State, but with little or no consultation. Basically the Government went to the industry and said, 'You are going to have to cop this taxation increase.' It was a *fait accompli*. There was no consultation and discussion and, although the member for Unley shakes his head, the reality is that there was no consultation.

Nor had the Government done an impact statement. No effort was made to determine what negative impact this tax would have on employment numbers and what impact it would have on business—and this is from a Government that is supposed to be pro-business and is all about the small

business person. It has basically said to the hoteliers around Adelaide, 'We do not particularly care about the impact on your business. We are going to slug you another \$25 million. We have done no impact assessment into it; we just happen to think it is a good thing to do.' That flies in the face of comments by the Premier, who said strongly that there would be no taxation increase during this term of office, but that did not stop the Treasurer of this State from doing the Premier's dirty work and agreeing to this tax increase.

The hoteliers and the clubs rallied against it, and many in the Labor Party felt that it was an injustice to the hotel industry. As is the case in all issues of this nature, not everyone in the Labor Party was opposed to it but, from my reckoning, a significant number were. It is important that the hotel industry understand that it was the Labor Party members who dug the trench, who fought this issue and who made it clear to this Government and to anyone else who wanted to listen that we were opposed to the progressive taxation rate on turnover that was proposed by the Treasurer and the Government. In the past month or so I have read the commentary in the *Hotelier* magazine, in which Mr Peter Hurley, the proprietor of the Arkaba, was keen to praise this Government and the Treasurer for the final position they took, but it cannot go without acknowledgment that it was not the Liberal Party that stood up for the hotel industry in this State: it was the Labor Party.

As long as I am a member of Parliament, I will remind the hoteliers and club people in my electorate that it was the Labor Party that brokered this deal and made it clear to the Government that it would not get away with such a shoddy attempt to reap in another \$25 million. I put on the public record that I thought that the President of the AHA could have been a little less congratulatory towards the Liberal Party and perhaps in one line could have acknowledged the significant role played by the Labor Party, particularly by my colleague the member for Playford, who took up this issue on behalf of the Labor Party. Perhaps that little omission could be corrected in the next edition of the *Hotelier*.

Another issue of great hypocrisy involving the Treasurer concerns the amount of money that is being put aside for those in our community who have to deal with the social consequences of poker machines. I was not in Parliament when the vote on poker machines was taken, but I am prepared to put on record that, had I been here, I would have supported the Bill. My colleague the member for Giles has argued well on the record why he supported poker machines, and my position is very similar to his. Poker machines have had social consequences in this State but, unfortunately, not enough attention has been paid to the positive side of the poker machines issue.

In my electorate, which has high unemployment and high youth unemployment, many young people have got employment that otherwise they would have been denied. There is no doubt that the businesses of many hoteliers and club owners in my electorate, and throughout South Australia, have survived because of the introduction of poker machines. Of course, there has been a social cost and it is an indictment of this Treasurer that he has not been prepared to accept that. I just cannot understand how the Premier can stand in this place and elsewhere when his Government is reaping in \$25 million of extra taxation revenue while he is prepared to allocate only a miserly \$1 million for these people.

When in opposition, the Treasurer suggested a figure of \$5 million. I would have thought that \$5 million out of \$146 million plus was not a big ask. It is even more ironic

that it was the member sitting opposite—the Treasurer, the Deputy Leader of this State, someone who, arguably, next to the Premier, is the most powerful politician in this State—who suggested that figure in opposition and who could have said to Treasury, ‘We will put aside \$5 million.’ How short are the memories of the members on the Government benches as to what they said when they were in opposition! If I read *Hansard* correctly, I understand that the Treasurer was an opponent of poker machines, but he has been converted by the extraordinary revenue stream that they are now providing this State.

The Opposition simply seeks to restore the original position of the Treasurer, and a sum of \$5 million, which is to be put aside into the charitable and social welfare organisations fund, is an appropriate figure. Whether or not the figure stays at \$5 million remains to be seen, but clearly \$1 million is not sufficient. Again, I put on the record that it is the Labor Party that is putting forward the appropriate reform of this legislation and it is the Government that is withstanding the pressure at this stage. It is the Labor Party that is sticking up for social welfare organisations and delivery agencies that provide necessary community services to those people most adversely affected by the introduction of poker machines. It is disappointing that no Liberal members are prepared to indicate at this stage that they are willing to support the Opposition in this move, but we will see what that means a little closer to the vote.

There is another issue that I suspect improves with experience, that is, the inability of our State Treasury from time to time to be particularly good at forecasting. I do not want to dig into history, but the State Treasury was remiss or wayward in predicting a few things. It is not the appropriate time to question the role of State Treasury through the State Bank affair, but I am on the record as suggesting that the State Treasury, many officers of which are still there, was less than proficient in its monitoring of that organisation. It has not been able to predict the level of revenue that the gaming machines would provide to this State. What was \$40 million became \$60 million, \$80 million and \$100 million; now it is tipped to be \$146 million and I understand that it may go even higher than that. I am saying to the Government that, in terms of its take, enough is enough. Let us use this as an opportunity to provide resources to the community that otherwise would not be available.

I refer to the support of community-based sporting and recreation clubs. As members of Parliament, all of us, whether Liberal or Labor, represent a number of sporting clubs and community groups that are doing it pretty hard. They are unable to get their tennis courts refurbished, to put up new cyclone fencing around the tennis courts, to re-seed their oval or to build a club room, because they are not large enough or able to put in poker machines. Is this not a good opportunity to channel just a fraction of that community money—2 or 3 per cent—back into our electorates, back into community organisations, back into supporting sporting clubs that are providing such a vital community service? We all know that the elite sports people in our State and our country receive significant amounts of money—as they should—but we will not have the sporting champions of tomorrow unless we nurture the young sports people who are starting off their sporting careers at community level. This is a perfect opportunity to put some of that surplus cash into a fund that can give it to real people in real clubs. I note that some of my colleagues have been somewhat critical of Foundation SA tonight. In part, that criticism is certainly warranted.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** I have never appointed or had any commentary on the appointment of anyone on the Foundation SA board at all.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass):** Order! The honourable member is out of order.

**Mr FOLEY:** It may well be that the nature of Foundation SA does not allow it to provide funding to our community. Whatever the reason, it is simply not happening. So, another mechanism to ensure that that money gets through is a very good thing and something which all members of Parliament should be quite happy to support and should be aggressively supporting here tonight. If you cannot stand up in this Chamber for your community, if any member of the Liberal Party here tonight is not prepared to stand up for their sporting club, be it Henley Greeks, the Hectorville Sporting Club or the Unley Cricket Club, I really have to ask them, ‘What are you doing in this Chamber?’ It is time we said to Treasurers, ‘Enough is enough. You have taken enough cash from gambling machines in this State; it is time to put some into some dedicated funding lines to ensure that both the charitable groups and the community sporting groups are adequately funded.’

I come back to the theme on which I started—the Government’s handling of this matter. I would have thought that, after two years of government and two budgets, this Treasurer—this Deputy Premier—would have learnt a little about handling difficult issues. What has he done? He has blindly stumbled into something; he has blindly gone in and said he will impose a progressive tax. This is a Liberal member of Government saying he will tax the rich, and damn the consequences. Damn the fact that it will affect about 85 per cent of all businesses in the gaming industry; 85 per cent of all pubs and clubs would be affected.

There was no study to assess the impact; no study to determine whether it would put people out of business; and no study into the net effect on the economy right around the State. Simply, it felt like a good thing to do at the time. It made him feel warm inside; it made him feel good. You do not run Governments like that. You do not run a State like that, and it is about time this Liberal Government started to show some style about the way it runs Government. I have to say that for a Liberal Government to blunder into what could be deemed as its natural constituency in the way that it did smacks of arrogance. I would have thought that there were plenty of lessons around now about what happens to Governments that do not listen to the people. This Government so early in its tenure is falling quickly into that trap of divorcing itself from public opinion.

The Treasurer was forced into a back-down and a compromise, because the scenario we would have faced had the Deputy Premier been allowed to continue would have been somewhat catastrophic for many within the hotel industry. Luckily, some common sense prevailed. The Treasurer saw that what he was proposing was a dopey thing to do and he sat down with the industry and worked out a compromise that would still see the financial objectives of the Government reached but without causing the hardship and chaos within the industry that could potentially occur. I simply ask the Treasurer why he did not do that in the beginning. As the member for Giles said earlier tonight, in this game you can do it either hard or easy. Why, time and time again on a whole raft of issues, does this Government choose the hard option? Why force yourself into a position where you look silly and are forced to back down? All it takes

is a little less arrogance and a little more communication. You sit down with the industry; you work through a taxation regime that you and the industry can live with. Sure, you play it firm. The industry is not going to say, 'Hey, we want to pay more tax', but behind closed doors you could have arrived at the situation with a lot less pain. You have not, and that is for you to deal with.

Another issue is that we must have an increase in the money put aside for charitable and social welfare organisations. I agree that this should not become a well of money that is available for any organisation that can put on a hat that fits the criteria. It must be well targeted, but that money should be made available.

It is with great interest that I note that there have been so few speakers from the Government benches throughout this whole process. I look forward to some contributions. I see the member for Unley—the Parliamentary Secretary for Education (I apologise for not addressing him correctly)—scribbling away, and perhaps we will hear from him tonight if he is not too busy thinking what his next major policy statement on education will be.

**An honourable member:** That could be a problem.

**Mr FOLEY:** That could be a problem. I would like to say that the member for Hartley is a parliamentary secretary, but of course he was not considered appropriate to be a parliamentary secretary. I grieve for him, because he is one of only half a dozen, but never mind.

In conclusion, I urge members here tonight to support the Opposition and the member for Playford's amendments. They are good, constructive amendments and, as has been the case throughout this entire affair, it has been the Labor Party in this State that has been solid, pragmatic, constructive, professional and supportive of the hotels and clubs industry in this State. There is one Party in this State that supports the hotel industry and the club industry, and that is the Labor Party. It did not take the Labor Party six or eight weeks to change its position: we were there on day one. It was the Labor Party through this matter's entire history that has supported the clubs and hotels.

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

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** I am honoured to be considered a lance corporal. It is a higher rank than the member opposite will ever achieve. I remind the member for Ross Smith that the highest rank ever reached by Napoleon was lance corporal. There was a guy in—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is out of order.

**Mr BRINDAL:** Caesar's horse speaks! I acknowledge the contribution of the member for Hartley. He came up to me and remarked on the contribution of the member for Hart. He said of the member for Hart, 'This will truly go down as one of the great speeches in Parliament. It would produce 100 tomatoes to the metre.' If anything, he was being slightly less than factual—I think it would produce a few more than 100 tomatoes to the metre. I have not heard many more examples of hypocrisy coming from members opposite.

**Ms White:** You always say that, Mark!

**Mr BRINDAL:** The honourable member says that I always say that. Perhaps I always say that because something that is true does not remain less true for the repeating. A lesson I learnt as a teacher is that when you are dealing with

people of limited intelligence you have to repeat the lesson and eventually it sinks in. Here we have an Opposition that talks about financial responsibility to a Government that is seeking to exercise it. Here we have people—

**Mr Clarke:** You are almost sounding like—

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I understand, was warned twice by the Speaker. He has been given the opportunity to speak and I understand the member for Hart was also given the opportunity to speak without interjections, and the member for Unley will have the same privilege. The member for Unley.

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Hart said that you do not run a Government like that; you do not run a State like that. I point out to all members of this House that the member for Hart was a principal adviser to a Government that has given us 7 000 million reasons not to believe him—7 000 million reasons why we should not listen to a man who stands up and lectures a competent Treasurer on what a good Government does do.

**Mr Clarke:** Who said that?

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Hart said that, and the member for Hart was a principal adviser to a former Premier in this place in one of the most catastrophic fiscal periods of South Australia's history. The member for Hart also spoke about the Government's falling into the trap of divorcing itself from the prevailing public opinion. That from a man who is part of a Party which two weeks ago did not heed any electorate lesson around the States of Australia and went to the polls to receive the most catastrophic loss that has occurred in many years federally. I would like to know who does not listen to public opinion. I do not think it is the Deputy Premier, the Premier, any Minister, or indeed any backbencher on this side of the House. I think it is the members opposite.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The honourable member opposite again interjects. I am very pleased there are not too many backbenchers. Every person on this side of the House—no matter what they are assigned to do—has a useful job, which is more than can be said for some of the members opposite. Some of them appear to have nothing at all to do.

The measure before the House is a good one. The propositions put forward by the member for Playford are worthy of serious consideration, as indeed is some of the argument put forward by the Opposition backbenchers: it is wrong, but it is worth serious consideration. Not many members on the Government side of the House would not admit that, in putting forward the original proposition for a new division of taxation, the Government erred. The Government put that forward, consulted with the AHA and came into this House tonight with a revamped proposition. That is called consultation.

We went out there and said, 'This is what we propose.' The AHA, and a number of other bodies said, 'Hang on, you've got it wrong.' Every member on this side of the House listened carefully to what was being told us, analysed it, talked about it in the Party room and came into the Chamber with a new proposition. The Opposition bleats and grizzles about consultation. I say that is consultation. I do not know why there is a fixation opposite—why members opposite have to go behind closed doors, secretly negotiate everything and appear always to be right. There is a certain virtue in this Government's having put forward a proposition, realising the figures did not quite work, then re-analysing the figures and bringing this proposition before the House. I say that is fairly



good Government and a long way removed from the previous Government, which, while the ship was sinking, could not even recognise the fact that it was up to its neck in water.

Members of the previous Government are still out there publicly proclaiming they did not do anything wrong and they do not know why the public took such a horrendous vengeance on them at the last election. That is the foresight and the history of members opposite. What we are debating tonight is not an extra taxation measure as such. It is a fact—

**Mr Clarke:** What would you call it?

**Mr BRINDAL:** I will tell the member for Ross Smith if he will shut his mouth long enough to listen. If he engages his ears instead of his tongue for a change he might hear. I do not know which end of Caesar's horse is currently working but the noises are unintelligible.

**Ms Stevens:** That was not very tasteful.

**Mr BRINDAL:** It was not very tasteful, was it? What happened was that when the previous Government—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! That will be enough from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr BRINDAL:** When the previous Government brought the poker machine legislation into this House it was vigorously debated and voted for on a conscience decision, although I note that the Government at the time found that its conscience was of one accord—sorry, I apologise to the member for Price—was, generally speaking, of one accord. There seemed to be a conscience that went with the dollar value to the Treasury, but I might be being a little unkind to some members. I say this to the member for Price who was here: I was surprised that some members, who I did not really think would ever vote for poker machine legislation, did so. I was surprised because I found that to be inconsistent with their voting on all other conscience measures in their time in the House. I do not run them down for that, I just make that observation.

On that night we were working on projected figures. The member for Giles, I believe, was the Treasurer at the time. He sat in this House and said, 'These are the figures. This is what we can expect from this revenue.' The AHA at the time was saying, 'No, you've got the figures wrong. These are the figures we can expect.' But, as I am discovering is the way with Treasurers, they do tend to underestimate the figures so that they can then come in with a great big bucket of money and say, 'Aren't we lucky; we've made a windfall gain' and divide it in some other way. The Hon. Mr Blevins may well have been no different. Nevertheless, they got the figures wrong and the AHA said they would. Interestingly, the figures are now coming in at about the AHA projections, and that is why I think so many members on this side of the House listened so carefully to what the AHA had to say in discussions on this in January.

Because the figures were so wrong the Treasurer and the Government said, 'What we are talking about here is a windfall gain.' This Parliament passed a proposition which gives to hotels and clubs a unique opportunity to raise revenue. It does not give it to delicatessens, to school canteens or to Woolworths supermarkets: it gives it to hotels and clubs. All members will recall the argument about whether clubs alone should be given the opportunity and whether hotels should be included. The decision was made. There was a windfall profit to be made, and there was an agreement on the division of the windfall gain regarding the amount of money that the Government would receive.

