

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, 3 December 2019

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. A.L. McLachlan)** took the chair at 14:15 and read prayers.

The PRESIDENT: We acknowledge Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as the traditional owners of this country throughout Australia, and their connection to the land and community. We pay our respects to them and their cultures, and to the elders both past and present.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

The PRESIDENT: I direct that written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the President—

Ombudsman SA: Report, 2018-19 [Ordered to be published]
Report of the Auditor-General on Darlington Upgrade Project, Report 11 of 2019
Report of the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption titled Troubling
Ambiguity: Governance in SA Health [Ordered to be published]

By the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas)—

Rules of Court
Magistrates Court Act 1991—Civil—Amendment No. 28

By the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment (Hon. D.W. Ridgway)—

Regulations under Acts—
Development Act 1993—Solar Panels

Parliamentary Committees

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:17): I bring up the report of the committee on its inquiry into the provision of services for people with mental illness under the transition to the National Disability Insurance Scheme.

Report received and ordered to be published.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON REDEVELOPMENT OF ADELAIDE OVAL

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:18): I bring up the interim report of the select committee.

Report received and ordered to be published.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON MATTERS RELATING TO SA PATHOLOGY AND SA MEDICAL IMAGING

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:19): I bring up the interim report of the select committee.

Report received and ordered to be published.

*Question Time***SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT**

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:21): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: Earlier today, a report by the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption, the Hon. Bruce Lander QC, entitled *Troubling Ambiguity: Governance in SA Health*, was tabled in the parliament. ICAC and its Office for Public Integrity have recorded more than 1,000 complaints about SA Health, which accounts for 20 per cent of the total complaints. The ICAC commissioner has previously sought \$2 million to conduct a full-scale investigation into SA Health, which the government has refused to provide. My questions to the minister are:

1. Now that the report has been tabled, will the minister now provide funding to the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption, the Hon. Bruce Lander, to conduct a full evaluation into SA Health as per his request, which was originally denied by the government?

2. Does the minister agree with the Hon. Bruce Lander that, without additional resources, he is unable to conduct a widespread, comprehensive investigation into SA Health without unduly interfering with other functions?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:22): I thank the honourable member for her question. I think the quality of the report received by Commissioner Lander highlights the point that the government has been making right along, which is that the ICAC commissioner has a standing budget. I understand that it is more than \$15 million. Those resources are available to the ICAC commissioner to undertake investigations and evaluations. It is up to him as to how he prioritises his work. I welcome the fact that he has taken time to provide an overview of his insights in relation to SA Health. I believe it will be very useful in the ongoing reform of the portfolio.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Bourke, a supplementary.

SA HEALTH

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:23): Just so the minister can make it clear to the chamber: what additional funding will the minister be providing to the ICAC to investigate matters in SA Health?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:23): I appreciate we are down to the third drop when it comes to Labor leaders, but the honourable member might want to go back and look at the piles and piles of questions that we have been asked on this matter, at which both the Treasurer and I have acknowledged the fact that I don't carry the cheque book. The Treasurer and the Attorney-General are the appropriate ministers in relation to resourcing of the ICAC.

SA HEALTH

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:24): Supplementary: is the minister unable to agree with the Hon. Bruce Lander that, without additional resources, he is unable to conduct a widespread and comprehensive investigation into SA Health without unduly interfering with other functions? Does this not concern the minister that other functions will be compromised without additional funding?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:24): The simple point I would make is that a lot of the issues that are highlighted by the ICAC commissioner are already being worked on by both the health portfolio and agencies beyond the health portfolio. We welcome this contribution in the ongoing process of reform.

SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:24): Supplementary: whose responsibility is it to address the scathing report tabled in parliament today?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:24): I proposed and the government will be establishing a cross-agency task force, chaired by the Chief Executive Officer of

the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Mr Jim McDowell. It will have representation from the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, go on with your answer.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Just so that honourable members don't lose their train of thought, I might recap. The cross-agency task force will be chaired by the CEO of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. It will also include the Commissioner of Public Sector Employment. Obviously, the ICAC report raises a whole range of issues that relate to human resource management. It will also include a representative of the Department of Treasury and Finance.

I presume that the Treasurer will nominate somebody bringing industrial relations expertise, because there is so much in this report that relates to such matters. Also, there will be representatives from the Department for Health and Wellbeing and a representative from a local health network. I hope I haven't forgotten anyone, but that's the basic membership of the cross-agency task force.

The reason why we think a cross-agency task force will be particularly useful in this project is because the expertise required to deal with these issues is beyond the expertise of SA Health. For example, the honourable Treasurer's department are the government experts on industrial relations. It makes sense that that expertise would be engaged.

SA HEALTH

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:26): Supplementary: given that it appears the minister is rejecting almost universal calls for an independent inquiry in his answer, and he has also refused to provide Mr Lander the necessary funding for the review which he has requested, is he at least willing to concede that in some way, without those funds for the ICAC commissioner, there may be matters which will not be identified in this process?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:27): I welcome the report from the ICAC commissioner. It will be the task of the cross-agency task force, working with myself and my cabinet colleagues, to make sure that we have a comprehensive implementation plan so that issues are addressed. It's important to appreciate that a lot of the work that is highlighted here, the ICAC commissioner indicates, is work in progress. After all, the report highlights that some of these issues were highlighted in the Auditor-General's report of 2013.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Bonaros has the call, and then I will give the call to the Hon. Mr Hanson.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Bonaros is on her feet.

SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:28): Do you accept the grave concerns raised by Commissioner Lander that not only clinical care is being severely impacted but public servants are escaping prosecution for corruption within SA Health and that that has continued to occur under your watch?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:28): Of course I am concerned if the ICAC commissioner has the view that poor record keeping could well mask corruption. It will be part of this task force work, part of the government's response to this report, to improve record management.

We have done a lot in recent times. For example, EPAS, which is mentioned in the report, was a disaster that was let roll on and on by the former government. As soon as we were elected, we paused it and had an independent review. There was a fundamental recast of the program, and it has been successfully rolled out at Mount Gambier and at Royal Adelaide. I presume the implementation is ongoing, but what I'm saying is, up to this point, the implementation has been successful.

I just highlight the point that, whether it's EPLIS, whether it's EPAS, the former Labor government made botched attempts to improve our record management system. This government is giving management the tools to improve their oversight. Better record management will lead to better capacity for the ICAC commissioner to identify corruption when it occurs.

SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:29): Part of that question was whether the minister accepts the commissioner's concerns in relation to clinical care for patients being severely impacted as a result of these actions.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:30): I would appreciate the honourable member perhaps after the session highlighting that part of the report. That isn't—

The Hon. C. Bonaros: That's a direct quote.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Okay. As I said, I will be interested just to refer to it.

MCGOWAN, DR C.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:30): Supplementary: given that the entire leadership of SA Health, that being all senior officers except the highest paid one, that being the CEO of SA Health, fronted the media this morning with the minister to answer questions about what he's now setting up, can you please explain if the chief executive, the highest paid member of SA Health, has been sidelined or stood down or, if not, could he just not be bothered attending the press conference?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:30): I thank the honourable member for his question. I think he asserted that all of the leadership of SA Health was at the press conference except for Chris McGowan.

The Hon. J.E. Hanson: Nine out of 10.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Well, that's an interesting claim because I didn't see Don Frater, I didn't see Lynne Cowan, I didn't see the CEO of the Commission on Excellence and Innovation in Health, and I didn't see Lyn Dean, the CEO of Wellbeing SA. All of those people are CEOs or deputies.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Point of order: Mr President, I can't hear the minister's answer. It's impossible to hear, even as close as this.

The PRESIDENT: Well—

The Hon. S.G. WADE: So the fact of the matter is, what the honourable member has highlighted—

The Hon. J.E. Hanson interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hanson, please restrain yourself.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —is that we didn't have the head office bureaucrats at the press conference. Well done!

MCGOWAN, DR C.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:31): I will ask my question again. Perhaps I will make it really simple for the minister because he doesn't seem to get it. He held a press conference today. His hand-picked chief, Dr Chris McGowan, wasn't there. Why not?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:31): Because I had there the leaders of our local health networks. They manage 39,000 employees. Chris McGowan and his team manage about 1,000.

MCGOWAN, DR C.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:32): Supplementary to the minister: did your Chief Executive of SA Health, Dr Chris McGowan, provide a copy to the minister of the draft report of the ICAC commissioner's damning findings when he was provided it, as stated in the report today?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:32): Not that I am aware of. The government received a report on Friday and we tabled it on the first opportunity.

SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:32): Supplementary: has the minister read the report that was tabled today?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:32): I started reading it and I will continue to read it.

MCGOWAN, DR C.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:33): I direct a question to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the minister advise whether the Chief Executive of SA Health, Dr Chris McGowan, is receiving any legal assistance or any financial assistance for legal assistance in relation to the investigation of his conduct being led by Professor John McMillan? If so, what is the quantum and who approves such assistance?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:33): I am not aware of any such assistance, but I will take the honourable member's question on notice.

MCGOWAN, DR C.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:33): Supplementary: whilst the minister is taking that on notice, can he also take on notice whether Dr McGowan has ever received any personal legal advice directly from the government, or subsidised by the government, since taking up the position of chief executive?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:33): I am happy to take that on notice.

MCGOWAN, DR C.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:34): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Has the minister communicated with Professor John McMillan regarding his independent investigation into the SA Health chief executive's conduct and, if so, what has been the nature of that contact?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:34): I haven't made contact with Professor McMillan, but he has made contact with my office.

MCGOWAN, DR C.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:34): Supplementary, following that answer: who from his office has met, or will be meeting, with Professor McMillan, the independent investigator? Has a submission been made by him or her to that independent investigator?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:34): I have nothing to add to my previous answer.

MCGOWAN, DR C.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:34): Supplementary based on that response: does the minister still maintain confidence in his chief executive, given what has transpired between his office and the independent investigator?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:35): Let me be clear: I have confidence in my chief executive. I am not accepting the tale because I am not going to go into conversations with independent investigators. Labor might like to play out the soap opera, in question

time, of 'he said, she said'. I am going to respect the independent investigator and the important task that he has.

MCGOWAN, DR C.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:35): Supplementary: then does the minister back his chief executive's refusal to stand down while the independent investigation is underway?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:35): I refer the honourable member to my answers to questions in this place last week.

BUSINESS MISSION CALENDAR

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:35): My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. Can the minister please update the council on the 2020 business mission calendar?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:36): I thank the honourable member for his question and his ongoing interest in growing South Australia's economy. The government is committed to assisting South Australian businesses looking to build success overseas. In addition to working directly with our expanding network of overseas offices, businesses will also be able to participate in an extensive range of outbound and inbound missions throughout 2020.

I am happy to inform the chamber that today we are launching the 2020 business mission calendar, which will go live on the DTTI website later this afternoon. Releasing this calendar for business is in line with the recommendations of the Joyce review, which identified that realigning South Australia's international and interstate engagement was vital for lifting our state's economic growth and increasing our prosperity. Targeted business missions are not only important for helping to grow our trade and investment opportunities in overseas markets, they also bring overseas buyers and investors to South Australia.

Business missions during 2019 included Wine Australia's Far From Ordinary Roadshow in the USA, the Hannover Messe, the China International Import Expo in Shanghai, and many more. These missions, both inbound and outbound, support international engagement and are of significant importance to grow our great state product by 3 per cent per annum. The new calendar for 2020 will see a range of both outbound and inbound events, tailored specifically to the nine growth sectors, including international education, food, wine, agribusiness, defence, high-tech, etc.

Approximately 43 business missions will be undertaken in countries all over the world, including Vietnam, Japan, Cambodia, Germany, Singapore, France, India and China. Thirty-four of the planned missions will be outbound, and we will be hosting nine inbound missions. Missions will attend events such as South by South West in the United States in March, Hannover Messe again in April, Euronaval in France in October, the China International Import Expo again in November, and plenty more.

Releasing the calendar shows that South Australia is open for business, and I look forward to seeing the positive benefits for South Australia and our industries that result from these very important business missions. I encourage anyone with an interest in engaging with overseas markets—and any businesses, in particular—to look at the business mission calendar online today and register their interest in attending any of the outbound or inbound missions.

SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:39): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Minister, do you not see that there is a perception that the credibility of such an investigation will now be compromised, with a task force made up of hand-picked government officials—basically, the government investigating itself? Who decided on the members of this task force; just what powers of investigation will this task force have in calling and compelling witnesses to give evidence; how much will it cost; when will it complete its investigation; and is the reason that the government is refusing to allocate resources to the ICAC commissioner because it has no confidence in the ICAC commissioner?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:39): I thank the honourable member for his question, because it gives me the opportunity to clarify any misunderstandings there

might have been into the role of the cross-agency implementation task force. Let's be clear: it's not a royal commission; it's not a judicial inquiry; it's not, if you like, a pseudo-evaluation.

What it is is an attempt to identify the work that is already being done in the streams of concerns that the ICAC commissioner has; to take on board the observations of the ICAC commissioner, which draw on six years of dealing with numerous health issues; and to coordinate the implementation of the implementation plan.

I am hopeful that the government will have a detailed response by the end of the year. It will be the cross-agency task force's job to oversee the implementation of that plan and to coordinate the resources of government, and beyond government, to the task before us.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo, a supplementary.

SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:41): Can you just clarify that, minister: the end of this year? Do you reckon they will be able to complete their investigations by the end of this year?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:41): Again, could I clarify my previous answer. What I was referring to being available by the end of this year was the detailed response.

CENTRAL ADELAIDE LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:41): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Is the minister aware of concerns raised about a contract signed by the Chief Executive of the Central Adelaide Local Health Network, Lesley Dwyer, for a short-term consultancy with a personal contractor known to her, and does the minister share these concerns?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:42): This issue was raised by the media earlier today. I am yet to receive information, but I would ask the honourable member to reflect on the words she uses. Apparently, we are supposed to be horrified that somebody has entered into a contract with somebody they know. There are professional networks right around the world. If we are going to say that you can't employ anybody you have ever actually met, it's a pretty poor, strange concept of probity.

CENTRAL ADELAIDE LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:42): Supplementary: what is the value of the consultancy contract that Ms Dwyer was asked about in your press conference earlier today?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:42): I don't have that information.

The PRESIDENT: Further supplementary, the Hon. Ms Pnevmatikos.

CENTRAL ADELAIDE LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:43): Did the consultancy contract that Ms Dwyer was asked about in your press conference today go out for open tender and, if not, why not?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:43): I don't have that information.

The PRESIDENT: Further supplementary, the Hon. Ms Pnevmatikos.

CENTRAL ADELAIDE LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:43): What services were provided by contractor Critical Friends?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:43): I notice that the honourable member is stretching the concept of supplementary question—but I don't have that information.

CENTRAL ADELAIDE LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:43): Will the minister take those questions on notice and respond to the issues that have been raised by those questions?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:43): I am happy to do so.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Lee.

INCLUSIVE PLAY SPACES

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:44): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question to the Minister for Human Services about inclusive play spaces.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: In February this year, the Marshall Liberal government announced the establishment of an inclusive play working group to develop guidelines for local government and other agencies to use when designing and building safe and fun play spaces that are accessible and improve outcomes for children living with disability. On the International Day of People with Disability, can the minister please update the council on this important work?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:44): I thank the honourable member for her question and for her interest in this very important area. It gives me great pleasure, today being International Day of People with Disability, that we have launched our inclusive play guidelines to assist any organisation involved in the development of children's playgrounds and play spaces, for which there are many possible applications from local government playgrounds to those that are in our kindergartens, childcare centres, and a whole range of other areas where there may be play equipment.

The inclusive play guidelines are a new go-to guide for local government and other agencies to ensure that inclusive play is considered in the design of all playgrounds and play spaces. I think it is fair to say that people do not know what they do not know. We have had a very diverse group of organisations and individuals who have contributed to the development of these guidelines, and we are incredibly grateful that they came along to provide us with their expertise in terms of ensuring that these guidelines are inclusive of all disabilities. People with disability are very diverse and their disabilities are very diverse, so it is important to incorporate elements that will assist everyone.

The organisations that contributed to the inclusive play working group included: Architecture and Access, Autism SA, Can:Do, the City of Adelaide, the City of Marion, the City of Playford, the Commissioner for Children and Young People, Community Centres SA, the Community Visitor Scheme, the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, Disability Recreation and Sports SA, the Department for Education, Inclusive Sport SA, Kalaya Children's Group, the Office of Recreation and Sport, Playgroup SA and Purple Orange.

These inclusive guidelines for families and children with disability means that they will, into the future, have more places where they can attend. We had a family attend today who has a son with autism, and they are very appreciative that a range of organisations are embracing inclusivity. As they put it to me, it is important that people who do not have disability understand the needs of people with disability so that everybody can participate, because we know that play is very important to children and to their development. The message, in terms of inclusion, is incredibly important, I think, for people with disability to be embraced by everybody.

We already have the Hendrie Street playground at Park Holme. The Quentin Kenihan Inclusive Playspace is under development by the Adelaide city council and the Bonython Park playground. I was also speaking to Maurice Corcoran, the previous community visitor. I am aware that there are playgrounds at Semaphore that he has appreciated as a person who is a wheelchair user: people often do not think about the fact that parents with disabilities need to access play as well.

We are very excited about these guidelines; we look forward to a number of organisations using them as they develop their playgrounds into the future and that children are able to fully participate with the rest of the community.

CONFUCIUS INSTITUTE

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:48): Under standing order 107, I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Hon. Jing Lee on the topic of the Foreign Influence Transparency Scheme Act 2018.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Members would be well aware that concerns have been raised about the Confucius Institutes in Australia, and elsewhere, by no less than the Human Rights Watch organisation, which has this year released a Resisting Chinese Government Efforts to Undermine Academic Freedom Abroad—a broad document which contains some 12 points, with advice for academic institutions to uphold human rights. No. 7 of that particular document is 'Reject Confucius Institutes.'

Further, members will also be well aware that previously questions were raised with the honourable member, which she has now provided answers to. Those questions were in response to concerns raised by me as to why the Confucius Institute of Adelaide University had not, at first, complied with requests to release the contract between themselves and Hanban; the nature of the role of the honourable member as a parliamentary ambassador; and why the Confucius Institutes—specifically in this case at Adelaide University—had not complied with the Attorney-General Department's request, and the Attorney-General Dan Tehan's request, to register on the foreign influence registry.

I note that those requests remain unmet, despite other similar groups having complied. I note in particular in Perth the USAsia Centre at the University of Western Australia and the United States Studies Centre at the University of Sydney have lodged their relationships with foreign governments with the Foreign Influence Transparency register. In response to my questions of 12 September, the honourable member stated, 'I have been informed that the activities of the Adelaide Confucius Institute approved by the university for 2019 do not fall under the category of registrable activities under the Foreign Influence Transparency Scheme.' My questions to the honourable member are:

1. Who informed you?
2. What advice did you personally seek, or did you only seek the advice of the University of Adelaide?
3. How many other parliamentary ambassadors are there of Confucius Institutes in Australia who are sitting members of a parliament: state, federal or territory?
4. Is your appointment as a parliamentary ambassador in and of itself a reason that the University of Adelaide's Confucius Institute should have registered?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:51): I thank the honourable member for her ongoing questions and interest in the Confucius Institutes. Many of the questions that she has asked I have already provided answers to, and many of them are not directly relating to my work as either the assistant minister or as a member of the Legislative Council, in terms of how they have structured the ambassadorship.

I previously provided clarification that the only reason they have called me or titled me as parliamentary ambassador is because I happen to be a member of parliament and then, later on, corrected their records openly on their website and in some of their material in terms of marketing. In terms of the questions that have been asked about foreign transparency and questions relating to the Attorney-General's Department, I will take those questions on notice to refer to the Attorney-General.

CONFUCIUS INSTITUTE

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:53): Supplementary: how will the honourable member refer this to the Attorney-General, being Dan Tehan, our federal Attorney-General, who has requested that the Confucius Institutes register under the Foreign Influence Transparency Scheme?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:53): I will take those questions on notice. As I said, a lot of the matters that have been referred to are under the jurisdiction of the federal government.

CONFUCIUS INSTITUTE

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:53): Supplementary: which Attorney-General did the member mean when she said she would refer this to the Attorney-General, and what advice has she personally received regarding her role as parliamentary ambassador at the Confucius Institute with regard to the Foreign Influence Transparency Scheme Act 2018?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:53): I will take those questions on notice.

CONFUCIUS INSTITUTE

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:54): Supplementary: has the member taken any independent advice, as in independent of the Confucius Institute at the University of Adelaide, on this matter?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:54): As I said, I will take those questions on notice. The advice I have received is from the direct answers given by the Adelaide University, because they have certainly complied with whatever is imposed on them. Those are the answers provided by the Adelaide University to me.

CONFUCIUS INSTITUTE

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:54): A supplementary: does the honourable member feel that her role assisting the Premier on multicultural affairs is compromised by her role as what she once called brand ambassador but what is officially parliamentary ambassador of the Confucius Institute of the University of Adelaide?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:54): I do not believe my role has in any way been compromised by being the ambassador of the Confucius Institute. I have clarified that before. The role of the ambassadorship was by bipartisan and multipartisan agreement back then, when we were all promoting language studies within the Confucius Institute.

Is there any evidence the honourable member would like to point out that the Confucius Institute, based at Adelaide University, has been involved in any wrongdoing? If that has been proven or if there is evidence, prove it or show it instead of just calling me out because I believe in language studies and believe in the development of language and culture within South Australia.

CONFUCIUS INSTITUTE

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:55): A further supplementary: did the honourable member meet with the Uygur community this week, who were hosted by the ambassador of the United States of America?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:56): No, I haven't.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Franks, that was pushing the envelope, that last one.

SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:57): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. When did the minister or his office first receive a copy of the ICAC report?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:57): The government was provided the report on Friday, and the report was tabled at the first opportunity.

SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:57): A supplementary: considering that the report was provided to your office on Friday, how has the minister not yet had time to read the report?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:57): I have nothing to add to my answer.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, a supplementary.

SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:57): I think the minister earlier today said that the report was provided to his office. He has just now said that the report was provided to the government. For the sake of clarity, was that report first delivered to the minister's office?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:58): The government was provided with the report on Friday, and the report was tabled at the first opportunity.

SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:58): Why is the minister refusing to answer the question whether it was to his office that the report was tabled?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Stephens.

JAPAN AND SOUTH KOREA, TRADE AND INVESTMENT

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (14:58): My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. Can the minister update the council on how the relationship between South Australia and Japan continues to grow?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Minister, you have the call.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:58): I thank the honourable member for his question, in particular his interest in growing our business opportunities in North Asia and in the Japanese market, in particular. The Treasurer and my hardworking leader, we know, as the only Japanese Catholic member of the South Australian parliament, has a strong interest in growing our presence there. That's why we opened the second of our five international trade offices established earlier this year and, as we well know, hired Ms Sally Townsend to lead our North Asia office, which encompasses not only Japan but the Korean market as well.

Members would also be aware that South Australia will be hosting the Australia Japan Business Co-operation Committee next year for the first time in three decades, which I had the pleasure of announcing at the conference in Osaka in October. During that trip I met with many Japanese companies who were very interested in doing business in South Australia. In particular, most of them—the chief executives and senior executives—had never been to South Australia before. Since those meetings, I am pleased to tell the chamber, I've had several inbound business missions from Japanese companies that we met at the conference and began building relationships with.

As members would know, I place a strong value on building relationships between our great state and other parts of the world. Two weeks ago, we had Mitsubishi Heavy Industries visit to look at opportunities across a variety of sectors, including mining, high tech and hydrogen. They also visited the Tonsley precinct and Lot Fourteen. It is interesting that it is known and recognised across Japan and Korea that South Australia is the most advanced in the hydrogen sector, with the most recent release of our Hydrogen Action Plan. Of course, it was pleasing to see the Premier turn the first sod down at the hydrolyser in Tonsley yesterday.

A few weeks prior to the Mitsubishi visit we had a visit from the Japanese company Sojitz, who we also met at the conference in Osaka. My department developed a strong program around sector opportunities, including mining and energy, particularly hydrogen; food and beverage; space; and international education. Furthermore, we will have another inbound mission from the Tokyo university on 12 and 13 December. I look forward to seeing the outcomes that result from that visit.

I'm confident that these relationships will continue to grow further and bear fruit for South Australia. Both companies are very keen to visit South Australia again and plan on attending the AJBCC in Adelaide in October next year. In fact, Mitsubishi have recently indicated they are likely to come back early in the new year.

South Australian businesses have also had an opportunity to participate in recent outbound missions to the Japan region, including BioJapan 2019 and the Korea Clinical Trial Industry Roadshow in mid-October and the craft beverages mission from 12 to 17 November. Organised by my department and our Japanese office, the craft beverages mission was attended by the Never Never Distilling Co., Prohibition Liquor, Kangaroo Island Spirits and Momentum Food and Wine.

As part of the program, they attended the Tokyo Whisky Festival, where over 8,500 consumers and traders participated, and hosted a tasting seminar about the South Australian craft gin scene. I'm advised that no other Australian state governments had a presence at the event, so we are really starting to lead the way and punch above our weight in the craft spirits sector.

The delegation also participated in the first Tasting South Australia event held on 15 and 16 November in Tokyo, where Japanese consumers were educated on our premium food, wine and spirits from our world-renowned regions such as McLaren Vale, the Adelaide Hills and the Barossa. The event also promoted South Australia as a study abroad and tourism destination. Tasting South Australia is proposed to be an annual event and will increase awareness and exposure of South Australian goods, increasing demand and promoting our state as a destination to visit.

I would encourage all businesses to look again at the inbound and outbound missions calendar that is live on the website and look for opportunities. We have a great team in China and a great team in Japan and are soon to have similar support in the US, Dubai and South-East Asia—Kuala Lumpur—to support our exporters to take their products to the world, grow the economy and create jobs here in South Australia.

SA HEALTH

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:03): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Health and Wellbeing a question about SA Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: It is no secret that SA Health is terminally ill, and today's damning report by the ICAC commissioner, Bruce Lander, is the latest scathing indictment of one of the state's largest and critical departments. My question to the minister is: why does this government continue to so vehemently oppose a royal commission into SA Health's public services when the dire warning signs are there for absolutely everybody to see?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:03): This house has, if you like, a binary challenge before it. On the one hand I am being told I should give money to the ICAC commissioner for an ICAC inquiry. On the other hand, I am being told I need a royal commission. What this government is committed to is acting on the issues that have been highlighted by the ICAC commissioner. And that is clear; that is demonstrated by the fact that we have already acted.

Let me illustrate some of them: in relation to KordaMentha, KordaMentha was actually appointed in the Central Adelaide Local Health Network in the context of the commissioner's concern. That engagement is an \$18 million investment in dealing with maladministration. As has been highlighted, the recovery plan is an important step to improve the culture and the financial management of that network. For example, the ICAC commissioner has concerns about record management. KordaMentha also highlighted the problem with poor record keeping in the area of medical coding and indicated a multimillion dollar loss, potentially, in annual revenue.

KordaMentha is addressing a number of the concerns of the commissioner, and one of their priorities in their recovery plan is to actually deal with culture and governance. On the issue of governance, the government is of the view that devolution of health administration to local boards—which only started on 1 July—will be a major step forward in terms of improving governance at the local level.

I cannot comprehend how Labor honestly felt that centralising health care in Hindmarsh Square was actually going to improve governance—it hasn't. Under 40,000 staff—my understanding, about 30,000 FTEs—spread across one of the most geographically diverse states in the nation, and expecting that to be effectively managed from an ivory tower by bureaucrats was never going to work. I fundamentally believe that the introduction of local health network management, backed up by boards, which are staffed by people independent of SA Health, providing governance, connecting

with their communities, connecting with their clinicians, will lead to much better outcomes on a range of domains, particularly the ones that are highlighted in the ICAC commissioner's analysis.

SA HEALTH

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:06): Supplementary: how many SA Health disasters have been published in the press since those announcements were made by this government?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:06): I think it would be fair to say that SA Health is a very diverse organisation, which faces many challenges. Having an ICAC inquiry and having a royal commission—none of those are going to stop the challenges that SA Health will need to continue to work on.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Let's put it this way: there is nothing magic about a royal commission.

SA HEALTH

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:07): Supplementary: does the minister accept that there is a toxic culture in SA Health underpinning everything that he has just outlined?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:07): I believe that the culture in SA Health is toxic and we do need to change it. That's why we are leading fundamental change, particularly through devolution. We are expecting boards to strengthen the governance, particularly through the risk and audit committees. One of the issues highlighted in the ICAC report was compliance with policies: that is the bread and butter of boards' risk and audit committees.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo, a supplementary?

INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:07): Does the government have confidence in the ICAC commissioner? You haven't answered that question.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:07): I certainly do.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL CAR PARK

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:07): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the minister advise when the decision was made to open the new Queen Elizabeth Hospital car park on Sunday 1 December, and who made that decision?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:08): I will take that question on notice.

VACCINATION PROGRAMS

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:08): My question is directed to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the minister update the council—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: Well, neither have you!

The PRESIDENT: Order! Ask your question, please, the Hon. Mr Dawkins.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: My question is directed to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the minister update the council on vaccination programs in South Australia?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:08): I thank the honourable member for his question. I might actually do it in two parts, if you don't mind. One is in relation to meningococcal B. Last year, the Marshall Liberal government established a vaccine program for South Australians against meningococcal B. The program was developed by an expert working group made up of clinicians and immunisation experts. Based on that expert advice, we launched the nation's first meningococcal B immunisation program and it targeted two particular cohorts. Free meningococcal B vaccines are provided to infants between six weeks and four years of age, and at year 10.