When it was discovered that the amount of money being collected was grossly in excess of the expectations on which the Government was working, there was general consensus, I believe, that there was every right of the Government to renegotiate a share of profits on behalf of the people, and that the people, through this Chamber, had granted that windfall gain to the hotels and clubs. I see nothing wrong with that: it is part of the barter in a free market. It is part of this Parliament, the people of South Australia, exercising their right to have a share of something which they have helped to create: a unique situation for these people. I think—in fact I am fairly sure—that the AHA did not object to that at any stage.

In discussions which I personally had with the AHA, I formed the opinion that it was more than happy, where excessive profits were being made, for some of those profits to be reclaimed by the Government. I believe that the sticking point with the AHA was and always has been that our first model was unfair in that it unfairly penalised those who were not making windfall profits but were just breaking even, and that it could, in fact, have driven some people from profit into loss.

The Government listened to that. The Government has amended its legislation accordingly, and I believe that the AHA is happy with the result. In fact, I would be most surprised if it was not happy with the result, because I am quite sure that it would have telephoned me and a number of other members and we would be in no doubt as we spoke in this Chamber on its view. As it has not, I must assume that it is happy with the result. So, we are now claiming a greater share of a profit which we would not have expected to have made, and I believe the AHA is happy with it. With regard to this cant and hypocrisy from the other side about being the only true friends of the AHA, the true friends of the publicans are the Labor Party—

**Mr Clarke:** You tried to ruin them, and you would have.

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Ross Smith is drawing a long bow, but that is nothing unusual for him.

**Mr Clarke:** You voted for them in the Party room.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** The member for Ross Smith will be drawing a very short walk in a minute.

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Ross Smith might know more about the Party room than I do, but I can assure him—and I say in this House—that I voted against poker machines originally but, as we now have poker machines, I have never since voted for any measure in the Party room or in this Chamber other than would help the better running of those poker machines for the hotels and clubs. I had a personal opinion in respect of the original legislation. I do not believe that you can run a State where you encourage people to invest millions of dollars and then turn around a year later and say, 'You can't have that any more', and make it so stupid that it cannot run.

So, if the member for Ross Smith thinks he knows what happened in the Party room let him get it right. I do not mind telling him it was my vote, and I do not mind telling him how I exercised it and how I will continue to exercise it, even though I opposed poker machines originally and even though the AHA knew exactly why I opposed poker machines in the beginning. It is, therefore, about the division of funds. We have heard a lot about sporting clubs. We have heard a lot about the AHA. I remind members opposite that we used to have dedicated funds for road safety, too, and those dedicated funds for road safety generally were taken away progressively by Labor Governments on the ground that any Treasurer has

the right to apply moneys, and if the Treasurer wants to apply moneys to road safety then he should have an unfettered right to do so and not have all these special little bicky barrels all round the place.

That is what the Premier was grizzling about in this House today with regard to the principle of the Commonwealth Government's saying, 'You can have \$500 million, but we will tie it up in all sorts of ways.' So, the principle that the Treasurer espouses is a good principle, and if sporting clubs need extra money he is the Treasurer. We have a ministry which can fight it out around the Cabinet table and those clubs can be given extra money, but it does not have to be tied up in some sort of dedicated fund to prove that they need it.

I found the speech of the member for Ross Smith extraordinarily patronising, because he was lambasting his local hotels for not giving to Lutheran Community Care, which is undoubtedly a very good and deserving organisation. The member for Ross Smith forgets the \$1.5 million that the AHA voluntarily committed to welfare organisations which are not part of this legislation and it was not a requirement: it was a voluntary commitment and it exceeds that. On the one hand, he is saying to these people in his local hotels, 'You are part of a \$1.5 million pool given to people generally, but incidentally put your hands in your pockets and give a bit more to this other group.' I would not accuse the member for Ross Smith, but what he is saying is, 'I want my pet projects funded by you, and if you fund them I will say you are good guys, but if you do not fund them I will get up and blast you in Parliament.'

**Mr Clarke:** That's right.

**Mr BRINDAL:** Well, that's wonderful, isn't it! One wouldn't call that pork barrelling, would one!

**Mr Clarke:** Yes, I would.

**Mr BRINDAL:** Good. One wouldn't call it almost corrupt or coercive, would one? No, you would not. You would just say that pork barrelling and coercion are a bit different. I do not understand the difference, but perhaps the member for Ross Smith could describe the difference to his publicans, because I would say, if I was being uncharitable, that it was almost blackmail. But I will not say that, because that would be uncharitable and he would get upset.

One problem that worries me and worries me considerably is the universal calls we get from very good welfare organisations for the application of more funds. I have to say that, while I support the good application of moneys to welfare organisations—I am talking not about sporting places now but about welfare organisations—I do not believe that they have a right to come into this Parliament and milk the hotels and clubs because they see pokies as a means of giving them *carte blanche* for the expenditure of Government money.

**Mr Clarke:** You are the ones who did the milking when you jacked up the taxes.

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Ross Smith says that we want to put up the tax: that is true, and we have dealt with that.

*Ms White interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** I don't care what you call it; call it what you want.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** The member for Taylor will have the right to speak in a minute, so she should wait for her turn.

**Mr BRINDAL:** We are getting more money. That money will be applied for the good of South Australians. Some of it should go to welfare purposes. But we have churches that are

now saying that they want more money. Why? Because their bingo is failing, because this or that is not working. The previous Treasurer probably knows that their bingo was failing years before pokies came in. Some welfare organisations see the hotels and the clubs as the milch cow for an endless supply of money which they think they can apply without accountability.

**Mr Clarke:** If anybody is going to do the milking it will be the Treasurer.

**Mr BRINDAL:** You can only have one dairy maid. Have you ever tried to have three people milking the cow at once? It is a disaster. If there is going to be one milkmaid, let it be the Treasurer.

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** The member for Giles has had his opportunity to speak.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I would like members opposite and members on this side to consider this: that when we are applying more money to charities—and I do not mind that happening—I want to see the money which is applied to charities properly accounted for and properly spent. I do not want to see the money coming out of the poker machines used to build \$2 million edifices for the administration of social welfare by various powerful churches around Adelaide.

**Mr Clarke:** Name them.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I saw in the paper that my own church, the Anglican Church, of which I am very proud to be a member, was looking at a new headquarters for Anglican Community Services. I would hope that that money was coming from the parishes and the church's general revenue and not from poker machine profits. I would be the first to write to the Archbishop if that was not the case and say, 'If this Parliament applies money for people in need, then the money should be used for those people and not for propping up non-government bureaucracies.'

I do not believe in overweening Government bureaucracies, so I certainly do not support unaccountable church bureaucracies which want to get their money from poker machines and any other means they can and then not be accountable. So, I applaud extra money going into churches and welfare organisations, but I also ask the House to recognise that, when we apply that extra money, a level of accountability is demanded.

With respect to sporting clubs, I have heard complaints about Foundation SA. I wonder whether that organisation is as effective as it should be. I do not believe we should say, 'That is not effective; let's put in some more money elsewhere.' We should fix Foundation SA and make sure that it is effective. I find it non-sequential to say, 'Let's leave this and fix that.'

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

**Ms WHITE (Taylor):** I rise to support the amendments proposed by the Labor Party. It is a taxation Bill, despite the confused position of the member for Unley on this. I usually would not repeat anything that the member for Unley says, but since he has been the only Liberal member in this entire Chamber—one out of 36—to bother to speak on this Bill, to stand up and give any position whatsoever, I will acknowledge the member for Unley, even though he got it wrong. Money out of people's pockets into the Treasury—that is a tax.

**Mr Brindal:** We speak with one voice over here!

**Ms WHITE:** God help the Government if it is your voice! I want to point out also, as many of our members on this side have done, that it has been the Labor Party that has stood up for the hotels and clubs industry in this State. We hear often from the Government that it supports business, that it supports industry development in this State, but, when it comes to the crunch, it was going to saddle the industry with a turnover super tax. What happened to cause this? Did it just come out of the blue? No, there was the Hill report, an inquiry into the effects of gaming, the cover that allowed the Government to say, 'We have to tax this industry more', and that is what it was going to do anyway.

Of course, the backlash was felt by every member of this Chamber, and we were lobbied profusely. We know the effects that this proposed tax would have had on the industry. Three main amendments have been put forward. The first amendment reduces the operation of poker machines each day by six hours. The Opposition's proposed amendment breaks up that timeframe. I believe that the reduction in operating hours will do nothing to address problems associated with gambling. Every member of this Chamber would recognise that. It will affect a few hotels that rely for their business on shift workers coming into their hotels. The operative word there is 'workers'—those people whom the Government is not in the habit of supporting.

It should be pointed out to members that a reduction in hours will do absolutely nothing. It might make members opposite feel good. Liberal backbenchers might be able to go out into their constituency and say, 'I have stood up against the dreaded poker machines by reducing the hours', but it does nothing. It does not fool anyone. It is useless. I will support the Opposition's amendment to break up that time, but, if that is lost, I indicate that I will not support that six hours reduction.

The proposed funding of \$5 million for charities is very worthwhile. We heard the member for Unley and the Treasurer talk about \$1 million that has already gone to charities. The question has to be asked, 'Who paid for that? Was it Government money?' No, it was not. The \$5 million to charities is necessary. With all the cuts the Government has been making across the board, in education and health, we are finding more and more that people are suffering because of the reduction in the very necessary welfare functions which have always been regarded as the core business of Government. The Government is so stingy that its figure is \$1 million. The Labor Opposition's figure is \$5 million, and we will insist upon it.

The final amendment refers to the distribution of any revenue raised over the \$146 million proposed by the Treasurer as the income from this revenue raising measure. The Labor Opposition seeks to have any additional revenue distributed amongst sporting clubs. Sporting clubs are doing it pretty tough out there. We know that. They perform a very useful function in our community and, quite frankly, their facilities could do with a bit of input from the Government. This revenue could be used to put back some of the money that comes out of the community in the first place.

I must reiterate some of the comments made by members on this side about the arrogance of the Government and the way the Government has handled the passage of this legislation. I think it was the member for Playford who referred to a lunch at about Christmas time last year, held by the AHA, and attended by many Liberal members in this Chamber who felt quite happy to go and sit with members of the hotel industry. I remember very clearly the Treasurer getting up

and saying, in quite an arrogant way, that it was his opinion that he should be congratulated for what he was about to do. Well, I looked around the room after the Treasurer's speech and saw lots of smiles and handshakes, and quite obviously the hoteliers in that room had received the impression that things would be okay. But, of course, they were not because immediately the Government slapped them with the prospect of a turnover super tax.

I think it is worth the Government's recognising the contribution in terms of industry development that hotels and clubs in this State have provided. In my own electorate, several hotels have gone from being dingy and fairly rough to places which now offer facilities that our community has never had before.

*Mr Quirke interjecting:*

**Ms WHITE:** Yes, very cheap lunches.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** Subsidised lunches?

**Ms WHITE:** Yes.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** Not by the taxpayer?

**Ms WHITE:** Not at all.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Giles has already spoken.

**Ms WHITE:** There has also been investment, in terms of the development of hotels, and also employment opportunities for young people. In my own electorate, when a hotel upgrades, 40 or 50 young people get a job they never would have had before.

**Mr Brindal:** We are not arguing against that.

**Ms WHITE:** You have argued against that. The Government has got it wrong. In essence, I urge every member to think about how they will vote. Only one member opposite has had the mettle to speak on this issue at all. Members opposite will have the opportunity to vote now, and that is what their electorate will be watching for. Given that so many Liberal backbenchers have been doing the figures on the most recent Federal election, it would have to be said that, if a sizeable proportion of Liberal backbenchers do not cross the floor on this issue, they do not deserve to get back for another term. I urge all members to support the amendments put forward by the Labor Opposition.

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** I will be reasonably brief because most of the points have been made by other speakers. I am certainly on record in this House in relation to this issue because I moved a motion last year relating to the need for the Government to fully fund the shortfall to social welfare agencies as a result of gaming machines. When I moved that motion, I spoke fairly extensively on the issue.

When poker machines were introduced in South Australia in July 1994, there was an unprecedented take-up by clubs and pubs and the community of gaming machines and the use of gaming machines. The Hill report stated that by the end of September 1995 there were 7 890 gaming machines installed in 334 venues—an unprecedented and surprising installation of machines and the patronage of them.

As a result of that, there was a range of impacts that we did not foresee but which we need to address. First, I will refer to hotels and clubs, and in so doing I will concur with other speakers. It has been a good thing for the industry. I certainly acknowledge that in my area of Elizabeth there has been the renovation and upgrading of hotels, and certainly the Central Districts Football Club. The introduction of gaming machines has meant a significant upgrading of hotels and clubs and a significant increase in employment opportunities

for those in the community, and I acknowledge that that has been a good thing.

However, there have been other impacts that we need to consider. The impact for the Government has been fantastic. The taxation windfall to the Government from poker machines has surpassed all expectations. In 1994-95 the Government received revenue of \$53.2 million from poker machines. In 1995-96 it appears that the revenue will exceed \$120 million—a huge amount of money. About \$210 000 per day is accruing to the Government from the use of gaming machines. For the Government, it is a huge windfall.

We know from the findings in the Hill report and the coverage prior to the Hill report that there have been other impacts. Small businesses have registered concern that they have had a downturn as a result of the skewing of money into one sector. Charitable organisations have registered concern that their fundraising activities have been curtailed.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** The member for Elizabeth will address her remarks through the Chair, and the member for Unley will listen to those remarks.

**Ms STEVENS:** We know that it has become an issue for many charitable organisations, which have registered concern that it is now harder to raise money. Clubs and organisations who relied on bingo days and the bingo booths at shopping centres have registered concern that they are no longer able to raise the same amount of money because the money is just not there in the community.

We also know that demand for assistance from social welfare agencies has significantly increased. It is in relation to those issues that I moved the motion in the House last year. Since the introduction of poker machines—and this has been well established—there has been an unprecedented demand on welfare agencies for help not only from those people directly affected by excessive gambling but also from their families. There is a multiplier effect for those people.

Help or support for people adversely affected by gambling was addressed in some way—a very small way—by the establishment of the Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund. We need to be clear that this fund has a very small amount of money. The money in this fund—\$1.5 million in 1994-95 and \$2 million in 1995-96—came only from the hotel and gaming industry and the Casino. No money was put into this fund by the Government. While the Government was reaping huge amounts of money from the taxation, it was not putting money back to redress some of the downsides as a result of the introduction of poker machines.

I would like to acknowledge that not only did the hotel and gaming industry put money in but also the hotel and gaming industry collaborated—and I mentioned this last year when I spoke to my motion—with the social welfare agencies to do something constructive in relation to dealing with problem gambling. I commend the industry for taking that approach to the issue.

The community was faced with something being made available that was not previously available, that is, gaming machines. We had an unprecedented uptake and patronage of these machines. We had a range of effects that worked across our community. We had upsides and downsides. We needed to take a balanced approach across the board to handle this problem, to be fair and equitable, and to do the best we could across the board.

Following the Hill report, we know that the Government proposed a taxation on turnover—the super tax on turnover. This was followed by a huge outcry from the hotels and

clubs. All members were contacted and lobbied, quite properly, by hotels and clubs who said—and rightly so—that this had been applied too soon after the introduction of poker machines; that they had had to invest huge amounts of money to upgrade establishments and buy machines; and they also indicated the issues in relation to employment. Those things were fair: those complaints and concerns were real for that industry and needed to be taken into account. Concern was also registered that there had been little consultation. It is a pity that there had not been full and proper consultation with the industry and the clubs at that point in order to avoid the first taxation arrangement coming out as it did.

The second point that arose, following the Hill report, was the \$1 million that was to be allocated to social welfare agencies in order for them to deal with the downside of poker machines. This was quite outrageous. I know that throughout the social welfare sector people felt absolutely used and manipulated. They felt that the Government had said that it was going to do this good thing to try to redress what had happened to the social welfare sector, but instead it threw it a crumb—only \$1 million—with the remaining \$24 million being used by the Government to plug into other areas of the economy, areas from which the Government had pulled out enormous amounts of money, namely education and health.

As do other members on this side of the House, I strenuously disagree with the \$1 million proposition, and we have put up the \$5 million proposition because we believe that is a much more realistic and fair proposal. In relation to accountability, I noted the member for Unley's comments about church groups using this money to build edifices for themselves. Obviously, there needs to be accountability. Under the proposal put forward by the member for Playford in his amendments, there will certainly be accountability, and I do not believe that organisations such as Anglican Community Services will have any problem in dealing with accountability.

I believe that the third proposal the member for Playford has included in his amendment in relation to the sporting clubs fund—the fund that will take money in excess of the \$146 million tax threshold—is a good initiative. The points have been made adequately by all those who have spoken. Obviously, there are many sporting clubs in all our communities that struggle, and that is an initiative worthy of our support. To sum up, I, along with my colleagues on this side of the House, support the amendments as proposed by the member for Playford. We believe that, with those amendments, we will emerge from this debate with a result that is both fair and workable.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** I will be brief. I was one of four Government members who crossed the floor back in 1992 and opposed the introduction of poker machines in this State. I still do not like them: I think they are a mindless activity. However, they are a fact of life and, despite my personal feelings, I recognise and pay tribute to the people in clubs and hotels who have made a considerable sacrifice and made courageous investments in capital works and other infrastructure in extending their premises and so on to cater for poker machines. In addition, they have made a considerable investment in the poker machines themselves. Of course, what goes with this is the increased employment opportunities that have been created by the introduction of poker

machines, and I recognise that aspect as well. As I say, I pay tribute to the massive commitments made by the proprietors of hotels and the managers of clubs in providing this facility.

There is strong evidence that poker machines have had a dramatic effect on the community, especially on small businesses and charitable organisations. I agree with many of the comments made by the member for Giles in relation to people being able to choose how they spend their money: that is a fundamental right. However, the fact remains that there has been a shift in the direction in which people's discretionary money goes, and the overall job that many of these charities do in the community is substantial and needs recognition. I support the amendments to be moved by the member for Playford.

The proposal regarding close-down hours is a step in the right direction. The amendment gives some flexibility to the establishment in this regard rather than the six hours in one piece that the Government proposition puts up. I also support the \$5 million allocation to charities and social welfare organisations. That was the figure that the now Treasurer (and in 1992 the shadow Treasurer) put forward in this House during the debate. I remember it distinctly. It was based on expected Government revenue at that time of \$55 million. The Minister suggested that it be \$5 million, based on that premise at the time. Given the amount of tax revenue that has come in since poker machines have been introduced, this figure should be up around \$7 million or \$8 million. However, I am happy to support the \$5 million as put up in the amendment by the member for Playford.

The third point is the \$146 million-plus threshold, and I support that, with money in excess of this figure going to sporting clubs. It is a worthwhile initiative and, as has been pointed out by members, many of these clubs miss out on the other traditional areas of assistance. I know that in my electorate many of these sporting clubs do a remarkable job and make a massive contribution to the community, and they should be recognised. This is a way in which that could be done. They make a terrific contribution to keeping young people off the streets and out of trouble, and their contribution is very hard to measure in dollar terms. This is a very good initiative that will go a long way in assisting them.

Despite my continued opposition to poker machines, as I say, they are a fact of life. They have made an impact on the community, and a very positive one in many ways. I recognise that. I am prepared to accept that they are here to stay, and I have much pleasure in supporting the amendments to be put up by the member for Playford.

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens):** I had chosen not to contribute to this debate this evening but to do so at a later date but, having heard the comments—

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** I was saying that I was not going to contribute to this debate but, having heard many comments this evening, particularly those of the member for Unley, I decided that there were one or two points that I wanted to make. I support the amendments that have been foreshadowed by the member for Playford. There has been some discussion about those amendments and, having spoken to the member for Playford, I support them. However, like the member for Price, I do not believe that the \$5 million that is to be distributed to charitable service provider organisations is enough: it should be substantially more.

The Government will have a windfall with this tax and, over time, this Government has systematically withdrawn or slashed funding to organisations that support those in need, whatever the need. I have to say that, with the new Howard Federal Government, we fear that this slashing will go even further. I am particularly mindful of an organisation called NECAP in my electorate without which our community would not be able to continue to support many who find themselves in need. Unfortunately, that need has been enhanced, in part, by poker machines. I do not lay all the blame on those machines but they certainly have played a part. I do not think that \$5 million is enough, by any means.

Sporting organisations give opportunities to many of our talented youth and, without the support of these clubs, they would not be able to have these opportunities. Sporting clubs also provide a focal point for youth who, without that support, may spend their time in what could be deemed to be less proper activities, so proper funding for sporting clubs is long overdue. By way of example, I point out that I have written to the Premier, I believe, about the matter of the State men's under 18 netball team. This team is struggling to find enough money to travel interstate to represent South Australia. It is going to represent our State, but it is struggling to find money. It has held the usual raffles and so on, but there is no proper funding to support such groups.

It is absolutely appalling that that group is not being supported, and that is probably because it is not in the mainstream of sporting activities. Dare I say it: men's netball does not rate highly at this stage. However, if they are able to get funding and can do well interstate, I am sure that we will all stand up and make wonderful statements about them and thereby encourage suitable funding. This team is being disadvantaged. My concern about the money that is to be given to sporting clubs is that I am not convinced that the surplus above \$146 million will be forthcoming in suitable amounts. As I said, I have spoken to the member for Playford and he has given me some confidence about that issue, so I support that provision, as well. However, I am still a bit concerned about it.

I was raised in New South Wales, and poker machines were permitted in our clubs but not in the hotels. I have never been a great supporter of poker machines but, like other members, I believe it is a person's individual right to take up any form of gambling, whichever they choose. It is up to them how they spend their money, as the member for Giles said. At times, it is the draw of instant wealth and the chance at that lucky break that makes us have a bet, perhaps on the horses. I am a bit partial to the dogs on occasions and I put a few bob on them, picking it by the name, and there goes my money. I understand—

**Mr Quirke:** I bet on elections.

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** The member for Playford bets on elections. We should have taken a pool and reaped in a few bob just recently. The draw of instant wealth encourages many in the community to indulge in gambling. Poker machines are very available and they are in many hotels throughout my electorate, so the opportunity is a bit easier. I support the amendment but I reiterate that I do not think that \$5 million is enough, and I still have some concerns about the amount of money surplus of the \$146 million that will go to our sporting organisations.

**Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurana):** One of the main things that we need to consider in this legislation is the reason for which the change is being introduced. Is it an attempt to

control the addict spending on poker machines? I doubt that is the case. Is it an attempt to change the outcome for poker machine users? I doubt that is the case.

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Giles will read Standing Order 142.

**Mrs ROSENBERG:** It certainly should not be about decreasing profits for business. It is really about gaining extra revenue from successful businesses to top up various programs. One can call that a tax if one wishes: one can call it anything one likes, but that is the reality. It is about raising extra revenue to top up various programs. When poker machines were introduced to hotels and clubs in July 1994, the first mistake was created. In my opinion, the actual introduction of poker machines was a mistake. A recent survey by the *Advertiser* revealed that 70 per cent of people also disagreed with their introduction, and that means that I am probably one of the majority in that opinion. Having said that their introduction was a mistake, they have been introduced. The question now is about how they are used and controlled and how we look after those people who are not capable of looking after themselves, for one reason or another.

**Mr Brindal:** You are talking about the Opposition.

**Mrs ROSENBERG:** They're the ones. We must consider the families of those people who become addicts to poker machines and to all other forms of gambling. Poker machines are not the only disaster in South Australia because a lot of other forms of gambling cause addiction, too. For some reason, poker machines seem to be singled out by the media. They are always the problem with every form of gambling addiction.

The issue is really about an improvement to the system, and this measure is to be supported if this additional take from poker machines does anything to improve the family situation for those who are the real victims—not the poker machine addict, for whom I have no sympathy, but the families related to that addict, for whom I have a great deal of sympathy. I support the legislation very strongly, because extra money will go to a dedicated fund that will be used for topping up the system for those people who are related to the addict and who are the actual victims.

Let us also be quite honest that only 1 per cent of South Australia will fall into this category of so-called 'addict', so we are talking about a very small proportion of the South Australian population that is addicted to poker machine playing. The hotel industry has gone about the process of trying to overcome this by way of a voluntary code. It has introduced a booklet, *Smart Play*, which I support 100 per cent and which indicates various ways in which people can identify that they may or may not have a problem. It suggests some fairly subtle ways that people can quietly take that book away and read it, and if they identify that they have a problem they can seek help and do something about it. I support that. It is a voluntary system. It was not imposed on them; they took it upon themselves to do that and I applaud them for doing so.

Most people simply use the poker machine as a form of enjoyment and entertainment, and do not have any addiction or problem. I do not see that this money will do anything for them; it concerns the group of people, a very small proportion of our population, who need to be supported as a result of an addiction. I think the media have a lot to answer for in the way they have promoted the idea that almost all of South Australia is addicted to poker machines. It is absolutely

outrageous the way the media have portrayed the types of people using poker machines. I have visited a number of the places in my electorate that have poker machines. Frankly, from speaking to those people, particularly older women, I know that these machines have given them a new outlet—the only outlet they have ever had for socialising. That has been a very positive aspect of the introduction of poker machines.

The Small Retailers Association has made some comments that its downturn in business has been a result of the introduction of poker machines. So, yet again poker machines have been blamed for one more problem in the community, particularly by those shops selling food and drink. I can see the connection and understand the reason why that connection is being made. However, business is business, competition is competition; and I am sure that small retailers will fight back and will once again be very successful in South Australia. I would also say that the figures that are being put around at the moment about the increases in retailing in South Australia include poker machine revenue, which is certainly a substantial part of that increase in retailing.

Obviously, this Bill has some major points, and I wish to talk about only the tax side of that. It is proposed that the flat rate turnover be replaced by a two-tier system. I agree with that; it was a sensible decision. The reassessment of the allowable level before reaching 40 per cent is probably wise. However, there is a range of groups in our community that are still saying fairly loudly and clearly to me, and I am sure to a lot of other members in this House, that they do not support the lumping together of hotels and clubs. I must mention one in particular, the South Adelaide Football Club, because it is in my electorate. It has come to me specifically to raise these issues. In a letter it has sent to me and, I am sure, to other members of this House, it states:

All the clubs listed in the letter are deeply concerned about the proposed increase to the taxation and recommend an amendment to the legislation before it is passed.

Later, it goes on to state:

It is now long overdue for the Government to recognise the fundamental difference between licensed clubs and privately owned pubs and motels. The difference in the taxation proposed in the enclosed letter is marginal but will compensate clubs for the many disadvantages we currently suffer and benefit the community that support us.

I am told today that, actually, only three football clubs have a problem with this process; however, the letter is signed by South Adelaide Football Club; Racquets SA; Central Districts Football Club; Glenelg Football Club; Para Hills Community Club; the British Working Men's Club Incorporated, Wingfield; Parafield Gardens Community Club; Southern Districts Working Men's Club, Morphett Vale; and Marion Sports and Community Club, Marion. On their behalf I must state that they wrote to Mr Beck, the Licensed Clubs Association representative, on 29 February, urging their representative (the Licensed Clubs Association) to request the Government urgently to consider an amendment.

They gave a series of reasons for being concerned and requiring amendments to be considered. They include: that all licensed community and sporting clubs are incorporated bodies and their profit is pumped back into the community; that the reduced revenue to the Government by keeping the clubs' taxation at the present level would have a negligible effect on the Government revenue, because pubs and motels represent by far (approximately 90 per cent) the largest revenue raisers; and that clubs are continually disadvantaged when competing with privately owned pubs and motels, due

to their more limited financial and professional personnel resources. This is clearly demonstrated by the fact that all the high revenue earners are pubs and motels. One could extend that and suggest that even the very small sporting clubs such as Christies Beach Football Club, which is also in my electorate, and the Christies Beach Sports and Social Club are also looking down the barrel, because even South Adelaide's poker machines are competing against them. So, unfortunately, it is a never-ending spiral downward for most of the smaller clubs in our area.

With regard to the expected revenue of \$25 million, we could do sums all night about whether it is \$25 million, \$40 million or \$50 million, but the estimated revenue that we are thinking about putting aside is \$25 million, which must go into a dedicated fund. The Bill provides that it would go into a Community Development Fund to be used on expenditure in education, health, welfare and community development. Later I will ask the Minister exactly what community development might be, and that might satisfy some of my concerns. It is absolutely essential that the area of SSOs is determined by the money spent on education, and it is essential that waiting lists are the aspects of the health budget that are supported by this money.

In Committee I will ask whether, if the amounts of money have been set down at this stage, there is a break-down for the amount of money that will go to health, education and welfare and where the sporting clubs and minor sporting clubs will fit into that. In terms of the EFTPOS machines and breaking the cycle, we probably feel as if we have achieved a lot of things but, in terms of making a difference to the poker machine use, I doubt that they will have much effect at all. In reality, I support parts of the legislation and will ask a series of questions in Committee.

**Ms GREIG (Reynell):** This evening we have heard continuous debate on what we should be doing with moneys gained from gaming machines; moneys that at this stage are an estimation of what should come in. Although this so-called windfall has not come in yet, we are all in an extreme hurry to spend it. I agree that community service groups deserve additional funding. I agree that \$1 million is a small amount of money, but at the same time I also see the need for a considerable amount of money to be put into health and education. I do not believe that any member opposite would deny their communities these extra funds. The Deputy Premier has stated clearly that the new fund into which \$25 million will be paid annually, commencing in 1996-97, will be called the Community Development Fund. The moneys in the fund are to provide additional funding for education, health and community development, as well as providing additional assistance of \$1 million to welfare groups in 1996-97.

Earlier tonight we listened to a lot of heartfelt debate on charities, sporting clubs, etc. What about the small businesses that are struggling? What about those individuals involved in a family business? No-one has given them any consideration in all of this. Are we also forgetting the AHA contribution to charities and the individual hotel support for local sporting groups? I have only one hotel in my electorate: the Lonsdale. It is also the only poker machine venue in the electorate. The proprietors have agreed to the Bill, which I have discussed with them. As a local business they have also boosted local employment through the introduction of their machines. They have made a strong commitment to meeting community needs and are supporting local sporting groups. I have spoken to

members of my electorate on the issue, and many do see gaming machines as an unnecessary evil. However, they also feel that, if we must have them and if people feel compelled to use them, why should our children, our sick and even our elderly not benefit from any possible windfall?

I am not a supporter of poker machines but I see what they are doing for our local hotels and clubs. I admit I have concerns for our local football club, South Adelaide, but nothing discussed tonight addresses their concerns. I am also concerned for my local sporting groups, particularly netball and basketball, but I have also seen my groups address these changes and adopt alternative funding methods. They have seen what is happening and have sought sponsorship and donations from our hotels and other sources. One of our under-18 netball teams raised enough funding on its own to travel to the United Kingdom last year to play in the Birmingham Greater Manchester Games and this year they are off to Canada. Fundraising in the club situation is never easy but it can be done. I see the decision taken by our Government as a sensible decision.