In an international first, a program was put in place for adolescents and young people between the ages of 17 and 21. Following further work by our clinicians, this catch-up program, which was due to finish this calendar year, will now be extended until the end of February next year. This will provide an opportunity for better protection to this demographic. They are more highly at risk than many any other demographics, but at the same time they are also less likely to avail themselves of programs being delivered for their protection. An awareness campaign will be rolled out along with the extension to ensure as many young people as possible take up the opportunity to protect themselves from what can be a terrible disease.

In 2019, we have seen six South Australian adults contract meningococcal B. We know they are at risk and we are acting to protect them. The Marshall Liberal government is proud of delivering this world-leading program, and we are working in other areas of immunisation to ensure that South Australians are given the opportunity to be vaccinated, both themselves and for their loved ones.

In the area of flu vaccines, the vaccines advisory council is looking at a proposal to lower the age of children to whom pharmacists can administer the flu vaccine. Under current regulations, pharmacists can give flu vaccines outside of the national immunisation program to children 16 years and above. The council will provide advice around the lowering of this age to 10 years. This will make vaccinations easier on families who might otherwise have to schedule in a visit to their GP as well as a visit to the pharmacy if they have children who fall into both categories. The Marshall Liberal government is committed to delivering better primary and preventive health care. These vaccine programs are a clear example of that commitment being delivered every day.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:11): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing about compliance with freedom of information laws.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: Three weeks ago I asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing why he had not yet complied with a determination of the Ombudsman to release certain documents to me under the Freedom of Information Act. These were documents that related to the subject of genetically modified organisms, which I note has occupied a little of the time of the other place today. The documents the Ombudsman ordered to be released were followed up by my office after the 30-day appeal period had expired. They were followed up again by email and again today, and yet we still have no indication that the minister intends to abide by the law.

The problem that I have is that I don't have the right to go to SACAT on appeal, because I am not aggrieved at the Ombudsman's decision. The Ombudsman made a most excellent decision. I've got no right to go to court, yet there appears to be no mechanism to force the minister to obey the law.

My questions again of the minister are: when will you obey the law; when will you comply with the Ombudsman's ruling; and when will you provide these freedom of information documents that you were ordered to provide back in September?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:13): I have every intention of abiding by the law. In relation to the freedom of information law, there are processes for review not only of a minister's office or department's decision but also in relation to decisions of the Ombudsman. We will continue to consider our options in relation to the freedom of information.

MCGOWAN, DR C.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:13): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Now that the minister has had several days to seek clarification, was the minister aware that Dr Chris McGowan flew to Perth to visit Silver Chain and their Integrum program last February? Does the minister believe this visit was consistent with Dr Chris McGowan's statements to the Budget and Finance Committee regarding his involvement with Silver Chain?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:14): Having had a few days to consider my previous answer, I refer the honourable member to it.

MCGOWAN, DR C.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:14): Supplementary: considering the minister's answer, was the minister aware that Dr McGowan actively followed up the outcomes of the Integrum program?

The PRESIDENT: I am not entirely sure it's a supplementary, minister. The choice is yours, whether you wish to respond. The Hon. Mr Stephens.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Are we all finished, because I would like to hear the Hon. Mr Stephens' important question.

TEACHERS DISPUTE

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:14): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer update the council with regard to the long-running teachers' pay dispute?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:15): I thank the honourable member for his question. I am pleased to advise that sometime late yesterday afternoon or early evening the Australian Education Union executive unanimously, so we are advised, endorsed a proposal to put the government's revised enterprise bargaining offer to its members for a ballot. That ballot will be conducted, as I understand it, over the next week to eight days—there's only 1½ school weeks left in the school year—of AEU members.

I am also very pleased that the Australian Education Union, together with the government representatives, have agreed to discontinue the conciliation proceedings before the South Australian Employment Tribunal. I think, again, that's a wholly positive response. As minister responsible for the enterprise bargaining negotiations, I am hopeful that AEU members will take the opportunity over the next week to support the revised offer. It is obviously a decision for them to take. Should they do so, given that the AEU doesn't represent all teachers and staff within schools, there would then be a requirement in the first week, or maybe two weeks, of school term next year to conduct a ballot of all teachers and staff within government schools in relation to the enterprise bargaining agreement.

The reality is that long history indicates that if the AEU membership endorse a particular enterprise offer from the employer it is highly likely then that the majority of the remaining membership will also so endorse it. Obviously, they are decisions that have to be taken, firstly, in this instance, over the next week. If that was to be successful, then there will be a ballot in the first week, or maybe two weeks, of term one next year.

As I have indicated on a number of occasions, the taxpayers were not in a position to be able to afford any more generous a salary increase than the 2.35 per cent that the government on behalf of taxpayers had offered and 3.35 per cent for principals and preschool directors. We did say that on the issue that the union indicated was of greater significance to them and their members, which was extra support for teachers in the classroom, the government was prepared to further negotiate. In the interest of compromise, we have increased the offer from \$12 million a year to \$15 million a year in terms of what is referred to as the 'complexity allowance'. In simple terms, that's additional assistance which is available to teachers in classrooms to support students who require additional assistance.

It can mean, I am advised, up to an extra \$158,000 for a school, where a decision will be taken at the local level as to whether that means the employment of additional SSO support or whatever other support the school may so determine to provide that assistance to teachers in the classroom. The nature of the revised offer also means that the additional assistance, the complexity allowance, will be made available to all schools, obviously in varying elements depending on a formula which has been offered.

There are a number of other assistance parts of the package which provide additional assistance for country incentives in terms of encouraging teachers to both move to and to be retained in harder to staff country schools. I won't relay all of the details of the revised offer that has gone to, firstly, the AEU executive and now is to be balloted upon by AEU members.

Suffice to say that if it is successful then I think—on behalf of the taxpayers of South Australia but, just as importantly, on behalf of the students, the hardworking teachers and the staff—it will be an entirely reasonable and sensible resolution to what has been a long-running and ongoing dispute between the union and the government.

ROADWORKS, SMALL BUSINESS IMPACT

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:20): My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment representing the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. On 30 October this year, the Small Business Commissioner released a document, titled *Open to Business—Making Roadworks Work*, outlining guidelines for local and state government to follow regarding how to manage the impacts of roadworks on small businesses. Can the minister provide information on how the government will be responding to this document? What changes, if any, will be made to departmental processes in dealing with small businesses affected by the construction of roadworks?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:20): I thank the honourable member for his question in relation to the report that I think was released by the Small Business Commissioner. I was on a select committee with the honourable member before the last election, in relation to land acquisition and the impact that roadworks have on small businesses, whether they are big bits of infrastructure like South Road or even just upgrades as we have seen on King William Road with local government. The actual repaving and renovating of that particular street has had an impact on small businesses. So it really does fall into the responsibility of the minister for transport, planning and infrastructure, and I will be delighted to refer the question to him and bring back a reply.

The PRESIDENT: The time for questions without notice has expired, but I am going to give the call to the Hon. Mr Wade for him to provide further information to an answer.

CENTRAL ADELAIDE LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:21): I seek leave to provide further information in relation to an answer given earlier today.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I am advised that CALHN has established a Critical Friends framework to assist the organisation's recovery. The Critical Friends provide clinical advice and expertise to complement KordaMentha and have had a significant impact on culture and optimism as CALHN strives to become a world-class health network. Dr Diana Hamilton-Fairley has recently spent time with the network to provide an expert and objective lens on critical issues, such as clinical governance, change management and medical leadership. She has encouraged reflective practice in change leadership and staff to think differently about strategy and operations.

She has previously held roles with Guy's and St Thomas', as the medical lead for education and leadership at Health Education England. CALHN's chief executive worked with Dr Hamilton-Fairley at Medway when the Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust was asked to buddy with the trust to provide expert advice to aid its improvement from quality special measures to a high-performing trust. She was later appointed as a medical director and director of strategy at Medway Foundation Trust. She is currently the lead for Kent community care, establishing an integrated health system within Kent.

Dr Hamilton-Fairley is paid a daily rate of A\$2,000 a day plus expenses. All Critical Friends have been chosen for their specific expert knowledge and experience. The network will continue to use Critical Friends and to capitalise on other partnerships to bring about the rapid turnaround that is required at CALHN. Chief executive Lesley Dwyer's recent international health experience in large turnaround projects has been successful as a result of engaging expert leading professionals to provide advice.

Members

MEMBER'S LEAVE

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:23): I move:

That the Hon. K.J. Maher be granted leave of absence from 12 November 2019 to 12 December 2019 on account of cultural business.

In speaking briefly to the motion, I indicate on behalf of government members that we are pleased to be moving this particular motion. For the avid readers of *Hansard*, it is required because if any member, for whatever reason, is absent from the chamber for a period of 12 or more days, they immediately vacate their seat.

As tempting as that might have been, the government and I, on behalf of the government, did not take up that particular option. I think this would certainly be the first motion moved in these particular terms. We accept the reasons that have been given on behalf of the honourable member by his colleagues in relation to the motion and we would urge the support of the council for the motion.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:25): Very briefly, on behalf of the Hon. Kyam Maher, I rise to thank the leader for moving the motion and the council for their anticipated support for this. The Hon. Kyam Maher is very grateful, and I would like to say that I think the council, in supporting this motion, is paying the appropriate respect to the APY communities as well. Thank you.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Committees

BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:25): I move:

That the committee have leave to sit during the recess and to report on the first day of the next session.

Motion carried.

Motions

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST LAND DISPOSAL

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:26): I move:

That pursuant to section 44(2)(a) of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act 2013, this council resolves that the Aboriginal Lands Trust may dispose of the land and buildings held by the trust at 50-56 Sussex Street, North Adelaide (Certificate of Title Volume 5546 Folio 989 and Certificate of Title Volume 5536 Folio 252).

In speaking to the motion, I have been provided with the following information. The Aboriginal Lands Trust owns a property at 50-56 Sussex Street, North Adelaide. The property has an area of 1,538 square metres, so I am advised, and comprises a former boarding house, a caretaker's house, an office, a small playground and a car park.

The property was owned and run by various benevolent organisations before entering the trust estate in 1980, after which it was used to house Aboriginal women coming to Adelaide for medical treatment. It was last used for this purpose in 1995, and has been derelict for some time. In the meantime, the Aboriginal Lands Trust has been incurring considerable property maintenance costs.

The trust's board considered improving the building and using it for office premises. However, a feasibility study identified that the building did not meet occupational health and safety criteria, while Sussex Street is now zoned residential, precluding alternative uses. The current value of the Sussex Street property, based on SA Water rating, is in excess of \$3 million. At its board meeting on 10 October 2019, the trust resolved unanimously to sell the property. This decision was informed by community consultation undertaken by the trust.

The trust is an independent statutory authority. It receives funding of just over \$1 million per annum from the state government. About 20 per cent of its budget is allocated to rental costs for its current Adelaide CBD office. The trust intends to use proceeds from the sale of the Sussex Street property to secure its own premises, which will include multi-use spaces that can be used by Aboriginal communities as well as being available for hire to create a new income stream for the trust.

Earlier this year, the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee completed a report, as required by the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee Act 2003, following

its review into the operations of the trust. The government recently provided a response to the committee's Presiding Member, noting that the government has been in discussion with the trust about further action that could be taken to put the trust in a sustainable financial position. This includes the proposal for sale of the Sussex Street property. Section 44(2)(a) of the act requires a resolution of both houses of parliament to approve the disposal of trust land.

My understanding is that the House of Assembly—the other chamber—may have already passed the motion, perhaps last week. Nevertheless, the act requires both houses of parliament at some stage to approve the disposal of the trust land. It is for that reason that I, on behalf of the government, move the motion standing in my name.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:29): I rise on behalf of the Labor opposition to indicate our support for the motion. The redevelopment of the Aboriginal Lands Trust property at Sussex Street is a project, I am advised, that has been under consideration for some time. Some disappointment has been expressed, I understand, that the ALT are not undertaking the redevelopment themselves, but we also understand that the ALT simply do not have the financial capacity to undertake this work themselves.

Additional concerns have been raised that, because of the disbanding of the ALT's commercial development advisory committee, that committee's advice could not be taken into consideration on this matter. However, I am advised that the ongoing involvement of the Indigenous Land Corporation, including with assistance in developing the business case, will provide a degree of reassurance. This provides an opportunity for reinvigoration of the ALT. It will allow the purchase of a new headquarters, as well as further investment in ALT businesses from the proceeds of the sale. So I indicate that Labor will be supporting the motion.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:30): I rise very briefly to indicate that the Greens will also support this motion and that we wish the ALT well with the sale of the property to ensure their prosperity into the future.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:31): I rise very briefly to indicate that I endorse the remarks that the Treasurer made in moving this motion, particularly the reference to the Premier's and the government's reference to the report of the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee. The Premier asked that I take this matter to the committee before it be brought to the parliament. I note that the committee supported this action wholeheartedly, and I endorse the motion.

Motion carried.

Bills

GAMBLING ADMINISTRATION BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 November 2019).

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:32): I move:

That the debate be now adjourned.

The council divided on the motion:

Ayes 5
Noes 14
Majority 9

AYES

Bonaros, C.
Pangallo, F.

Darley, J.A.
Parnell, M.C.

Franks, T.A. (teller)

NOES

Bourke, E.S.
Hood, D.G.E.
Lensink, J.M.A.
Pnevmatikos, I.
Wade, S.G.

Dawkins, J.S.L.
Hunter, I.K.
Lucas, R.I. (teller)
Ridgway, D.W.
Wortley, R.P.

Hanson, J.E.
Lee, J.S.
Ngo, T.T.
Stephens, T.J.

Motion thus negatived.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:36): I rise on behalf of the Greens to speak to the Gambling Administration Bill 2019. I thank the government for their briefing—which was held yesterday. I thank them for the scant answers that I have received so far to my questions. I note that in their contribution the opposition, represented by the Hon. Clare Scriven, made a contribution of some 397 words on this bill. Of course, that stands in absolute glory compared to their 134 words on the regulation bill that is its companion. The opposition had 397 words to say on this bill, a bill which contains—

The Hon. T.J. Stephens: Quality not quantity.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: This contains neither quality nor quantity. I ask my first question: does the opposition today—that has just gagged the ability of the crossbenchers to engage in this debate—have a lead spokesperson for this debate today to answer the crossbenchers' questions about the agreement, the deal, the backroom brokered deal, between the Treasurer and the shadow treasurer on this bill that is now embodied in these pieces of government legislation, or will the opposition continue to hide behind that deal and not face the music in this place?

This bill, as it is described by the government, aligns and consolidates various administrative matters under the act across all sectors of the gambling industry, including that of the commissioner's powers of inquiry and direction, and the commissioner's powers when conducting proceedings. It ensures uniform rights for gambling providers to seek a review of a decision by the commissioner before the Licensing Court. It also provides for a streamlined process for the commissioner to prescribe advertising and responsible gambling, codes of practice and gambling administration guidelines.

It extends the expiation fees to all gambling providers for a breach of the code of practice. It also ensures the appointment of persons as inspectors for the purposes of the gambling acts and provides uniform powers of inspection, and it also simplifies and standardises the legislative power for compliance, enforcement and disciplinary action. Simplifies and standardises: well when they did the dodgy deal, the backroom deal, that shadow treasurer and the Treasurer, they certainly simplified and standardised processes in this place between the opposition and the government.

The bill will also allow persons at risk of harm or at risk of causing harm to a family member because of their gambling addiction problem to be barred for a period or for an indefinite period, including from the premises of a single gambling provider or from the premises of multiple gambling providers. This bill also broadens barring orders and those provisions to allow for a barring order, whether self-imposed or enforced by the commissioner or enforced by a third-party, to be initiated for any period of time or indefinitely, should those circumstances permit.

Those provisions are not ones that the crossbench seeks to query today. Indeed, much of this bill will provide some better and clearer measures, but the lack of transparency, the lack of process, the lack of respect for the crossbenches today reflects a lack of transparency, a lack of process and a lack of respect given to the community sector, and to those voices within the community that should have been at the table when the Treasurer and shadow treasure did the deal on note acceptors in exchange for facial recognition, in exchange for no conscience vote on the side of the government, no conscience vote on the side of the opposition—and today, almost no debate whatsoever in this place on the merits or otherwise of this bill, in particular on the merits or otherwise of the changes made by the Labor opposition to this bill in the other place.

There are 397 words, and not one about how the facial recognition technology will be applied, not a word in the 134 words on the regulations bill, not a word about whether or not facial recognition

technology will be ensured to apply only to those who have barring orders, and not used to apply to actually create problem gamblers or fleece willing gamblers from their money more regularly, more quickly and more strategically.

We have no safeguards in this bill from the proposition put before us by the Labor opposition with no consultation with stakeholders, those who represent those at risk of gambling harm, to ensure that this technology will not be used for nefarious purposes rather than protective ones. However, we do have an agreement between Labor and Liberal that we are going to see note acceptors in this state, which means that people will be able to gamble away their money more quickly and, in cases of problem gamblers, with less protection in some situations.

This bill will also insert those requirements for facial recognition I have mentioned. They are the Labor amendments to the government bill in the other place. Indeed, the facial recognition systems will be approved by the commissioner under the Casino Act 1997 or the Gaming Machines Act 1992. It also allows some greater scope for the commissioner to make publicly available information regarding expenditure on gambling activities undertaken under a gambling act. It mandates the commissioner's report to include the total net state wagering revenue of all authorised betting operators and the total net gambling revenue of the holders of all gaming machine licenses and the special club licence.

I note we had the briefing on this bill just yesterday, so I did ask some questions and I will now place them onto the record. These were received today at 1.46pm and it is now a quarter to four. Being in question time, I have not had a great deal of time to digest the responses to our questions.

We did ask in our briefing who was involved in the consultation on this bill. We were told that there had been a round table. I note that at that round table from the government sector there was the Department of Human Services, the Department of Treasury and Finance, the Licensing Court of South Australia, SAPOL Licensing Enforcement Branch, the Lotteries Commission of South Australia and the office for recreation and sport.

There were support services and researchers, including the University of Adelaide's SA Centre for Economic Studies, the University of Adelaide School of Psychology, Aboriginal Family Support Services, AnglicareSA, Lifeline Mount Gambier, OARS Community Transitions, the overseas Chinese students association, PsychMed Pty Ltd, Relationships Australia South Australia, the South Australian Council of Social Service (SACOSS), the Statewide Gambling Therapy Service, Uniting Communities, Uniting Country SA, and the Vietnamese Community in Australia SA chapter.

And from the industry, of course, always at the table, there was the Adelaide Casino, Club One (SA) Ltd, the Independent Gaming Corporation (IGC), the Australian Hotels Association, Gaming Care, Clubs SA/Club Safe, Greyhound Racing SA, Harness Racing SA, Responsible Wagering Australia, the South Australian Bookmakers League Incorporated, Thoroughbred Racing SA, Tabcorp Holdings, and Sport SA.

That was at the round table. Some of those aforementioned made a submission and some did not make a written submission, following that round table. What I am interested to hear from government is how many of those submissions, either at that round table that day, in the informal meeting or following that with the written submission, made a submission on note acceptors and made a submission on facial recognition technology. We will be seeking those answers from government.

Certainly in the briefing the full nature of the deal that has presented itself and wended its way to this upper house of this parliament was not consulted on at that particular round table. I note also that we asked the government about the community impact test. I will let the Hon. Connie Bonaros go into further detail on that, but I flag with the government that we will be asking further questions with regard to the community impact test as we move into the committee stage of this bill.

For, while the Greens will be opposing this bill today, we have seen quite starkly that the government and the opposition will be in lockstep on this, and they will be in lockstep to a point where no consideration will be given to other voices other than the Treasurer and the shadow treasurer and their deal behind the scenes that was done without the scrutiny of parliament, without the scrutiny of a committee process, without the scrutiny of proper community consultation on the very measures

that were brokered, and that facial recognition technology, whether or not that shall be protected from being used, not to protect gamblers, as the opposition has put it, but indeed to procure gamblers. So again, I ask the government to give us some guarantees on that front, that this deal that they have done with the Labor opposition will not lead to unforeseen outcomes.

This bill is certainly one that we will be going through in committee stage in great detail. I could get up and speak for five hours. We could do what has been done in the past in terms of a WorkCover debate or a Return to Work debate. Indeed, with the Return to Work debate, when the Weatherill government rammed that one through, the fact that the now Premier, the then Leader of the Opposition, had told everyone to vote Labor made a whole lot more sense.

When it comes to some of these matters of great state importance, Labor and Liberal are often in lockstep. They are in lockstep to the point where they tread all over the voices of those in the community who are harmed and the voices of the crossbenchers in this place who were duly elected to represent views that are not often heard in this place and were certainly not given appropriate opportunity to be heard, with a rushed process where the opposition and the government have done a backroom deal.

They have ensured that note acceptors in this state will allow South Australians to lose money more quickly, at a greater pace and with potentially greater harm, without the scrutiny and without the respect of even having the lead speaker of the opposition—the person who contributed the 397 words on this bill and the 134 words on the other bill in this place—answer questions about Labor's deal with the government that has been done behind the scenes and not with the transparency of parliament. With those few words, I anticipate a very robust committee process.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:51): I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The council divided on the motion:

Ayes.....5
 Noes 14
 Majority 9

AYES

Bonaros, C. (teller)
 Pangallo, F.

Darley, J.A.
 Parnell, M.C.

Franks, T.A.

NOES

Bourke, E.S.
 Hood, D.G.E.
 Lensink, J.M.A.
 Pnevmatikos, I.
 Wade, S.G.

Dawkins, J.S.L.
 Hunter, I.K.
 Lucas, R.I. (teller)
 Ridgway, D.W.
 Wortley, R.P.

Hanson, J.E.
 Lee, J.S.
 Ngo, T.T.
 Stephens, T.J.

Motion thus negatived.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:55): I rise to speak on the Gambling Administration Bill, given that we have no choice but to do so now. In doing so, I echo the sentiments of the Hon. Tammy Franks in her contribution. We, too, received a briefing on this bill yesterday. We, too, received scant detail at best in response to most, if not all, of the questions asked. We, too, have only just received responses to some of the questions that were raised during that process, and we, too, are disappointed bitterly in the government and the opposition—and maybe perhaps particularly the opposition—in terms of their approach to this bill.

I will take the opportunity now to reflect, as did the Hon. Tammy Franks, on the lack of transparency, the lack of respect that has been shown to the crossbench. Again, as pointed out by the Hon. Tammy Franks, I point to the contribution that was made in this place last week by the

Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Clare Scriven, who, as the Hon. Tammy Franks referred to, spoke to both these bills for a total of less than six minutes. The courtesy that she afforded the Gambling Administration Bill was a contribution of 397 words—397 words.

The opposition's contribution on these bills is a reflection not only of the deal done between the government and the opposition, which has been well articulated by the Hon. Tammy Franks; it is a reflection of the lack of courtesy and respect that has been shown to the crossbench, but above everything else it is a lack of courtesy, respect and acknowledgement of the issues that problem gamblers in our society face each and every day. It is a lack of respect for every single family impacted by problem gambling and poker machines in particular. The Hon. Clare Scriven's contribution on this bill was nothing short of abysmal. It was a complete and utter disgrace.

On that point, I would like to go to another member of the opposition and refer to a letter that was sent to Shonica Guy, a well-known advocate of poker machine reforms in this jurisdiction, by a member in the other place, Ms Nat Cook, in which she stated:

Dear Shonica and the Pokies Anonymous Group

Thank you for contacting me and the Leader of the Labor Party, Peter Malinauskas MP regarding South Australian Labor's decision to support poker machine reform legislation introduced by the Marshall Liberal Government.

Firstly, let me assure you as the Shadow Minister for Human Services, in which the portfolio area of Problem Gambling falls, I take this and other gambling matters very seriously.

As justifiably unpopular as poker machines are in this state, it's the unfortunate reality that, because consecutive governments have let them in to pubs and clubs over the last 25 years, the vast majority of these businesses have got business models which rely upon them.

The Labor Cabinet and Caucus looked at the Government's reforms very closely, and we haven't blindly decided to support the legislation.

Whilst you are correct that we did support the introduction of note acceptors in South Australia, which is the last state in Australia not to have them, we will only accept such introduction if the maximum note possible is \$50.

Additionally, we have proposed a significant amount of amendments to the government which we required the government to look at before we would support the legislation.

The member then goes on to outline those amendments, including:

- LIMITING the maximum amount of credit that can be loaded into a machine to \$100, down from the current \$1000.
- BANNING EFTPOS withdrawals of more than \$250 at a venue in a 24-hour period, aligning it with ATMs.
- ALLOWING notes of only \$50 or less in acceptors.
- BLOCKING poker machine operation on Christmas Day and Good Friday.
- STOPPING State Government plans to let clubs have up to 60 poker machines, compared to the current 40 cap.
- KEEPING a currently legislated pokie reduction target, and introducing a new buyback scheme, to be funded by any extra taxes from reform.

We also believe online betting is fast becoming a bigger problem than poker machines across the country; therefore, our plan also means that online betting firms would also be forced to provide detailed data on the scale of SA activity, plus be barred from offering markets on an increased number of amateur sports.

Whilst poker machines will always be a divisive issue, the South Australian Labor party is committed to the reduction in poker machine harm; and harm caused by other forms of problem gambling.

I have never heard a bigger bunch of rubbish come from a shadow minister in relation to poker machine reforms. As articulated by the Hon. Tammy Franks, it is well-known that this legislation is the result of a deal done behind closed doors between the government and the opposition. Everybody knows that is the case. The opposition has said to me, 'Well, we didn't have any amendments to consider when we were looking at this, so we had no choice but to take the package as it existed to caucus and vote on it and vote on our amendments.'

My response to the opposition was, 'We didn't have the opportunity to provide any amendments. We didn't have any opportunity to provide any meaningful input into this bill because

you've both chosen to ram it through this parliament against—against—the normal procedures that we follow in this place.' In fact, I think yesterday it was made very clear to us that, despite the fact that we have followed every protocol that exists in this place in terms of drafting amendments, in terms of having them filed on time and in terms of making them available to members so that they have a week's notice at least to consider them before this debate is dealt with, we were told very clearly that this debate will conclude this week.

That is the process that we have chosen to follow in this instance. We have decided that we are going to gag this debate, that we are going to ignore all the stakeholders who have said quite explicitly that they have not been involved in any way in the development of this bill, that they have not been consulted on issues as important as the introduction of note acceptors. In fact, I think the advice I received yesterday at the briefing from the government was that note acceptors was not a policy when they consulted on the bill and it was put to the stakeholders after the bill was introduced, after the deal was done with the opposition. A fat lot of good that did them.

In terms of that process, and to make it clear to the opposition so there is absolutely no doubt in the Leader of the Opposition's mind as to this question, as soon as these bills were introduced the first thing that we did together with the Hon. Tammy Franks was invite all those stakeholder groups in here for a roundtable discussion. The groups that we invited included all the groups that represent the social welfare sector and all the groups that represent gambling addiction in this jurisdiction.

The Hon. E.S. Bourke: Plus Pokies Anonymous.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Plus Pokies Anonymous. They included the Centre for Economic Studies. Michael O'Neil from the Centre for Economic Studies was present. They included Shonica Guy, Pamela Higginson and Andrew Robinson from Pokies Anonymous. They included Sharon Hollamby from Communities Against Pokies. They included Dr Greg Ogle from SACOSS. They included Mark Henley from Uniting Communities. They included Dr Jane Oakes, Dr Quentin Black and Sue Lemon from PsychMed. They included Tony Mohr from the Alliance for Gambling Reform. They included Peter Sandeman from AnglicareSA, and they included Simon Schrapel, Chief Executive of Uniting Communities.

So we did our due diligence. We invited all those groups in. We certainly knew that the AHA and Clubs SA had been consulted on this bill. They had been consulted extensively. In fact, I am pretty sure, if the Treasurer would like to go back to the media monitoring records, he will find that Ian Horne was on the radio spruiking this information as 'our' legislation—not the government's legislation but 'our' legislation. That is a reflection of just how much this government chose to consult with the AHA, Clubs SA, the poker machine barons and the poker machine lobby, rather than the people who are left to deal with the mess of poker machines each and every day in this state. That is who the government chose to consult with over this bill.

In terms of that issue of transparency, procedure and process, as I made clear to the Leader of the Opposition, once we had that round table discussion, our next step was to go straight to parliamentary counsel to ask for amendments to be drafted. That is what we have been doing for the last couple of weeks.

For the last fortnight, we have been drafting amendments to this bill and the next bill. But, of course, if we were following normal process, the government would know—and I am sure they know very well—that in order to draft amendments to this bill we obviously have to wait for the outcome of the lower house debate. So those amendments could not be finalised any sooner than they were. In fact, right up until this morning, my staff, and I am sure the Hon. Tammy Franks' staff, have been working like—I cannot even explain the extent and the hours that they have put into this to ensure that we have something to present to this chamber today.

We have completely and utterly dismissed process. It seems that, in the last two weeks of parliament, all we are going to do is override process. We did it last week with GM crops, and we are going to do it this week with gambling reform. Yesterday, when we attended the briefing offered by the government, we asked a number of questions. A number of those questions were directly related to some of the amendments we would have liked to move—and which we will be moving.

When the Leader of the Opposition says to me, 'We haven't had a chance to reflect on your amendments,' I say to the Leader of the Opposition, 'Perhaps, if you had not gagged the debate on this bill, and the next bill, you would have had ample opportunity to reflect on them. There may be some good measures in there, some genuine measures that have been proposed that you could have considered, that would have made this bad piece of legislation slightly better.' But we are not going to do that: we are going to ignore every good measure that has been proposed by every industry expert, and we are going to take the word of the AHA and Clubs SA that this is the approach we should be adopting.