The member for Kaurna has outlined the voluntary systems being used to support those who are heading for trouble or who are in trouble with gaming machines and, as I said earlier, the AHA is also addressing the issue—and addressing it very well indeed—and, at the same time, those who can and want to are enjoying their new social activity. As I said earlier, the areas of health and education are also a community concern and I want to ensure that through this legislation we will give these areas our full support.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer):** I make a number of observations about the contributions made particularly by members of the Opposition. I make it clear from the outset that it looks like history revisited. We are making the first amendments to this Act, other than those governing the control of the industry, since the legislation was first introduced. I raise the question: who introduced the legislation? Of course, it was the member for Giles. When the debate occurred on moneys being set aside and on provisions for charitable purposes or for those who were afflicted by gambling addiction, or whatever we believed was the downside of poker machines, any change of that nature was fiercely resisted.

The member for Giles has made no secret of that fact. He said quite clearly in this House, 'You should not hypothecate money. You should put it to general revenue and it should go to the highest and best use.' One thing I can say about the member for Giles, who was the architect of poker machine legislation in this State, is that he is totally consistent. What I do find astounding is that the rest of his Party do not seem to be with him.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** They all listened to you.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** The only point that members opposite are listening to is opposition for the sake of opposition. And so, when there was opportunity to make provision, no provision was made. It was the same with the Casino debates: there was to be an investigation, there was to be research, but not a thing was done. There are one or two members present who were part and parcel of that process. When we look at hypocrisy we should look back at the former Government because it stridently refused to make any provision whatsoever for any person or any organisation. I

find it a little hypocritical for members opposite to now say that they want the money for this, that and something else. They are new members and I can forgive them a little, but I cannot forgive the Leader of the Opposition, who was present during that process and who, indeed, endorsed the process commenced by the member for Giles. If we are talking about sheer hypocrisy, the Leader of the Opposition happens to be right up front.

In terms of some other inane statements that were made about the glory associated with the introduction of poker machines, some reference was made to people who supported it and people who did not support it. As members opposite will recall, I did not support the introduction of poker machines. I have never made any secret of that fact. I made a speech to the House, and people can read it if they wish, as some have already done.

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I will finish my speech. I did not interrupt the member for Giles and I guess we may receive the same courtesy from the honourable member, because I am sure he is aware of Standing Orders. The issue of poker machines was fiercely debated at the time. A number of members strongly supported it on both sides of the House, although the predominant numbers came from the Government at the time. A person for whom I have a great deal of regard, the Hon. Lynn Arnold, was opposed to poker machines.

Some of the comments made by members opposite that reflected on the votes that were taken at the time I find somewhat inappropriate, because they also reflect on at least three of their own members—there might have been four—that I can remember. The Hon. Murray De Laine was one of them, the Hon. Lynn Arnold was another and I think the Hon. Greg Crafter was yet another. I could probably go back in *Hansard* to confirm this, but we are talking about very honourable people. For members opposite to suggest that there was some glory in supporting poker machines and that there was something wrong with the mentality of those who did not support poker machines, or that the members concerned had been affected in some way, does not reflect very well on members opposite. So, I ask members to go back and check the record.

In terms of the contributions made, we did have an enormous amount of repetition during the debate. There was a script set and occasionally they deviated from that script to give some local colour to the picture. There are some things on which we can agree. Even though I did not support poker machines for the reasons that I stated at the time, as appointed Treasurer of this State I took the job of Government very seriously, as I am sure members are aware, and indeed we introduced poker machines in a respectable time frame and without any losses, any breakdowns or any smell of corruption that may have been present in other States. It was a very professional exercise and we were assisted in that process by the AHA and licensed clubs. It is important to remember that this was the first time that those two organisations, or their like in any State, had come together in that form to provide the product that both were seeking. It is a great credit to those organisations for the initiative taken in that regard.

Some disparaging remarks have been made about the Treasurer, and I always think that they are grist for the mill or water off the duck's back in terms of how matters could be handled. I simply suggest to those members, including the member for Hart, who have made gratuitous remarks that, if any member believes that a Government can go to an industry

and say, 'Hey, give me \$25 million worth of tax', and be greeted warmly or be able to reach a sensible conclusion, I hope that member is never Treasurer of this State, because he could be putting his hand out all the time and receiving nothing in return. That does not mean to say that the industries are not constructive: it is a simple fact of life that no-one wants to pay any more tax.

If the honourable member believes that I could have trumpeted from the treetops that decisions were going to be taken and that everybody had a right to talk to everybody concerned and apply what I regard as significant pressure, I do not think we would have seen these changes here today. Members can reflect on that situation.

The Deputy Leader made two unfortunate references in the House and, as a result, I think that anybody who reads *Hansard* would question the Opposition's approach. The Deputy Leader cannot help himself. I think that his comments revealed a very worrying sign for anyone who would ever suggest that the Opposition was capable of taking over the reigns of Government. In fact, the Deputy Leader said, 'We want a bit of payola. We want a bit of money in the kick.' If members wish to reflect on the Deputy Leader's contribution, they can read it in *Hansard*. He said, 'The industry should be shovelling money our way to congratulate us for what we are doing or trying to do.' I have extreme reservations about that. In fact, I abhor any suggestion that money should change hands because of some service delivered by the Government or the Opposition for the benefit or profit of a particular organisation.

**Mr Foley:** What about Catch Tim?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Again, I would ask the member for Hart to read the record and straighten himself out a bit.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Hart is out of order.

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** And so is the member for Giles.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** If the member for Hart wants to participate in the Committee debate, I suggest that he proceed cautiously.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** It is very dangerous and totally out of order to suggest that members of particular industries shovel cash into the ALP coffers for their own personal benefit. The honourable member should reflect on his statements: they may come back to haunt him later. In terms of the introduction of gaming machines, we are all aware that there has been an impact, and it was always expected that there would be some fallout from poker machines. For the majority of people, they act as a form of relief, a form of entertainment. They have certainly assisted the clubs and pubs which have implemented them judiciously to upgrade their premises and provide a far greater service to their communities than they have been able to do in the past.

I did note, from the large number of submissions that we received from the hotels and clubs when the first announcement about the tax change was made, the extent to which hotels and clubs make a contribution to their communities. There are very many generous hoteliers in this town. I looked at the extent to which those people are putting money back into the local community, whether that be sporting organisations or through charitable fundraising. It covered a whole range of areas. Some of them have been very charitable, and the Government applauds the fact that they are sharing some



of their dividend. However, some of them have put that money mainly into their own pockets for their own benefit.

One of the issues that led to some of the expressions of outrage at the time the poker machine industry started to mature was the extent to which the wealth that was being accumulated was flouted by those who were some of the highest earners. I reflect that, whilst the poker machine industry may have been maturing, some of its membership was not. It was at this time that welfare agencies and charities were saying, 'How about us? We believe that we are being badly affected whilst the other side is benefiting from poker machines.' For them to display and make known to everyone the amount of money that was being made out of poker machines I think produced some of the results that members can now reflect upon.

With regard to the cry for help from sporting clubs, I have been a treasurer, secretary and president of a number of sporting organisations over a period of time, right up to the time I entered Parliament. It was always a struggle to raise funds, to get the new court down, to buy some new nets, to refurbish basketball courts or even to help some of the kids in their playing areas, which we did. Having been there and done that, like most members of this House, what we are seeing today is nothing new—it has happened over the past 20 years.

I can look at areas in my electorate and point to clubs that were great in their day but which have now declined to a point where they no longer exist. We see areas which are in need of refurbishment because the clubs no longer exist. That is part of the process that occurs in the rise and fall of areas. It has a lot to do with demographics and the zest and vigour of clubs in the way that they organise themselves. Every member would recognise that. In fact, every member of this place would know of clubs in their area that meet the needs of their players and members and other clubs that are falling behind.

The advent of poker machines has had very little to do with the demise of clubs which went into decline as a result of demographics, bad management, the cost of upgrading facilities or whatever. Many fledgling clubs will benefit from the advent of poker machines. This reflects on the suggestion that there should be some way of having equity in the system. Many country areas, which have been some of the strongest sporting communities in this State, due to the rural demise, for example, have become blighted in sporting terms simply because of the movement in population.

In some areas they cannot raise the traditional football club because there are not enough players or money. The point to be made is how many of those clubs are into long-term survival anyway. When you are trying to pick winners and losers and the extent to which you believe they can succeed, that is when I raise the question about that capacity. It is interesting to note that the Victorian Government set aside money for just this purpose, and I understand that it will all be spent on one stadium.

**Mr Foley:** Which one?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I think it is a tennis stadium or something. An amount of \$150 million was set aside for one sporting venue after a number of people had received large promises. However, they do things differently in other States. We recognise that everyday MPs are asked to spend money on one thing or another. As Treasurer, I receive a different request every day of the week. If it does not come from Ministers who believe that they need extra money to fulfil the needs that are being placed upon them, it comes from the

wider community of people suggesting that we could better spend our money in a particular area or, more importantly, saying that more money should be spent in another area.

I know that the Opposition has supported a number of those groups and has said, 'Yes, this is a good idea.' I remind members that, with an underlying budget deficit of \$350 million, the task of bringing this State back to some reasonable financial viability has been very difficult and will remain difficult, and it certainly will not get any easier. In terms of our capacity to deliver the services that we need, we have to provide the greatest service for the smallest number of dollars; we have to get the best results from the widest distribution to those people who are genuinely in need and who require that service from Government.

To the extent to which the former Treasurer commented upon the issue of hypothecation, I agree with him entirely on that. The reason why we departed from that principle in this Bill is quite simple. The fact is that more money was being raised and there was a demand that we should show the benefit of that special fund-raising as a result. The Government's determination was quite clear, given the budgetary stresses, and I can inform the Parliament that that \$25 million which has not been allocated will be allocated in the budget process.

So, quite clearly, we did separate the normal demands made on ministries and the demands made by Ministers on Treasury. In the budget negotiating process, we separated out that amount of money. The Government believed there had to be a special impact that would assist this State in a way that would make a meaningful difference, knowing that it is very easy to have all that money absorbed in the budgetary process and that nobody can see the benefit. So, we were quite clear on that. We have not changed our mind on that at all. That will be a matter for considerable deliberation, and everybody perceives that the \$24 million or \$25 million, whatever the final sum is, depending on the final outcomes, will assist their particular area of interest. As members would reflect, it has probably been spent four times over, at least on paper. The demands to do something special are there. The way in which it will be spent will be part of a very clear process, and it will be described and placed in the budget papers as a separate allocation item.

As to the issue of the charities, we recognised, and the Hill report made it explicit, that some of the charities have suffered loss as a result of the introduction of poker machines. We were fortunate enough to receive, upon request, a large number of financial statements going back over a number of years. I am the first one to applaud the efforts of the charities, not only because they meet a need that may well fall on Government if they were not there but because of the enormous amount of energy spent by volunteers who provide such wonderful service to the wider community. However, there are some anomalies.

Some of those fundraising efforts were in decline before poker machines were introduced. Other charities have managed to survive and in fact improve their situation simply because they saw that change was coming. They could see some of their traditional areas being eroded by a whole range of activities, including electronic forms of gambling. So, the old scratchies and some of the bingo sessions were in fact showing some raggedness at the edges well before poker machines were introduced. I defy anyone to say which charity is more worthy, and the extent to which charities have been affected in terms of recompense is not easy to determine.

A number of points were made about the six hour issue. Without going through every contribution, I thank members for the time they spent putting forward an argument either for or against various propositions in the Bill. I thank all members for their contributions to the debate. I do take seriously some of the matters raised in that debate. As the member for Playford has mentioned, there have been discussions of a particular nature, and I have given an undertaking that I will reflect further on his contribution during the passage of the Bill between the two Houses. Whilst I do not believe that the ALP has been instrumental in change in terms of bringing in a different tax regime, I can assure members that sense finally prevailed after some considerable time was spent looking at various alternatives, and that was as a result of some fairly dynamic lobbying on behalf of the affected constituency, in this case the hotels and clubs, but also many submissions from my own Party as well as members opposite. You could say it was a total effort to say, 'Is there a better solution?'

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** We do not run a Caucus room, and I do not believe I have told any fibs, but if the member for Giles can actually pinpoint one example, if I have inadvertently told a porky pie, I will apologise. I assure all members—

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! This is not a Committee debate.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** That is totally untrue. I do not think I have gilded the lily or stretched the imagination during this process.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Hart will have his chance.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** If he wants to give a good example, I am sure I could respond accordingly. I believe that sense has prevailed, as was always going to be the case. If I cannot get something right in the first instance, I will always have a look at it again. One of the great moments in life is to say, 'Did I get it right?', and reflect upon it, or 'Could I have done it better?' In the circumstances, we reflected upon the enormous number of submissions, and I believe that, given the demand on the Government for this extra revenue and this special fund, I believe the outcome is consistent with a better marriage between the partners.

In terms of what is being contributed, I also mention the fact that, before the gaming machines were introduced, because of the difficulties we experienced when we came in—we had a difficult Act to deal with, and progress was not occurring as fast as the hotels and clubs would have expected originally—I made the situation quite clear when I said, 'Let's get this new industry up and running, and do it as well and as efficiently as possible. I will review a number of the issues at a later date.' That was made quite clear. We did not have time to reflect on potential problems, nor to project how much profit would be generated. Under the Act, we had one duty—to make sure that the new industry began effectively. We were able to achieve that with a great deal of cooperation. I make no excuse for the fact that the John Hill report was the first review of the operation of the Act. I do not think that anybody should have been surprised when that occurred, because I made it quite clear at the time.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** But you did not follow it.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Indeed, we did. I just ask members to reflect on the circumstances, the fact that the original legislation did not provide anything at all. Consistent

with that was my willingness to go back into the Act and look at anything which would change the legislation, including the risks associated with a new Parliament having a different view on gaming machines. It was obviously important that we did not make any amendments. It was very constructive for the hotels and clubs to come together in respect of the gamblers rehabilitation fund. It was a credit to them, as I did not want to change the legislation at that stage, as everybody would understand. It was a credit to the hotel and hospitality industry that money was set aside by the industry to help those people who were more seriously affected.

In terms of additional allocation, a further \$1 million will be added to the \$500 000 which comes from the levy on poker machines within the Casino. Therefore, \$3 million will come from sources within and outside Government to look after two major areas. The first is to effectively deal with people who have a gambling addiction—an Australian first—and, secondly, to provide meaningful assistance to those whose finances and circumstances are such that they are in dire need, basically as a result of a family member becoming involved in gaming machines to a much larger degree than they should have.

I believe there have been a number of important outcomes in this State which are different from those that prevail interstate. From that point of view, I am pleased with the outcomes and, although we did require more taxation, we now have a taxation regime that is more palatable. I make the point quite clearly before we go into Committee that, having determined that there should be some additional revenue forthcoming from industry, I had two choices.

One choice was to go down the path that we have followed here. The second choice, and a far easier choice, was to use my power and discretion to change the regulation and do it by change of one rate to be applied across the industry. I have often contemplated that it would have been easier simply to change the rate and then allow the debate to rage publicly, but within the province of my powers to implement an additional amount of revenue for a special purpose. That was not my desire. It certainly was not my desire to affect the struggling clubs as compared with those that had a greater capacity to pay.

The debates and conversations that have surrounded this Bill have been of great interest. They have certainly put me on a learning curve in terms of my understanding of how the industry operates and it meant that I had to go back and look at everything that had been brought to my attention. That has been constructive, but I believe that the new taxation regime allows some of the smaller clubs to lift their game and do better while the larger clubs have the capacity to pay at a greater rate. We have changed the tax regime and it is now based on profit rather than turnover. I trust that all those things will work at the end of the day and we will not have to go into any pick up mechanism that is in the Bill should the moneys fall short. I thank all members for their contribution. I move:

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

Motion carried.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Conditions.'

**Mr QUIRKE:** I move:

Page 2, line 18—Leave out ‘there is on all other days a continuous period of at least six hours’ and insert ‘at other times there are at least six hours in each 24 hour period (which may be a continuous period of six hours, or two separate periods of three hours or three separate periods of two hours)’.