In her second reading contribution, the Attorney-General said that the bill:

...seeks to regulate and control gambling activities in the state and to repeal the Gambling Administration Act 1995. The Marshall Liberal government is committed to gambling laws that meet contemporary needs and community expectations while maintaining the right balance between reducing the risks and costs to the community and individuals from harm caused by gambling and the maintenance of an economically viable and socially responsible gambling industry in South Australia.

I have never heard a bigger bunch of rubbish my life. This government, the Attorney, claims that this bill:

...meet[s] contemporary needs and community expectations while maintaining the right balance between reducing the risks and costs to the community...

That is the very community that she failed to consult with appropriately in response to this bill. That is who she claims to be supporting with the introduction of this bill.

We know all too well that since their introduction into pubs and clubs in 1994, poker machines have driven an exponential increase in gambling losses in SA, and with it enormous social and economic harm. Over \$14.3 billion has been lost, while state government has collected over \$5.6 billion in tax revenues, and that is not even to mention what the poker machine lobby has gained in revenue.

The minute that poker machine lobby saw their revenue being threatened, being at risk, with the introduction of new limits on machines—\$5 down from \$10—what did they do? They lobbied the new government for changes that would suit their needs, they lobbied the government for note acceptors and they lobbied the government to get rid of social effect certificate tests, because none of that suited their agenda. They were looking at a hole in their revenue and they wanted to fill it, and this government has obliged. They have done absolutely everything in their power to ensure that their friends in the poker machine industry do not suffer any more losses to their revenue. They have also done that to ensure that they are propping up their own revenue base that they get from poker machines.

The gambling industry in SA and its large poker machine owners have disproportionate economic and political influence, with both the government and the opposition seemingly falling over each other to keep them happy, and nothing could be more true than that today when we see both the government and the opposition trying to gag this debate in order to ram these bills through this parliament. In their aggressive pursuit of profit, they have unleashed an enormous amount of individual, family and community misery, something we do not talk about in this place at all.

We are quite happy to stand up here and talk about statistics on suicide, but we ignore the fact that over 400 people a year—more than one person a day—take their lives because of a gambling addiction. We do not talk about that in here. We talk about statistics on suicide in every other respect, but we ignore the fact that more people lose their lives through gambling addiction in this country than many other forms of addiction, illness or violence.

In response to those sorts of statistics, this government and the former government have failed to provide responsible and effective regulation to protect the community. We know that for every one problem gambler at least seven other individuals are impacted. We know that crimes are committed as a result of problem gambling. We know that people steal. We know that it results in other forms of disruption to families' lives each and every day. People lose their jobs, they go to gaol, they steal and they commit suicide because of gambling addiction. But that's okay: we will just ram a bill through parliament that makes gambling addiction more of a problem and more of a burden on

the community, without even taking into account the total social and economic cost to our communities.

We have been clear all along in relation to our position on gambling reform. On that note, I note that the Leader of the Opposition has recently taken a swipe at me and at SA-Best for its blind ideology on matters that are raised in this place—blind ideology on matters that concern unions. But there is no blind ideology when it comes to problem gambling. There is no blind ideology when it comes to the cost to the community. There is no blind ideology when it comes to suicides. There is no blind ideology when people end up in gaol. There is only blind ideology when we do not support a bill that suits the opposition's agenda, or that suits this government's agenda.

I am very happy to stand up in this place now, today, tomorrow, next week, next year, and use my position to support those people who voted us into this place and to ensure that we remain true to our values and principles—values and principles of transparency, accountability and openness—even when the government and opposition choose to get together behind closed doors and do a cosy deal that suits the poker machine barons to the detriment of our communities.

We make no apologies for that. Research by the Productivity Commission and two landmark research reports indicate that about 40 per cent of poker machine losses come from those people who experience severe problem gambling harm. In its 2010 report—one that I am sure the Treasurer is all too familiar with—the Productivity Commission noted that nationally there were at least 80,000 to 160,000 people suffering severe problems from their gambling, and between 230,000 and 350,000 Australians at real risk of a full-blown gambling addiction. That equates to almost one person per machine having a severe gambling problem, and almost two other people—1.7—at risk of a full-blown gambling addiction Australia wide.

The opposition can come into this place and say, 'Look at us, we've secured an inquiry into online gambling', and we have not for one second ever underestimated the impacts of online gambling, but to correct the Leader of the Opposition in this place, who is not even here today, but poker machine reform, poker machine addiction in this state—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: He's at a funeral.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Okay. Well, whoever is in the role of the Leader of the Opposition—we do not know because we have not been told—poker machine addiction far outweighs online gambling in terms of its prevalence to this day. They are not my stats, they are official stats. Poker machine addiction still outweighs online gambling in terms of its addictiveness and prevalence in this country.

It drives up levels of crime, poverty, depression and other serious mental health problems. The majority of gambling-related fraud is due to poker machines. The poker machine fraud generates crimes amongst many otherwise non-offending citizens. Whatever the government makes in poker machine revenue in the short term is just not worth it in the long term.

The economic impact cannot be underestimated either, because on average we know that over the last 10 years alone some \$731 million has been lost each year on poker machines in hotels and clubs in South Australia. That is money diverted away not just from individuals who have lost their money and their families but it also deprives retailers, supermarkets and other small businesses of valuable revenue.

A study by the Adelaide University centre for economics found that for every \$1 million spent on poker machines only three jobs were created, compared with more than double that for \$1 million spent on retail and double again for jobs created in hospitality, in cafes, in fast food and in restaurants. For every \$100 million not spent on poker machines but spent on retail goods, there would be 300 to 350 additional jobs in retail and more than double this in hospitality, cafes, restaurants and other small businesses. They are the statistics we fail to acknowledge in this debate. That is the long-term outcome we could be looking at, but instead we are not only focused but stuck on the short-term gain from poker machines across this state.

On 8 November 2019, The SA Centre for Economic Studies published a media release in response to this gambling package and in that release they said, 'Giving gamblers ready access to cash and allowing electronic gaming machines to accept banknotes will only worsen the situation for

problem gamblers in South Australia.' That is the review of researchers at the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies at the University of Adelaide, a view that has been completely ignored and undermined in this debate.

The Centre for Economic Studies has been a leader in analysing the economic and social impacts of gambling activities, particularly electronic gaming machines, for more than 20 years. The government has not bothered to reach out to them during this debate. Speaking about the state government's amendments to gambling laws which are currently before parliament, Professor Michael O'Neil said:

The State Government has argued that its reforms will help protect the community 'against gambling-related harm.' To say that these proposed amendments are concerned with 'harm minimisation' contradicts all serious gambling research.

Serious gambling research that did not see the light of day in the government's consideration when it drafted these bills. In relation to note acceptors he states:

The introduction of note acceptors compounds an existing problem in South Australia: easy access to cash through EFTPOS inside a gaming room and ATMs inside venues with gaming facilities.

'Other states have banned ATMs and EFTPOS in gaming machine areas of clubs, hotels, and in most casinos', Professor O'Neil said. If the gambling reforms are passed, South Australia will stand alone as the worst gambling jurisdiction in the nation for its ability to allow gamblers to access easy cash in a gaming venue. That is what the government and the opposition today can congratulate themselves on: they can congratulate themselves on standing alone, making South Australia stand alone as the worst gambling jurisdiction in the nation for its ability to allow gamblers easy access to cash in a gaming venue.

Professor O'Neil goes on to say that research in Australia and overseas clearly demonstrates that the introduction of note acceptors has reinforced problem gambling behaviour. By contrast, other research has shown that bans on the use of note acceptors has resulted in a reduction in gambling turnover and a significant drop in the number of gamblers and relatives making calls to gambling helplines. He called on the state government to follow the lead of the Victorian government and ensure that gambling data at the level of individual venues be made publicly available to enable a full assessment of the impact of gambling.

The lack of transparency and the poor record of serious gambling research commissioned in South Australia provides a veil of secrecy that is certainly not in the public interest. It reflects a lack of maturity in policy debates, leaving policymakers to fall back on conjecture and assumptions or the powerful influence of lobbyists and industries.

I hope that by the time we get to the committee stage of the bill I can have some answers in response to the questions that I asked on this very issue yesterday during the briefing that was offered to us by the Attorney-General's office and by the commissioner, specifically in relation to the issue of statistics and data and why it should or should not be made available publicly so that each and every time we front up to this place to have a debate on problem gambling, gambling addiction and poker machine reforms, we can do so with the requisite knowledge and the requisite information that we need, research that we need, to make informed decisions.

Informed decisions as opposed to the sorts of decisions that have been made in this place today; informed decisions as opposed to backdoor deals between the government and the opposition that have completely dismissed, undermined and ignored the research that has been done in this area, the experts who have provided feedback in this area and the knowledge that they had to share with both the government and the opposition, which was completely and utterly ignored.

It is not just us who are being shown a lack of respect and courtesy, it is not just the community that is being shown a lack of respect and courtesy—to their detriment, I might add—but it is also those people who we rely on each and every day in this place to inform us about the decisions that we make about the welfare of those individuals in this state.

I am sure that when the Treasurer speaks on this he will tell us that a gambling addict will walk over cut glass to access a poker machine if they have an addiction—I am sure of it. I have heard it before. It has stayed with me for years: they will walk over cut glass. No-one has argued against

that, but our job in this place is to ensure that we provide appropriate harm minimisation measures, that we provide appropriate protections to those who are most vulnerable in our communities. That is what we have failed to do in this instance.

We have failed, at the most fundamental level, to afford to those individuals who need them the most the protections they deserve against problem gambling, against gambling addiction, and against poker machines. That is what we are achieving today.

In relation to the issue of the social effects certificate and note acceptors, as well as a number of other issues I have spoken to, I indicate that I will have a lot more to say about those matters when we get to the gambling regulation bill. We have touched on some of those matters now because all these bills are interrelated, they are linked and are reliant upon each other, but when we finally get to the gambling regulation bill—which no doubt will be very shortly—I will have a lot more to say on those measures, and I am sure the Hon. Tammy Franks will have a lot more to say on those measures as well.

In the meantime I would like to read from an email that was sent to me in relation to this bill from someone referred to earlier, Sharon Hollamby of Communities Against Pokies. She is one of the individuals who has been trying, at length, to ensure there is some sense of transparency in this debate and some sense of ensuring that everything gets on the record that needs to be on the record. She sent my office an email—or somebody has sent an email to my office on her behalf—saying that she has been nice enough to keep them up to date with the proposed legislation, and that they would be most grateful 'if you could share Chieu's story in parliament in opposition to these bills', because they 'don't want anyone else to have to go through' what they have gone through. I quote:

In her final note Chieu wrote 'my life has been a total wreck and it seems like each day it gets worse...I really feel lost and no matter how much I cry out for help no one is there...finally I've had enough of it and I feel the world is much better without me...I just feel like I'm stuck in the middle and everything is falling all around me and there's nothing I can do to change it. I can't hold it up. I can't stop it.'

Since that time, the email we received from Mr Anthony Neave, reads:

Dear Minister,

Four years ago today my life changed forever. My wife Chieu took her own life, leaving behind our then 16 year old son.

According to the police report, my wife 'appeared to have a serious gambling problem which resulted in her squandering a substantial amount of...money'. In the opinion of the investigating officer, this was 'one of the most prevalent (factors)' in her decision to take her own life.

As you may have heard in the news, several people, including my wife, were able to withdraw more [money] than the prescribed EFTPOS limit at the Mansfield Park Hotel. At several other venues Chieu frequented, namely the Adelaide Casino, The Regency Tavern, Greyhound Racing SA, The Bartley Tavern and the Grand Junction Tavern, she was able to withdraw \$200 three, four or on many occasions, five times per session. Who knows how many more times they would have let her [withdraw] money if she wasn't limited by the bankcards she was using.

Chieu kept her addiction hidden very well. I never once saw her in front of a machine, but the operators at these venues did, and they kept feeding her addiction, until she had lost everything and ultimately took her own life.

The last 5 years or so of my life have been emotionally very difficult. I have had to seek counselling and medical assistance for depression and anxiety on numerous occasions, not only after her death, but during our separation. Chieu lied to me many times about her addiction, and that loss of trust destroyed our marriage.

I still experience post-traumatic flashbacks after finding Chieu's body. If my son Kae had decided to go to the house to look for her that day, instead of taking the bus to school, he would have found her. I cannot begin to imagine how painful it must be for Kae to lose his mum at such a young age. I am constantly anxious about his future.

As you see, poker machine addiction impacts more than just the people who use them. They really do destroy people's lives, and they destroy families.

Less than 2 weeks after receiving a letter from the Hon. Vickie Chapman to say that 'the Government is genuinely concerned about issues associated with problem gambling,' the minister appeared on TV news announcing proposals allowing cash acceptors on machines, reducing red tape for licensees' and allowing venues to open on Christmas day and Good Friday. I'm deeply saddened that she thinks these measures will somehow reduce the harm they continue to cause. According to the executive director of the SA Centre for Economic Studies, Mr Michael O'Neil, there has been a 47% increase in losses in the Northern Territory since they introduced cash acceptors in 2013.

I implore you to vote against any changes that would increase the damage caused by these machines.

With respect,
Anthony Neave

Over the years, I have heard countless stories just like Chieu's and just like Anthony's, and that is why each and every time one of these bills comes up here I will ensure, despite how much it may annoy other members, that we do our utmost to ensure that their voices are heard during these debates, to ensure that those people who ultimately suffer the consequences of gambling addiction and their families, those people who end up committing crimes, those people who end up committing frauds, those people who end up taking their lives, are recorded in *Hansard* as a reflection of the deals done in this place when a government and an opposition get together and ram through measures that we all know, that industry experts have told us, will result in detrimental impacts for our communities.

This is a very sad day for South Australia and is yet another growing example of the Marshall government's greed, arrogance and hypocrisy, and the opposition this time round can take credit for sharing in that very same greed, arrogance and hypocrisy. I acknowledge for the benefit of the Treasurer that there are some good measures in here that we would have very happily supported had we not rammed them in between a number of very detrimental and hurtful measures, but for the Attorney to suggest, as she did in her second reading speech, that these bills 'meet contemporary needs and community expectations while maintaining the right balance between reducing the risks and costs to the community and individuals from harm caused by gambling and the maintenance of an economically viable and sociable responsible gambling industry in South Australia' is disappointing to say the least.

For those reasons, we will be opposing this bill, and we will have much more to say on the issue of the package when we get to debating the gambling regulation bill. I look forward during this debate to receiving responses to all of the questions I have so far had the opportunity to place on the record with the Attorney at the briefing that was offered yesterday.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (16:34): I move:

That the debate be now adjourned.

The council divided on the motion:

Ayes	5
Noes	14
Majority.....	9

AYES

Bonaros, C.	Darley, J.A.	Franks, T.A.
Pangallo, F.	Parnell, M.C. (teller)	

NOES

Bourke, E.S.	Dawkins, J.S.L.	Hanson, J.E.
Hood, D.G.E.	Hunter, I.K.	Lee, J.S.
Lensink, J.M.A.	Lucas, R.I. (teller)	Ngo, T.T.
Pnevmatikos, I.	Ridgway, D.W.	Stephens, T.J.
Wade, S.G.	Wortley, R.P.	

Motion thus negatived.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (16:38): I had not put myself down on the list earlier today because I had assumed that common sense would prevail, and given that the crossbench briefing was only held yesterday and that so many questions remain unanswered I had assumed that decency would prevail and the bill would be adjourned, but, clearly, deals have been done and we are now going through the motions with this bill and the two that follow it.

At the outset, I acknowledge the work of my colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks on this issue. She is the lead spokesperson for the Greens on gambling issues and she has done a good job in putting our position, and the position of those whom we seek to protect from gambling harm, on the record. So my contribution is in addition to what my colleague has said and not in substitution.

I was reflecting also on some of the remarks of the Hon. Connie Bonaros and some of the stories that she was telling of the harm that has been perpetrated on people who have gambling problems and gambling addictions. That harm obviously reaches the pinnacle of harm when people effectively die as a result of their addiction.

I was reflecting that, when I first came here in the 2006 election, a person who came somewhat out of left field, who people did not expect would do that well, was the Hon. Nick Xenophon. On a 'no pokies' ticket he secured about a quarter, from memory, of the statewide vote. I think this is an issue on which the crossbench has a lot of support in the community, and there is a lot of debate that still needs to be had, rather than just rushing this bill through in the hours that we have left in this session of parliament.

When we were discussing poker machines back in 2006, if someone had stood up and said, 'I've got an idea. Why don't we let them feed \$50 notes straight into the machine?', then people would have said, 'You're mad. We know enough about problem gambling that that would never happen.' Yet that is exactly what we are debating this afternoon, feeding \$50 notes straight into the machine.

My colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks told me about the briefing that she had yesterday. One of the documents that was provided in relation to that briefing was a list of people who attended the government's round table. That list was further annotated with the names of those organisations that had made formal submissions, and yet we do not see the government being forthcoming with providing those submissions. It may be that some of them might have been obtained by other means, but certainly I have not seen what Lifeline had to say about this bill, and I have not seen what some of the gambling organisations said. I am assuming that a lot of what they said fell on very fertile ground, but we do not know what it is they have pushed for because we have not seen the submissions.

The government also kindly provided a document that related to facial recognition. When I had a look at that brief document, the technology was not just about having a look at who is coming in the front door and matching it to see whether they are on the problem gambler list; it was also about spying on your staff to make sure they are doing their job properly, to make sure that they are doing their rounds as they are obliged to do. I do not recall that ever being highlighted as part of the reason for facial recognition technology.

When we do get into the detailed debate on these bills, I will certainly be interested in what the government has to say about facial recognition technology, because I think I am probably the person who has said most about it over the years. I was the only person who even noted in parliament that the previous South Australian government had handed over the biggest and most comprehensive database of South Australians in existence. It handed it over to the feds for the purposes of facial recognition. I am referring, of course, to the South Australian driver licence database. It is a database of increasingly high-resolution photos plus the names, addresses, dates of birth, bank details, contact details of just about every adult South Australian, and that has gone off to the feds.

I am not one for saying, 'The horse has bolted. There is no point arguing about facial recognition. Let's just assume that every government and non-government organisation or corporation has access to your mugshot and can match it electronically with a database.' I am not prepared to concede that yet. The government keeps talking about safeguards, and yet every day we get an email, even from our good friends at Parliamentary Network Support Group, telling us about the latest phishing scandal, the latest hacking attempt. Apparently just yesterday people were trying to hack into the parliamentary network.

We know from news reports that the networks of law enforcement authorities are no safer. We know that the national parliament itself has been hacked into. I do not for one minute trust that this increased reliance on facial recognition is something that is safe or that it is something that the

community accepts. Therefore, I want to explore that in a lot more detail when we get into the committee stage of these bills.

I am disappointed that the last sitting week or two is going to end like this. The government is pushing these bills through when, clearly, for members of the crossbench, this is core business. As I said, our friends at SA-Best were formerly the No Pokies party in a previous iteration, with the Hon. John Darley as well. So we have three members, together with the two Greens, for whom preventing harm from gambling is core business. For the government to say, 'Well, we've got the numbers; we're just going to push this through,' I think is an appalling way to end what has otherwise been a fairly civil session of this parliament.

It is not just in this place. In the other place they are still debating a bill. They are in the fourth hour of debate on a bill that no-one had seen until it was put on their desks at 11 o'clock. We still have not seen it here, and yet we are concerned that the government will try to ram legislation through roughshod. I have heard nothing from the government in relation to these gambling bills as to why there is a pressing need for them to pass in this week. I know the government has said they want them to pass this week.

Given the briefing was held only yesterday, given the absolutely fundamental nature of this topic to five members of this chamber, I cannot believe that the government has any pressing reason to get this through other than that they have done a deal with the Labor Party, they can get it through on the numbers and they are going to just push it through. I think that is an appalling way to manage the legislative workload.

My plea to the government would be to come back in February. We have the sitting calendar for next year. We still do not know a prorogation date, although I think it is the magical Tuesday 4 February, which would normally be a sitting date and appears to be absent from the calendar. I am expecting that that one might be it, but I have been wrong before; it might be some other time in that week. There will be no reason why the government cannot bring this back in February. That would be a much better way to proceed.

The other aspect that we do not know about is what deals have been done with the gambling industry. I can still remember one of the very first lobbyists who knocked on my door in Parliament House; he was from the Casino. I do not think he was too happy. I said, 'How come you've got a pass to Parliament House?' 'I used to work here,' he said. He still had his pass—in Parliament House, knocking on members' doors, lobbying. We got his pass taken away; that was good thing. I know that lobbyists from the gambling industry are in the ears of members of the major parties, if not constantly then very regularly.

I also remember, as a very young fresh-eyed member of parliament, the very first committee luncheon that I was invited to. I thought, 'I will go along to that and be collegial.' It was at the Casino. I thought, 'I'm not really interested in that.' It was in the restaurant attached to the Casino. We sat down and the deal was that we were all going to pay for ourselves, but within a short period of time a man who I did not know turned up. Everyone else seemed to know him quite well. The first question was, 'What are you drinking?' And all of a sudden, he snaps his fingers and another bottle of the same wine emerged. Given the person who was choosing the wine was incredibly knowledgeable about wine, it was not the cheapest on the list, I can tell you.

When I went to leave, I got my wallet out and I paid for my lunch, and I could see other members begrudgingly getting their wallets out. As I was leaving, the person who I did not know said, 'Don't worry about it; it's on the house. It's fine.' Members of parliament getting a free feed at the expense of the Casino, and then they wonder why we ask questions in this place when gambling bills are brought forward.

Similarly with the Casino expansion, driving down King William Road the other day I realised that you have now lost sight of a lot of the vista because of that new extension. I keep calling it the railway station. I think I am probably the last person to call it that. For everyone else, it is the Casino, an appalling privatisation of an important public space, as far as I am concerned. We know that there are ongoing arguments about the five-storey car park that will be built behind Parliament House. The key issue there is: how many car parks can we wrangle from the Casino for the staff and members of parliament?

The gambling industry get so many concessions from government and their lobbyists haunt these corridors with apparently gay abandon. So I am very nervous about the deals that are being done. We will forensically examine these bills in detail. We will ask the questions and we will try to get to the bottom of it, but in the meantime I put those brief comments in relation to the second reading. We will see where these debates go from here.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:50): I move that the debate be adjourned.

The PRESIDENT: I understand from the Clerk that it was only 12 minutes, so the motion was not validly put. Greater attention needs to be placed on the clock. I rule that the motion is invalid, on the advice of the Clerk, on time.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (16:50): I rise to put on the record that I am wholeheartedly supportive of the SA-Best and Greens amendments to the bill that have recently been filed. These amendments address some of the very problematic elements of the bill, such as the introduction of note acceptors onto electronic gaming machines. The amendments aim to make improvements for problem gamblers and I am supportive of those measures.

I think it is appalling that the government has removed the prohibition on note acceptors on pokies. The government believes that they are introducing a harm minimisation measure because they have legislated that the maximum note that will be accepted will be \$50. This is laughable and demonstrates that the government has no understanding of problem gambling, or that they simply do not care. The cash withdrawal limit of \$250 per card per cash facility is also a measure that has been dressed up to be done in the name of harm minimisation but is so far off the mark that I am not sure the same game is being played.

Given my previous stance on \$1 bet limits and EFTPOS facilities in gaming venues, I do not think it would be a surprise that I will be opposing much of this bill and supporting the SA-Best and Greens amendments. I know other members have lengthy contributions to the bill and I do not want to repeat what they have to say. With that, I support the second reading of the bill.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:52): I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The council divided on the motion:

Ayes..... 5
 Noes 13
 Majority 8

AYES

Bonaros, C.	Darley, J.A.	Franks, T.A.
Pangallo, F. (teller)	Parnell, M.C.	

NOES

Bourke, E.S.	Dawkins, J.S.L.	Hanson, J.E.
Hood, D.G.E.	Hunter, I.K.	Lee, J.S.
Lensink, J.M.A.	Lucas, R.I. (teller)	Ngo, T.T.
Pnevmatikos, I.	Ridgway, D.W.	Stephens, T.J.
Wortley, R.P.		

Motion thus negatived.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:56): I rise to say that I will be, obviously, joining my colleagues in opposing this bill. I would like to thank the Hon. Mark Parnell, the Hon. Tammy Franks and the Hon. John Darley for their words, and, obviously, the Hon. Connie Bonaros, who has been very passionate over a long time about the impacts that poker machines have had on people not only in our community but also in the wider Australian community.

I have been around a long time. I can still remember the days when poker machines were introduced in South Australia. At the time, it was done with perhaps more anticipation of a boost to the state's economy. There was also the fact that the hotel industry was really suffering because of the onset of drink-driving laws in South Australia. I do not think many people realise that just as we have seen here, where deals have been concocted, a deal was concocted in those days.

The hotel lobby was very strong in South Australia. It had strong influences through the media, and I am quite familiar with the influence that they had on various sections of the media here. They felt that the introduction of drink-driving laws had impacted on their revenue streams. They wanted something to supplement that, to supplement what they were doing, and of course we had the start of the insidious what I think we used to call at the time 'one-armed bandits'. That is what they were known as in New South Wales, in the clubs over there.

I remember in my youth visiting clubs in New South Wales where they had these so-called one-armed bandits. I could see the impact that they were having on people playing them. They became quite addictive for them. Also, they raised a lot of money for those particular clubs that had the licences for that, and a lot of that money went into the community generally. Of course, here it was a different thing. It was not the clubs that were going to benefit as such. It was actually the hotels, the pokie barons, the people who owned some of the biggest chains of hotels in South Australia.

There was much excitement when these machines were introduced, but at the same time a lot of naivety because nobody really in those days had done any research into the impacts that it would have on people: that there would be problem gambling, that there would be issues that would result from problem gambling, including increasing crime, issues with family violence, homelessness—all those issues were never taken into consideration when the government of the day decided it would introduce these machines.

Twenty-five years on, I have spoken to one of the Labor members whose vote was quite crucial in that, the Hon. John Trainer, former Speaker of the House of Assembly, and he tells me how sorry, regretful and shameful he feels because he voted for it. To this day he regrets that he and the parliament did not stand up and oppose these machines. We have seen over a period of time that people become quite wealthy. The pokie barons have become quite wealthy as a result of the losses incurred by the most vulnerable people in South Australia.

It is incredible that the Australian Hotels Association, which has been at the forefront of promoting its gaming venues and also in supporting this legislation, which the Hon. Connie Bonaros has aptly described what they claim is 'our legislation', can wield so much influence in this town—not only influence in terms of its lobbying strength but also the amount of money it can expend in trying to prop itself up, prop up its ill-gotten profits.

That could not have been more evident than at the 2018 election, when the former senator, Nick Xenophon, who headed our party—Nick Xenophon, SA-Best—was running. The opinion polls were very strong for SA-Best at the time. Nick had built quite a strong following in South Australia because of his strong stand against poker machines and other social justice issues. Nick stood up for the downtrodden, for the voiceless, the people who needed help, and he was particularly strong when it came to these insidious poker machines. He earned enough respect and support in the community to be elected to parliament.

Nick continued his strong stand against these machines right up until he was beaten at the state election. Let me just say—let's not beat around the bush—that the reason the Liberals are in office today is because of the influence and money that had been poured into that campaign by the Australian Hotels Association, of course run by its chief executive, Ian Horne. I cannot ever recall a campaign like that, particularly where one group had such a strong presence in trying to impose itself on the South Australian community, impose its will by spreading complete untruths about what would happen if Nick Xenophon and members of his party were elected to the House of Assembly and also to the upper house, the impact it would have on things like live entertainment, jobs and all that sort of stuff. It was totally unfounded, totally baseless.

I think the biggest shock came afterwards when we learnt how much they had spent. It turns out that the Australian Hotels Association has emerged as the second-largest political donor in Australia with declared political gifts leaping from \$153,000 in 2016-17 to \$1.1 million last financial

year: \$1.1 million last financial year from the Australian Hotels Association—buying influence; that's how they bought elections in South Australia and in Tasmania.

The AHA's generosity was also focused strongly on the Tasmanian division of the Liberal Party, which received \$289,000 as it fought an election campaign against the Labor Party which, at the time, showed a bit of gumption because it promised to ban poker machines in the state's pubs. We do not get that promise here from Labor. We did not get that and now we know why we did not get it, because they were resoundingly beaten by a campaign that was launched by the AHA.

According to figures released from the AEC that covered the 2017-18 financial year, the AHA of South Australia donated nearly \$325,000 to the South Australian Liberal Party, the South Australian ALP, and the Australian Conservatives. So there you go: hence why we have such a cosy sweetheart arrangement between Labor and the government over this bill.

The Tasmanian Liberal top five declared donors all had poker machine interests and together they gave the party \$513,750 in 2017-18. New data from the Australian Electoral Commission shows that further donations to the Tasmanian Liberals flowed from mainland gambling interests including \$12,000 from the Australian Hotels Association's federal office and \$2,750 from Tabcorp. The Tasmanian Liberals received \$4.1 million in total donations compared with just \$1 million to the state's Labor Party. The Liberal Party only had to declare the source of \$950,000 of that sum because they are not compelled to declare donors who give less than \$13,500. More than half the Tasmanian Liberal Party's declared donations came from poker machine owners or their representatives.

The Tasmanian election was a test case, according to author and historian James Boyce who said, 'We now know what happens when a political party dares to campaign against the poker machine industry.' Mr Boyce also said:

Your political opponents will be given whatever they ask to destroy you. They use that money to buy up all the available advertising space.

Does this ring a bell, Mr President? It should ring a bell to Labor and the Liberals because that is what happened here. You could not help but notice, if you picked up *The Advertiser* during the election campaign, the AHA ads all over the place: you saw them on television, you heard them on radio and they were all over the internet.

The Tasmanian federal MP Andrew Wilkie said that lax disclosure regulations mean that voters would never know how much money the gambling lobby donated to the Tasmanian Liberal Party. Mr Wilkie said:

This is a mind-blowing amount of money in itself but it's all the more alarming when you consider all of the spending that isn't disclosed.

Quoting him again:

No big political donor hands over money without expecting a return on that investment and the poker machine industry sure did hit paydirt at last year's state election.

Here we have it today, all this hysteria going on in the other states about Chinese influence, money being donated to political parties, perhaps to curry favour with those political parties, yet here no-one says anything about a major lobby group, the AHA, throwing millions of dollars into political campaigns. How is that? We will probably need legislation to prevent this from happening in future.

I must point out the role of Ian Horne in all this. There he was at the head; he was the figurehead of the AHA's campaign throughout, all the ads were authorised by Ian Horne. Yet there he is, sitting on the board of the South Australian Tourism Commission—and he was reappointed again this year. I think that has the odour of a job for the boys, thank you very much.

Mr Horne certainly has an interest in the hotel industry, and we know that the hotel industry is a big part of tourism in this state. However, is it appropriate that a person who oversaw the spending of millions of dollars in an election campaign, in a political campaign, should then be able to hold a government position such as that?

There is no doubt that this legislation—let me say, probably the most vile, vulgar legislation I have seen come before the South Australian parliament—is some kind of a pay back to the AHA. We know they have been whingeing that their profits from gaming have been diminishing, so they

needed some kind of a prop up for their profits. Of course, you boost their profits and up go their taxes.

This legislation is all about propping up the gaming industry in South Australia, propping up the AHA and, of course, propping up the Casino next door and that edifice that is currently going up. It looks like it is going up quite quickly. Members may have noticed the exterior; by the time it is finished I think I will give it the moniker 'The Midas Tower', because that is what is going to happen. They will hope it will attract more gamblers to go in there, they will have more machines in there for gamblers to play—and, of course, these machines are going to be different.

That is probably part of the reason the government is so keen to rush this legislation through, because not only will hotels benefit, we know that the Casino will also benefit from note acceptors. Note acceptors are something I find totally abhorrent, and I would say that the rest of the South Australian community would find them totally abhorrent, in a world where gambling seems to be almost accepted as part of our society these days.

In Australia we seem to be renowned for our affinity for gambling. Whether it is on racehorses, two snails, flies going up a wall, two-up or whatever, Australians seem to have a penchant for gambling. Of course, we now have casinos and with those casinos we have online gambling as well, which is now probably going to be one of the worst of these influences from gambling that we can imagine. Online gambling is, to me—in fact gambling is—the tobacco of the 21st century. No doubt about it.

Online gambling is going to present our society with a lot of problems in future. You see constantly on television, in newspapers, on radio, on the internet, the online gambling companies that are constantly peppering users with their advertisements to entice people to go and gamble. But they are not only enticing adults, they are also enticing the next generation of gambling addicts: young kids.

There is nothing more disturbing than sitting down with my family—for instance, while I was watching the soccer World Cup, with young kids, young nephews, around me—and suddenly, as the teams come out, it cuts to a commercial break with an online gambling pundit giving you the odds as the game is about to start. What message is that sending to the young kids? I have also had young kids, when we are discussing AFL football and the winning chances of the Adelaide Crows or Port Adelaide Power, it is always prefaced with, 'Oh, you know, Uncle Frank, they are a \$1.30 favourites on Sportsbet.'

Really? Is that how you judge which team is going to win, based on what their sporting odds are? That is where society has gone in Australia and we are continuing to encourage that with money that has been thrown at improving facilities that encourage gambling, supporting gambling venues, like this legislation here.

I want to go back to the note acceptors and just how repulsive this type of machine is going to be to the unfortunates who are attracted to these gaming machines. Just think about it: today, they put in coins, and the coins can act as a bit of a break because if you run out of your coins I guess you can always go out and try to get a few more, so there is an opportunity there to at least take a break from the habit. With notes, you do not have that. With notes, you can just keep feeding the machine. It will empty the wallets of workers, it will empty the purses of pensioners, it will just keep taking money.

You can also withdraw money from within gaming venues. How sickening is that? That is something that the last Labor government allowed, for people to withdraw cash inside gaming venues. What concerns do they have about problem gamblers or trying to curb it? None. I hark back to some comments that were made by Professor Michael O'Neil, an extremely well-respected academic at the Centre for Economic Studies. Here is what Professor O'Neil had to say when the Attorney-General released details of the legislation. He says:

...South Australia was the only state and territory not to have banknote acceptors...both in clubs and hotels and the Casino...South Australia had an enviable track record [there] because the research on gambling in regard to banknote acceptors shows that the introduction of note acceptors into hotels and clubs leads to a substantial increase basically in losses by the individual and the Productivity Commission and all other researchers that have looked at it have basically counselled against banknote acceptors [and] certainly, if [there is to be a] limit of about \$20 as the load

up limit...there are elements of the proposed changes in the gambling area that I think will have serious implications for problem gamblers and people who are vulnerable to excessive gambling.

He had a blunt message for the government. He said:

...state governments pay lip service to the research done by gambling researchers. South Australia I think, not only the Centre for Economic Studies, but Dr Paul Delfabbro, in the psychology department, one of the top researchers in the world, [says] governments also pay lip service to research and, in fact, they will use Orwellian doublespeak basically to say, 'Well, the introduction of note acceptors is a protection against harm,' because, what, the individual will go up to a machine, an ATM or an EFTPOS machine, and withdraw cash and go back to the machine and put it in. Very, very limited human contact...we know that there [was also] court case [recently where] one hotel that did not police individuals accessing money from EFTPOS machines not once, not twice, but a number of times, so this is just one venue that's now in the forefront of the public domain. How [often] does this occur?

he asks. He continues:

[So] this is the problem: the government use Orwellian doublespeak. They ignore research. They basically listen to the industry.

And we know why. It continues:

...South Australia introduced the fact that a gambler could access cash inside the gaming area...[actually] inside...where the machines are...to my knowledge—

Michael O'Neil said—

this was absolutely a ridiculous policy...I can't find anywhere in the world in which a problem gambler is able to access cash inside a gaming area...South Australia claims it's at the forefront of harm minimisation. Well, South Australia, with the banknote acceptors and accessing the cash in gaming venue, is probably the laggard of all states and territories...

In Victoria, there are no ATMs in hotels or clubs with gambling, but there are in South Australia. You cannot access the gaming area in Victoria but you can in South Australia. There are strict limits on EFTPOS in Victoria. Victoria has trialled pre-commitment...South Australia has not. So, South Australia's research in this area is very, very poor...

Overall, this is a very bad public policy without sufficient consultation and there's not a balance between what the industry might want but what researchers have thrown through...quite good peer-review research...

Allow me to indulge the Legislative Council with some research. First, a paper from one of the world's most respected gambling analysts, Dr Charles Livingstone, and his report, 'How electronic gambling machines work'. It states:

Electronic gambling machines (EGMs), known colloquially as 'pokies', have their origins in older style lever-operated machines which spun a series of physical reels, on which were portrayed a number of winning symbols. These devices used mechanical stops to arrest the spin of the reels in order, usually from left to right. When the winning symbols lined up, a prize was delivered, usually via a coin dump into the tray at the bottom of the machine.

Today, EGMs are computers. However, many are still reminiscent of older style games, being housed in large upright boxes and utilising 'reels' that appear to spin.

At the core of any EGM is a random number generator. When a button or touch screen is activated, the computer accesses the numbers generated at that point in time and converts them to a display on the screen. The numbers correspond to a position on a 'reel map'—the number and order of symbols on each virtual reel—and a 'pay table'—the prizes awarded for each combination of symbols appearing on a line. For example, if the random process generates three Kings, this will be mapped to the pay table to pay, e.g., five credits.

Every country has its own regulations governing EGM design. This paper focusses on so-called 'Australian-style' EGMs...In the documentary film KaChing! Pokie Nation (Lawrence & Goldman, 2015), Schüll comments that Australian-style machines are seen internationally as sophisticated and successful at achieving their goal—attracting people to use them, and encouraging repeated expenditure. They were rapidly adopted by American casino operators after being introduced there in the 1990s.

Is it any wonder, if you have had look at the share market, why one of the gaming machine maker's share prices are always so high? It is a consequence of the Americans being able to uptake that technology. It continues:

In Australia, EGMs are required to conform to the Australian and New Zealand Gaming Machine Technical Standards. However, each jurisdiction requires slightly different parameter settings (return to player ratio, maximum bet, credit load-up limit etc.). Each jurisdiction also requires EGM games to be approved separately, although some regulators take notice of game approvals in other Australian jurisdictions. Australian jurisdictions outsource game approval testing to licensed private agencies, which certify games as compliant.

Policy and Regulation

In Australia, EGMs account for over \$14 billion in gambler losses, or 62% of all gambling revenue. Around \$2.5 billion of those losses occur in casinos.

That was a finding from a Productivity Commission report in 2010. The paper continues:

A recent study using nationally representative data from four countries found that while high expenditure on EGMs is associated with the most harm, harm can also accrue to those spending more moderate amounts...

Policy makers and regulators tasked with protecting gamblers and reducing harm associated with EGMs have at their disposal the Australia/New Zealand Gaming Machine National Standard...

The standard currently applies to all Australasian jurisdictions and specifies a range of technical standards required for approval by regulators. It is not without its problems. One is that each Australian jurisdiction applies distinct parameters...Another is the orientation of the standard towards technical, rather than harm prevention or reduction, priorities...

Arguably the biggest problem with the standard is that understanding of specific 'structural characteristics' of EGMs and their relationship to gambling harm and behaviours is not well reflected in it.

EGM structural characteristics...are discrete but integrated elements of game design that in the aggregate constitute the game portrayed on an EGM. They are the 'building blocks' of an EGM game.

You may be bored out there, but perhaps none of you actually know the internal operations of a modern gaming machine, so while you are passing this bill you may as well learn how these things operate and how they will be fleecing people. It continues:

Some EGM characteristics may add to the enjoyment of those who derive pleasure from the machines. The issue for policy-makers is to balance this consideration against the harm generated by an EGM characteristic. This is identical to challenges arising when developing policy and regulation for other consumer goods, services and public practices (e.g., motor vehicles).

EGM characteristics are not accidental aspects of game design, nor are they immutable. EGMs have evolved rapidly in recent years to utilise many characteristics known to increase the addictive potential of games, and, as a corollary, increase the likelihood of harmful consequences for a substantial proportion of those who use them.

So these games are designed to increase addiction. It continues:

The process of game evolution has been well documented...and its rapid growth has delivered digital devices that far exceed the revenue performance, and addictive and harm-inducing potential, of older, mechanical poker machines.

No wonder they want note acceptors on them. It continues:

Given the rapid and continuing evolution of EGM design, it appears that regulators are not always aware of the implications of some aspects of game design. Australian regulators have all 'outsourced' game testing to commercial operators who determine whether games meet the standards, and issue certification.

Research relating to many specific game characteristics and configurations is relatively modest... Facilitating researchers' understanding of the new generation of EGMs would assist regulators in the crafting and application of standards.

Rapid progress in understanding the impacts and effects of EGM design could be facilitated by providing bona fide researchers with regular access to probability accounting reports (PAR sheets), and actual game data. Improved access to actual game data would be supported by the introduction of comprehensive pre-commitment systems, enabling de-identified data sets to be generated.

Then, in an approach for public health, the author states:

Gambling regulation has become overtly aligned with public health principles in recent years. Gaming machine standards and other requirements for approval of EGM games provide an important set of tools to incorporate practical and highly effective mechanisms for the prevention and reduction of harm, and the improvement of consumer protection measures.

Understanding the effects of EGM structural characteristics, and re-orienting the national gaming machine standards towards harm prevention and reduction priorities, represents a reflection of a fundamental principle of the public health approach. Access to better information and real-world data would be of great benefit in achieving this goal.

However, there is already ample evidence available of the relationship between some important EGM structural characteristics, and the harms associated with the use of EGMs. Acting on this understanding would provide considerable benefits...

Like other forms of gambling, EGMs have a price, a kind of negative return on investment known as the 'return to player' ratio.

Let's explain the return to player ratio:

A return to player (RTP) ratio is the proportion of each wager an EGM game is designed to return on average to users. RTP represents an average deduction from the user's wager for each bet, calculated over the game cycle.

Australian jurisdictions prescribe a range of minimum RTP. In clubs and [hotels] in NSW, Victoria, Tasmania, Queensland and the Northern Territory, minimum RTP is set at 85%. In the ACT, minimum RTP is 87%, and in South Australia it is 87.5%. EGMs in casinos generally have a higher minimum RTP (reflecting their greater turnover and higher bet limits).

So the Casino is going to benefit greatly. It continues:

If minimum RTP is set at 85%, this means that, over the long term (often described as the 'game cycle'), the game must return to the user at least 85% of the amount they wager.

The prescribed method of calculation for this to be achieved varies between jurisdictions. In Victoria, the actual RTP is calculated by assessing the aggregated wagers and total returns paid to users over the course of a year for all EGMs operating within a specific venue...In other jurisdictions, an individual machine must return at least the minimum RTP over its game cycle. The game cycle, however, may be many years, because of the large number of possible outcomes...

A machine's theoretical return to player ratio (TRTP) is determined by its 'game maths': the interaction of the configuration of the game's 'reel maps', the number and order of symbols on each virtual reel, and the 'pay table', the prizes awarded for each combination of symbols appearing on a line.

A game's TRTP can be readily determined mathematically, but it is important to note that TRTP is very unlikely to be achieved on an EGM game in the scale of an individual user's interaction with the game. Most EGM games have a very large number of potential outcomes—frequently 50,000,000 or more.

Dolphin Treasure, a relatively old-style EGM game still provided in many Australian venues, has 35,640,000 possible outcomes. This can be derived from the number of symbols on each of the five reels utilised by the game—

and the formula for that is—

$(30 \times 30 \times 30 \times 30 \times 44)$. Thus, the time to traverse the full repertoire of possible outcomes of such a game would require a minimum—

get this: a minimum—

of 5.6 years of continuous use (at game intervals of 5 seconds per spin, for 24 hours per day, every day).

Are you getting dizzy, Treasurer? It continues:

However, the probability that even such a time commitment would produce all possible results in an EGM game is very close to zero.

Let us look at the reality of player returns:

The price of EGM games can be defined as $1 - \text{RTP}$, so that an RTP of 85% (or 0.85) produces an average price per wager of 0.15 or 15%. That is, the 'house edge' for Australian EGMs is as high as 15%. It is...rare for such an outcome to be achieved in the short term.

However, in an experiment where the price of a game was varied substantially (and rather more than occurs in practice—between 2% and 15%), users were reportedly able to detect this...

In some Australian jurisdictions, RTP must be displayed on a user information screen, while others prescribe that such information must be available at a venue upon request. But even when disclosed, the question remains whether EGM users understand the meaning of RTP or its relevance to their outcomes.

I may well have to, when the Casino opens up, borrow *Hansard* and go with them because they will get an explanation here of how it all works. It continues:

The bottom line is that, unlike in other addictive consumptions, such as alcohol and tobacco, price as a concept is difficult to apply to the case of EGMs.

Common misconceptions

Many EGM users believe that if the game is operated in a fair manner they should leave gambling venues with an amount consistent with the return to player ratio as advertised—that is, 85% or 87% of their stake (depending on jurisdiction).

In this state, 87.5%. It continues:

In fact, the 'price' calculation is best conceived as the deduction of the price factor, the (1-RTP) on average for each bet wagered (i.e., for each spin).

A user operating an EGM with a price of 15% will on average lose 15% of their wager at each spin. The effect is cumulative. So, if a user inserts \$10 and wagers \$1 each spin, even if the game performs exactly as predicted (and this is extremely unlikely), the user would exhaust their funds in little more than five minutes (at the rate of one wager every five seconds). With \$5 bets, this process would occupy a little over a minute.

So imagine when you have note acceptors how quickly that is going to be, how quickly they are going to lose their shirts. It continues:

In a simulation of the popular game Black Rhino, the Productivity Commission undertook an exercise to calculate the mean and median time on a device with a given stake. Their calculation, based on a \$30 stake, \$1.50 in wagers and 5-second spins, was that average time on the game before the funds were expended was 13 minutes and 4 seconds, with a median time of less than four minutes.

The maths behind major prizes is just as stark. The Productivity Commission developed a calculation to assess the number of spins that would be required to provide a 50% probability of winning the major prize on an EGM. Applying their calculation to the Dolphin Treasure game, it would require 24,703,765 spins to achieve a 50% probability (a 1 in 2 chance) of winning the major prize. Wagering a single line at 40¢ per spin at intervals of five seconds, this would cost nearly \$1.2 million and occupy 1,429.6 days (or 3.9 years) of continuous use.

The betting 'strategy' of users will influence time on a [machine]... If a user bets only one credit on one 'line', they may experience extended time on the game compared to the above examples. However, most experienced EGM users employ a 'mini-max' or a similar strategy, whereby they will select multiple lines... and bet the minimum on each line. This means that no 'winning' line will be missed. It also makes 'losses disguised as wins' possible.

If gamblers' demand for EGM gambling were highly responsive to price—that is, if users changed their behaviour as prices rose—then the conclusion would be that EGMs had significant price elasticity. Raise the price and lower the demand. The Productivity Commission has noted a lack of evidence of price elasticity for gambling in general, and in particular for EGMs. But on the basis of available evidence, the Productivity Commission concluded that demand for EGMs was most likely price inelastic, because of the lack of price information and the lack of substitute ability.

Although in casinos alternative gambling forms, such as somewhat lower priced table games, are readily available, [the Productivity Commission reported that] EGM users continue to utilise EGMs—which may cost as much as 10 times the price of a table game...

Let us look at the structural characteristics of EGMs:

The goal of game designers is to maximise revenue per available customer (RevPAC) and 'time on device' (ToD). For the most part, designers utilise structural characteristics to do so...

Structural characteristics define the capacity of EGMs to induce substantial expenditure in users. They may also have an addictive or habituating effect on users...

Basic psychological characteristics underpin all EGM designs. These characteristics deliver 'reinforcement' to users; render games attractive to, or popular with, users; and appear to be associated with the establishment of persistent game utilisation or addiction. There are many such characteristics delivering game outcomes, and it is appropriate to consider them as relevant to harm minimisation interventions. All psychological characteristics are amenable to modification, given the computer-based nature of EGMs...

In psychology, reinforcement means anything that increases the likelihood that a response will occur...

Operant conditioning is a psychological concept related to the provision of an irregular, variable or random schedule of reinforcement—that is, of rewards or 'prizes'...

It has been repeatedly demonstrated that animals (including humans) develop habitual behaviour when exposed to an unpredictable pattern of rewards in response to specific activities.

You may like to draw an analogy to the 2018 state election. It continues:

Operant conditioning is a key element of EGM design and is incorporated in EGM games via their 'game maths': the interplay of random outcomes and the reward schedule of the game.

Variables of EGM operant conditioning.

Volatility.

This concept relates to the extent to which an EGM game conforms in the short term to its programmed overall...outcomes. For example, a game with a 90% return to player ratio (RTP) can achieve that outcome by providing a steady stream of small rewards, or by providing larger rewards more infrequently. The latter game would be regarded as more volatile than the former...

Frequency of rewards is related to the volatility of a game and its prize structure. If rewards are awarded regularly, the game is likely to have a lower maximum prize, or to provide that maximum prize only very rarely; this may permit users with a fixed stake to use the game for a longer period than a more volatile game...

The structure of rewards is also related to volatility and frequency of rewards. A game with many modest rewards may have a lower or rarer jackpot than a more volatile game. However, a game with regular modest rewards may also have a large maximum reward if it does not have a spread of rewards in the middle ranges, or if that maximum reward is very rare...

Many games offer jackpots, which may be either stand-alone or linked. Stand-alone jackpots apply to a single machine. Linked jackpots contribute to an aggregate prize pool, which is accessible as a single jackpot for any user of a linked machine.

In either case, if the jackpot is what is known as 'progressive' the game makes a pre-determined contribution to the jackpot pool, which is then paid to the user who achieves the successful combination of symbols. The effect of this is to lower the actual return to player (RTP) to users who use the game without achieving a jackpot payout. The user of such a game is unlikely to understand the impact of this effect.

In other words, they are totally oblivious to what is actually going on inside the electronic brain of that EGM. They just blindly feed in their coins—or will soon be blindly feeding in their notes—unaware that all this is pre-programmed to achieve a desired result for the operator of that machine. It continues:

For example, the game's base theoretical RTP may be 87%. If 5% is contributed to a linked jackpot, the base RTP for that game alone will be reduced to 82%. Stand-alone jackpots operate in a similar manner. RTP is calculated having regard to the effects of jackpot contributions.

Progressive jackpots permit the game to portray large prizes as available, although the most likely effect is to reduce the user's 'time on device' for a specific amount of money relative to a similar game without a progressive jackpot.

Some progressive jackpots may be less than completely random: that is, the probability of these events occurring may vary from time to time. This type of jackpot may arise by use of a 'deterministic' algorithm which imposes some constraint on the conditions under which the jackpot may be achieved. This may involve a combination of the amount the jackpot pool contains, the number of EGMs being utilised within the linked network, or the number of bets made within a certain time period. This is in contradiction of the usual random nature of EGMs, and is another characteristic generally not well explained to EGM users.

They would not have a clue how this thing operates. I am sure that if they did they would have second thoughts and think, 'Oh, well, am I ever going to beat this machine?' It continues:

The parameter constraints of progressive jackpots may not be apparent to EGM users, although Hing (2007) has reported that some criminal syndicates have attempted to dominate the use of EGMs on linked networks when they believe an algorithm's conditions have been met.

The maximum prize available on a game may also be referred to as a 'jackpot'. However, a maximum prize jackpot is non-progressive (i.e., the size of the prize is not increased via the contributions of users), and the RTP of the game incorporates the effect of this—usually very rare—event.

Non-deterministic jackpots, like all other prizes on EGMs, have a constant probability of occurring at any time...

There is some evidence that jackpots influence user behaviour, including increasing expenditure and bet size...

The maximum value of rewards on EGM games is related to volatility and reward structure. Maximum prizes in Australia are generally subject to a regulated maximum value of \$10,000, although unrestricted games available in casinos may offer higher maximum prizes.

Classical conditioning.

Classical conditioning, made famous by Ivan Pavlov...postulates that animals, including humans, will learn to associate favourable and rewarding outcomes or events with specific physiological stimuli—for example, sounds, lights, odours and sensations. There is ample evidence that classical conditioning can be associated with any type of stimulus, and that it is as effective in humans as in other animals.

It has been some time since I have been in a gaming venue, but people who have been in there have asked if anyone has ever seen a clock inside a gaming venue? I have not. It continues:

EGM games typically signal delivery of rewards with a combination of melodies and sounds, visual displays—such as lights and colourful images—and, in some cases, messages indicating a 'successful' outcome.

Such signals become associated with the achievement of a successful outcome (a reward) and deliver classical reinforcements across a range of highly stimulating audio-visual stimuli...

Messaging on EGMs is typically reinforcing. Messages displayed on the screen may congratulate the user on their 'good fortune' or 'luck'; they may indicate the scale of the reward (usually by an accumulating display of 'win' credits); in some cases, they may suggest that the user is beating the odds. Congratulatory messages of this nature are not universal, but where they are displayed they provide users with a reinforcing message indicating that rewards reflect the user's luck or good fortune.

Regarding messaging, I think we know that gaming machines in South Australia were supposed to have messages, messages that would—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: We cannot do that here? We can do everything else that indicates how lucky you have been or how much you have won but, no, I think more than 80 per cent cannot display messages that have warnings about problem gambling. They need more time and perhaps need more money—it may come through the note acceptors. It continues:

Melodies for EGMs are typically composed for purpose and will vary to reflect the scale of the reward. A large reward will be accompanied by a lengthy melody, aligned with the game's theme. However, even small rewards are accompanied by a melody.

I bet members did not know any of this. It continues:

Typically, game melodies are upbeat, use major chords, and conclude on a rising chord structure...

Some games employ sounds such as animals galloping, engines revving, tires screeching, simulations of coins dropping into a tray, railway engine whistles or horns, or some other sound effect associated with the theme of the game. These sounds are triggered by rewards occurring in the game, including the awarding of 'features' (usually 'free' spins) that characterise many games...

EGM lighting effects can be very spectacular and typically include flashing coloured lights on or around the periphery of the screen, waves of colour traversing the screen and so on...

Many games utilise animated effects on screen, for example, treasure chests opening to display jewels and gold, dolphins leaping, cars crashing through the screen, goddesses or other supernatural creatures appearing and smiling. Such effects are also invariably aligned with the theme of the game.

The achievement of some combinations of symbols triggers often spectacular visual effects focused on symbols, and these are likely to have a conditioning effect.

You can just see the psychological impacts and all the science and technology that actually goes into trying to get people addicted, to stay at these machines. It is quite complex, quite complicated. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

LAND TAX (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The House of Assembly agreed to the suggested amendments made by the Legislative Council without any amendment and amended the bill accordingly.

GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS MANAGEMENT (DESIGNATED AREA) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

Sitting suspended from 18:01 until 19:45.

GAMBLING ADMINISTRATION BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (19:45): Before the dinner break, I was going through not only the algorithms but all the other traps to get punters addicted to these electronic gaming machines. I am sure that, so far, I have enlightened many of the members on both sides of the house about how

complex and sophisticated these machines are in order to have people addicted to them. I will continue on the general characteristics of EGMs:

Despite the modest state of knowledge around specific game characteristics...there are some aspects of EGM structural characteristics for which good evidence is available. These include the effects of:

- credit insertion;
- bet size;
- display configuration;
- [wagering strategies];
- 'features'...
- ...'near misses'; [and]
- 'losses disguised as wins'...

As for credit insertion with coins, notes, Ticket-in Ticket-out (TITO) and cards:

Contemporary EGMs permit the insertion of either coins (generally \$1 coins) or banknotes to load credits. Most Australian jurisdictions allow banknotes to be inserted into EGMs, although South Australia has not permitted the installation of banknote acceptors...on EGMs in clubs and hotels [yet]. In some venues in some jurisdictions, 'ticket-in ticket-out' (TITO) systems allow users to insert a ticket or slip with a printed scan code to load credits.

I am not sure whether we have that configuration of machine to come into South Australia. It continues:

If a user cashes out of such a machine, the TITO ticket can be inserted into another machine or 'cashed out' via a cashier or terminal. 'Tokenisation' of gambling has been associated with loss of connection to actual value, and TITO systems may have a similar effect...

So you do not realise just how much you have blown on those machines. It continues:

Load up limits and note configuration

Australian jurisdictions prescribe different limits for 'load up' (the amount of money that can be loaded as credits at any one time) and for denomination of notes.

NSW permits a load up of \$7,500, and the insertion of all Australian banknotes. Victoria has a load up limit of \$1,000, with the largest denomination note permitted being \$50. In Queensland, the load up is \$100, and in the ACT, NT and Tasmania it is not specified. In South Australia, the load up limit is not specified but banknotes are not permitted on EGMs in clubs and hotels [yet]. Large load up limits with high denomination banknotes permit very rapid expenditure.

Already, you can see the alarm bells should be ringing about these machines. It continues:

The Productivity Commission recommended that the load up limit for EGMs should be \$20...

What we have at the moment, I think, is \$50. It continues:

Card-based gambling

Some jurisdictions in the US and elsewhere permit EGM users to load credits directly onto EGM games using a credit or EFTPOS card. This is not permitted in any Australian jurisdiction.

Not yet, anyway, but I imagine, once they get their way with the note acceptors, we will then see that these types of machines will soon make their way into clubs, pubs, casinos and other venues. It continues:

Victoria and NSW permit EGM venues to offer systems whereby users may load value on to a card or an account accessible via a card; the card is then inserted into a reader built into or added to the EGM...This is distinct from a pre-commitment system.

The exact implications of this system are unclear but may involve a more 'abstract' approach to the cost of gambling: that is, it may allow EGM users to distance themselves from the experience of losing their money. The consequence of this may be to 'facilitate spending and make it harder for people to keep track of their expenditure'...Reduced cash handling and lower risks of robbery may also be by-products of cashless EGM gambling...

The quantum of bet size obviously is of interest to regulators seeking to reduce harm to gamblers experiencing problems...

The quantum of a maximum bet varies between Australian jurisdictions. A \$5 maximum bet (that is, the most that can be wagered in one 'spin') applies in Victoria, Tasmania, South Australia, and Queensland. Maximum bets of \$10 can be wagered in NSW, the ACT and the NT. In casinos, however, many jurisdictions permit unrestricted maximum bets, though in some cases with the proviso that insertion of a loyalty card is required to permit this. The Productivity Commission...recommended a reduction in the bet size to \$1.

A 2001 study...indicated that reducing the maximum bet size to \$1 would reduce harm to gamblers experiencing problems while not impinging on the enjoyment of 'recreational gamblers'.

But, of course, this is not what the government or Labor want. They want gamblers to actually be able to put in amounts of up to \$50. It continues:

The scale of a minimum bet is a direct function of the credit value of the game. A 1¢ credit value EGM will have a minimum bet of 1¢ where one line is bet at minimum credits. However, such a game could also permit bets up to the level of the maximum bet, depending on the number of lines used and the use of multiple credits per line. A 1¢ credit value game with 50 lines and a capacity to bet 10 credits per line will permit a \$5 maximum bet. A 2¢ game with the same characteristics will permit a \$10 maximum bet. See 'The reality of player returns', above, for more information on different betting strategies.