This amendment covers the first issue that we raised in debate on this Bill tonight. I take this opportunity to raise a point that has not been raised so far. There is a large repository of gaming machines not far from here. It has about 700 gaming machines or even more. We do not see anything in any of these changes that affects that organisation. There is no doubt that this proposal to restrict hours is just another one of those sops to a group of people in the Liberal Party who just do not believe that there ought to be gaming machines at all. I understand that there was a dispute regarding an eight hour limit and the industry said, ‘Let’s try for four and be reasonable about this.’ No-one cared too much about squashing a few small operations that will be hurt by the six hour proposal—and hurt considerably. The Casino gets away with the whole thing.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** Twenty-four hours.

**Mr QUIRKE:** The Casino can do what it likes. A cynical member might suggest that it is because the Casino is largely Government owned and will soon be dragged to the auction block. That would be a cynical connotation on the whole thing.

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**Mr QUIRKE:** I honestly do not know. I would believe anything these days. I have spent time on this issue and I have seen many things that have stunned me, including the lunch last December where we could not quite organise to have the whole thing announced until afterwards.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** And you’re not easily shocked.

**Mr QUIRKE:** No, I am not easily shocked, but that did surprise me somewhat.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr QUIRKE:** It’s because you carry on in that way that you are not a parliamentary secretary. I would dry up if I were you. You have committed enough sins around here. This amendment is fairly simple. It seeks to take a reprehensible, cheap and shoddy principle and put a little bit of flexibility into it so that a few of the hotels, particularly along the North Terrace precinct, will not be hurt, just to appease a bunch of wowers who would probably prefer to have pubs closed on a 24 hour consecutive basis, every day of the week, every day of the year.

We are moving a simple proposal. Yes, you can have your six hours. If it makes you feel better, have your six hours. It does not do much for me. As I said before, I am a free market man on this. As far as I am concerned, the pubs and clubs can service their clientele and, when they do not service their clientele, the people will vote with their feet. If you must have the six hours, let it be broken up into a few little combinations that will help one or two of those organisations. At least have the decency to allow that to happen. This six hour debate is nothing more than a sham. It is a sop to those persons in the Liberal Party who, for whatever reason, oppose gaming machines and probably oppose a pile of other things as well.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I support the amendment proposed by the member for Playford, only on the basis that I think it is the lesser of the evils before us. I will be voting for the member for Playford’s amendment and then I will oppose the whole clause, because I do not believe that there is any justification whatsoever for saying to hotels,

clubs or any venue that has poker machines that they must close them at certain times. We as a community are quite able to make decisions as to when we wish to play poker machines, if we wish to play them at all, or to drink alcohol or anything else. Again, I always state that that is provided we do it quietly. I think that people ought to be able to do pretty well what they like when they like. I note that we have had an Adelaide Festival of Arts over this past few weeks, and I do not know that there has been a great restriction on those people.

We have had Red Square going all hours of the day and night, with people drinking, dancing and carrying on, with no suggestion that they ought to knock off at certain times of the night. They can do what they like, and so they ought to. I am not opposed to that. But why single out poker machine venues? There is absolutely no sense in it at all. The argument that is being used is that people have to be protected from themselves—that some people cannot stop. I say that people also have to accept responsibility for their own actions. People voluntarily walk into pubs and clubs and play these poker machines. No-one whips them through the door: no-one says ‘You have to do this.’ And if they are doing it, and doing it at three or four o’clock in the morning when, for whatever reason, they ought not to be, it is their fault. It is not the fault of the hotels, not the fault of the clubs and not the fault of the legislation.

The individuals themselves really have to accept some responsibility for their actions. They are all adults and, if they cannot control themselves at a poker machine, a dog track, a race track or a bar, or wherever people do other things with their money, they have to accept responsibility for that and the consequences. I do not think that, because some people behave in a manner of which most people do not approve, the whole of society has to be penalised and have its rights restricted. It is their own fault, and they should learn to control themselves. If they cannot, they accept the consequences.

Also, I do not like the idea of pubs and clubs being told what to do when their competitor, the Casino, can run for 24 hours a day, seven days a week, I think 365 days a year; I am not quite sure. I think they voluntarily close on Christmas Day, but I do not know; I cannot remember. It seems to me that, if this is such a huge evil and they must be closed down at three o’clock in the morning, then close the lot. I am not advocating that the Casino be closed and, if someone brought in some amending legislation to the Casino Act that closed down the Casino for six hours, I would oppose that as strongly as I oppose this.

But where is the consistency and the fairness in saying to a hotel directly across the road, for example, from the Casino that it has to close its poker machines at certain times but that customers can walk 20 yards to the Casino and go 24 hours a day? Where is the fairness in that? There is no fairness, no logic, no consistency. This is giving the Casino some kind of benefit, and I note also that a financial benefit arises indirectly to the Casino, and again it is quite wrong that that should occur. Let us have a little bit of a level playing field here. As I say, while I support the amendment of the member for Playford, I will oppose this clause if either the amendment or the clause itself goes through.

**Ms WHITE:** I have already stated in my second reading contribution on this Bill that I will be supporting the Labor Opposition’s amendment and then, if that is not carried, I will be opposing the clause. I note in neither the Deputy Premier’s second reading explanation nor in any of the discussion that

I have heard any justification for a reduction in operating hours, so I ask the Treasurer directly, as the representative of the Liberal Party in this place on this issue—a representative of the Party that portrays itself as the upholder of individuals' rights—what does he intend to achieve by this restriction of operating hours?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** In answer to the member for Giles, the honourable member made his position quite clear, and that is a matter for him. He has consistently debated along those lines for as long as I have known him, so I find no difficulty in understanding the point put by the member for Giles. Turning to the issue raised by the member for Taylor, the matter was debated at the time the report came out. The issues that were looked at by the parliamentary Liberal Party in determining its stance on the outcome that we see here today revolved—

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** What report?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Mention was made in the Hill report about some of the—

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** Are you saying this was a recommendation of the Hill report?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** No, it was not a recommendation of the Hill report. One of the issues which was raised by the Hill report and which members can—

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** Have you read the Hill report?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Of course I have read the Hill report. Perhaps the member for Giles should go back and read the Hill report. One of the issues was addiction and the extent to which people get locked into 24 hour a day gambling. I know that some publicity was given to one such person outside the State. However, one of the interesting aspects of gaming is the extent to which some people are very unfortunate—and we are trying to pick them up through the gamblers rehabilitation process—in that they get locked into a habit that dies only when their card or money runs out and they cannot pawn their shirt, shoes or whatever. There are other examples. Representations were made to me about families not having one or the other partner home simply because there was a capacity to continue the process of poker machines well into the morning and through the next day.

They are some of the issues and people can make up their own mind as to whether this is an appropriate mechanism. The matter was debated quite fiercely. I think the general majority of the Parliamentary Liberal Party agreed that there should be some break. The issue of how long that break should be varied between four hours and 24 hours, as the member for Giles quite rightly pointed out. In the end, six hours was accepted as a reasonable compromise in terms of providing a break. I note that certain establishments can be alluded to, or it can be said that there are special circumstances in that they take shift workers or they take the overrun from another establishment. We must remember that the choice of the six hours is still with them.

Indeed, anyone can reflect on what is prime time and what is low time and the extent to which there is capacity within a hotel or club actually to meet the requirement with very little loss of business in the process. As has been reflected upon, this matter was debated at some length. It was a matter that I believe a number of charities and welfare agencies as well as some other outside groups actually applauded, saying that this is the right way to go. It may well be the gambling issue, it may well be just having a member of the family back home when they should be home, but it was seen as a very positive initiative, and the clubs, I believe, have the capacity to meet that without severe detriment to their revenue.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I just remind the Treasurer that he did not respond to my query as to why the Casino can go for 24 hours when, 10 strides away across the street, the mad gambling addict has to be tossed out of the hotel for six hours. If it is so absolutely critical and necessary, why not close down the Casino so that the mad gambling addict cannot just walk across the road and carry on with the evil habit, if that is what it is?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** The member for Giles has raised another relevant question, as are most of his questions.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** Thank you.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Most of them. It revolves around the issue of what is the Casino. Despite its remarkable decline as a result of the introduction of poker machines in the past two years, it remains the major tourism visitor venue in South Australia. We are saying that there should be a difference. That was not necessarily supported by all members, as the honourable member would recognise. The second issue is that, on most occasions, there is automatic closing down to allow the cleaning process to go ahead, so I am not sure that the six hours is not naturally met under the current Casino arrangements.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** How often?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** It is pretty well always, but there would be occasions when it is not. For practical purposes, to a large extent the Casino has a sort of automatic shutdown because they run out of customers and they need to clean up the place. The third issue is that, as a result of the demise of the Casino, we are going through a complete review of the Casino's operations, including the structures. The whole ASER issue is being looked at and how it trades and other issues concerning the Casino will have to be brought back to Parliament because some structural changes are required. That will be an appropriate time to further debate the issue, once we have completed the whole package.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I just want to stress that that is the biggest load of waffle I have heard from the Treasurer, who is noted for his waffle when he has no sustainable argument to put to the Committee.

**The Hon. S.J. Baker:** I thought I gave you three good points.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** No, not at all. The question of reviewing the Casino Act is entirely separate. If the Government wants to review the Casino Act, fine, review it. It is the biggest dog's breakfast that you ever saw, except that it is there. It was either a dog's breakfast or nothing, so it is there. The Government can review that at any time it likes. However, the Government is creating an unlevel playing field. The only reason that I can think of for that action is that the Government is trying to unload what it has had to pick up through the asset management group, and I understand all that and have no difficulty with it. I think it is very good that the Government is doing that, but it is quite wrong to give an advantage to a private operator in this field against other private operators, and that is what will happen.

The other private operators are small businesses. In the main, hotels are small businesses. The clubs are not even businesses. This tax regime will be less favourable to them than it will be to what I can assure you will be big business that buys the Casino. It is good that some other big business does buy the Casino because the present owners and operators of it have been total failures, and that is a great disappointment. But it is quite wrong for this Government to give an advantage to big business over small business. I will ask the member for Kaurna, who gives us this information via

the *Advertiser*, whether the Treasurer gave the Liberal Party room this piece of information, that small business would be disadvantaged *vis-a-vis* the Casino. Was that discussed in the Party room?

It seems to me from what I read in the paper and from what people have told me that this was brought up in a very offhand manner, that no detailed explanation was given and that people thought they were lied to. They were certainly misled. I should like to hear from some members opposite as to whether they have considered the disadvantage that their small businesses will have *vis-a-vis* big business at the Casino. If they have not, I urge them to do so, because it is quite wrong, quite unfair and quite unnecessary. If they talk about supporting small business, then give them a go. They are not asking for anything extra. They just want to be able to compete fairly on hours and on a taxation regime with the big business at the Casino. Why should the hotels opposite and around the Casino not have the same taxation regime and the same access to hours as big business at the Casino? It is a fair enough issue for members opposite to consider and at least explain to their small businesses why they are supporting this disparity. There must be a reason why they are doing it: please tell us.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Let me make two comments. The first is that the Casino believes it is disadvantaged according to the new tax regime of the hotels and, as the honourable member would recognise, a number of propositions were put up to him over time and those propositions have not changed.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** I don't know what you mean.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Perhaps they did not put up any propositions to the then Treasurer, but they have certainly put up some proposals to me in terms of taxation regimes and a taxation process based on profit rather than turnover.

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Well, that is fine. My second comment is that if the honourable member wants to whisper to someone in the corridor 'Was it discussed?' In terms of the position of the Casino, it certainly was, and some of the issues that the member for Giles raised were also put forcefully by members on my side. That issue was debated fully.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

AYES (10)

|                        |               |
|------------------------|---------------|
| Blevins, F. T.         | Clarke, R. D. |
| De Laine, M. R.        | Foley, K. O.  |
| Geraghty, R. K.        | Hurley, A. K. |
| Quirke, J. A. (teller) | Rann, M. D.   |
| Stevens, L.            | White, P. L.  |

NOES (27)

|                    |                       |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Andrew, K. A.      | Armitage, M. H.       |
| Ashenden, E. S.    | Baker, S. J. (teller) |
| Becker, H.         | Brindal, M. K.        |
| Brokenshire, R. L. | Caudell, C. J.        |
| Condous, S. G.     | Cummins, J. G.        |
| Evans, I. F.       | Greig, J. M.          |
| Gunn, G. M.        | Hall, J. L.           |
| Ingerson, G. A.    | Leggett, S. R.        |
| Matthew, W. A.     | Meier, E. J.          |
| Olsen, J. W.       | Oswald, J. K. G.      |
| Penfold, E. M.     | Rosenberg, L. F.      |
| Rossi, J. P.       | Scalzi, G.            |
| Venning, I. H.     | Wade, D. E.           |
| Wotton, D. C.      |                       |

PAIRS

|                 |             |
|-----------------|-------------|
| Atkinson, M. J. | Allison, H. |
|-----------------|-------------|

Majority of 17 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I move:

Page 2, line 18—Leave out 'on all other days' and insert 'at other times'.

This amendment is consequential. It addresses the issue of whether a six-hour period should cross midnight and therefore extend into another day, should the proprietor so choose. It is a neater resolution.

Amendment carried.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I move:

Page 2, line 18—After '6 hours' insert 'in every 24 hour period'.

This is the issue alluded to in the previous amendment. They are both reasonably consistent and provide that, should a publican or a club decide that there is a better time to close and it is past midnight, they are capable of exercising that judgment.

**Mr QUIRKE:** I oppose this amendment on the following grounds. We tried to make this a reasonable measure so that it did not discriminate against some of the clubs that had a shift worker clientele. We are being asked to provide a six-hour closure here and, frankly, I do not think it ought to be anyone's business when these places are open. It is quite up hill and down dale here. This Government is telling people what they ought to be doing and when they ought to be doing it. That debate was lost years ago. It is a fact that gaming machines are now here in South Australia. The Government loves them down there in the Casino—all 700 of them. Nothing is happening to them because, of course, the Government wants to flog off the Casino. I do not mind that. I agree with the member for Giles that it would be eminently sensible to put the Casino in any other hands. I cannot understand why the Casino cannot make a quid. I do not want to take up too much time with this.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr QUIRKE:** That is probably right: it is probably the only one that does not make money. I could offer some advice on that. We will be late enough with all this, but I want to make clear and put on record now that I think the Government ought to butt out of this and leave the pubs and clubs out there to determine what is best for them. We had this from day one with the Lotteries Commission and all the rest of it. It wanted to go out there and control the whole thing. That was rejected by this House four years ago. What we see now is just a sop to a bunch of people who do not have the guts to stand up to their own Treasurer and say they do not want gaming machines: that is what this is all about.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** That is an interesting interpretation. I presume the honourable member is talking about the clause rather than the amendment, because the amendment adds flexibility. I have not seen anything from the Opposition on this issue and it certainly did not happen in the time of the previous Government. The fact is that we do control hours. We control them through licensing and they have been controlled for a great many years. The interesting change that has taken place is that a specific licence is being used. Hours are specified for a normal hotel licence.

What has happened is that a number of them have run across the border and picked up a general facilities licence. That is another debate. It has been announced by the Attorney-General that there will be an investigation into licensing. If the member is true to his argument, the facts of life are that we have had licensing laws in this State for a long time, and those licensing laws have applied restrictions. There has been

some capacity for tourism venues to operate at different times. What was the exception has now become part of the rule. If the member wants to discuss whether we should have licensing hours, school hours or any other hours, that should be left for another debate. The issue is the principle here, not the fact that the member takes exception to any restrictions that are placed on this form of gambling.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I support the member for Playford because the Treasurer is wrong. The principle put forward by the member for Playford is that, while a hotel is allowed to open, it ought to be possible to play the poker machines. What the Treasurer is now saying is that a hotel can be open, you can drink yourself stupid at the bar, and I suppose you can play the TAB or all these other things that they quite rightly have, but you cannot play a poker machine. That is different from what the Treasurer said, that is, that we have always had restricted hours. I am not arguing about that—there are far too many restrictions on hours.