Scaling up bets

Increasing the credits wagered per line is achieved by pressing the relevant button on the machine's fascia panel, or in some cases its touch screen. If '10 credits' is selected, this increases the size of the bet tenfold, and so on. Increasing the credit value of the wager also increases the potential payout, which is a multiple of the credits wagered. If the bet is increased by a specific factor, any reward from that spin is also increased by the same factor. However, the rate of losses is also increased by the same factor...

The display of most contemporary EGMs is via a LED or similar screen, and in many cases these incorporate touch screen characteristics. Some displays utilise large, wrap around displays incorporating curved and immersive screens, and some feature elaborate housings. However, most EGMs in hotels, clubs and casinos in Australia are [currently] stand-alone devices with a relatively traditional appearance, generally lined up in rows and sitting on boxes or stands that permit their operation by users standing, or more commonly sitting on high bar stools...

The reels appearing on contemporary electronic EGMs are a simulation of mechanical reels of older-style mechanical gambling machines.

The effect of reels 'spinning' is an illusion generated by the game software. The outcome of the event is known immediately after the button has been pushed.

The order of reel symbols on games authorised for use in Australia must remain constant, mimicking mechanical reels. For example, if the reel displays the symbols A, B, C,...X, Y, Z, in that order, they must always be displayed in that order. So-called 'progressive games' (distinct from progressive jackpots), which are triggered by a specific set of symbols appearing on the main game, may incorporate a different order of symbols when compared to those appearing on the main game. However, these must also maintain a constant order of symbols for the duration of the 'progressive game'...

There is no requirement for the same number of symbols to appear on every reel, nor for the same arrangement or type of symbols to appear on each reel. Thus, a game may have four reels of 30 symbols and a final reel of 44 symbols (which occurs on the game Dolphin Treasure). Currently the user has no way of knowing the length of each reel. This is not generally understood by users, and is not detailed in information screens (where these are available)...

The winning symbols on the reels may be disproportionately placed on specific reels.

For example, Dolphin Treasure has one 'King' symbol on the first reel, two King symbols on the second reel, four on the third, five on the fourth and three on the fifth. The effects of reel 'starving' (industry nomenclature) in generating 'near misses' are discussed—

in an article below the article I am reading. It continues:

Again, this is a characteristic of EGM games that users are not familiar with, and which is not described on information screens, where available...

Typical EGM wagering centres on the ability for users to lay bets on the combination of symbols appearing on one or more 'lines' (rows), and in some cases reels (columns)...

Contemporary EGMs almost invariably permit wagers to be made on multiple lines. The default single line option is the line of five symbols across the centre of the screen. The two lines above and below the centre line can also be used, as can a large array of other arrangements...Wagers may be on a single line, on all available lines, or on some subset of the available lines.

It is common for contemporary EGMs to allow bets to be placed on up to 50 (and in some cases more) lines. Livingstone and Woolley (2008) analysed South Australian EGM game-level data, which indicated that multiline games were successful in encouraging users to wager relatively high average bets...

Reel betting differs from line betting in that the winning symbols are displayed on a combination of reels...and lines. The default combination for Aristocrat's ReelPower games is the first reel plus the middle line. Increasing the combinations upon which bets may be placed brings more reels and lines into play. ReelPower games allow up to 243 (or in some cases more) bets to be placed. The effect of this is to increase average bet sizes, and the rate of losses, quite substantially—

designed, again, to encourage gamblers to spend more and, of course, lose more. It continues:

EGM 'features' are triggered by the appearance on the screen of a series of symbols, often as 'scatters' (i.e., not necessarily lined up along a line in use). When the necessary number of scattered symbols appear, they trigger a feature...

...(Livingstone & Woolley, 2008...found that features are very popular with regular EGM users, and may be associated with a transition to harmful EGM use...

A feature, which is triggered by a scatter of symbols, consists of a series of 'free' spins, which operate automatically once the user initiates them. In some cases, it involves a separate game or set of winning combinations. In other cases, the game is identical to that of the main game on the EGM, but rewards are multiplied—the extent of multiplication usually relating to the number of scatters that triggered the feature...

The RTP of any game takes into account the effect of features, so the spins are not 'free' as most users understand them to be. The cost and rewards of the feature spins is calculated into the game's outcomes and conforms overall to the game's RTP.

An EGM user who neither wins a jackpot nor major prize, nor triggers a feature, will achieve an average price of game use below the average RTP for that game, given that 'deductions' from RTP are required to fund these characteristics.

For conditioning purposes...features provide a specific and sought-after reward, so the likely effect of features is to provide an additional reinforcement, akin to a jackpot or large win...

Contemporary EGMs incorporate two structural characteristics known as 'near misses' and 'losses disguised as wins' which both generate a form of physiological response which is similar in nature to that exhibited from a win...Their effect is to add a cost-free (for the venue) reinforcement to the reward schedule of the game...

'Near misses' involve the display of a series of symbols which are perceived to come close to providing a reward, but which do not in fact deliver this. In Australia, the deliberate engineering of near misses is prohibited (i.e., the technical standards forbid game designs from deliberately programming near misses). However, by their very nature, any EGM must sometimes produce outcomes where a winning symbol is on the wrong line for a big win. It is not possible to have a standard gaming machine with randomly determined outcomes that does not on some occasions generate near misses.

I guess it is also known as 'the sucker spin'. It continues:

In the Dolphin Treasure game, the total number of symbols on each reel is not constant, and the number of King symbols varies per reel: there are fewer King symbols in the early reels...and more in the later reels.

The odds of obtaining five King symbols are $1/30 \times 2/30 \times 4/30 \times 5/30 \times 3/44 = 120/35,640,000$ or 1 in 297,000.

Given that there are multiple King symbols on later reels...it is not particularly unusual to see a grouping of multiple King symbols on the screen i.e., the odds of seeing a King on the last three reels are 1/660, and on both the third and fourth reels they are 1/45.

Such combinations will therefore occur relatively frequently. However, the game pays rewards from left to right, and the odds of achieving three kings on the first three reels (and achieving the most modest reward for King symbols, a prize of five credits) is $1/30 \times 2/30 \times 4/30$, or 1 in 3,375.

The odds of achieving a substantial win are reduced by the starving of the early reels. Lines pay out from left to right: nevertheless, the appearance of King symbols in the later reels may be interpreted as a near miss by a user. This will have a reinforcing effect on the user...

'Losses disguised as wins' [as described by Dixon in 2010] is a term that refers to the possibility of winning an amount less than that wagered via a spin of an EGM.

Contemporary EGMs almost invariably offer the choice of multiple lines or, on reel betting games, 'ways' of winning, which permit the user to bet on many lines.

If the user bets 1¢ on each of 50 lines, and one of those lines provides a modest reward (e.g., 5¢), the EGM will deliver a reinforcement via screen displays, sounds and other stimuli—even though the net result of this wager is a loss of 45¢.

So there you go. The design is so tricky to encourage players to keep going and lose more money. It continues:

Dixon et al. suggest that the consequences of this characteristic are to...increase the amount staked per spin, and thus to increase the overall level of gambling revenue; and...deliver reinforcement at up to twice the rate possible via a single-line game.

In sum, the reinforcing effect of losses disguised as wins serves to:

1. increase expenditure per user; and
2. establish behaviour that is more difficult to extinguish than that achieved by a single-line game.

These effects are not well understood by EGM users, nor by many policy makers. However, the Queensland iteration of the Gaming Machine standards uniquely prohibits audible sounds from accompanying [a loss disguised as a win]. The game may display the line where winning symbols occur and add the credit value to the 'win' register...

That is one report by Dr Charles Livingstone. He is quite an accomplished and respected academic at Monash University, a well-respected gambling researcher. His interest is in the relationship between poker machine gambling, socio-economic disadvantage and health inequity; and in the development and implementation of relevant harm minimisation policies and strategies. He has also researched the structural characteristics of poker machines and the relationship of these and the structure of gambling systems to the development of gambling problems.

His current research is focused on mechanisms of the gambling industry influence in relation to public policy and on regulatory issues around development of best practice gambling policy. Of course, Charles Livingstone is quite aware of the legislation currently before the Legislative Council and he, like others, including Professor Michael O'Neil, have been extremely critical of what has been proposed.

Another paper by Charles Livingstone, 'A blueprint for preventing and minimising harm from electronic gambling machines in the ACT', goes into extreme detail about these impacts. I will read from some of the report:

Gambling in all forms lawfully undertaken under the jurisdiction of the ACT in 2015-16 provided gambling expenditure...(equivalent to user losses) totalling \$232.11 million in 2015-16. The ACT has the second highest EGM density in Australia (14.8 per 1,000 adults). It has two and a half times the EGM density of Victoria, twice that of Queensland, and other than NSW (15.5 EGMs/1,000 adults) has a higher density than all other states and territories.

That is extraordinary. The report continues:

In 2016-17, EGMs in the ACT provided [gambling expenditure] of \$166.5 million—

these were 2015-16 values—

a decline of 1.4% from the previous year. In 2015-16, real [gambling expenditure] from EGM gambling in the ACT was \$168.5 million. EGMs account for 73% of ACT gambling expenditure...

Per capita EGM expenditure in the ACT was \$537 per adult in 2015-16. This ranked fourth amongst Australian jurisdictions, on par with Victoria but higher than the NT, South Australia and Tasmania.

About 20% of ACT adults used EGMs in 2014. On 2015-16 population estimates, this means there were 62,300 EGM users, spending an average \$2,667 p.a.

Although extra-territorial gambling via the internet is not reported, the amount spent on this by ACT residents is likely to be in the range of \$20 million per annum. About 8% of ACT residents reported internet gambling activity in 2014. The 25,000 estimated internet gamblers spent an average of about \$812 in 2015-16.

Based on 2014 prevalence data, about 17,000 people (5.4% of adults) were directly affected by gambling harm in the ACT in 2015-16. About 4,700 (1.5% of adults) experienced harms at moderate or high levels. Using the Years of Life lost via Disability method developed by Browne et al, this means that the burden of harm (measured as Years of Life Lost to Disability, or YLD₁) for the ACT was estimated as the same order of magnitude as alcohol harms for the ACT.

The burden of harm for gambling is equivalent to 92% of the YLD₁ for alcohol harmful use and alcohol dependency, and on par with the burden associated with moderate levels of major depression.

Not all gambling-related harm is associated with EGM use. However, 76 per cent of CPGI 3+ gamblers reported using EGMs in 2014 and over 70% per cent of gambling expenditure in the ACT derives from EGMs. On that basis, between 70 per cent and 80 per cent of those experiencing harm from gambling in the ACT would experience it principally as a consequence of EGM use, as is the case in the rest of Australia...

That is from the Productivity Commission's 2010 report. It continues:

Harms from gambling affect more than simply the gambler. Goodwin et al (2017) estimate that each high risk gambler affects 6 others (on average), each moderate risk gambler 3 others, and each low risk gambler another person. Those adversely affected include children, other family, friends and employers, for example.

On that basis, over 47,000 people in the ACT are affected by gambling harms at any one time. This is equivalent to 11.8% of the total ACT population.

Browne et al (2017) estimated social costs of gambling harm at around \$7 billion p.a. in Victoria in 2015. This study estimated the costs of harm at \$6,304 p.a. per 'low risk' gambler, \$15,507 per 'moderate risk' gambler, and \$66,560 per 'problem gambler'.

Applying these estimates to the ACT situation produces social harm cost estimates of \$214.2 million p.a.

The Gambling and Racing Control Act 1999 establishes the ACT Gambling and Racing Commission...to, inter alia 'administer the gaming laws' and 'control, supervise and regulate gaming in the ACT'.

The Act specifically requires the Commission to prescribe codes of practice for the conduct of gambling by licensees.

The Commission's 2016-17 Annual Report emphasis its commitment to a public health approach to gambling harm prevention and minimisation. The Commission also commits itself to improving its understanding of recent research in this area and to provide support and treatment for those experiencing gambling harm.

All Australian jurisdictions require adherence to a code of conduct or practice intended to provide minimum standards and to minimise harms experienced by gamblers. The code applying in the ACT differs from others in Australian jurisdictions by permitting licensees to initiate self-exclusion.

For the purposes of the code, a person has a gambling problem if they have difficulty limiting the amount of money or time they spend on gambling and this leads to adverse consequences for that person or another person.

The code is broadly similar to those operating in other Australian jurisdictions. It emphasises 'downstream' harm minimisation measures...but does not provide effective preventive measures.

All Australasian jurisdictions adopt the Australia/New Zealand Gaming Machine Standards in their regulatory arrangements.

Although these are purportedly national in scope they allow each jurisdiction to adopt distinct parameter settings.

Parameter settings describe some important structural characteristics of EGMs. Structural characteristics can be understood as the 'building blocks' of EGM games. Structural characteristics of games can be used as a means of restraining the addictive potential of EGMs.

At present, parameter settings for the ACT are not well oriented towards consumer protection, and almost certainly exacerbate the harmful potential of EGMs.

Quite clearly, there are some serious issues also with EGMs in the ACT, and those figures indicate just the level of harm that they are causing in that community.

Another interesting article is by Charles Livingstone and Matthew Stevens and is titled, 'Evaluating changes in electronic gambling machine policy on user losses in an Australian jurisdiction'. As Drs Livingstone and Stevens say:

Electronic gambling machines (EGMs) are a ubiquitous feature in community venues (hotels and clubs) across all jurisdictions in Australia, except Western Australia. Hotels, also known as pubs in Australia, are commercial for-profit businesses, while clubs are not-for-profit incorporated associations, and usually attached to a sporting club or clubs. EGMs are also located in the thirteen casinos spread across all jurisdictions, with Queensland housing four, two each in Tasmania and the Northern Territory (NT), and one in each of the other jurisdictions.

Of course, there is one here, and one in Victoria and New South Wales. They continue:

As a form of gambling, EGMs have long been known to be the gambling product most associated with problem gambling risk and associated harms in Australia. The higher risk for EGM gambling is linked to a range of features including the rapid or continuous speed or 'event frequency' at which users can gamble, and other structural characteristics including 'near misses' and 'losses disguised as wins' (LDWs), and in their accessibility in community venues. Interestingly, the link between LDWs, heightened arousal and more frequent gambling was established as far back as the 1980s.

Before going in to regulatory approaches that can influence harms associated with EGMs, it is worth highlighting changes to the International Classification of Diseases for Mortality and Morbidity Statistics that place gambling disorder in mortality and morbidity statistics. The World Health Organisation (WHO) only recently included Gambling Disorder in the International Classification of Diseases...under 06 Mental, behavioural or neurodevelopmental disorders, 06C Disorders due to addictive behaviours, 06C50 Gambling disorder. This addition to the ICD coding system brings it more into line with definitions in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental

Disorders (DSM-5), and places gambling alongside Gaming disorder and acknowledges that it can contribute to mortality and morbidity. The inclusion of gambling (and gaming) in the health statistics framework is welcome, and comes behind a growing evidence base that problem and moderate risk gambling contributes to the burden of disease in Australia and New Zealand at similar levels to severe and moderate alcohol disorder. The slowness of government health departments to allocate resources to gambling harm is far from ideal, given the ubiquitousness of gambling products in Australia, and particularly EGMs, given they are currently the riskiest form of gambling available in Australia.

So despite the already acknowledged health impacts on gamblers, what the authors are saying is that governments are reluctant to throw more money at trying to curb these problems. They continue:

EGMs must conform to a set of national standards for Australia and New Zealand, but each jurisdiction can apply different guidelines around parameter settings on the EGMs, such as return to user ratio, maximum bet per spin, near misses, LDWs—

we know what that is: losses disguised as wins—

and how much money can be loaded into the EGM (the 'load-up limit') and in what denomination of notes or coins. However, these jurisdictional differences are not well publicised. Such regulatory differences can affect gamblers' style and risk of gambling harm. For example, Leino et al. found that LDWs increased the odds that a gambler will continue to gamble, compared with a loss—

so losses disguised as wins act as the sucker bed to keep them at the machine—

but that this effect was less than the likelihood of continuing to gamble after a win. In Queensland and Tasmania, EGMs are not permitted to reward LDWs via reinforcement effects such as 'winning' sounds or messages. This is not the case in other jurisdictions. Other features of EGMs such as maximum bet per spin, the load-up limit, and the denomination of notes accepted may also affect user losses, and varies across jurisdictions in Australia.

For example, in New South Wales (NSW), EGM gamblers can load up to \$7500—

although this was reduced to \$5,000 prior to the report that was compiled here; they were able to put that amount into an EGM at one time—

while in the Northern Territory (NT) up until December 2013, note acceptors were not allowed on EGMs in community venues (hotels and clubs), and gamblers loaded \$1 coins into the machine, with a maximum amount of \$250. However, in May 2013 the NT regulation was changed, with no consultation with either community, counselling services or academics.

Does that ring a bell? No consultation, just like we had here. The authors continue:

EGMs in community venues were subsequently modified for a load up limit of \$1000 in any note denomination. The reasoning behind the change made by the NT Government was not clear, and goes against the latest evidence base, with a recent systematic review in Canada finding that removal of large note acceptors from EGMs to be one of the most effective strategies to reduce consumer harm associated with this gambling product, and the recommendation of a maximum \$20 load-up by Australia's Productivity Commission.

So here we have it: lots of evidence to indicate that one of the best harm minimisation methods is to remove these note acceptors, but in South Australia we are about to put them in.

The Hon. T.A. Franks: We're not; they are.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: They are, yes. Thank you, the Hon. Tammy Franks. The report continues:

Additionally, the previous caps on numbers of machines in community venues were lifted in early 2015 from 10 to 20 for hotels and 45 to 55 for clubs. Venues were required to complete a social impact assessment to demonstrate that the introduction of new machines would not cause additional harm to the surrounding communities. All applications for increases in EGM numbers by community venues were approved leading to increased EGM numbers from December 2015. This fortuitously occurred just after the 2015 NT Gambling Prevalence and Wellbeing Survey was completed in the field...The NT Government has now commissioned a repeat of the survey, to be conducted—

in fact, it has probably been completed by now, according to this document. It continues:

The presence of EGMs in community venues has been a politically contentious issue in Australia, with the two major political parties in the 2018 Tasmanian election having opposing views towards EGMs in community venues, with one major party's policy [the ALP] to remove all EGMs from community venues. The 2005 NT Gambling Prevalence Survey found that 49% of NT adults support a decrease in poker machines in community venues, while the 2015 survey found 53 and 50% of adults endorsed a decrease in EGMs in clubs and hotels respectively, though this result was not available to government until after the policy change lifting the cap on community venue EGMs in early 2015...

I just wonder, if we conducted a survey in South Australia, what the result would be, particularly with the projected introduction of these machines that will handle notes. The report goes on:

Across Australia introduction of indoor smoking bans led to declines of between 5 and 10% in EGM user losses across all jurisdictions when introduced, with Victoria being the first to introduce bans and see reductions...and reductions observed across all jurisdictions...Paradoxically, it was this policy that has led to the biggest reduction in EGM user losses, and likely the most successful in reducing rates of problem gambling.

Reducing smoking has been the most effective thing, not the harm minimisation programs. The report continues:

The EGM user losses from the NT's two casinos provide an interesting comparison, and a natural policy experiment, as the casinos' EGMs have always had note acceptors. Over this same period, user losses in the casinos dropped after the smoking ban and then user losses have remained stagnant (or decreased in real dollars) and did not show an increase from 2013, as was observed in community venue user losses...The two most recent reports from the NT Director General report that community venue EGM user losses continued to grow after the introduction of note acceptors, followed by a doubling of EGMs permitted in hotels, and a 20% increase in clubs...

Changes in EGM user loss can reflect policy changes, consumer preferences, or changes in accessibility to venues, and machines within venues. There were four changes to policy and regulation over the period 2003 to 2017 that have likely affected user losses and the number of EGMs operating in the NT over the last several years:

- Smoking ban in all venues started from 1 January 2010.
- Note acceptors allowed in community venues (hotels and clubs) from 28 May 2013, allowing users a maximum loading limit of \$1000 using \$20, \$50 or \$100 notes. Previous caps of 10 EGMs per hotel and 45 EGMs per club were lifted in July 2015 to allow hotels up to 20 EGMs and clubs up to 55 EGMs, though no new EGMs were installed until after social impact assessments were carried out and reviewed by the government, which occurred in December 2015 and early 2016).
- Minimum percentage return to player (RTP) was amended on 21 September 2015 for casinos from 88 to 85%, which brought them into line with community venues.

Interestingly, EGM data obtained from the NT Government and published in the 2015 Gambling Prevalence and Wellbeing Survey report showed that RTP in community venues has, on average, increased between 2003/4 and 2014/15 from 88.6 to 90.5%. For casinos over the same period the RTP was between 91.1 and 91.9%. Thus, although the change in minimum RTP standardises casino and community venue minimum RTP, the change does not reflect venue (casino and community) practices regarding RTP.

The inconsistency in EGM regulation across Australia, and the lack of finely grained data, has limited public health researchers' capacity to evaluate EGM regulatory changes. However, the recent change in EGM policy to allow the installation of note acceptors and an increase in number of EGMs in community venues in the NT is a policy change that warrants investigation, given research has shown that removal of large note acceptors from EGMs can lead to reductions in problematic gambling behaviour.

Again, we have well-respected academic research that clearly shows the harm these machines can cause and that, by reducing them, harm is reduced; yet, here in South Australia, Labor and the Liberals are intent on bringing them in. They want to increase the problem gamblers in the state and problem gambling in our community. It is shameful.

[Problematic gambling behaviour] provides an opportunity to assess changes in community venue user losses and compare over time (before and after note acceptors and increase in EGMs) with user losses from casino EGMs (which have always had note acceptors).

This paper will evaluate the effect of the installation of note acceptors and increased load amount in community venues in 2013, and the change in EGM numbers occurring in late 2015 on user losses (and user losses per EGM) by venue type (hotel, club and casino) and size (as measured by number of EGMs in the venue). The paper will also use data from the 2005 and 2015 NT Gambling Prevalence Surveys to estimate changes in user losses per adult (18 years or more), per EGM user and per EGM problem and/or moderate risk gambler as classified by the Problem Gambling Severity Index...

The NT Government Department of Attorney General and Justice provided two sets of EGM data for the research. The first included venue name, monthly user losses and number of EGMs for the years 2003 to 2017. The second data set was at the EGM level and included venue name, and the date corresponding to the first insertion of notes into the machine. This second data set was for the years 2013 to 2017, and was for the period following policy change allowing note acceptors into community venue EGMs.

The NT Gambling Prevalence and Wellbeing Survey was undertaken in late 2015 and was the follow-up survey to the 2005 NT Gambling Prevalence Survey. Full details for both survey designs are available in [a report by] Stevens et al. and Young et al. with a summary provided [in this report] The 2005 NT Gambling Prevalence Survey, conducted August to September, replicated the methods used in the Productivity Commission's 1999 national survey,

and used a two-stage population survey with a stratified (age, sex, region), quota-based random CATI telephone sample of adults in the NT. All respondents were screened for gambling (all types) and categorised as non-gamblers, regular and non-regular gamblers, with regular gamblers being screened for problem gambling risk. A sub-sample of these groups then received the full survey (all regular gamblers and one in four non-regular gamblers, and one in two non-gamblers). The sample frame included all households with a telephone number listed in the NT telephone directory, with the last birthday method used to recruit respondents. The response rates were determined using the conservative method and the upper bound method, both of which calculate the response rate based on number of respondents who participated as a proportion of those eligible to participate, with the latter also including calls where there were no replies, answering machines or engaged numbers, and gave response rates of 32 and 37% [respectively].

The 2015 NT Gambling Prevalence and Wellbeing Survey used a similar two-stage population survey with a stratified (age, sex, region), quota-based random CATI telephone sample of adults in the NT. However, dual frame sampling was used with a landline frame and three separate mobile phone lists used to draw a random sample of mobile phone users, to capture adults who predominantly or only use a mobile phone. The three mobile phone lists were merged and de-duplication steps undertaken, and from this list, mobile numbers were randomly sampled. The 'last birthday' approach was again used to select a respondent within the household for the landline sample, though about midway through sampling, it was noticed that females were being oversampled, so interviewers changed to asking to speak with the male in the house who had the last birthday.

It goes on to state:

User loss is the amount of money lost on EGMs, or the difference between how much the user puts in the EGM and how much they take home after finishing the session. This is also referred to as Net Gambling Revenue (NGR). Conversely, from a venue point of view, user losses represent EGM [venues]. Number of EGMs was measured per venue and is reported annually, and is the average number of operating EGMs in each month. User losses per EGM was derived by dividing the user losses for a venue by the number of operating EGMs...

So these were the criteria for them to conduct their survey. We will now go to the results, which show:

...the number of community venues (hotels and clubs) in the NT ranged between 71 and 87 over the period from 2003 to 2017, peaking at 87 in 2011, before declining again to 74 in 2017. The number of casinos operating EGMs in the NT was constant at two from 2003 to 2017. The number of hotels with EGMs increased from 38 in 2003 to 52 in 2011, and then declined to 40 in 2015, and increased again to 44 in 2017. The number of clubs with EGMs has been ranged between 34 and 36 between 2003 and 2012, and then declined from 35 in 2012 to 30 in 2017. The lifting of the EGM cap in 2015 is evident, with less hotels and clubs in the categories of venue size below the old EGM cap of 10 EGMs per hotel and 45 EGMs per club.

I will go to the conclusions of this report:

The recent regulatory changes in EGM policy in the NT have led to significant increases in EGM user losses in community venues, with the analysis providing evidence that the increase was very likely resultant on the change in EGM policy allowing note acceptors with loading of up to \$1000 into community venue EGMs. The affect was most notable in hotels and clubs which already housed the maximum number of EGMs, with these clubs having greater capacity and resources to update their EGM stock. The effects of the increased caps will likely see EGM user losses continue to rise at levels well above inflation.

Australian jurisdictions continue to ignore recommendations made by the Productivity Commission and public health gambling researchers to implement appropriate harm minimisation measures for EGMs, particularly those located in community venues. The analysis demonstrates that increased venue size (via additional EGMs), and modifications to EGM characteristics have had a significant impact on expenditure and related harms. It is therefore feasible that altering such venue and machine characteristics would likely to have a preventive effect, although that would be likely associated with a decline in net gambling revenue. That is, the analysis demonstrates that reductions in the load up limit, and/or the abolition of note acceptors, and reductions in the number of EGMs in venues is likely to reduce harm.

You cannot have it any clearer than that. The report continues:

Reductions in EGM numbers in community venues were supported by more than 50% of NT adults in the 2015 survey. The reduction in the minimum return to user to 85% for casino EGMs in 2013 was an unusual policy change, given analysis by Stevens et al. showed that casinos return to user has consistently hovered around 91%, while community venues have been increasing the return to user on their EGMs from 87% in 2003/4 to 90.5% in 2015/16. However, research evidence demonstrates that EGM users have little comprehension of the 'price' of EGM gambling, and a reduction in the RTP means EGM gamblers lose money faster. Further, there is no legislated daily withdrawal limit on ATMs in community venues in the NT (currently it is the bank or ATM operator default). The introduction of daily withdrawals as imposed in Vitoria, for example, should be considered.

Additional harm prevention and minimisation interventions include reducing maximum bets; prohibiting LDWs; lessening accessibility through reduced operating hours of gaming rooms in venues; and mandatory use of pre-commitment options available set at low thresholds by default. Given the demonstrated inability for Australian

jurisdictions to identify and implement effective harm prevention and minimisation interventions, a national approach to gambling regulation in Australia may be desirable.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Mr President, I draw your attention to the state of the council.

A quorum having been formed:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo, continue.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Thank you, Mr President. Perhaps I should have borrowed Nick Xenophon's pyjamas for tonight—

The PRESIDENT: No.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: Please don't; just focus on your job.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Do you wear pyjamas?

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: What I wear in bed has nothing to do with you or this chamber.

The PRESIDENT: Let's get on with it, the Hon. Mr Pangallo. Don't engage about pyjamas with the Hon. Mr Ridgway.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I withdraw that remark regarding the Hon. David Ridgway and what he does or does not wear in bed. Just going back:

A holistic public health approach to harm prevention and minimisation, could include transparency and consultation around gambling policy changes; data availability for consistent monitoring and evaluation; national co-ordination of research, particularly on EGMs and online betting; improved health promotion around harms associated with gambling; and ensuring services are available not only for those experiencing [a] gambling problem personally, but for those affected by other's gambling.

The 2010 Productivity Commission report argued that 'governments have improved their policy-making and regulations with respect to gambling, but significant governance flaws remain in most jurisdictions, including insufficient transparency, regulatory independence and coordination'...If state and territory jurisdictions are unable to address these challenges, it is appropriate for the Australian government to do so.

That brings me to one of my favourite papers—

An honourable member: Another one? Here comes another one.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: This is one of my real favourites, 'Games of chance or masters of illusion: multiline slots design may promote cognitive distortions', by Kevin Harrigan, Vance MacLaren, Dan Brown, Mike J. Dixon and Charles Livingston. The authors say:

Problem gamblers often hold beliefs about gambling that are incorrect or distorted, and it is widely believed that such erroneous cognitions may be critical in the development and maintenance of problem gambling...The two cognitive distortions that have been most consistently shown to be higher in problem gamblers than non-problem gamblers are the illusion of control and the gambler's fallacy...Illusions of control may foster player behaviour that is intended to alter the odds of winning at the game. The gambler's fallacy is the belief that after a number of consecutive losses a win is 'due'.

The focus of the present article is the source of these two cognitive distortions in relation to modern multiline slot machine games. Although some authors and treatment providers attribute problem gamblers' faulty thinking about control and their belief in the gambler's fallacy to their misunderstanding of probability and random events, problem gamblers who play slot machines do not have an inherent tendency toward faulty thinking about these mathematical subjects that is any different from non-problem players.

In this article the authors use the term 'celebratory'—

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: If you can't say it you can't read it out.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I can read it. The authors use the term 'celebratory feedback rate'—it is a bit of a tongue twister, the Hon. Mr Stephens; I am sure your tongue has been twisted at times—to report what is typically reported in the gambling literature as hit frequency. They write:

Like hit frequency, celebratory feedback rate includes any spin that results in audiovisual feedback that indicates that a prize has been won. It is a more inclusive term because it includes winning outcomes where a prize is earned on the spin that is greater than the total amount wagered on all paylines for the spin, but also includes instances where the total prize is less than the total wager per spin. We report the 'legitimate win rate' separately as the rate at

which legitimate wins occur with total prizes exceeding total wagers. This legitimate win rate will always be less than or equal to the celebratory feedback rate.

As has been shown previously...the number of paylines that a player places bets upon determines the schedule of reinforcement (i.e. the average frequency with which winning, or seemingly winning, outcomes are delivered). Counterintuitively, the number of lines played has no effect whatsoever on the 'hold' or 'house-edge' (i.e. the average proportion of the wager that is kept by the casino and not returned as prizes). Although the outcome of each individual gamble is randomly determined and unpredictable, when players place bets on many paylines on a single spin, they are effectively betting on multiple events simultaneously...The frequency of 'hits' can increase dramatically because the chances of winning a prize on at least one of the simultaneous bets increases with the number of bets that are placed. Thus a player can experience more frequent hits simply by placing simultaneous bets on multiple paylines.

When wagering on multiple paylines there is a tendency for many of the hits to be small credit gains that are obtained on one or a few paylines, but with the total number of credits gained being less than the total amount wagered on all of the paylines. These hits are still presented with audiovisual feedback to celebrate any prize that is won, even when the prize amounts are trivial. On such 'fake wins'...the sights and sounds that are presented are typically brief but have content similar to what is given following legitimate wins (i.e. when the amount won is larger than the total amount wagered, generating a net profit for the player). We consider this arrangement to be misleading to players and we prefer the term 'losses disguised as wins' (LDW) to denote this game design element that masks net monetary losses by presenting 'winning' sights and 'winning' sounds in order to blur the distinction between legitimate wins and LDWs. In Pavlovian conditioning terms, the audiovisual feedback that accompanies emotionally evocative legitimate wins also occurs on LDWs so that the two become subjectively equivalent. Conflating these two types of outcomes in this way allows LDWs to serve as secondary operant reinforcers. The frequent signalling of hits in multiline gambling may promote a subjective impression of very frequent winning that is illusory because many of the hits are LDWs. This creates an anomalous situation where players feel as if they are winning consistently, yet end up with no money in their wallet. The emotional equivalence of LDWs and legitimate wins has been demonstrated experimentally—both LDWs and legitimate wins trigger psychophysiological arousal responses that are significantly greater than full losses...Indeed, much of the increased reinforcement that is experienced when players opt to place bets on multiple paylines is directly attributable to the high frequency of LDWs.

The second way that players can exert some control over their gambling experience is to adjust the size of their wagers per line and, in so doing, adjust the size of the winnings that are realized. Slot machine games allow players to adjust the amount wagered per payline on each spin, so if they feel 'lucky' on a particular spin they can bet more and potentially win more, or if they are feeling more cautious they can bet less and potentially minimize their losses. In multiline slot machines, players use one set of buttons to select the number of lines they wish to play, and a separate set of buttons to choose the number of credits they wish to bet on each line. Playing more paylines and wagering more credits per payline means that monetary outlay increases multiplicatively. Experienced slots players typically use a 'mini-max' strategy...in which the amount wagered per payline is usually kept to a minimum but bets are placed on most or all available paylines which results in the maximum celebratory feedback rate for that game, and compared to 'max bet' this wagering strategy delays the depletion of funds and prolongs their 'time on device'. Players may also strive to win larger prizes by betting larger amounts...but this 'max bet' strategy depletes funds quickly if the hoped-for large prizes do not materialize. Importantly, players always have the option to bet larger amounts whenever they feel that a win is imminent, and this interactivity may foster an illusory belief that slot machines can be played strategically so that with practice and knowledge one can develop into a 'skilled' slots gambler...The problem with this faulty reasoning is that any effective strategy would have to capitalize on some predictable patterning of wins and losses. Such predictability is simply not possible when all spins occur at random and are independent of one another. Nevertheless, to discover an effective strategy of timing the size of one's bets to coincide with winning outcomes is the holy grail for problem gamblers.

When wagering on a single line, players will either lose their spin wager, or get a legitimate win accompanied by celebratory feedback. There are no LDWs. During single line play, gamblers will tend to experience chains of full losses interspersed with occasional legitimate wins. Players subjectively refer to the chains of consecutive losses as losing streaks. When wagering on multiple paylines, the length of these losing streaks tends to be reduced as players encounter far more outcomes that have celebratory feedback. People have a natural tendency to try to understand their surroundings and to be able to predict future events on the basis of salient current and past events. In the gambler's fallacy, there is a belief that imminent game outcomes can be predicted on the basis of recent outcomes, though in fact all events are independent of one another...Since the celebratory feedback rate is controllable as a function of the number of simultaneous wagers placed on multiple paylines, a player can reduce the average length of losing streak by betting on as many paylines as possible. Furthermore, a high celebratory feedback rate means lower volatility in the length of losing streaks. With single line play, the volatility of losing streak lengths can be high (occasionally one will encounter a very short losing streak, whereas most of the time streak length will be long). In multiline play very long losing streaks are quite rare—a fact that leads to lower volatility of losing streak length. This may support the subjective impression that outcomes can be predicted. After playing a multiline game extensively, an experienced gambler might acquire an informal heuristic that a chain of losses rarely exceeds a certain length, and when that length is reached a spin with celebratory feedback is likely to occur (i.e. the gambler's fallacy that a win is 'due'). Increasing the celebratory feedback rate does not negate the fact that all outcomes are independent. However, having extensive 'a posteriori' experience and knowledge of the celebratory feedback rate of a particular game might give experienced players a false sense of having 'a priori' knowledge of the game, and hence misguided confidence

in their skill at predicting outcomes. The scenario that would lead players to fall into this trap involves reducing the apparent randomness of the game by consistently playing all paylines in order to get the highest celebratory reinforcement rate, the shortest average length of losing streaks, and the lowest losing streak volatility. In this situation, encountering a long losing streak might entice players to increase their bets since in their minds they are 'due' for a win. Thus, a player could effectively exert a very powerful form of control over the game that seems to make the pattern of losses and spins with celebratory feedback more predictable. Although this would be yet another instance of illusory control that has no real effect on the hold or [would be yet another instance of] 'payback percentage', the subjective effects on players might lead them to misinterpret any long series of losses as support for their hope that a spin with celebratory reinforcement is imminent and stimulate their appetite for the anticipated reward, thereby reinforcing continued play despite recurring losses...

Increasing the number of lines played not only reduces the volatility of the length of losing streaks, but also reduces the outcome-to-outcome variability. Consider a player who bets five credits on one line versus a player who distributes his or her wager across five lines (one credit per line). If each player encounters the same win of 10 times his or her wager on one of the paylines, the single-line player would win 50 credits, whereas the multiline player would win 10 credits. Thus the 50-credit win would markedly stand out from the chain of losses in single line play, leading to a perception of high volatility in terms of the size of the amounts won. By contrast, the small win of 10 credits would blend in amongst the other small wins and LDWs in multiline play. This smoothing of the experience in multiline play is therefore due to both a reduction in losing streak lengths and to a reduction in outcome-to-outcome variability...

The higher variability with one line wagered results in many players losing their bankroll quickly, while some players have a big win and can either play for a long period of time or leave with their big win. A consequence of the variability is that the median 'time on device' with one line wagered is less than the median playing time with nine lines wagered—

and the authors consider—

...the median to be the statistic of most interest...because the frequency distribution of wins is highly skewed, so occasional large wins have less effect on the median than the mean).

Again, this is another important piece of research that shows the impact and just what these machines are designed to do to encourage more play and, consequently, more losses.

We mentioned this game before, but the authors also looked into the game called Dolphin Treasure—probably one of the most popular games, I gather. To investigate the effects of wagering on one line versus multiple lines, the authors wrote a Java computer program to simulate a popular machine, known as Dolphin Treasure, which was developed, where else but here in Australia by Aristocrat Leisure Limited. The study continues:

It has been popular since the late 1990s in various versions. In 2005-2006 the Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner...in South Australia released a list of the 250 top performing slot machine games in terms of net gaming revenue. Dolphin Treasure was the fourth most prominent game on the list. The popularity of Dolphin Treasure has also been identified in qualitative and quantitative research conducted in South Australia...involving interviews with 64 self-identified recovering slot machine problem gamblers and a telephone survey of 180 non-treatment seeking gamblers. Dolphin Treasure figured prominently with both groups of gamblers, and Dolphin Treasure was identified as the most popular game by 22 of the problem gamblers.

The publication describes the design of the Dolphin Treasure game as follows:

Dolphin Treasure is a typical multiline slots game, with five animated reels that 'spin' independently of one another, with their final resting positions of the middle row determined by five randomly generated numbers. The order of the symbols on each reel is fixed so, for any given reel, there is a dependency between the image on the middle row and the image on the row above and the row below. Not all combinations of the images on the top, middle and bottom rows are possible. Also, in multiline slots there is a dependency between winning outcomes on the various lines due to the overlapping nature of the lines. For example, 2 occurrences of the '9' symbol starting from the left on a played line is a win that pays 2x the wager. Assuming the player wagered on all lines (i.e. the common mini-max strategy), if the '9' symbols occurs on the top row of both reel 1 and reel 2 then that is a win of 2x the line wager on line 2 and 2x the line wager on line 6 for a total win of 4x the line wager.

At the end of a spin there are 3 symbols seen on each reel, forming a 3x5 grid of symbols across the reels. Most of the winning outcomes require matching symbols (e.g., 3 seahorses) to appear on 'paylines' that span the reels running left to right. Prize amounts increase as the number of matching symbols on a payline increases, and if the matching symbols are rare or have special bonus features associated with them. Players can bet on single or multiple paylines, with up to 9, 15, or 20 paylines being typical. Players can also adjust the size of their wagers, typically from 1 to 5 or 1 to 10 credits per payline. Multiple prizes can be won on a single spin when bets are placed on more than one payline, and wins are proportionally greater when more credits are wagered per payline.

[The authors have] access to a Dolphin Treasure slot machine in [their] research lab. It is configured so that players can wager 1-5 credits on 1-9 paylines, and thus the minimum wager per spin is 1 credit (i.e. 1 credit bet on

1 payline) and the maximum wager is 45 credits (i.e. 5 credits on each of 9 paylines). Each credit is valued at two cents. The nine paylines are shown [in the diagram]...

The pay table of the slots games showed that various prizes can be won for different outcomes. To know how likely each of the outcomes is to occur requires not just an indication of the map of the reels, but the authors were able to generate a reel map for the version of Dolphin Treasure for their research lab. They went through a number of simulations with this machine to see what it churned out. The results showed the calculations of various descriptive statistics regarding Dolphin Treasure and that the cycle of a slot machine game is the number of possible outcomes. The article continues:

Dolphin Treasure has 35,640,000 unique outcomes in base mode, calculated by multiplying the number of symbols on each reel (i.e. $30 * 30 * 30 * 30 * 44$). Of these outcomes, 249,966 are scatter wins that reward the player with 15 free spins. [The authors] generated 249,966 * 15 free spins. Some of these free spins generated more free spins for a total of approximately 4,100,000 free spins. The player gets a scatter win that initiates 15 free spins, on average, every 14.3 minutes assuming a rate of 10 spins per minute. The 87.87% payback percentage of the game is composed of 64.96% from base mode spins and approximately 22.93% from free spins (this 22.93% varies slightly each time [they ran their own] simulation as the free spins are generated randomly). With 1 line wagered the legitimate win rate is 11.28% and there are no LDWs. With 9 lines wagered, 16.69% of spins result in a legitimate win and 14.38% result in an LDW, resulting in a celebratory feedback rate of 31.07%.

To determine whether wagering on multiple lines yields a smoother game experience (less outcome-to-outcome variability) we generated all 35,640,000 spin outcomes with 1 line and 9 lines wagered. We then measured the variability of these outcomes around the expected outcome determined by the hold of the game... In the 1-line game the wager per spin was \$0.90 on a single line. In the 9-line game the wager was \$0.10 on each of 9 lines, for a total spin wager of \$0.90. In both cases the hold in each game was \$.11 (\$0.90 wager times the hold percentage 12.3%). Thus the expected outcome was \$0.90 minus \$0.11 or \$0.79. When wagering on 1 line the standard deviation around the expected outcome in Dolphin Treasure was 12.12 and it dropped to 5.25 with 9 lines wagered... another way of capturing the smoother playing experience in the nine-line game. Two sample blocks of 250 spins... with one line wagered and 1 with 9 lines wagered...

Again, what it showed is that there were:

...peak balances of 2x and 10x the original bankroll as 'big wins' and showed that 21.69% of the 1-line players reached 2x their original bankroll compared with 20.46% of the 9-line players. At this point they could have quit gambling and doubled their money. As for achieving a balance of 10x the original stake at some point in the scenario, just 2.55% of the 1-line players and 0.27% of the 9-line players did this. We noted a dramatic difference in the length of time taken to completely extinguish the funds of the 1-line and 9-line players, with 9-line play resulting in a median time to depletion of 49.7 minutes versus 31.2 minutes when playing 1 line.

Those figures sort of speak for themselves. I will just go to their conclusion because I have other reports here I wish to get through:

The design of modern multiline electronic gaming machines of the type [in this report] does a masterful job of conveying the false impression that players can control salient features of the game that seem as if they should be related to hold or payback percentage.

If a gambler learns that he or she can control the frequency and size of wins, it would seem rational to assume that the odds of profiting are likewise controllable. This belief seems perfectly rational and not what we normally think of as distorted thinking. However, what is probably not so obvious to players is that any increase in the frequency or magnitude of wins that they can effect by adjusting the number of lines and the wager per line is equally offset by a proportional increase in expenditure so there is no net change to the hold. It is true that players can exert real control over the frequency and size of wins and these impacts can be compelling, but those effects are completely independent of the outcome that should really be of most interest to gamblers—whether they win money or lose money over the long haul. Indeed, players will almost certainly lose money over the long haul if the payback percentage is anything less than 100%, and it always is.

Player controls may create the subjective impression in some players that slotmachine gambling is a skill that can be learned and practised to yield some advantage. Indeed, there is a large literature documenting the presence of such cognitive distortions in problem gamblers—

and that is an article by Goodie & Fortune in 2013—

but it has also been argued that careful game design and marketing may be another source of these untrue beliefs... An extreme view might hold that problem gamblers' widely held cognitive distortions merely reflect the effectiveness of manipulation by the gaming industry through careful game design and skilled marketing. We do not take such a position but a more mainstream and moderate view. Cognitive distortion is clearly a central feature of problem gambling. Here we have shown that the design of modern multiline electronic gambling machines has the potential to reinforce incorrect beliefs that are widely held by problem gamblers, such as the gambler's fallacy and illusion of control. If this is correct, there is a social responsibility imperative that player controls be regulated for their potentially harmful impact on problem gamblers. Before advocating for that extreme position, we would suggest that at least three questions

need to be answered experimentally: do problem and non-problem players actually understand how much control they have over these games? Do they exercise that control under realistic conditions? And would regulatory limits on player control features have a positive impact on problem gamblers while preserving the entertainment value of the games for non-problem players?

Again, that report is quite comprehensive and details that these machines are designed for people to lose. They are not designed for people to make money or earn a fortune; they are designed for people to lose.

I would like to go to this comprehensive report that actually deals with a problem in South Australia, just for the sake of—

The Hon. T.J. Stephens: No. What, South Australia?

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Yes, in South Australia. Perhaps it is a report that both Labor and the Liberals should have acquainted themselves with. It is titled, 'Gambling Prevalence in South Australia 2018 Final Report', and it was prepared for the Department of Human Services—I notice the minister is not here to hear this; I wonder if she has read it. It has been prepared by Alison Woods, Kerry Sproston, Kate Brook, Professor Paul Delfabbro and Associate Professor Michael O'Neil.

The Hon. T.A. Franks: An expert.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: An absolute expert. I will begin with the executive summary of this very detailed look into this industry in South Australia. The authors say:

Gambling continues to be a prominent public policy area within South Australia...particularly the impact of problem gambling. The gambling industry has evolved rapidly over recent years, particularly with respect to the growth of new modes such as wagering on mobile devices. The last SA gambling prevalence survey was conducted in 2012. The 2018 survey aimed to provide an updated estimate of problem gambling prevalence, as well as exploring the nature and prevalence of gambling activities undertaken by South Australians.

As with the previous research in 2005...the 2018 study involved a telephone survey of a large...representative sample of residents of SA—

that is, 20,017 people. It continues:

Just under two-thirds of SA residents (65%) had participated in at least one form of gambling in the last 12 months, a significant decrease from the equivalent 2012 result of 69%. The most popular activities were: the purchase of scratch tickets and lottery products (48%); purchasing a major lottery ticket for a major prize, such as a house, holiday or car (26%); Electronic Gaming Machines, or EGMs (19%); and betting on horse, harness or greyhound races (12%). Furthermore, 7% of respondents had participated in sports betting, while 6% had played table games at a casino during the last 12 months.

In 2018, 13% of the SA population had gambled online on either sporting events, horse, harness or greyhound races, fantasy sports, novelty events, casino games online or purchased lottery products through the internet. This represents an eight percentage point increase on the 2012 prevalence of online gambling in SA...and a 12 percentage point increase on the 2005 prevalence (1%).

In 2018, the activities that were the most likely to have taken place online were fantasy sports (76% of players had bet online)—

which is what I was saying earlier, namely, that it is starting to become the preferred mode. Of course, while they are doing that, we know that they are also encouraging the next generation of gamblers, with all the exotic types of bets that they offer—

sporting events (75% had bet online) and novelty events (61% had bet online).

Gamblers who would bet on an activity online typically bet more frequently than those who did not bet online. Specifically, nearly one in five (19%) respondents who had bet on sports online had bet more than 25 times in a year. Only one in 10 (11%) of sports bettors who had not gambled on sports through the internet had bet that frequently (more than 25 times).

The same pattern was found with betting on horse, harness and greyhound racing and the purchase of lottery products.

...A notable finding was that those who had gambled on the internet during the past 12 months were much more likely to be classified as at-risk gamblers (9.6%) than non-internet gamblers (3.2%). This relationship was still present, although slightly reduced, when excluding respondents who had only purchased lottery products or tickets (and therefore automatically classified as non-problem gamblers). That is, 9.6% of online gamblers were classified as at-risk, compared to 6.9% of non-internet gamblers who had bet on an activity other than lottery products.

As might be expected, gamblers who were classified as having a problem with gambling, according to the PGSI, tended to gamble more frequently and with higher stakes across all activities. For example, 40% of EGM-playing problem gamblers reported playing more than once a week on average (53 times or more) in the last 12 months, compared to 4% for EGM players overall. Similarly, problem EGM gamblers were more likely to play higher-value machines (28% played \$1 machines or higher vs 9% overall) and to always bet the maximum amount (14% vs 4% for EGM players overall).

Last year gamblers (gambled on any activity in the last 12 months), excluding those who had only purchased lottery products or a major lottery ticket, were asked follow-up questions about their gambling and help-seeking behaviour in general. Three-quarters of problem gamblers reported having a binge gambling session (where they bet far more than usual) in the last 12 months (75% vs 13% overall). Problem gamblers were more likely to have been alone (65% vs 29% overall) during this binge session, and less likely to be with friends (18% vs 34% overall) or a partner (8% vs 20% overall). This is a salient finding—

the authors suggest, and they say that tells them that—

problem gamblers not only spend more money overall, but also tend to engage in binges, or display similar uncontrolled behaviour, leading to exceptionally large expenditure.

Just over a third (36%) of problem gamblers reported that they had used a gambling help service in the last 12 months, meaning the majority had not (64%). Clubs and hotels were the most popular gambling venues (69% of last year gamblers, excluding lottery players, had bet at one), followed by a casino (28%) and a standalone UBET (13%). Twelve per cent of respondents who had gambled at venues reported having a loyalty card, which increased to 25% and 41% for moderate-risk and problem gamblers respectively. Among those who had gambled at any type of venue in the last 12 months, about seven people in a thousand (0.7%) had requested to have themselves excluded or barred—

seven people in a thousand—

and (as might be expected) this figure was significantly higher among moderate risk (3.1%) and problem gamblers (15.4%).

One in twenty online gamblers (5%) reported that they had excluded themselves from an online gambling site. This figure increased to 18% for moderate-risk online gamblers.

For just a bit of background, the 2018 South Australian gambling prevalence survey was:

...the seventh gambling prevalence survey undertaken in [the state] since 1995. Gambling continues to be a prominent public policy topic within SA, particularly with respect to the impact of problem gambling. The gambling industry that has been rapidly evolving over the past years, introducing new modes of play in the form of interactive gambling (e.g., mobile wagering). The last SA gambling prevalence survey was in 2012, and the 2018 survey was commissioned to provide an updated estimate of the nature and prevalence of the gambling activities currently being undertaken by South Australians and to highlight changes and emerging trends.

The 2018 survey was conducted, as I said, using telephones, and the number surveyed was about 20,017. It was in a manner similar to that conducted in 2012, when they surveyed 9,508, and 2005, when they surveyed 17,745. Regarding the objectives of this survey:

The aim of the research was to assess gambling and problem gambling trends in SA. Specifically, the research sought to:

- identify trends in problem gambling (based on the previous six SA gambling prevalence surveys);
- determine the prevalence of problem gambling in SA;
- identify participation in various types of gambling activities; and
- identify awareness of gambling help services and help seeking behaviour.

This information is intended to:

...inform policy and planning decisions for the development and provision of gambling help services, communication and prevention strategies around harmful gambling behaviour.

I do not need to remind members of the council of something I read earlier this evening that made it quite clear—and Professor O'Neil believes it—that governments just pay lip service to this type of research that is conducted by well-credentialed experts in their field. As to how they tackled this survey, the target sample was:

...residents aged 18 years and over (the 2012 survey included respondents aged 15 to 17 years old).

An overlapping dual sampling frame approach was used, whereby interviews were conducted via landline sample and via mobile phone sample. The sampling frames are overlapping in that those with both a landline and a

mobile phone are able to be selected from either frame. The particular benefit of this design is that it provides access to those persons, particularly younger people, who do not have a fixed landline at home and are thus 'mobile only'.

The sampling frames used for the overlapping dual-frame approach (mobile and fixed landline) were provided by SamplePages.

For landline numbers, a random digit dialling (RDD) sample was derived from a database of all fixed line prefixes in Australia (maintained by the Australian Communications and Media Authority (ACMA)). Random suffixes were then generated and the resulting numbers pinged.

In other words, they rang silently at the exchanges to determine if they were live numbers. Perhaps the Liberal Party could have used this type of sampling in their robocalls earlier this year. The authors continue:

An RDD sample frame was not feasible for the mobile component as mobile numbers are not able to be pinged to specific locations, and furthermore SA mobile numbers only account for about 7% of the total mobile numbers in Australia. SamplePages list-based mobile sample was instead utilised, which is a composite phone database that is built from contributors including charities, telemarketing companies and other business entities. This list accounts for about 10%-12% of all mobile phone owners in SA.

The authors submitted a sample design proportional to the South Australian population, and there is a table here that illustrates the quotas used that were based on the ABS Greater Capital Cities Statistical Area definitions. I will not go through that. Regarding the call procedures:

The within-household selection routine used for the landline sample was—

as I mentioned in previous sampling in other surveys—

the 'last birthday' method. For the mobile sample, in-scope phone answerers were selected for interview. All phone numbers were attempted a maximum of 6 times before being inactivated.

Just to look at the questionnaire design:

[It] was designed with the following in mind:

- the need for trend analysis to previous prevalence studies;
- a desire for comparison to other recent prevalence studies across different states; and
- a requirement to assess emerging issues relevant to current policy.

An initial questionnaire was drafted by the research team, with the content and relevant issues reviewed and discussed where needed by the Department's internal steering committee.

During the development of the questionnaire, the research team ultimately decided to use the original four-point response scale of the PGSI rather than the five-point scale response used in the 2012 survey, and further determined that the survey would not ask about illicit drug use. The justification for these survey design decisions is discussed further within the separate technical and methodological report.

Just looking at the numbers of the people they surveyed in this report: people 65 to 74 years, 4,336 (22 per cent); and people 75 years or older, 2,877 (14 per cent). In relation to people of Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander origin: those who said yes, 237 (1 per cent); those who responded no, 19,677 (98 per cent); and those who refused to answer, 103 (1 per cent). In relation to people who speak a language other than English at home: yes, speak a language other than English at home, 1,863 (9 per cent); and, no, only speak English at home, 18,091 (90 per cent).

The employment status figures are interesting. Those employed full time, 6,276 (31 per cent); employed part time/variable or casual hours, 3,694 (18 per cent); unemployed, 621 (3 per cent); retired or on a pension, 7,669 (38 per cent); those who are full-time students, 377 (2 per cent); those engaged in full-time home duties, 689 (3 per cent); self-employed, 370 (2 per cent); other, 167 (1 per cent); and those who refused to answer, 136 (1 per cent).

Looking at their annual household incomes: from \$1 to \$24,999, 1,782 (9 per cent); between \$25,000 and \$39,999, 1,540 (8 per cent); those who were earning between \$40,000 and \$54,999, 1,471 (7 per cent); those earning \$55,000 to \$69,999, 1,130 (6 per cent); \$70,000 to \$99,999, 1,959 (10 per cent); \$100,000 to \$149,999, 2,047 (10 per cent); those earning \$150,000-plus, 2,252 (11 per cent); those that did not know how much they earned or what their income was, 3,788 (19 per cent); and those who refused to provide their income, 4,048 (20 per cent).

I have the figures on the relationship status of those who were surveyed: single, 3,835 (19 per cent); married or living with a partner, 12,244 (61 per cent); divorced or separated, 1,784 (9 per cent); widowed, 1,912 (10 per cent); and those who refused to answer the question, 242 (1 per cent). In relation to where the respondents lived: in Adelaide, 15,516 (78 per cent); and the rest of South Australia, 4,501 (22 per cent). Getting into the nitty-gritty of this report:

The final draft questionnaire, CATI programming and operational procedures were tested prior to the main fieldwork through a pilot survey...between 4 June and 6 June. A detailed debrief with interviewers was conducted at the completion of the pilot and feedback was provided on the questionnaire length, content and sequential order.

As for the main field work:

After the pilot, the questionnaire and operational procedures were finalised. The main fieldwork was launched on 14 June [2018], which included a two-day dress rehearsal where results and protocols were closely monitored and no issues were found.

Finally, regarding the ethics considerations and approval:

The research project and draft questionnaire were reviewed and approved by the University of Adelaide's School of Psychology Human Research Ethics Subcommittee (approval code 18/20)...

The report includes comparisons to the 2012 and 2005...prevalence surveys. However, these need to be interpreted with caution due to differences in methodology and questionnaire design changes detailed in the separate technical and methodological report...

Unless specified otherwise, all of the results that have been reported on are based on weighted data to make the findings representative of the population of SA.

Totals for questions with single-response answers may not add to 100% due to rounding or refused/don't know responses that may not have been included. Multiple-response items may add to more than 100% due to respondents selecting multiple response codes.

Sample sizes vary between some questions, since not all questions were asked of every respondent.

Some sections and questions reported on have a small sample size—these findings should be interpreted with caution. SA regions were primarily reported on by 'Greater Adelaide' and 'Rest of SA' groupings to increase the robustness of the analyses. Key results by smaller regions are described [further] in section 8.3.

In regard to the overall gambling participation and pattern results:

All respondents were asked whether they had participated in any of the activities listed in Figure 1 [of this report] or any other...gambling in the last 12 months. Just under two-thirds of SA residents (65%) had participated in at least one form of gambling, with the most commonly reported activity being the purchase of scratch tickets and lottery products (48%). This was followed by purchasing a major lottery ticket, which is a ticket in a draw for a house, car, boat or any other major prize (26%), EGMs—

electronic gaming machines—

(19%) and betting on horse, harness or greyhound races (12%). Furthermore, 7% of respondents had participated in sports betting while 6% had played table games at a casino.

The overall prevalence of gambling in the [past] 12 months was significantly higher among men (67%) than women (63%). Gambling participation peaked at age 45 to 64 years (71%) and was lowest among the youngest (56% for 18- to 24-year-olds) and the oldest respondents (56% for 75 years or older...[A table in this report] shows that gambling in the last 12 months was significantly more prevalent among the higher income brackets (\$70,000 or more) and peaked at \$150,000...[which was about] (73%).

Gambling participation in the last 12 months was additionally significantly higher than average among the following persons:

- respondents living outside of Adelaide (69% vs 64% living in Adelaide)
- respondents who only spoke English at home (66% vs 52% who spoke a language other than English)
- respondents who were employed full-time (71%)
- respondents who were divorced/separated (68%) or married/living with a partner (66% vs 62% who were single and 59% who were widowed).

Participation in at least one gambling activity has decreased significantly since 2012 (69%) by 4 percentage points to 65%. Due to questionnaire differences, trend data based on comparisons to the 2012 survey are not available for all activities. Significant [data] decreases since 2012 were observed for EGMs (19% vs 27% in 2012) and horse or greyhound race betting (12% vs 21% in 2012). There was a slight (although statistically significant) increase in betting on sports events from 6% in 2012 to 7% in 2018. There were no differences between 2018 and 2012 participation in

keno [which was about 8 per cent for both], playing casino table games (6% for both), bingo (3% for both) or playing card games privately for money (3% for both).