**The Hon. S.J. Baker:** You didn't listen.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I did; I listened very carefully. What you said was waffle. What the member for Playford quite rightly says is that, if a hotel is allowed to trade, all facets of trade within that hotel ought to be available to the customers. If you do not want poker machines operating between midnight and 6 o'clock, close down the hotels: bring in the legislation and let us have a look at it. I will oppose it. Hotels ought to be allowed to open 24 hours a day, if they wish, as long as they do not make a noise; and the same goes for churches—let 100 flowers bloom. People are entitled to have a choice. Do not put up a phoney argument that, because we have always had control, this is absolutely another logical control. It is utterly illogical to have licensed premises open but some parts of those premises must be closed, particularly when you have exactly the same facility available in the Casino and it is open.

This is silly. It was a knee jerk reaction from the Premier, as I read it in the newspapers—that is all I know, and what members opposite have told me—to a campaign by the *Advertiser* saying how awful all this is. In the past I have distributed—I have not distributed it tonight, but I will again; I keep bringing it out of the archives—a copy of an *Advertiser* editorial demanding that Mr Bannon bring in poker machines immediately. Do not let us react to silly editorials in the *Advertiser*. That is where the closure provision has come from. The Premier panicked because there was some article in the *Advertiser* critical of poker machines. The *Advertiser* has moved on to koalas today. You cannot take these characters seriously. There are four pages on koalas. The *Advertiser* wants them to kill all the trees and then starve to death. All right, it is entitled to a point of view. That is all this six hour closure is—a silly reaction to a silly campaign by a silly newspaper and a spineless Premier. We should not encourage any of those people.

Amendment carried.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I oppose the clause for the reasons I have given. I do not believe that there ought to be any restrictions. If licensed premises are entitled to be open, all aspects ought to be open. I also find new subsection (7)(b)(i) offensive. I see no reason at all, if I want to go into some gambling place on Christmas Day and Good Friday, why anyone ought to stop me. It is my business and no-one else's. It is not compulsory. If people find that gambling on Christmas Day or Good Friday is inappropriate for them, they can stay home. I assume it would be for religious reasons, but they ought not to be permitted to force their religious views

on those of us who either do not have a religious view or have a different religious view.

Clause as amended passed.

Clauses 6 and 7 passed.

Clause 8—'EFTPOS or ATM facilities, etc., not to be provided within gaming area.'

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I oppose the clause. I see absolutely no reason at all for not having EFTPOS or ATM facilities in licensed premises where there are gaming machines. Again, people have the right to access their own money as they wish. They have to accept responsibility for their own actions and, if they draw out more than they ought to play poker machines, to buy cars that they cannot afford or to back horses that are too slow, or anything, it is their business and no-one else's. In fact, I have seen ATM facilities in the Casino in Hobart when I have stayed at the Hobart Casino. I have stayed there on a number of occasions at ALP conferences. I found the ATM machine very handy for getting money. I assure members that I certainly left none of it in the hotel, on any of the gambling tables or in the poker machines.

Had I wanted to, it was my money and nobody else's business. I think that, in some respects, there is an obligation on licensed premises to supply that service. I look at it the other way around. It is a service industry. If I want to get money to play a poker machine or buy a drink, and sufficient people feel the same way, the service industry should supply that service and we should not interfere. I oppose the clause, but I do not suppose that anybody else is interested in that. Clause 8(2) provides:

The Commissioner may, by instrument in writing, exempt a licensee [from this provision]. . .

Why is that provision included? Can the Minister give me an example of where the Commissioner may do this? Subclause (4) looks to me to be an identical provision, whereby the Minister may do it as well. If it is an identical provision, I am not sure why both the Commissioner and the Minister have this power. What would they see as exceptional circumstances? Why have this provision at all?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** The member for Giles may be confused. If he reads the first lines, it does not allow an EFTPOS facility to be within a gaming area. The EFTPOS facility can be in the hotel, club or whatever, but it should not be in the gaming area. That was one of the strong recommendations that came out of the Hill report—the extent to which, when people run out of cash, they go for plastic. It is a small separation but it will provide a break in concentration on a machine. I am sure the member for Giles is aware of some of the problems that are created, that the next time you operate the machine you will hit the jackpot.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** I am sorry, the Treasurer is right. Now I will not bother opposing it; it is meaningless. I apologise for not reading it more carefully.

Clause passed.

Clause 9 passed.

Clause 10—'Insertion of ss. 72A and 72B.'

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I move:

Page 4, after line 7—Insert new subsection as follows:

(1a) Where a gaming machine licence is surrendered in the course of a financial year conditionally upon the grant of another gaming machine licence to the same person and in respect of the same premises, the licensee will, for the purposes of subsection (1), be taken to have carried on business under the one licence during that year.

One item that has been picked up relates to when a licence is forfeited and whether there is capacity to recoup the revenue. The amendment ensures that we get the revenue.

Amendment carried.

**Mr QUIRKE:** I move:

Page 4, line 13—Leave out ‘\$25 million’ and insert ‘\$20 million (CPI adjusted)’.

This is the second issue the Opposition wants to raise with respect to this legislation. In essence, what this is about is the quantum of money. The remainder of the amendments that we will move will establish a board for the disbursement of moneys that are to go into that fund. In essence, the amendment changes the numbers in the Government Bill so that \$5 million goes into the charitable and social welfare organisation fund.

Members should be under no illusion about this. This is one of the key issues in the legislation. I do not think there is much point staying here until midnight tonight debating this, because it will be back here. I make that prediction now, because I do not think that further down the corridor the Minister will get away with the sorts of things he can get away with in here. I think he knows that. He is a reasonable fellow and he knows what will happen. In this debate there is a question of what is a reasonable level of funding for charitable and social welfare organisations. Quite frankly, the only person in Adelaide who thinks the provisions that he has made are adequate is the Minister himself.

I do not believe that, if there were to be a free vote on this issue, the Minister would get a single vote because it is a miserable, meagre amount of money, and the Minister knows that he will not get away with it. Having said that, we are in a position tonight to get massacred, and I understand that. I know the reality. It is the Public Service superannuation issue all over again. However, I am confident that we will be back here, and I think the debate further down the corridor will ensure that we will be back here. If not, every organisation in Adelaide which has made it crystal clear that the Government has not made an adequate response will be let down. We are standing firm on it. We have made it absolutely clear that we think that a much greater amount of money must go to affected organisations. Our other amendments establish what we think is a reasonable mechanism for the disbursement of those funds. There is no point staying here too much later tonight. The issue is simple: the provision the Treasurer has made is manifestly inadequate, and everybody agrees with that.

**Mrs ROSENBERG:** In terms of clarification, I understand that the member for Playford is suggesting that \$25 million be split into \$20 million and \$5 million, with the \$5 million going to charitable and social welfare organisations and the remainder going to a community development or sporting fund of some sort. I seek clarification from the Minister. The Bill provides for \$25 million to go to the Community Development Fund. First, I would like to know the clear and specific definition of ‘Community Development Fund’ in terms of its inclusion, if possible, in service and sports clubs. Secondly, in terms of the \$25 million, I would like a clear explanation of the amount of money that we are proposing to set aside for charity.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I will answer both questions at once, as they have a bearing on each other. The target of \$25 million was announced at the time of the disclosure of the taxation change. It was also the belief of the Government of the day that it should go into special areas—education and

health being the mainstream areas—and the wider community development area, including the arts, sport and other areas. We were not definitive to the level where we said, ‘Look, there will be \$500 000 here and \$1 million here’, for very good reason. We have hypothecated on this sum, which the former Treasurer has reflected upon. We also know that it has probably been spent 20 or 50 times already. From the point of view of those who have an interest in this matter, we believe that it is important that it be spent on areas of specific need which would not or could not be met under normal budgetary processes.

Having said that, I point out that, of the \$25 million, already \$1 million has been set aside for that welfare purpose. A total of \$500 000 was taken from the Casino and put with that fund, and that was paid out over Christmas. The \$1 million will be generated in the period 1 July through to June 1997, and that money, together with the \$500 000 from the other side, will be \$1.5 million, of which \$1 million will come out of the \$25 million fund.

To that extent, that is the only thing that has been determined, and it is relevant to point that out to the Committee. The broad definition is to look at those areas of particular need that would not necessarily be satisfied in the normal budget process in the widest definitional sense, and to use this area of revenue for that purpose: we get some gain that we would not have got through the normal budget process.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I do not think I could add very much to the explanation I have given. I am simply saying that \$24 million is there yet to be allocated, and it will be allocated through the budget process. The areas will be highlighted and explained explicitly in the budget papers.

In terms of the issue raised by the member for Playford and the extent to which we allocate money to particular areas, having seen a number of the balance sheets and the areas affected which we can say were affected by other forms of gambling such as poker machines, which did impact on fundraising areas, whether scratchies or bingo—they are the obvious areas where people might have made a choice—I believe that the impact will probably be less than \$500 000, if we use that as the criteria. There are still a number of matters I would like to think about in the interim. The points have been taken.

We are looking at the areas of need and the way we can best address them. We are already addressing a need through the generosity of the hotels and clubs. There is the Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund. Because of another amount of money, \$1.5 million, we are addressing the immediate need of certain families. That issue has been raised by the charities. I would contest the extent to which that impact was not already in the system and exacerbated by poker machines and the extent to which you should then compensate, but I am willing to look at the argument on that matter.

**Ms HURLEY:** With respect to compensation of social welfare groups from the \$1.5 million—I think that was the sort of money he was talking about—I have some information from the Elizabeth and Munno Para Community Fund which states:

Since the introduction of gaming machines into the Elizabeth council and Munno Para council areas, the number of new clients presenting to our fund rose from 969 for the fiscal year to 30 June 1994 to 1341 for the fiscal year to 30 June 1995, an increase of 38 per cent.

Later, they say they are refusing clients, because they do not have the funding, at an average ratio of 1.3 refusals to each client serviced for this fiscal year. They go on to say:

We have not received one cent of State Government money into our fund to assist in alleviating the trauma caused by the State Government sanctioned gaming machines at this stage.

In relation to that, if the \$1.5 million is not regarded as sufficient to cover groups such as the community fund, will it be further taken out of the rest of the \$25 million put aside, and how will the Treasurer monitor this?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** The honourable member has a relevant point. I do not know that any of these distributions are allocated efficiently and effectively and compensate in the areas that the Government perceives they should be compensating. This is a fairly inexact science and there may well be an organisation in Elizabeth that did not receive recognition in the process. One of the issues will be how that \$1.5 million will be distributed over the next financial year, and that matter is being addressed at the moment to ensure there is a better distribution or spread.

Our initial indications were that, if we looked at people who for a whole range of other reasons were not fronting up, the \$1.5 million would generally cover that area, and that came from some work we did on this matter with people in the north, covering the extent to which they found they had been affected and being based on information coming back from the Salvation Army, the Central Mission and these sorts of organisations. I hope we can get this distributional process working to the level that we believe is appropriate and that the \$1.5 million will actually hit the areas of need in the way it should.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Before we proceed, I point out that we are debating the amendment moved by the member for Playford to clause 10, page 4, line 13. Are there any questions about that?

**Mr EVANS:** The member for Playford proposes that the fund be titled the Charitable and Social Welfare Organisations Fund. Will that include service clubs, even if they are not registered under the Charitable Purposes Act?

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Bass):** The honourable member is now debating clause 10, page 4, line 15. The Committee is debating line 13.

**Mr EVANS:** I understood that the member for Playford made it clear that line 13 was to be the substantive clause and, if that was defeated, he would not proceed with the next one.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Proceed with your question.

**Mr EVANS:** Would the honourable member's definition of charitable and social welfare organisations include a service club that may or may not be a registered charity under the Act? Secondly, the title includes social welfare organisations whereas the original Government Bill referred to non-government social welfare organisations. Is it the deliberate intention to include Government social welfare organisations under the amendment?

**Mr QUIRKE:** The first thing that needs to be said is that, with respect to the \$25 million fund as proposed by the Government for health, education and community welfare purposes, a cursory look at the budgetary figures indicates that, in any case, 57¢ of every dollar that goes into consolidated revenue is spent on health and education. I do not want members to think that we are cutting down on health, education and social welfare: those issues will be addressed in terms of the remainder of the \$146 million.

In specific answer to the member for Davenport, this is the threshold amendment and, if this gets up, it will create a fund. The fund will be disbursed through the creation of a committee, which is the subject of further amendments, and any organisation that can make out a case can front up to that board.

Regarding the title of the fund, Caucus felt that the words 'social welfare' needed to be included. That would cover some organisations that would probably not immediately see themselves as charities. The honourable member has touched on those and the answer is 'Yes.'

There are two groups that fit into this category: there are those groups, charities or organisations—whatever you want to call them—that are immediately involved in the question of gambling and the rehabilitation of gamblers—those groups immediately at the front line; then there are those organisations that pick up the pieces, and we meet many of those in our electorates—the Red Cross, the Salvation Army, the Central Mission—the list is extensive. We believe that those organisations need funding to support their increased work resulting from the introduction of gaming machines in South Australia.

**Mr WADE:** I thought I understood what the amendment meant until the member for Playford spoke. I thought I heard him say that any sum above the amount going into the Consolidated Account—the \$1.6 million—would not be taken away from health and education but would be used for that purpose. Looking at this amendment, I read it that \$5 million goes into the Charitable and Social Welfare Organisation Fund; \$20 million goes into the Community Development Fund; anything above \$146 million, as in part B, goes into the sporting clubs fund. Therefore, if there is a windfall of some nature and we receive \$200 million in that year, the member for Playford is saying that \$54 million goes into the sporting clubs fund, yet \$5 million goes into the charitable fund. That is different from what the member for Playford was saying a few minutes ago when he said that anything above \$146 million would be available for health. It is not: it is available for sport.

**Mr QUIRKE:** The member who has just graced us with his presence ought to realise that we are examining this clause by clause and I did make it quite clear that there would be two threshold issues. There is the question of the charities and what we will do about it under this clause. Had he been here long enough—and was listening—he would have realised that the next issue is the question of the sporting clubs or the \$146 million plus. Regarding what he has just touched on, he is right: the Treasurer's proposal is a \$25 million fund. We are using this as the threshold issue to raise the question of the \$5 million. We believe that should be the starting point for charitable and social welfare organisations which require funding to address the issue of gaming machines. We will deal with the other issues later.

**Ms WHITE:** I have a question that is similar to that asked by the member for Davenport, but it is directed to the Treasurer and relates to the \$1.5 million for charitable organisations. Is the target of that money to be those organisations that can demonstrate a decrease in their fundraising due to gaming machines and/or those organisations that assist people whose welfare is adversely affected by gambling habits and/or those organisations that deal directly with gambling addiction problems?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** As we know, there is the \$1.5 million for the rehabilitation fund. Everyone is clear on that. Money will be directed towards grabbing those people who



cannot help themselves in trying to change their bad habits. In terms of the \$1.5 million fund, it is the leading edge of service delivery and that is the food parcel and additional cash when in strife. One of the difficulties that was encountered at the time of distribution was how you allocate it so that it is meaningful and hits the targets at which you are aiming. Guidelines are being developed to improve service delivery. The original thinking was related to those who are victims of the gambling process and included the families of people who are involved in the system. It has spread somewhat wider than that in terms of meeting additional need, rather than trying to find whether it came from the poker machines or other sources. There will be clear guidelines for the distribution of the \$1.5 million over the next financial year.

**Mrs ROSENBERG:** I would also like clarification. In our situation, we are saying that \$25 million will go into the Community Development Fund. The amendment proposed by the member for Playford provides that \$5 million will go into charitable welfare and then \$20 million into the Community Development Fund. Is the member for Playford's definition of 'the Community Development Fund' the same as in the Bill? Are you including sporting bodies?

**Mr QUIRKE:** We need to step back a bit for a moment. We suggest that a \$5 million fund be established to compensate the charities and the social welfare organisations. It is not the intention under this provision to look after sporting clubs or any other organisations. That is to come under the next threshold issue. I do not know what other members may have on file, whether there are any other amendments. Once we have dispensed with this issue, we will get down to the question of sporting clubs.

**Mrs ROSENBERG:** I raise that issue because it may influence the way members vote. When I asked a question of the Deputy Premier, I received an answer that sporting clubs would be funded as part of the \$25 million. Under the proposal of the member for Playford, the \$20 million would not include sporting clubs, so there would be more money in the Community Development Fund for education and health, and the sporting funds come afterwards if we are lucky enough to raise \$146 million dollars plus.

**Mr QUIRKE:** I cannot control what the Government does with its \$20 million or \$25 million fund. It is beyond the control of the Opposition and members such as me to set the ground rules. This addresses the question of the affected charities and the social welfare organisations as a result of gaming machines. The Treasurer might have said that sporting organisations and whatever else are included. I can only go on what statements have been made, and as recently as today the Premier made a statement that this component of the money would be used for health, education and social welfare.

If the Treasurer is telling us that sporting clubs and a number of others can climb on board and make applications for this \$20 million or \$25 million, as the member for Kaurna seems to have indicated is so, I did not pick that up. If that is the case, I will line them up as well. The only thing I can say is that I cannot control that. What I have set out to do here is establish a fund that clearly fixes up the question of the charities. It may well be the case that this should have been done differently; that the \$5 million should have come out of the rest of the allocation of the funds and I should have left the \$25 million target fund that it goes to. That is an issue that the Opposition will address before the Bill gets to the other place. In answer to the member for Kaurna, I can control only

the \$5 million that is being excised out of it, and it is for the impact on charities and social welfare organisations.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** It seems to me extraordinary that what we have here is a source of income beyond anyone's wildest dreams two or three years ago. It is just pouring in, and the source of that income, the people who control it, agree with the Government. The Government goes to them and says, 'We want more money', and they say 'Fine, how much more do you want?' They talk over the table and even more comes pouring in. Only someone with a great deal of incompetence could turn that situation into these rows. Just imagine this pot of gold that keeps pouring out millions and millions, and if you want a few more tens of millions you just ask and it comes. It is absolutely extraordinary.

But what we have is a Party room totally misled; a Party room that I believe is still being misled, as is clear from the answers that have been given on the Casino. You have a Party room that I believe has been completely conned on the question of hypothecation. It is the Minister who has introduced hypothecation into this area in this clause. For the Minister to introduce that into the debate, given the politics of it and the numbers in the Upper House, I think shows staggering incompetence.

What it also shows, and this I cannot understand, is that where you have all this money pouring in, for the sake of a tiny fraction of it—and if you went back to the industry it would find you that as well; it would not even have to come out of your own money—you could shut up the churches and social welfare bodies. All these people could be given more money than they could dream of and you still would not notice it, because if you were extremely greedy you could go back to the industry again and say, 'I want another \$5 million because I want to give the Salvation Army a million; I want to give to all these people who are whingeing.' And the industry would sit down sensibly with you and say 'Yes'.

It is a Treasurer's dream: this is what Treasurers dream about and it has actually happened in this case, yet what do we have? We have an absolute shambles. It is a total, utter shambles. It is extraordinary, because the Minister has been unnecessarily miserable with these people: \$1 million is miserable, and unnecessarily miserable. Also, I remind everyone of what the Minister said when he was in Opposition. And I opposed it: I opposed all hypothecation, as did the Parliament and, I think, every speaker with the possible exception of the present Minister. He said that \$5 million ought to go to these people who were directly affected by having to pick up the pieces: not those who were indirectly affected because people made choices.

And this is \$5 million out of \$50 million. He was going to have a \$50 million take, and I thought that was too generous. I thought that \$2 million would cover it adequately. I said that we would give up to \$2 million after it has been in 12 months. We nominated the committee that would make the disbursement. I think the gentleman who runs the Port Adelaide Central Mission was nominated as chair, etc. And now we have three times the amount of money and the Treasurer is arguing about giving them \$1 million and, because of that, the wrath of all sides of the Parliament, the churches and every man and his dog is on his head.

I just think that shows an extremely high degree of absolute incompetence. If you cannot make a success of getting tens of millions of dollars for the asking, with no strings attached, then I just do not know what you can be successful in. On the question of hypothecation I would urge members opposite, rather than my going all the way through

it, to read the debate when the legislation was before the House. It spells out clearly from members of the then Opposition, the now Government (including Ministers), why hypothecation is a con. I can tell you how it works. If money is hypothecated to a particular area, I can tell you it is given, of course—the legislation says you have to—but it comes off the bottom.

Not one extra cent goes to any area. Read the debates; read what your Ministers and other members of the Liberal Party said in Opposition, as did members of the Government, and all of us were dead right. It is an out and out con. But if you have introduced hypothecation into the debate, do not introduce \$1 million out of \$150 million and make everyone whinge. If you are going to do it, give the \$5 million, get them off your back and make them happy. Settle for \$145 million and do not be greedy.

I go along with what the member for Playford says, but with no enthusiasm, because I just do not believe that there is any requirement for hypothecation. A Government is quite capable, with all this huge amount of money, of giving \$5 million or whatever—it really does not matter how much—to the affected charities who are picking up the pieces. Give them what they want: it will be negligible compared to the total pot, and we would not have all this carry-on of dealing with these huge amounts of money.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** The member for Giles has put two conflicting arguments. He put his position on the matter of funds, which has been my consistent position. With respect to the issue of funds, there was no contribution, and at the time of the debate I said that the Government had no intention in that respect. Indeed, the Government made quite clear that it had no intention on that issue and again I ask members to read the debate. The issue—

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Poker machines were not in. No contribution was being made and there was no intention of making a contribution. In the process of the debate, in absolute sheer frustration, knowing what the Government had done with the Casino and what would happen with poker machines, and given all the promises that had been made and had not been kept, I said, 'It is time you put your butts on the line.' That was the crux of the debate and the sum mentioned at that stage was \$5 million. I happen to be Treasurer now and I have to face the reality of budgets, wage rises and everything else. I want to be able to preserve that \$25 million fund and not have it eroded away by all the various claims. I notice that the Democrats want \$17 million of it. As I said, it could be—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** The honourable member says \$22 million! It has gone up. The member for Playford is looking pretty good at this stage! I am delighted that the member for Giles is telling me how to throw money around when he knows as I do that the making of budgets will be increasingly difficult. This is something extra that we were not able to do previously with the budget. I note the comments of the member for Giles. His thoughts on a number of these issues coincide fairly closely with my own.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

AYES (10)

|                        |               |
|------------------------|---------------|
| Blevins, F. T.         | Clarke, R. D. |
| De Laine, M. R.        | Foley, K. O.  |
| Geraghty, R. K.        | Hurley, A. K. |
| Quirke, J. A. (teller) | Rann, M. D.   |
| Stevens, L.            | White, P. L.  |

NOES (28)

|                    |                       |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Andrew, K. A.      | Armitage, M. H.       |
| Ashenden, E. S.    | Baker, S. J. (teller) |
| Becker, H.         | Brindal, M. K.        |
| Brokenshire, R. L. | Brown, D. C.          |
| Caudell, C. J.     | Condous, S. G.        |
| Cummins, J. G.     | Evans, I. F.          |
| Greig, J. M.       | Hall, J. L.           |
| Ingerson, G. A.    | Kerin, R. G.          |
| Leggett, S. R.     | Matthew, W. A.        |
| Meier, E. J.       | Olsen, J. W.          |
| Oswald, J. K. G.   | Penfold, E. M.        |
| Rosenberg, L. F.   | Rossi, J. P.          |
| Scalzi, G.         | Venning, I. H.        |
| Wade, D. E.        | Wotton, D. C.         |

PAIRS

Atkinson, M. J. Allison, H.

Majority of 18 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated.

**Mr QUIRKE:** I move:

Page 4, line 15—Leave out paragraph (b) and insert paragraphs as follows:

- (b) as to \$5 million (CPI adjusted)—into the Charitable and Social Welfare Organisations Fund established under this Part;
- (c) as to the balance—
  - (i) if the revenue received did not exceed \$146 million (CPI adjusted)—into the Consolidated Account;
  - (ii) if the revenue received exceeded \$146 million (CPI adjusted)—
    - (A) the amount of the balance up to that amount—into the Consolidated Account;
    - (B) the surplus over that amount—into the Sporting Clubs Fund established under this Part.

This is probably not the best way of approaching this debate, but unfortunately it is the way that the Bill has been constructed and we have to deal with it. There are one or two residual bits from the last debate, but I want to make clear what the issue is. We are told that the industry has guaranteed \$146 million to the Government. This amendment seeks to enshrine the principle that every dollar over \$146 million needs to go into a fund. That will be the subject of further amendments, but, in essence, it is called the Sporting Clubs Fund. The funds that go in there will be disbursed on the recommendation of the Director of the Department for Recreation, Sport and Racing through the IDC. I understand, by telepathy, that this was a key issue within the Liberal Party room. Through mental telepathy we managed to pick up—

*Mr Wade interjecting:*

**Mr QUIRKE:** It is funny that the member for Elder should ask whether I was there. I can confirm that the member for Elder is not among those who have told me all about it, but he is now one of the few who has not. At the end of the day I can say that I did not have that Churchillian hulk knock on my door, come in, and tell me all about it, but a few of his mates came in and sang. We are told that the Treasurer is happy with \$146 million: that is all that he wants out of this whole exercise.

In fact, the other day he and a couple of his friends tried to convince me that they would not get to the \$146 million, so in generosity I asked them to let me have my amendments anyway in that case because, if there will never be any money beyond the \$146 million, it will not matter. Of course, the conversation changed then, because we all know that they will get more than \$146 million and that a number of sporting

clubs out there would benefit from the grants scheme this would set up. It is a late hour. The issue is clear cut although, unfortunately, the amendments and the debate are constructed so that there are some residual issues in here. My new sections make quite clear that this is the sporting clubs fund. This is the key issue for it.

**Ms GREIG:** I appreciate the explanations given by the member for Playford, but I seek some further clarification to give me a better understanding. We spoke about a \$5 million allocation to the charitable and social welfare organisations, and (2)(b) provides that the surplus over the amount of the \$146 million goes to sporting clubs funds, etc. Am I to understand that, if we do not get over \$146 million, the sporting clubs do not get any funds but, if we happen to get, say, an extra \$30 million, the sporting club fund will have \$30 million? That worries me, because I see a big inequity there. We spoke about the needs of the social welfare organisations earlier. I cannot see any equity here if we have that extra money.

*Members interjecting:*

**Ms GREIG:** No, not when we can compare it to \$30 million.

**Mr QUIRKE:** I think that the honourable member has looked at some of the early parts of this section which are now in effect defunct, because they were defeated on the threshold issue of the \$20 million or \$25 million which we just quoted. In essence, the honourable member has just voted with the majority of members here to give \$1 million to effective charities out there. That was the effect of the last vote in here. The key to this now is the bottom part of this round of amendments. Again, I apologise for it but it is beyond my control: it is the way it is constructed. The honourable member is correct when she says that, if \$146 million is not reached, no funds are available to go into this sporting club fund. That is absolutely correct. This is seeking to ensure that every dollar over \$146 million does go into a sporting club fund. That is the issue. Obviously, there are a number of ways of dealing with this problem.

It may well be the case that the Treasurer will see reason, particularly given the letter I have here which came into my possession only today and which states what another organisation further down the corridor is proposing do. That honourable member will come along and suggest that it might be necessary to revisit this whole exercise and try to solve the problem of the charities and sporting clubs a little differently. I have given those hints out but, in essence, the member for Reynell is absolutely correct. If there is not more than \$146 million, then the sporting club fund is broke; it does not have anything in it. The Government has the rest of this money in here—the \$146 million—including the ‘tart shop’ that I have described: the large amount of money—\$24 million or so—that is left in there that can be used for all sorts of things.

If what the Treasurer said before about sporting clubs being able to access some of these funds is true—and we were not told about that until tonight—then perhaps they can have access into that fund. My guess—and this is purely speculative—is that anything that will win a vote for the Liberal Party at the next election will be funded out of that \$24 or \$25 million. That is just a bit a cynicism on it. Although the amendment is not all that clear cut, at the very bottom of it I think it is clear cut. The amendment provides that if there is over \$146 million in the fund it will be for sporting clubs. The fund is to be disbursed on the recommen-

dation of the Department of Sport and Recreation through the IDC.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I support the member for Playford’s amendment. Again, without any great enthusiasm, the Treasurer has introduced the question of hypothecation into this issue, and we have to deal with it. As I have said a number of times, I would rather it had not been introduced, so I will not go through that again. Hypothecation in the Bill has to be dealt with. The way it has been dealt with by the member for Playford is responsible, but I think that the member for Reynell has a point. We cannot see an end to this largesse. There does not seem to be any end to the enthusiasm that South Australians have for playing poker machines. People enjoy this area of recreation far more than I would have ever thought possible. So, the member for Reynell does have a point in that it may well be that \$200 million will come in. Who knows what the ceiling is. If that amount did come in it would put approximately \$50 million into the sporting club fund. That is an awful lot of money for sporting clubs. I am sure that they will put in submissions to the fund for three times that amount. There is no doubt about that. But perhaps the State’s priorities would not be to put \$50 million into the sporting clubs in the manner that the amendment suggests.

If the member for Reynell is serious about that she should move an amendment to the amendment of the member for Playford to put a ceiling on it of whatever the member for Reynell thinks is appropriate—\$5 million, \$10 million, \$20 million—and then the surplus of that will spill over into the Consolidated Account. That is the way to deal with what may become a very happy problem for the Treasurer to deal with. The one spark of light in the Treasurer’s life over the last two years must have been his daily reports on the poker machines. A Treasurer’s lot is not a happy lot. There is no doubt about that. It is a life that can be quite miserable, but to have this—

**Mr Clarke:** But he enjoys it.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Well, one has to be a certain type of person to enjoy it, and normally they are not very nice people. I loved it. But to have this ray of light growing brighter every day is something of which Treasurers can only dream. If I were the member for Reynell I would deal with what could be a future problem in terms of too much money in the sport and recreation fund. As I said, I do not believe that hypothecation should have been introduced. If there are only small amounts in the sporting club fund then I can assure members opposite that an adjustment will be made by the Government when it prepares the budget. The funds given one way or another to sporting clubs will be taken into consideration with adjustments made at the other end. I would support that.

Anyone who knows anything about it has done that. Again, I ask, why sporting clubs? I do not believe anyone has any right to be funded from the poker machine revenue. What right does anyone have to make a claim on these funds? What is owed to these people by the hospitality industry? Nothing. They have an awful cheek suggesting that they ought to have something from the hospitality industry. Most of these organisations have their hands deep in the taxpayer’s pocket, anyway. Why should they have their hands in the hospitality industry’s pocket? What a nerve; what a cheek. The only people who ought to have their hands in the industry’s pocket are the taxpayers as a whole through the Government, but not sporting clubs—I do not understand the rationale.

I know that in my electorate, if there were tens of millions of dollars to be distributed, I would have priorities other than sporting clubs. I like the sporting clubs—they are delightful people—but I would have other priorities. I know that the priority of the Liberal Party in the Party Room was the sporting clubs, which made me think that their priorities are odd. However, from what I understand, the sporting clubs were the go. I am not sure why other organisations were not included but, nevertheless, the Liberal Party and the Labor Party seem to have settled on sporting clubs and, as hypothecation is on the table, then I will go along. The principle in all of this is wrong. I have no idea why the Minister brought this legislation into Parliament at all.