The following is an overview of the questions that were asked of people:

...have you...?

- At least one gambling activity
- Bought instant scratch tickets, lotto or any other lottery game
- Bought a major lottery ticket
- Played gaming machines or 'pokies'
- Bet on horse, harness or greyhound races
- Played keno
- Bet on a sporting event
- Played table games at a casino
- Played bingo
- Played card games privately for money
- Used the internet to play casino games or poker for money
- Bet on novelty events
- Bet on fantasy sports
- Played any other gambling activity
- No gambling in the last 12 months

That was the basis of the questions that were asked. The authors stated:

In order to assess the prevalence and risk of problem gambling, all respondents were asked the nine item PGSI [which] is a subset of questions drawn from the larger Canadian Problem Gambling Index, which is a standardised screening tool that is used widely in international and Australian gambling surveys.

The PGSI was asked of all respondents who had participated in at least one gambling activity in the past 12 months, except for those persons who had only bought lottery products or a major lottery ticket. Respondents who had only purchased lottery products or bought a major lottery ticket were excluded from these questions, firstly because in other prevalence studies these activities are not typically strongly associated with problem gambling, and secondly due to feedback received in the pilot survey, as detailed in the separate technical and methodological report.

The results by each item are shown in figures in this report. It goes on:

Feeling guilty about the way you gamble or what happens when you gamble had the highest endorsement (some of the time, most of the time or almost always) at 13%, followed by going back to win money lost gambling (9%). The item that had the lowest endorsement was borrowing money or selling something for money to gamble (2%).

Those questions asked, 'Have you felt guilty about the way you gamble or what happens when you gamble?' As we have seen, 87 per cent responded 'never' but 13 per cent 'some of the time'. 'When you gambled, did you go back on another day to try to win back the money you lost?', 9 per cent. 'Have you bet more than you could really afford to lose?', 8 per cent. 'Have you felt that you might have a problem with gambling?', 6 per cent. 'Have you needed to gamble with larger amounts of money to get the same feeling of excitement?', 6 per cent.

'Have people criticised your betting or told you that you had a gambling problem, regardless of whether or not you thought it was true?', 6 per cent. 'Has gambling caused you any health problems, including stress or anxiety?', 5 per cent. 'Has your gambling caused any financial problems for your household?', 3 per cent responded yes. 'Have you borrowed money or sold anything to get money to gamble?', 2 per cent responded yes, either 'some of the time', 'most of the time' or 'almost always'. The report continues:

Problem gambling and level of risk for problem gambling was assessed based on responses to the PGSI. Specifically, each 'never' response received a score of zero...A total score was calculated by summing together all responses to the nine-item scale. Gamblers were subsequently split into one of four categories: problem gamblers, moderate-risk gamblers, low-risk gamblers or non-problem gamblers. It is important to note that the PGSI is a

screening measure that requires people to reach a certain score before they are said to be problem or moderate risk gamblers. Thus, it would be incorrect to interpret any score above 0 on this measure as being indicative of 'some problems'. To do this would be diagnostically incorrect because, as with any measure, endorsing 1 out of 8 symptoms does not mean that one has 1/8 of the illness or the disorder. A number of relevant symptoms or indicators would need to be present to classify someone as having a condition, and this includes problem gambling. A brief definition or guide to each of the four categories is below:

- Problem gamblers are defined as those who have experienced adverse consequences as a result of their gambling and who may have lost control of their gambling behaviour. Involvement in gambling may be at any level, but is likely to be heavy. Problem gamblers have scores of 8 or more on the PGSI.
- Moderate-risk gamblers are those who have responded 'never' to most of the indicators of behavioural problems in the PGSI, but who are likely to score on one or more 'most of the time' or 'always' responses. This group may or may not have experienced significant adverse consequences from gambling. Moderate-risk gamblers have scores of 3 to 7 on the PGSI.
- Low risk gamblers are likely to have experienced only minor adverse consequences from gambling, if any, and will have answered 'never' to most of the indicators of behavioural problems in the PGSI. Low-risk gamblers have scores of 1 or 2 on the PGSI.
- Non-problem gamblers are those who have responded 'never' to all of the indicators of behavioural problems (that is, who score 0 on the PGSI). Members of this group may or may not be frequent gamblers with heavy involvement in gambling in terms of time and money, but they will be unlikely to have experienced severe adverse consequences. Respondents who had only gambled through lottery products or major lottery draws, were not asked the PGSI and were automatically categorised as non-problem gamblers.

The survey found that males (1 per cent) were significantly more likely to be problem gamblers than females (0.5 per cent). The report continues:

Problem gambling was significantly more prevalent among respondents who were unemployed (1.9%)—more prevalent among respondents who were unemployed, who could not afford to lose, blowing their pensions or their Newstart allowance, or whatever, to try to get by or try to win something—and significantly lower among those who were retired or on a pension (0.5%). Consistent with this finding, problem gambling was lowest among the oldest two age brackets (0.4% of 65 to 74 years and 0.2% of 75 year or older...

Problem gambling was highest among the lowest income bracket (1.3% for \$1 to \$24,999) and the second-highest bracket \$100,000 to \$149,999 (1.2%). Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people were more likely to be at-risk gamblers (5.6% either problem or moderate-risk), than non-Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people (2.9%).

Respondents who were single were more likely to be problem gamblers compared to other relationship statuses, with problem gambling being the lowest among those who were married or living with a partner (0.5%) or widowed (0.3%).

I move on to 'Problem gambling by activity'. The report states:

[Table 6] shows the proportion of participants for each activity who were low-risk, moderate-risk or problem gamblers, and activities are listed in order of overall prevalence. Lottery games and major lottery tickets had the lowest proportion of problem gamblers (1.2% and 1.4% respectively). The four least-common gambling activities had the highest proportion of problem gamblers.

Specifically, 16% of respondents who had bet on casino games or poker on the internet were categorised as problem gamblers, as were 6.7% who had bet on novelty events, 6.8% who had bet on fantasy sports and 4.9% who had played card games privately for money. It is important to note, however, that participation in these activities is non-exclusive, and gamblers with problems are more likely to bet on multiple activities.

We now get to online gambling. The report states:

...the prevalence of the PGSI categories among internet and non-internet gamblers [shows that] Those who had gambled on the internet in some form in the last 12 months on any activity (including the purchase of lottery products online) were more likely to be problem (2.2%), moderate (7.4%) or low-risk gamblers (13.7%) than those who had not gambled on the internet in the last 12 months (0.9%, 2.3% and 5.4% respectively).

[Figure 12] shows the same results but excludes respondents who had only purchased lottery products or bought a major lottery ticket...The proportion of internet gamblers classified as moderate-risk or problem gamblers is still significantly higher than non-internet gamblers (9.6% vs 6.9%) when these respondents are excluded...

Aside from buying scratch or lottery tickets (which two-thirds to three-quarters of all at-risk gamblers had done (66%-77%), the most common form of gambling for problem gamblers who had used the internet to gamble was race betting (71%). Over two-thirds of this group had played EGMs—

electronic gaming machines—

(68%), and a similar proportion had bet on sporting events...

Playing online casino games or poker for money was also particularly common for problem gamblers who had used the internet to gamble (for any gambling activity), with 59% having done so. In comparison, 14% of low-risk internet gamblers, and a third of moderate-risk internet gamblers (33%) had played online casino games or poker.

Regarding problem gambling and associated factors, it states:

Multivariate analyses were conducted to further explore which factors were correlated with problem and at-risk gambling in SA. A logistic regression looks at the strength of association between the independent (or 'predictor') variables and the dependent variable (problem gambling status), after taking account of all of the other variables in the equation.

Three logistic regressions were carried out on the subsample of respondents who had gambled in the last twelve months. Each model used a different binary variable as the dependent variable, each of which was derived from the PGSI categories:

- problem gamblers (as opposed to non-problem, low-risk and moderate-risk gamblers)
- at risk gamblers (moderate-risk and problem gamblers combined, as opposed to non-problem and low-risk gamblers)
- any risk gamblers (low-risk, moderate-risk, or problem gamblers combined, as opposed to non-problem gamblers).

This enabled an exploration of the factors associated with any degree of at-risk gambling behaviour, as well as those associated with higher-risk and problem gambling.

The independent variables included in each model included:

- gender
- age group
- Greater Adelaide/ rest of SA
- gambling activities (any undertaken in the last twelve months)
- internet gambler/ non-internet gambler
- whether the target gambler had been personally affected by another person's gambling
- remembers a big win from when first started gambling
- remembers a big loss from when first started gambling
- how often alcohol was consumed while gambling
- overall health.

I am just trying to think of the last time I had a big win. I think it would have been at the races when I was a young man. I would attend in my capacity—

The Hon. T.J. Stephens: Shame—gambling!

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Well, I used to attend in my capacity as a journalist, working with our racing team. I remember going to Victoria Park on Melbourne Cup Day. I looked at the fields and I thought, 'Well, I don't earn much money. I need to find an outsider here in the Melbourne Cup.' I had a look, and I thought, 'Well, I better think big.' I got him at 25 to one. I put \$10 on, and when it won I thought, 'Wow, that was great.' That was probably my biggest ever win in a gambling sense. That was more than 45 years ago.

The prevalence of big wins amongst gamblers is not great. If you have a lot of money, perhaps there is opportunity for people to be able to gamble, but for normal hardworking people on average incomes, trying to strike a win can be quite difficult. The report continues:

The results are presented in the form of odds ratios. In the case of these analyses, the odds ratio indicates the relative likelihood of being a problem (or at-risk, or any-risk) gambler in terms of the independent variable, relative to the reference category, after taking account of all the other independent variables included in the regression model. That is, for each of the variables listed in the bullet points above, a reference category was set at 1, providing a base for the other categories within the variable to be measured against. For example, within the regression model the oldest age group of 70 years and over was set at 1, and the likelihood of problem gambling for the other age groups

is shown relative to that oldest age group. In Table 9 to Table 11, below, the independent variable reference categories are indicated with odds ratios of '1.00'...

The most striking relationship was found between self-reported health and problem gambling. There was a very clear increase in the likelihood of problem gambling as health deteriorated...Compared with gamblers who reported themselves as being in 'excellent' health, gamblers in 'poor' health were 9.86 times more likely to be classified as problem gamblers.

There was also a strong relationship between a person's own problem gambling and having been personally affected by another person's gambling in the last twelve months. Gamblers who had been affected by someone else's gambling were 3.44 times more likely to be problem gamblers themselves.

Interestingly, after taking account of all of the other variables in this regression model, men were not significantly more likely than women to be problem gamblers, despite the descriptive statistics that showed that the prevalence of problem gambling is higher among men (1%) than women (0.5%). This suggests that other factors included in this model were associated with problem gambling likelihood, and not gender per se.

Similarly, although the prevalence of problem gambling was higher among internet gamblers, internet gambling was not a predictor of problem gambling in the logistic regression, meaning that other factors were more important. It is interesting to note that the predictor variables differ slightly as the 'net widens' and lower-risk PGSI categories are included into the dependent variable...

Respondents who had used electronic gaming machines, or who had bet on events like elections, or on fantasy sports, were more likely to be problem gamblers than gamblers who had not participated in these activities...

Recalling having had a big win when they first started gambling was strongly associated with problem gambling, with people being 2.19 times more likely to be a problem gambler if they reported an early big win. Similarly, people who recalled a big loss when they first started gambling were 2.95 times more likely to be problem gamblers.

The associations between the predictor variables and at-risk gambling (moderate-risk and problem gambling combined) are shown in [tables in this report].

After taking into account all of the other variables in the regression model, gamblers who had played electronic gaming machines (2.65 odds ratio), Keno (2.22), or bet on novelty events (2.14 odds ratio) were more likely than those who had not participated in these forms of gambling to be moderate-risk or problem gamblers.

Being affected by someone else's gambling (2.08 odds ratio), remembering a big win (1.99 odds ratio) and remembering a big loss (3.34 odds ratio) were all significant 'predictors' of moderate-risk or problem gambling.

Again, poorer health was strongly associated with problem gambling risk, with respondents who classified themselves in the poor health category being 5.8 times more likely to be an at-risk gambler than those with excellent health.

In this case, internet gambling was a predictive factor, with internet gamblers being 1.45 times more likely than non-internet gamblers to fall into this combined moderate-risk/ problem gambler PGSI category.

The results of the logistic regression model which analysed the factors associated with any risk (low-risk, moderate and problem gambling combined) are shown [and they were quite clear]. As might be expected, the pattern of findings is similar to the previous model [I just outlined].

EGM and novelty event gambling remained the activities most likely to be associated with being an at-risk gambler...

In other words, you are more likely to become a problem gambler if you indulge in poker machines or you engage in novelty event gambling. Novelty event gambling, I would imagine, would be those weird exotic bets that are often offered by online bookmakers, etc. The report continues:

As with higher-risk gamblers, the following characteristics were more likely to be associated with some level of risk:

- having been affected by someone else' gambling (1.70 odds ratio)
- remembering an early big win (1.76 odds ratio)
- remembering an early big loss (2.83 odds ratio).

Again, gamblers who said they were in 'fair' or 'poor' health were more likely to be at-risk gamblers...than gamblers in 'excellent' health.

Taking into account the other factors included in this regression model, internet gambling was a significant predictor of at-risk gambling, with internet gamblers being 1.59 times more likely than non-internet gamblers to fall into this wider risk category (low risk through to problem gambler).

In regard to lifetime problem gambling, the report states:

In order to assess problem gambling behaviour over the lifetime, people who gambled in the last 12 months (excluding those who only purchased lottery products) were asked the short five-item version of the National Opinion Research Center DSM-IV Screen for Gambling Problems...respondents who had gambled during the last 12 months reported that they had previously tried to cut down or control their gambling. Nine per cent of gamblers overall had lied to family members or friends about their gambling at some point in their life, 8% had chased their losses (returned to win back money lost), 8% had gambled as a way to escape from problems and 8% spent two weeks or more thinking about their gambling.

Again:

Men were significantly more likely to report having done all of these, except for having gambled to escape personal problems, which was equivalent among men and women (both 8%). Prevalence of these measures all increased along with gambling risk...

Demographic groups with higher prevalence of at-risk and problem gambling were more likely to report that they had tried to cut down or control their gambling. Specifically, the following groups were particularly likely to report having tried to reduce their gambling:

- men (22% vs 11% of women)
- unemployed respondents (28%)
- respondents in the lowest income bracket (23%)
- single respondents (21%)
- those who spoke [another language, other than English] at home (25% vs 17% who only spoke English)
- internet gamblers (25% vs 14% of non-internet gamblers).

Looking at the legacy effects this has had, the report states:

To assess any legacy effects of problem or risky gambling, respondents who had gambled for money sometime in their life were asked if they had had any problems, during the last 12 months, that had arisen from previous gambling (that is gambling that took place more than one year ago)...all respondents had experienced issues resulting from past gambling behaviour. The predictors of legacy problems reflected those for current gambling problems. Specifically, legacy effects were more common among men (1.2% vs 0.5% of women), single (1.4%) or divorced/separated respondents (1.5%), unemployed respondents (2.2%) and respondents who had bet via the internet (2.0% vs 0.7% of non-internet gamblers).

Legacy effects from gambling showed an inverse relationship with educational level, starting at 1.2% for those who finished education up to or including year 12, 0.8% for those who had a trade certificate or a diploma and 0.5% for those who had attended university or college.

Respondents who were classified as current problem gamblers were also the most likely to report legacy effects from their previous gambling (33.5%), followed by moderate-risk gamblers (7.6%), low-risk gamblers (1.5%) and then least likely non-problem gamblers (0.3%).

In regard to the effects on significant others, the report states:

All respondents (regardless of gambling status) were asked the Short Harms Scale for Concerned Significant Others to assess the extended effects of gambling on friends, family and associates of gamblers. As shown, harm resulting from someone else's gambling was also strongly related to one's own risk for problem gambling. Specifically, nearly one-third (32%) of problem gamblers reported they had been affected by someone else's gambling, compared with 13% and 16% of low-risk and moderate-risk gamblers (respectively) and only 6% of non-problem gamblers. The lowest self-reported impact from someone else's gambling was among those who had not themselves participated in any gambling in the past 12 months...

6 per cent of respondents had been affected by someone else's gambling in the past 12 months. This impact decreased over the lifespan, starting at 7% to 8% for the three youngest age groups (18 to 44 years), to 6% for 45- to 64-year-olds and dropping to 4% for 65- to 74-year-olds and 2% for 75-year-olds and over. In-line with this decrease by age, respondents who were retired or on a pension were significantly less likely to report they had been personally affected by someone else's gambling, compared to other employment categories.

Self-reported impact was higher among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, with 10% of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people stating they had been impacted by someone else's gambling, compared to 6% of non-Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people. Similarly, self-reported impact was also influenced by relationship status, with impact being highest among single people (8%) and lowest among those who were married/living with a partner (5%) or widowed (2%).

Harm resulting from someone else's gambling was also strongly related to one's own risk for problem gambling. Specifically, nearly one-third (32%) of problem gamblers reported they had been affected by someone else's gambling, compared with 13% and 16% of low-risk and moderate-risk gamblers, respectively, and only 6% of non-

problem gamblers. The lowest self-reported impact from someone else's gambling was among those who had not themselves participated in any gambling in the past 12 months...

How many times have we heard stories of people who have been directly impacted by the problem gamblers in their lives? The reports certainly show that many families are affected; and women and children are affected by this. That is the sorry story that comes with this insidious disease: gambling. The report continues:

Respondents who had reported that they had been affected by another person's gambling were asked if they had been affected in any of the ways...The two most commonly reported effects were feeling distressed...or angry...about the other person's gambling.

That is the impact it has on people. It puts stress on people's lives. Not only does it put stress on people's lives—because there may be a loved one who has a problem they cannot control—but it has a roll-on effect. When you are losing money you cannot pay your bills, you cannot feed your family, and that compounds into serious emotional problems within families. Further:

In relation to financial effects, 42% reported a reduction in their spending money, 30% had a reduction in their savings and just over one-fifth (22%) had suffered petty theft. Effects on social and/or relationships, included 'experienced greater tension in my relationships' (58%), 'less enjoyment from time spent with people I care about' (57%) and 'spent less time attending social events' (25%). The least-common reported effect was using their work or study time to attend issues related to someone else's gambling (21%).

While there was no significant difference by gender in being affected by someone else's gambling, women were more likely to report being affected in multiple ways, with 92% reporting more than one effect (compared to 83% of men). Effects more likely to be reported by women were feeling distressed (84% [of women compared with] 71% of males), angry (63% vs 54%) and hopelessness (58% [or] 46%).

When I was a journalist, I did innumerable stories on people who had social problems—problems that were caused either as a result of pokie machines or other forms of gambling. They frittered away everything. To see the impact that it had on their families, their wives, spouses, partners and their children was particularly heartbreaking.

In regard to lottery products, recently we may all remember we saw a Powerball that had over \$100 million as a prize. There was a huge amount of money wagered by people around Australia buying those tickets—by that enticement to win such a big prize. When you see Powerball start to edge into the \$20 million, \$30 million, \$40 million bracket, people suddenly start to become excited and probably dream that they may themselves win that big prize.

The report notes that all respondents who had purchased instant scratch tickets, lotto or any other lottery games like Powerball, Oz Lotto, the Pools—I did not think the pools still existed—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Yes, they are still going, I gather. I do not gamble. I thought it was an ancient game that would have been superseded by all the online gambling. Anyway, respondents who had purchased lottery games like the Pools or bought lottery tickets in person or online in the past 12 months were asked follow-up questions about their behaviour. The results as well as the prevalence of purchasing lottery products by sociodemographic variables is described herein.

Nearly 48 per cent of South Australian residents had bought instant scratch tickets, lotto or any other lottery games. Purchasing lottery products in the last 12 months was higher among 45 to 74 year olds (58 per cent to 53 per cent); people living outside Greater Adelaide (53 per cent versus 47 per cent in Greater Adelaide); people who only spoke English at home (49 per cent versus 38 per cent who spoke a language other than English).

The three highest income brackets and people purchasing lottery tickets is quite interesting. You usually find that people who are actually on higher incomes are more susceptible to be tempted into going into a lottery agency to buy their Powerball, Oz Lotto tickets, or indeed Pools tickets, if they still do it. It was 52 per cent of the \$70,000 to \$99,999 bracket; 54 per cent of the \$100,000 to \$149,999 bracket; and 58 per cent of those in the \$150,000-plus bracket purchasing lottery tickets.

I imagine many of our good friends in here who are in that wage bracket would probably have purchased Powerball lottery tickets in the past 12 months. I will make a confession that I was tempted as well. I just bought a Powerball ticket. I did not win, of course. Full-time workers

(52 per cent) bought those tickets, people who were married or living with a partner (50 per cent) and people who were divorced or separated (54 per cent). The report continues:

Among people who had purchased lottery products, 1.2% were classified as problem gamblers, 3.1% were moderate-risk gamblers and 6.5% were low-risk gamblers.

I will put myself in that category. It continues:

Men typically spent more money on lottery products (\$26 on average the last time they purchased them vs \$20 for women)—

that is an interesting figure, because that is what I think I usually spend on a Powerball ticket, \$25 or \$26. It continues:

...(27% purchasing them more than 25 times in a year vs 19% of women).

Moderate-risk and problem gamblers were the biggest spenders on lottery products (\$67 and \$37 average respectively vs \$23 overall).

Purchasing lottery products results

Nearly half (48%) of SA residents had bought instant scratch tickets, lotto or another lottery game like Powerball, Oz Lotto, the Pools or bought lottery products in person or online in the last 12 months. Purchasing lottery products peaked at the middle age brackets 45 to 54 years (57%) and 55 to 64 years (58%), and was lowest among the [younger cohort]...(29% for 18 to 29 years) and oldest age brackets (42% for 75 years plus).

Purchasing lottery products was additionally higher among respondents who lived outside of Greater Adelaide (53% vs 47% in Greater Adelaide) and respondents who only spoke English (49% vs 38% who spoke...[another language]).

Purchasing lottery tickets increased by household income bracket, peaking at the three highest brackets of \$70,000 to \$99,999 (52%), \$100,000 to \$149,999 (54%) and \$150,000 plus (58%). Respondents who were employed full-time were additionally more likely to purchase lottery products (52%), compared to other employment categories. Similarly respondents who were divorced/separated (54%) or married/living with a partner (50%) were more likely to purchase lottery products compared to other relationship categories.

That is quite an interesting statistic and one that I was not aware of: that people on higher incomes are the ones who keep those big lotteries going. It continues:

Over half of respondents (53%) who had purchased lottery products only did so one to six times over the last year.

That probably puts me into that category. If the Powerball tends to get to a ridiculously high number that is probably when I get tempted but otherwise I tend to steer a clear path of lottery agencies. It continues:

Nearly one-quarter (23%) of respondents had purchased lottery products seven to 24 times, and 23% had purchased them 25 times or more. Men had purchased lottery products more frequently than women, with 27% purchasing them more than 25 times over the last year, compared to 19% of women.

On average, respondents had spent approximately \$23 the last time they purchased lottery products, however 5% had spent more than \$50...Men were more likely to have spent over \$50 (6%) than women (3%), and had a slightly higher average spend of \$17 compared to \$14 for women. Moderate-risk and problem gamblers additionally had a higher average spend (\$67 and \$37 respectively) and were more likely to have spent more than \$50 (14% for both).

...14% of people who had purchased lottery tickets had done so through the internet, and purchasing was more common among men (15%) than women (13%).

Purchasing lottery products through the internet was highest in the 25 to 44 year age bracket (20% to 18% [of women]), and then steadily decreased to 9% and 4% for respondents aged 65 to 74 years and 75 years or older respectively.

I guess we might have to put that down to the Luddite types in our community who have not been able to grasp the new technologies and go on the internet, so they still prefer to walk into their agencies and buy them face to face. The report continues:

Respondents who had purchased lottery products online in the last 12 months tended to purchase lottery products more frequently (28% bought them 25 times or more in the last 12 months) than those who had only purchased them in-person or through other means (20% 25 times or more).

I now move onto electronic gaming machines, or pokies.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Oh, is that what this bill is about?

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Yes, it is, but it is also about problem gambling, Treasurer.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: The last time it was lotteries.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: It is all about problem gambling, and you will find that—

The Hon. C. Bonaros: It is a package of reforms, Treasurer—a package.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: It is. The report continues:

All respondents who had played EGMs in the past 12 months—

that's 3,505—

were asked follow-up questions about their behaviour, which are detailed in this section along with EGM gambling prevalence by sociodemographic characteristics.

Here is a summary of the EGM's behaviour:

Overall participation in EGM gambling has decreased in SA to 19%, from 27% in 2012 and 30% in 2005. Participation in the last 12 months was higher among:

- men (21%)
- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people (29%)
- people living outside of Greater Adelaide (25%)
- people who only spoke English at home (21%)
- 18- to 24-year-olds (27%) and 25- to 35-year-olds (23%)
- households with incomes of less than \$40,000 (22%) or \$55,000 to \$69,999 (23%)
- full-time workers (21%)
- people who identified as 'single' (24%).

That is quite interesting. We should all perhaps rejoice that the participation in pokies has actually gone down. It is not an insignificant amount: from 27 per cent in 2012 and 30 per cent in 2005 to where it is now at 19 per cent. In one way, perhaps if people who are opposed to gambling and who are concerned about problem gamblers were to see that figure they would think that is a heartening result. But, of course, that result brings us to where we are today: suddenly, it has come to the realisation of the pokie barons, the Australian Hotels Association and the government, who see that the rivers of gold are suddenly starting to trickle, that they need more income, more tax revenue coming in, and that is why we are here today, tonight. They tried to ram through—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: What's that?

The Hon. T.J. Stephens: You said 'today tonight', and that's why we laughed.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Oh, is that what it is—I'm sorry, it's a late night.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. D.G.E. Hood): It is not a football game. We will hear from the Hon. Mr Pangallo.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Thank you very much, Mr Acting President. No, it is not a football game, but I appreciate the kind references to my former show, *Today Tonight*, which sadly went into extinction last week. Let me say that on *Today Tonight* we featured stories about pokie addicts over the years.

The Hon. E.S. Bourke: Did you happen to be on *Today Tonight*?

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Sorry?

The Hon. E.S. Bourke: Were you on *Today Tonight*?

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. D.G.E. Hood): Order! The Hon. Mr Pangallo, address the Chair.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Thank you very much, Mr Acting President. I was just pointing out the fact that the numbers have come down quite significantly in problem gambling; hence, the hotel lobby, the AHA, the Casino and others are probably concerned that their revenues are starting to dwindle. The government, also—the rivers of gold are trickling. We find ourselves in the situation that we have now, where they need to ensure that revenues will increase. To do that, they are proposing machines that accept notes.

As I have already outlined tonight, many of these reports clearly show that note acceptors are the very things that entice and encourage gamblers to splurge more and lose more. They know that, the AHA knows that, all the pokie barons know that, which is why they are so intent on getting these new machines with note acceptors, because they know that their revenues are suddenly going to go up after they have been going down for several years. They will be reliant on people now pumping more money into their machines by using notes.

Quite clearly, these figures would have put a fright up Treasury and Finance and also the hotel industry, which always has something to whinge about. Of course, it led to them spending such a huge amount of money in the 2018 election campaign—a huge amount of money. It was not only them, but also money that would have come into the AHA and others from the biggest pokie baron in South Australia, which, as we all know, is Woolworths.

Woolworths owns more pokie machines in South Australia than anyone else. This is Woolworths, the 'fresh food people', who offer 50 per cent discounts on products each week to get people to go through their stores for late-night shopping, on Boxing Day—they will get them there on Boxing Day, Treasurer. Just think about it: Woolworths position themselves in the marketplace as the place of discount grocery shopping, yet they own more pokie machines than any other operator in the state and probably in the country.

We know exactly where Woolworths are in relation to pokie machines. In fact, earlier this year, I was visited by two corporate executives from Woolworths who wanted to talk to us in relation to various matters. Of course, we brought up the matter of, 'Well, what are you going to do with your poker machines?' We know that Coles are already trying to get out of it, particularly in Queensland, but unfortunately for Woolworths they are stuck in a position because they also own the liquor shops that go with the pubs they have had to buy.

If you look at the venues that Woolworths has, they are predominantly either in the northern suburbs or to the south, the very suburbs where the most vulnerable people live, the people more likely to spend money on gambling, as pointed out in this extensive report. They are the ones who are likely to lose. So you have Woolworths, the biggest pokie operator, also being able to suck money out of its own customers who go to the venues they own. I sincerely hope that Woolworths take a deep look inside, have some sort of social conscience, look at the damage they are actually doing in the community and, in Australia, reflect upon their holdings and think that maybe it is time to get out of this business. I would certainly encourage that to happen.

Before I leave Woolworths, members may also recall the scandal that involved Woolies-owned venues interstate about two or three years ago, when staff working at a number of those venues were caught encouraging punters to stay at the machines longer by plying them with free drinks and other inducements. They were caught out at that time. Again, it just goes to show the ruthless nature of this gambling business, when they resort to those low tactics.

Going back to the proportion of EGM players who were classified as problem gamblers, that was 3.2 per cent and that was compared with 1.1 per cent of all last year's gamblers. The report continues:

A further 8.3% of EGM gamblers were moderate-risk gamblers (compared to 3.4% of all last year gamblers) and 15.3% were low-risk gamblers (compared to 7.1% of all last year gamblers).

Although respondents who spoke a LOTE at home were less likely to be EGM gamblers overall (11%), those who did participate played more frequently (11% more than 53 times in the last 12 months), and were more likely to play EGMs at casinos (22%) than those who only spoke English (22% and 11% respectively).