The poker machine legislation is absolutely word perfect compared with the Casino legislation. For 10 years people were telling me to bring the Casino legislation back into Parliament to tidy up various areas. I said, 'Not on your life. As far as I can see the Casino is opening every day. If you bring it back into Parliament, you will have every fruitcake trying to do various things to the Casino. Leave it alone. The tables seem to be spinning, the cards seem to be turning and the revenue seems to be coming in, despite all the so-called anomalies in the legislation. Forget all your suggestions to bring the legislation back before Parliament.' I am staggered that the Treasurer did not tell people the same thing in this instance.

**Mr OSWALD:** Members on both sides are missing the point in respect of this whole question of the funding of sport. Every speaker to whom I have listened tonight referred to money for sporting clubs. In fact, that is only part of the story. On many occasions the clubs are supplemented through hotels—and I congratulate the hotels for that. It replaces what was happening before through bingo and other forms of revenue raising. A number of members have been lobbied fairly heavily by clubs that are losing revenue because of the poker machines and perhaps because they are not picking it up through hotels. The big funding issue for sport is the funding of the administration of sport. For example, there is an organisation in South Australia called Sport SA. It has been formed only recently. It was spawned out of the Confederation of Australian Sport in the eastern States and Canberra, but it now represents about 80 organisations that are large enough to have an association.

Sport SA does not receive any funding. I attempted to fund it, to a certain degree, through a limited budget. We were able to provide it with some accommodation, but basically it does not receive much funding, yet it is the official representative for sport in South Australia. It has to get out there and be the driving force behind the management of sporting programs as well as the driving force behind junior sport, Aboriginal sport and masters' sport.

That body provides the driving force, but it has been working with limited funds. Its problem, of course, is that Governments of all persuasions—and the former Government was no better—had difficulty providing money in their budget for the administration of sport. I am not talking about the provision of money for local clubs, which is a different story, but the provision of money for the administration of sport. If it goes over \$146 million, I see an opportunity to provide some money for sport.

In Queensland, you will find that sport receives from Government sources tens of millions of dollars. That money goes to junior sport, Aboriginal sport and masters sport—and, as an industry, the sporting community benefits. The money is spent and it circulates: it goes to employment in sport and

facilities in sport, and it is used for the general health of the community. Kids have a lot to do with their time, because sport is highly organised. To have highly organised sport, you need sports administrators. In this day and age, administrators have to be paid but, with all the goodwill in the world, we do not have the funds to pay them. We now have an opportunity with this particular fund if it goes over \$146 million. I want members to focus on the fact that the money will not be used just to prop up sporting clubs which are being affected by poker machines: the vast majority of it will go to the organisation of the industry and the professionalisation of sport. I ask members to consider that when they vote on this amendment.

**Mr EVANS:** I support this amendment as someone who has spent most of his life in the voluntary administration of sporting organisations. This concept is long overdue by Governments of any persuasion and at any level. I invite members to look at my electorate in the sporting area for five minutes. The local council closed down the local soccer club for a measly \$15 000. It is now knocking on the door of the local football club for \$25 000. In my view, the local bowling club has been negotiated into accepting a \$200 000 loan to rebuild its facility. There is a recreation centre which the council is struggling to fund. It wants to expand to two or three times its size, but the money is not there at any level.

My electorate does not get any money from the State because Blackwood is not defined as a regional centre and, these days, everything is funded basically on regions. If you do not live in a region, bad luck. I was a member of a committee in my home district in the Stirling area which tried to second from the Government a tin shed in which we could house a basketball court. The Stirling council brought in a consultant who said that Stirling is not a regional centre. The regional centre for the Hills is Mount Barker. So, lo and behold, Stirling missed out on an indoor recreation centre.

My electorate is the wettest part of the State but it does not need an indoor recreation centre. The deal with the local administrator is that you go to either Mount Barker or Blackwood, both of which are 20 minutes away. Both Mount Barker and Blackwood want a pool. For 25 years, Blackwood has been talking about an indoor pool or even a community pool; even a 10 metre pool would be handy, but funding is not there. Stirling has been talking about one for donkey's years—I think since my father first went into politics when that was one of his platforms, so I will not revisit that—but 26 years down the track not one Government has bothered to fund it.

We could talk about the cuts to the volleyball program at Heathfield High School and the netball program at Blackwood High School. We could talk about the women's memorial playing fields at the bottom of Shepherds Hill Road, which cost the Government \$100 000 a year. That venue hosts the South Australian women's cricket team, but who will fund it? The simple answer is that no-one will, because there are no votes in sport and recreation. Why is that? It is because sport and recreation groups do not form themselves into lobby groups. You do not see football or netball associations marching down the street demanding better funding. How many years has it taken us as a State to develop a decent indoor netball facility?

Why has this happened? It has occurred because the sport and recreation people are, in my view, far too placid and not politically active. This move to sporting organisations is decades overdue. If I travel interstate, as a sports person I go green with envy. I look at sporting facilities in New South

Wales, which are basically built on pokies money, and they are fantastic. In Queensland, as the member for Morphet mentioned, tremendous facilities exist, but in South Australia we are simply not spending anywhere near enough money on sport and recreation.

I also speak with concern about country areas. As a country member, the member for Giles might listen to this. I speak about concerns for sport and recreation expenditure in the country. When State President of Apex, I had the pleasure to travel around a fair bit of this State, and it always concerned me that the sport and recreation facilities in the country always tended to struggle more than those in the city, because of the lack of numbers, a lack of population base and a lack of income base. The councils cannot get enough rate income to provide the facilities, and there are not the political groups in existence there to lobby for the facilities, so in many areas, especially small rural areas, there is simply not the recreation and sporting facilities that would be expected as a base for small country towns.

I have a particular concern for sport and recreation facilities not only in my own electorate but also certainly in country South Australia. I make the point that many supporting clubs have been affected by the pokies fund raising. The Blackwood Football Club cannot afford pokies. It does not have the financial base; it does not own the land but leases it from the council, which was chasing it for \$25 000. It simply does not have the finance to buy pokies, but the Blackwood RSL and the Belair Hotel have them. That is their business and I do not mind that. The Belair Hotel won an award for being the best gaming venue in the State, and so it should, as it has spent a lot of money there and it has turned out fantastically. However, that should not penalise the Blackwood Football Club.

This is an opportunity for the State to say, whether we get \$10 over \$146 million or \$100 million over \$146 million, 'Why not spend it on sport and recreation?' Sport and recreation provides a healthy outlook; it provides kids with an opportunity to become involved in a discipline; and it teaches them to compete. That does not scare me. It teaches kids to be involved in a team spirit and to understand the concept of winning and that of losing. They also get involved in the administration of the sport, and surely all those things can only be good for kids and good for the community.

I do not therefore share the concerns raised by the member for Reynell when she asks, 'What if \$30 million is raised and we do not spend the same amount on social welfare or welfare organisations?' That does not worry me. When I was national President of Apex we did not get anything from Government, and we have gone 60 years and survived well despite that. However, sporting organisations are something special in the community and, as a group of politicians, we need to pick it up and run with it. I fully support the amendment and congratulate the member for moving it.

**Mr FOLEY:** I also rise to support the amendment, and, as the shadow Minister for Sport, I think it is important that I quickly reflect on some of the comments that have been made here tonight. We could not get a greater authority on the Government's sports policy than a former Sports Minister who here tonight has made clear that there are deficiencies in the Government's sports policy. It is not without some significance that a former Minister makes that very point.

The reality, as the member for Davenport so eloquently put it, is how we will get money into sporting clubs in our community. This is an excellent opportunity; we can take the politics right out of it and make it a community based fund.

We can see the important community based sporting facilities supported financially by the Government.

I take the point made by the former Minister for Recreation and Sport that the administration costs and associated difficulties of running Sport SA—another excellent suggestion on which I commend the member for Morphet, the former Sports Minister. As the shadow Minister I will take it on board. It is in the spirit of what the member for Playford is moving, and I urge all members to support the amendment.

**Ms WHITE:** I also support the amendment. In so doing, I appeal to a couple of members in this Chamber. I indicate to the member for Reynell that I would like to see her explain to the South Adelaide Football Club why she opposes this amendment. I would like to see the members for Coles, Hartley and Norwood explain to their clubs why they stood up in Parliament, if that is what they will do, and not support this amendment to give their sporting clubs this funding. In closing, I appeal to all those backbenchers to think very carefully, because that is exactly what they will be doing if they do not vote for this amendment. If they think their clubs will not find out that they did not vote for this, they are quite wrong.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** This is the sharp boots. I do reflect upon the member for Giles, but what appals me most about this is the great desire to spend money that we do not have. I ask members to reflect on the fact that whether we actually get to the \$146 million is problematical. Indeed, if we look at the figures over the past few months, we would say that it was problematical. When we decided to change the taxation base, we were taking on an article of faith. That change from a turnover to a profit based tax will in fact produce a greatly increased amount of turnover on those machines, because the payout procedures can increase. I will not go through all the arguments that are involved.

I am simply saying that, through the process of increased turnover because of the different tax regime, we will net out of the system a sum which was set at \$146 million. Our expectation of the normal increase in funds that would come to us from the poker machines under the existing tax regime was approximately \$122 million to \$123 million, and there was another \$25 million potential that we wished to address specifically.

It is an article of faith. There is a call-back in the Bill, so to the extent that moneys will or will not be available, or whether further action will have to be taken as a result of a shortfall, that has yet to eventuate. That is a matter on which everybody should reflect. It is like a feeding frenzy around here. The member for Giles is quite right: it would be interesting to reflect and read the *Hansard* on how we can spend money. If it went to \$147 million, and we had \$1 million, I have just worked out that we would be \$5 million short on the demands on the system made by the member for Davenport.

**Mr FOLEY:** That was just an illustration.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I am merely saying that he put down a number of very pertinent examples. I am saying that, if I added them all up, I would still be \$4 million short, without anybody else's wish list in the process. If, for example, the figure did exceed \$146 million, and became \$150 or \$155 million, and members said that we did have a very optimistic result, would it mean that somebody in a wheelchair deserved less service as a result of a sporting club getting a new lawn or something else? The issue, as the member for Giles has raised right throughout this debate—

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** They could give it to the wheelchair sports!

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** The member for Giles has a perfect solution! Everybody knows about the pressures on Government, the extent to which the budgets are getting tighter and the extent to which this sum of money will assist in providing something that the new process will not provide. I ask everybody to reflect on the debate that we have heard here tonight and the extent to which we can satisfy everyone, whether it be the disabled people, who say 'We want all these matters satisfied', or the education system—and I know that due to years of neglect my Unley High School has some tremendous maintenance problems. However, we have to keep talking and say, 'Hang on, I am not sure that we can actually afford it.'

**Mr Quirke:** Are you the local member?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I am the local member, and that is always a problem. We have all these tremendous pressures on the budget and we are saying that a particular sector shall have priority in the system above the \$146 million. That is the first point. I raised earlier the issue of what is in the \$24 million or \$25 million and I said that education and health are the major items under community development. Certain areas in the arts have claims and areas in the sports have claims but I did not guarantee what the result will be. Every attempt will be made to satisfy areas which we believe are important but which cannot be satisfied through the normal budgetary process.

For all the reasons stated, it is not appropriate to pass the amendment tonight. Whether some level of understanding can be achieved as a result of movement between the Houses is another issue that will be discussed. I am simply putting the point that it is a bad budget process and it is wrong to say that the Government has discretion to allocate to the highest need by saying, 'This has the priority above this fantastic sum.' The sums are not coming out quite as well as I hoped they would but we still have a long way to go in the process.

**Mr WADE:** Mr Acting Chairman, I am curious about the direction of the debate. I thought we were dealing only with paragraph (c). Are we considering paragraph (b)? The member for Playford said that paragraph (b) was contingent on the amendment to line 13 succeeding or failing. As it failed, I have assumed that paragraph (b) failed as well but that has not been clarified at all. Therefore, I assume that paragraphs (b) and (c) will be voted on.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** The amendment to page 4, line 13 moved by the member for Playford was defeated, but the way the amendment has been promulgated in regard to line 15 is how the second amendment stands. We are discussing the entire amendment moved by the member for Playford.

**Mr WADE:** Mr Acting Chairman, if the amendment were to pass, would the clause read 'out of the revenue received \$25 million would go to the Community Development Fund, \$5 million would go to the Charitable and Social Welfare Organisations Fund and whatever is above the \$146 million would go to the Sporting Clubs Fund'? I see that we are adding \$5 million to the whole thing.

**Mr QUIRKE:** It is most infuriating because the member for Elder was in the Chamber. There was an excuse for him before, but this time there is no excuse. Because of the way the legislation has been constructed and needs to be amended, we are at the key threshold issue of \$146 million plus for the Sporting Clubs Fund. That is fact. I consulted with the Chairman before and that is the way it is set up, and I have

explained it four or five times. Everyone knows what the issue is except the member for Elder, who is trying to ingratiate himself with the Treasurer, who knows he is in a spot of bother. The member for Elder's clever little debating tricks have merely forced me to restate the position. As to this amendment and subsequent new clauses such as 73C, if they should get up, at the end of the Bill we will then clarify the issue clearly. This is the issue of the sporting clubs fund. I do not think the Treasurer needs the assistance of the member for Elder.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** The member for Elder is absolutely right. I have not taken a point of order. The confusion and problems about this matter have been clearly explained. If it had been drawn up properly, knowing the way we run through the Bill, there would have had to be a further amendment if the first clause failed, and the honourable member was aware that it would fail. The member for Elder is absolutely right. We are debating the clause. Given the treatment that was just handed out, the member for Elder is absolutely spot on. We are debating clause 10, page 4, line 15, which includes an item we have already dismissed. The member for Playford should understand that there is a level of accommodation that is occurring here.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

AYES (14)

|                        |                 |
|------------------------|-----------------|
| Baker, D. S.           | Blevins, F. T.  |
| Caudell, C. J.         | Clarke, R. D.   |
| De Laine, M. R.        | Evans I. F.     |
| Foley, K. O.           | Geraghty, R. K. |
| Hurley, A. K.          | Oswald, M. D.   |
| Quirke, J. A. (teller) | Rann, M. D.     |
| Stevens, L.            | White, P. L.    |

NOES (24)

|                  |                       |
|------------------|-----------------------|
| Andrew, K. A.    | Armitage, M. H.       |
| Ashenden, E. S.  | Baker, S. J. (teller) |
| Becker, H.       | Brindal, M. K.        |
| Condous, S. G.   | Cummins, J. G.        |
| Greig, J. M.     | Gunn, G. M.           |
| Hall, J. L.      | Ingerson, G. A.       |
| Kerin, R. G.     | Leggett, S. R.        |
| Matthew, W. A.   | Meier, E. J.          |
| Olsen, J. W.     | Penfold, E. M.        |
| Rosenberg, L. F. | Rossi, J. P.          |
| Scalzi, G.       | Venning, I. H.        |
| Wade, D. E.      | Wotton, D. C.         |

PAIRS

|                 |             |
|-----------------|-------------|
| Atkinson, M. J. | Allison, H. |
|-----------------|-------------|

Majority of 10 for the Noes.

Amendment negatived; clause as amended passed.

**Mr QUIRKE:** I do not wish to proceed with any of the consequential amendments. I have no further amendments that I intend proceeding with in this place on this legislation.

Clauses 11 and 12 passed.

Clause 13—'Transitional provision.'

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I move:

Page 6, line 36—Leave out 'on all other days' and insert 'at other times'; and after '6 hours' insert 'in each 24 hour period'.

Those amendments have been previously debated.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**FISHERIES (GULF ST VINCENT PRAWN  
FISHERY RATIONALIZATION) (LICENCE  
TRANSFER) AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

**ADJOURNMENT**

At 11.55 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday  
20 March 1996 at 2 p.m.