Overall, men also reported they had played EGMs more frequently (6% more than 53 times in 12 months vs 2% of women). Additionally, they reported playing higher-value machines (12% mostly played \$1 machines or higher vs 5% of women), and playing the maximum bet possible (11% 'always/often' vs 7%).

EGM gambling behaviour was quite different among problem gamblers compared to EGM players overall. For example, 40% of problem gamblers reported playing more than once a week on average (more than 53 times) compared to 4% for the overall sample. The median amount problem gamblers had spent the last time they played was \$200 compared to \$20 for all EGM players. Problem gamblers were also more likely to play higher value machines (28% played \$1 machines or higher vs 9% overall) and bet on multiple lines (77% 'always' bet more than one line vs 46% overall) and credits (51% 'always' bet more than one credit per line vs 13% overall). In-line with these results, problem gamblers were therefore more likely to report 'always' betting the maximum amount of credits in one bet/press of the button (14% vs 4% overall).

EGM gambling participation in the last 12 months by sociodemographic characteristics shows:

Nearly one-fifth (19%) of all SA residents had played EGMs at some point in the last 12 months, which is an 8 percentage point decrease on the equivalent 2012 figure (27%) and an 11 percentage point decrease from the 2005 figure (30%).

Participation in 2018 was significantly higher among men (21% vs 18% of women), Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people (29% vs 19% of non-Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people), residents living outside of Greater Adelaide (23% vs 18% living in Greater Adelaide) and respondents who only spoke English at home (21% vs 11% of those who spoke a LOTE).

Participation was highest among the two youngest age groups of 18 to 24 years (27%) and 25 to 35 years (23%), and then dropped to 17% for 35- to 54-year-olds. It then increased slightly by 2 percentage points for 55- to 74-year-olds (19%), and significantly dropped to 16% for respondents aged 75 years or older. A similar pattern was found in the 2012 survey.

EGM participation was significantly higher among the lower annual income brackets (22% for below \$40,000), and peaked at \$55,000 to \$69,999 (23%).

Respondents who worked full-time were significantly more likely to have played EGMs (21%) and respondents who were engaged in home duties were significantly less likely to have participated (15%). There were no other significant differences by employment status.

Based on relationship status, single respondents had the highest participation rate (24%) and respondents who were married / living with someone had the lowest (18%).

I will just make an observation. I quite clearly recall the days after the proposals were put up by the Attorney-General and she was interviewed on radio about this maelstrom of gambling that we are about to see. When the Attorney tried to defend her position regarding the note acceptors and also the fact that there will not be a maximum on the number of poker machines, she also stated that this type of 'entertainment', as she called it, was popular among the senior citizens in our community. This was a vindication for what she was doing: the seniors in our community enjoy playing poker machines.

Perhaps they do get some enjoyment out of it, if they can control themselves, but they are least likely or least able to afford to play these games. We are talking about pensioners. For the Attorney-General to suggest, 'Well, you know, it's okay. The seniors in our community love the entertainment.' Entertainment? I have just described, through previous reports, what that sort of entertainment does.

The specific lighting, the music that is chosen, the algorithms that are used on these machines are all selected to deliberately entrance and entice people to lose their money. Here is the Attorney-General openly saying, 'It's great; our senior citizens love playing them.' What kind of an attitude is that? I am sorry, but I think the Attorney-General really needs a reality check if she thinks that these machines are going to be good for seniors in the community. Going back to these EGMS:

Playing EGMs at a casino was significantly higher in Greater Adelaide (14%) compared to the rest of SA (4%).

This is predictable, of course. We only have one Casino; it is next door. It goes on:

Respondents who spoke a language other than English were also more likely to have primarily gambled on EGMs at a casino (22%), compared to those who only spoke English at home (11% at a casino).

...gambling on EGMs at a casino increased with income from 5% of those who earned less than \$40,000 a year to 16% in the income bracket \$100,000 to 149,999 and nearly a quarter (23%) for \$150,000 or over.

Casino EGM gambling decreased with age...starting at 13% for those aged 18 to 24 years, peaking at ages 25 to 34 years (19%) and then decreasing to 6% to 7% of those aged 55 years or older.

As we know, 'The Midas Tower' is going up at the moment. It is starting to look glossy with all the gold panelling that is going up. What an apt colour that is going to be. They are going to benefit significantly from hundreds more electronic gaming machines, which, of course, will have note acceptors. As we have seen, the Casino's revenues have also been down, so they will benefit greatly from these new machines.

I am just trying to think of the last time I was in the Casino. Each time I go in there I detest it even more. I think the last time was a particular work function at Channel 7 that I was compelled to attend. It was a work function or a Little Heroes or McGuinness McDermott function that we went to. That would have been probably 15 or 20 years ago. Going through that place, I felt so uneasy to see people in there throwing money all over the place.

I remember going to the opening of the Adelaide Casino. I do not think many here would. The Treasurer may have gone; he is in the same age bracket as I am. I remember that at the time I was working for *The News* newspaper. I think the Casino opened around 1985, and it opened with much fanfare. It was quite an event in Adelaide. It was probably the social event of the year. If you had a gold ticket to attend the opening of the Casino, that was a huge status symbol. Any who's who of Adelaide, or whatever, was there that night basically to take in the atmosphere and, of course, to participate in the gaming activities.

I think they gave out some play money or credits that night for people who were there. I do not know if you remember, but they also had a two-up pit as well; I am not sure whether they have that today. In those days, the Casino was the place to be seen and the place to go. These days, I do not think that it is. I think that people do not see it as that much of a social attraction for them, and they can see the evils that lurk there in those gaming machines and gaming tables. We will see how it goes when 'The Midas Tower' is completed.

Men generally played EGMs more frequently (6% 'more than 53 times'), as did respondents who were divorced or widowed (6% 'more than 53 times') and those who spoke [no English at home or] a LOTE at home (11% 'more than 53 times').

Forty per cent of problem gamblers had played EGMs more than once a week on average (53 times plus). This rate decreased to 16% for moderate-risk gamblers and 4% for low-risk gamblers.

...respondents reported they had played EGMs in the past year. The majority had only played 1 to 6 times (65%), 17% had played 7 to 12 times, 6% 13 to 24 times and 7% 25 to 52 times. Four per cent had played EGMs on average more than once a week (53 plus times).

Men generally played EGMs more frequently (6% 'more than 53 times'), as did respondents who were divorced or widowed (6%...) and those who spoke [another language] at home (11% 'more than 53 times').

Forty per cent of problem gamblers had played EGMs more than once a week on average (53 times plus). This rate decreased to 16% for moderate-risk gamblers and 4% for low-risk gamblers.

The report also shows the amount of money that respondents reported spending the last time they played EGMs. The report continues:

The largest proportion of EGM players (38%) had spent \$10 or less, 27% had spent \$11 to \$20 and 21% had spent \$21 to \$50. More than one in 10 (13%) of respondents had spent over \$50, with 3% of respondents having spent over \$200.

Men were more likely to have spent a larger amount than women, with 40% having spent more than \$20, (compared to 29% of women).

Median spend per occasion among problem gamblers was \$200, compared to \$50 for moderate-risk gamblers and \$20 overall. Twelve per cent of moderate-risk gamblers and two-fifths (42%) of problem gamblers had spent over \$200.

I am not a betting man but I am willing to bet that the next time such a comprehensive survey is done of gambling in South Australia, and note acceptors are in place, we will see a dramatic rise in the amount of money expended, because that is the intent. That is the intent of this legislation and that is what the Liberal government and the Labor opposition want to deliver to their friends at the Casino and the Australian Hotels Association: increased profits and people spending more in these machines.

It will not be long before note acceptors will then move to tap-and-go, tap-and-play machines, because that is the next thing they will want. People will go there with their credit card and just tap it and off they go and play. That will create even more problems. The report continues:

The most popular type of EGMs were 1 cent machines, with 62 per cent of respondents reporting that they had played them the most frequently.

I am sure that is going to disappear. It goes on:

All other types of machines were preferred by less than 10% of respondents. Men were significantly more likely to play machines with higher stakes, with 12% reporting that they frequently paid \$1 machines or higher as compared to only 5% of women.

Frequency of playing higher value machine (\$1 or more) increased with gambling risk, from 7% for non-problem gamblers, 10% for low-risk gamblers, 14% for moderate-risk gamblers to 28% for problem gamblers.

Nearly half (46%) of all EGM gamblers reported they would 'always' bet more than one line at each press of the button, with a further 13% saying they would 'often' and 21% 'sometimes...'. A larger proportion of men (53%) reported 'always' playing more than one line compared to women (38%). The likelihood of playing several lines at once increased with gambling risk, with 41% of non-problem gamblers reporting 'always' compared to 53% of low-risk gamblers, 61% of moderate-risk gamblers and 77% of problem gamblers.

EGM players who reported they had bet more than one line in the past 12 months (rarely or more...) were asked how often they had played the maximum number of lines possible on a machine...

around one-third (32%) reported they had 'always' played the maximum, 15% said 'often' and 16% 'sometimes'. Thirty-eight per cent of males who had bet more than one line 'always' bet the maximum number, significantly higher than the 25% of women.

Over half (55%) of problem gamblers reported they 'always' played the maximum number of lines, compared to 37% of moderate- and low-risk gamblers and 28% of non-problem gamblers.

All EGM players were asked how often, if ever, they bet more than 1 credit per line. Thirteen per cent reported they 'always' did this, with a further 13% reporting they did 'often' and 31% 'sometimes'. Just over one-fifth (22%) reported they never bet more than 1 credit per line and 17% reported 'rarely'. Men were significantly more likely to bet more than one credit per line 'always' or 'often' (32%) compared to women (19%). Problem gamblers were also much more likely to bet more than one credit per line, with (78%) reporting 'always' or 'often' compared to 46% of moderate-risk gamblers, 34% of low-risk gamblers and 19% of nonproblem gamblers.

EGM players were lastly asked how often, if ever, they would bet the maximum credits possible in one go (i.e. one press of the button).

They go for the big one. The report continues:

The results are shown... Only a minority of respondents reported they would 'always' (4%) or 'often' (5%) bet the maximum amount possible in a single bet.

Not only were men more likely to bet the maximum number of lines possible (47% 'always/often' vs 40% of women) and bet more than one credit per line (32% 'always/often' vs 19% of women), they were also more likely to bet the maximum credits possible (11% 'always/often' vs 7% of women).

Similarly, problem gamblers were far more likely to bet the maximum credits in one go, with 42% reporting 'always/often', followed by moderate-risk gamblers (17%), low-risk gamblers (9%) and non-problem gamblers (7%).

I move now to the gees-gees or the neddies, to talk about horse, harness and the dogs. The report states:

Respondents who had participated in horse or greyhound betting during the last 12 months were asked follow-up questions about their gambling behaviour. These results, as well as the prevalence of horse, harness and greyhound betting by sociodemographic variables, are discussed in this section.

The prevalence of betting on horse, harness or greyhound racing in SA residents had decreased to 12%, from 21% in 2012 and 19% in 2005.

I think this is an indication of the sorry state of racing in South Australia, whether it is thoroughbred racing or harness racing or even the greyhound racing, although somebody reported to me recently that there seems to be a little bit of an upsurge in greyhound racing.

But quite clearly, horse racing in South Australia is on its knees. We have seen that a number of trainers have already pulled up stumps and gone interstate and are now working in Victoria with their horses. There are others who are threatening to leave. The industry is in a sorry state. The

government has thrown some money at them but they are also suffering because of the gambling tax and it is not being pumped back into the industry.

I am in two minds about horseracing. I know that the SAJC has a virtual Reserve Bank full of pokie machines down there, and that is probably one of the things that keeps it afloat, but I also have some sympathy for horseracing trainers, for jockeys, and those who actually work in the industry. They are not necessarily gamblers; they are there to earn a living, and they also have an industry that has been vital in South Australia for so many years.

In fact, I believe at one point—and the Hon. Terry Stephens might recall this—they used to say that one in three South Australians worked in the racing industry or were indirectly linked to the racing industry. Sadly, these days it is a struggling industry.

I remember the days when I started as a cadet reporter at *The News* newspaper just across the road here, Rupert Murdoch's first newspaper. I initially started as a copy boy and then a cadet. I love my sport, and one of the first tasks assigned to me both as a copy boy and also as a cadet was to go with the racing team to the races at Victoria Park, at Morphettville, Cheltenham and even Oakbank.

In those days horseracing was a huge sport. It would attract probably 15,000 to 20,000 to a meeting at Morphettville, Cheltenham or Victoria Park. I used to go there, and I enjoyed going there with the racing team we had at *The News*, headed by the great Kevin Sattler, or Kasa, as he was well known, and we had guys like the late Ian Fewings, Graham Fisher, Graham 'Sporty' Rogers, and Jack Rowe, who we used to call Roscoe, who was not only a very adept racing writer but who was also a well-known harness racing rider. It was a big team that would go to the races each week to cover those events. That gives you an indication of how big that sport really was.

As I said, you would get 15,000 to 20,000 people going to the races, and I recall that not only were they there in the grandstand area, where there would have been something like 40 bookmakers taking bets, there was also an area called The Flat. You would have The Flat at Victoria Park, Cheltenham and also Morphettville, and you would have about 5,000 to 10,000 people in there. The Flat was usually the place they said was for the lower class of punter, the ones who did not spend that much money. They were relegated to The Flat, but the grandstand area was where all the punters would go. There would be women dressed to the nines who would go there. It was a huge day out.

In fact, in those days even Oakbank was an incredibly popular event. Again, reporters and young reporters would go to Oakbank, and I recall often having to look for somebody who had been going there religiously as a camper for decades. You would always find somebody, or a family, who had been going there for 30, 40 or 50 years; they were always there in the same spot to watch the Great Eastern Steeplechase and those other horseracing events at Oakbank.

I am not a big fan of jumps racing, I must say, but I do remember those glory days of horseracing in South Australia when there were thousands of people who would go to see the races. Of course in those days there was not really that much competition from other sports or what was on television. You did not have the internet or all those sorts of other distractions that would keep people. I am on a section here—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: The bill. You're talking about racing 20 years ago.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: That's okay; I am just giving you an indication of what has happened, Treasurer: in a short space of 30 or 40 years, that industry has dwindled to where you hardly get a crowd at any of the events now. What that keeps them going—and they know this is what is going to keep them going—are the poker machines, with note acceptors. That is what is going to help them sustain themselves.

Back to the report, the prevalence of betting on horse, harness or greyhound racing in SA residents, as I said, had decreased substantially. You could put that down to many factors, as I have already pointed out: a lot of competition, a lot of other sports. Also, people no longer have that much of an interest in it. Also, let's not forget the taxes that are being imposed on that sport. So it is suffering. In that sport, as far as betting is concerned, 16 per cent of men would bet as opposed to 8 per cent of women. The report also states:

- people who only spoke English at home (13% vs 5% who spoke a [language other than English])
- 25- to 34-year-olds (15%) and 45- to 54-year-olds (14%)
- households with incomes \$100,000 or more (17% for \$100,000 to \$149,999 and 22% for \$150,000 or more)
- full-time workers (17%)

The proportion of horse, harness and greyhound bettors who were classified as problem gamblers was 3.0% (compared to 1.1% of all last year gamblers). A further 7.0% were classified as moderate-risk gamblers (compared to 3.4% of all last year gamblers) and 14.0% were low-risk gamblers (compared to 7.1% of all last year gamblers).

Men typically bet more frequently on horse, harness and greyhound races (22% more than 24 times in the last 12 months vs 5% of women) and were more likely to have bet a larger amount the last time they bet (18% more than \$50 vs 9% of women). Men were more likely to have bet on the internet (38% vs 18% of women) and women were more likely to have bet at a race track (30% vs 20% of men).

Problem and moderate-risk gamblers were typically more frequent bettors (55% and 49% more than 25 times respectively, compared to 17% overall) and higher stakes horse and greyhound gamblers (\$159 and \$195 respectively compared to \$52 overall). Problem (49%) and moderate-risk (54%) gamblers were also more likely to have bet through the internet compared to horse and greyhound bettors overall...

So that gives you an indication why those racing codes are really struggling to attract crowds and also revenues: it has just been scooped up like vacuum cleaners by the online international bookmakers. The report continues:

...the proportion of SA residents who had bet on horse, harness or greyhound racing in the last 12 months, analysed by a number of sociodemographic characteristics. Twelve per cent of the population overall had gambled on horse or greyhound races. This figure had decreased since 2012 (21%) and 2005 (19%).

In the 2018 survey, men were twice as likely (16%) to have been horse or greyhound race bettors than women (8%) in the last 12 months. Respondents who only spoke English (13%) at home were also significantly more likely to participate in horse or greyhound race betting than those who spoke a language other than English (5%). Horse and greyhound race betting was highest among the middle age brackets (13% to 15% for 25 to 64 years) and lowest among the youngest (10% of 18- to 24-year-olds) and oldest groups (10% 65- to 75-year-olds and 7% of 75 years or older).

Horse or greyhound betting increased with income from 7% for households with less than \$25,000, to 22% of people in households earning \$150,000 or more per annum. In-line with this, horse or greyhound racing was significantly more prevalent among those who were working full-time (17%), and was lowest among those who were unemployed or engaged in home duties (6% for both).

Unlike EGM gambling (which was more prevalent among single respondents), horse and greyhound racing was most prevalent among respondents who were married or living with a partner (13%), followed by single respondents (11%), then those who were divorced or separated (10%) and then by those who were widowed (7%).

Questions were asked of these respondents about how often they usually bet on horse, harness or greyhound races, not including sweeps, such as, I would imagine, the Melbourne Cup and Adelaide Cup. It continues:

Two-thirds (66%) had only bet on horse or greyhound races six times or less in the last 12 months, 11% had bet seven to 12 times and 6% 13 to 24 times. Six per cent of respondents had bet more than once a week on average (more than 53 times in the last 12 months).

As well as being more likely to have bet on horse or greyhound racing, men were also more frequent gamblers than women, with 22% of men and 5% of women reporting they had bet on horse or greyhound races 25 or more times.

Frequent betting on horse or greyhound racing (25 times or more in the last 12 months) was highest among problem (55%) and moderate-risk gamblers (49%), and lowest among low-risk (30%) and non-problem gamblers (10%).

Respondents who had placed bets on horse, harness or greyhound racing through the internet typically bet more frequently (30% 25 times or more) than horse, harness or greyhound bettors who had only bet through other means (10% 25 times or more).

Horse, harness or greyhound bettors were asked how much they had spent the last time they had made a bet. The majority (61%) had bet less than \$20, while 14% had bet more than \$50, and only 2% reported they had bet over \$200.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. D.G.E. Hood): The Hon. Mr Pangallo, I raise the matter for your interest that, if these statistics you are quoting are purely of a statistical nature, you can offer to have them incorporated into *Hansard* without you reading them.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I would prefer not to do that, Mr Acting President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. D.G.E. Hood): I just thought you might consider it, the Hon. Mr Pangallo.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: No, I am quite comfortable reading them, thank you, and besides it is good to have this august report in *Hansard* for people to read. It continues:

The average stake increased with gambling risk from \$33 for non-problem gamblers, \$64 for low-risk gamblers, \$195 for moderate-risk gamblers and \$159 for problem gamblers.

...clubs, hotels and pubs were the most popular venue for people to bet on horse, harness or greyhound racing (44%), followed by betting on the internet (31%), betting at stand-alone UBETs (27%) and betting at race tracks (24%).

Women were significantly more likely to bet at race tracks (30% vs 20% of men) and men were more likely to bet through the internet (38% vs 18% of women). Problem (49%) and moderate-risk (54%) gamblers were more likely to have bet through the internet compared to horse and greyhound bettors overall (31%).

Again, it is quite an interesting statistic that the venues for people to bet the most on horse, harness or greyhound racing happen to be the very venues, of course, that are going to benefit from the note-accepting poker machines, if they are passed by parliament. It continues:

The majority had primarily bet on a mobile device, such as a mobile phone or tablet (83%), 13% bet on a computer and 3% had bet equally on both.

...betting on a computer was most common among older age groups, (29% for 55- to 64-year-olds and 50% for 65- to 74-year-olds), whereas betting on mobile devices was higher among younger age groups (95% to 96% for 18- to 34-year-olds).

Again, that is a worrying figure. The younger demographic, the younger generation, are certainly using their smart phones to be induced into gambling online with those online bookmakers. That brings us to betting on sporting events. The report states:

Respondents who had bet on sporting events (not including e-sports or fantasy sports) during the last 12 months were asked follow-up questions about their gambling behaviour. These results, as well as the prevalence of sports betting by sociodemographic variables, are discussed in this section.

I am about to go through those results. It continues:

The prevalence of betting on sporting events in SA was 7%, which is a slight increase from 6% in 2012 and 4% in 2005. Betting on sports events in the last 12 months was higher among:

- men (12% vs 2% of women)
- younger respondents (18 to 34 years 13% to 16%) and 65- to 74-year-olds (12%)
- people living in Greater Adelaide (8% vs 6% for the rest of SA)
- people who only spoke English at home (8% vs 6% who spoke a [language other than English])
- full-time workers (13%)
- the two highest household income brackets (11% for \$100,000 to \$149,999, 13% for \$150,000 plus)
- single respondents (9%).

So more men, of course, have taken to betting online on sporting events and it is quite an interesting figure that the younger demographic is represented, along with the higher income brackets. The report continues:

The proportion of sports bettors who were classified as problem gamblers was 3.5% (compared to 1.1% of all last year gamblers). A further 10.9% were classified as moderate-risk gamblers (compared to 3.4% of all last year gamblers) and 17.7% were low-risk gamblers (compared to 7.1% of all last year gamblers).

Men tended to be more frequent sports bettors (19% betting 25 times or more a year, vs 10% of women) and to spend higher amounts (32% having spent over \$20 vs 17% of women). Problem and moderate-risk gamblers were also more likely to have spent larger amounts the last time they played (\$80 and \$25 median respectively vs \$15 overall).

I hope you are taking notes, Mr Treasurer. We might have a quiz on these figures. The report continues:

...the prevalence of sports betting in the last 12 months overall and by sociodemographic characteristics...[shows that] Seven per cent of all SA residents had bet on at least one sporting event, which is a slight increase from 6% in 2012 and 4% in 2005.

A significantly higher proportion of men (12%) than women (2%) had bet on a sporting event in the last 12 months. Sports betting peaked among younger respondents (18 to 34 years at 13% to 16%) and then again at age 65 to 74 years (12%). Sports betting was more prevalent in Greater Adelaide (8%) than the rest of SA...and among respondents who only spoke English at home (8%) than those who spoke [another language other than English] (6%). Respondents who were employed full-time were the most likely to be sports bettors (13%), as were respondents in the two highest income brackets (11% for \$100,000 to \$149,000, 13% for \$150,000 plus).

All sports bettors were asked how many times they had bet on sporting events in the last 12 months...

Over half (54%) of sports bettors had only participated one to six times, 18% had participated seven to 12 times and 9% 13 to 24 times. Four per cent of sports bettors had participated 53 times or more (about once a week).

As well as being more likely to gamble on sports in general, male sports bettors also participated more frequently, with 19% betting 25 times or more...compared to 10% of women.

Respondents who had bet on sports through the internet typically bet more frequently, with nearly one in five (19%) betting more than 25 times in a year, compared to only about one in 10 (11%) of sports bettors who had not bet through the internet...Over two-thirds (68%) had spent less than \$20, 18% had spent \$21 to \$50 and 12% had spent over \$50. Men bet more money, with 32% having spent over \$20, compared to 17% of women...

Past year sports bettors were asked how they had placed their bets and the results are shown...By far the most popular way to bet on sports was via the internet (75%), followed by a club or hotel (18%), and a standalone UBET (12%). There were no significant differences by gender. Moderate-risk gamblers were significantly more likely to bet via a phone call. Although there were other differences by problem and moderate-risk gambling, none reached statistical significance.

[There was a] decreasing linear relationship between sports betting via the internet and age. More than nine in ten (92%) of sports bettors aged 18 to 24 years had bet on sports events through the internet.

Again, that is a disturbing figure. It continues:

This steadily decreased to 62% to 64% for 45 to 64 years, 47% for 65 to 74 years and further decreased to 26% for 75 years and over...

Among respondents who had bet on sports events through the internet, the overwhelming majority had placed their bets via a mobile device (88%) rather than a computer (10%) and 2% had bet equally on both.

As I say, it is quite disturbing because the next generation of compulsive gamblers has been well and truly born and they are ready to engage in that next step using their smart phones and all the online gambling enticements that are out there today in all these various sports and other exotic forms of betting. That brings us to gambling behaviour on fantasy sports. It is an interesting area in this digital age. Fantasy sports, including fantasy football, again seems to have targeted the younger demographic quite successfully. The report continues:

...fantasy sports...is a type of game where participants assemble virtual teams of real sports players. The prevalence of betting on fantasy sports in SA was 0.7% and its prevalence by sociodemographic variables is shown—

In fact, this is the first time that this group of researchers have assessed fantasy sports. It is a fairly new phenomenon, as we all know. On this occasion it was included, and it was also included in the 2016-17 Queensland Household Gambling Survey, which showed a prevalence of 0.3 per cent. It is important to note, say the authors, that in the Queensland survey fantasy sports were merged with e-sports. It continues:

Men were more likely to be fantasy sports gamblers (1.2%) as the prevalence among women was only 0.1%. Fantasy sports participation decreased dramatically with age, starting at 2.2% for 18- to 24-year-olds, 1.5% for 25- to 34-year-olds, 0.7% for 35 to 44 year olds to 0.2% or below for over 44-year-olds.

I will put myself in that category. I am not a big fan of fantasy sports. It is something that actually consumes a lot of productive time. Further:

Full-time students (2.5%) and people who work full-time (1.2%) were more likely to gamble on fantasy sports, as were respondents in the highest household income bracket of \$150,000 (1.0%). Moreover, fantasy sports betting was more prevalent among single respondents than those married or living with a partner (0.6%), divorced or separated (0.4%) and respondents who were widowed (0%).

Again, it indicates the demographic to which this is now appealing are the young males, who are quite deft at working online and also seem to have a lot of time on their hands to be able to make their team selections and then be able to follow everything that happens in the sport, if it is AFL or whatever, and be able to work out what the points are and how to change their team the week after. It is a very time-consuming exercise. Of course, there are great inducements for those who are quite successful. It continues:

All fantasy sports gamblers were asked how many times they had bet on fantasy sports in the last 12 months...

Over half (52%) of fantasy sports players had only participated 1 to 6 times, 14% had participated 7 to 12 times and 5% 13 to 24 times. Only 1% of fantasy sports gamblers had played 53 times or more (about more than once a week).

At the last time respondents had bet on fantasy sports, the majority (59%) had only spent \$10 or less, 28% had spent \$11 to \$50, and only 2% had spent over \$50...

As with general online sports gamblers, the large majority of fantasy sports gamblers placed their bets through a mobile device...rather than a computer...

The overall prevalence of SA residents betting on...novelty events—

novelty events, of course, would be elections. Some people would have probably done their shirt in May if they took the odds that were being offered then. It also includes, of course, those reality TV shows that we see. They are quite common on commercial television unfortunately, where commercial television has been totally dumbed down. Now, of course, it is attracting online gambling. Again, it is really targeting viewers in the younger demographic. It is getting the next generation of gambler. They are already hooked, and they do that with these so-called novelty events. The report notes:

Men were more likely than women to bet on novelty events—

I do not know why, but they do—

(1.4% vs 0.3% of women) as were respondents who were employed full-time (1.4%), respondents with a household income over \$150,000 (1.4%), and respondents who identified as single (1.2%). Betting on novelty events was more common among [naturally] younger people, specifically 18- to 24-year-olds (2.7%) and 25- to 34-year-olds (1.9%). Betting on novelty events decreased with age to 0.5% of 35- to 54-year-olds, 0.2% of 55- to 64-year-olds and finally dropped to 0.1% of respondents aged 65 years or older.

Basically, the older demographic does not give a rats about novelty events. The report continues:

Respondents were asked how often they had bet on novelty events...the majority (83%) had bet one to six times, and 12% had bet seven times or more. Nearly half (49%) of all novelty event bettors had spent approximately \$10 or less the last time they had placed a bet, 23% had spent \$11 to \$20 and 16% \$21 to \$50. Seven per cent had spent more than \$50.

The authors say:

As with sports betting, the most popular way to bet on novelty events was through the internet (61%). Seven per cent of novelty event gamblers had bet via SMS, 6% over the phone, 5% at a club or hotel and 5% at a standalone Ubet. Respondents who reported they had bet on novelty events through the internet, were most likely to have placed their bets via a mobile device (82%), as opposed to a computer (14%...

Keno is a game that surprisingly seems to have survived over the years and seems to be continuing. The report states:

Eight per cent of SA residents had gambled on keno in the last 12 months, which is in-line with the 2012 prevalence (also 8%).

It seems to have its loyal followers. The report continues:

...playing keno was more prevalent [again] among men (9% vs 6% of women), respondents who only spoke English at home (8% vs 4% of people who spoke...[another language]) and respondents who lived outside of Greater Adelaide (11% vs 7% who live in Greater Adelaide).

Keno was additionally more prevalent among the middle age group 45 to 54 years (10%), and the lowest among the two oldest age groups, 65- to 74-year-olds (6%) and 75 years or older (4%).

Nearly two-thirds (63%) of keno players had only played one to six times in a year, 16% had played seven to 12 times and 7% had played 13 to 24 times. Twelve per cent had played 25 times or more...Men were more likely to have played 25 times or more (14%) compared to women (8%).

Twenty per cent of problem gamblers had played 53 times or more (equivalent to more than once a week) compared to 4% of keno players overall. Respondents from Greater Adelaide (5% vs 1% from the rest of SA) or who were retired (7%) were also more likely to play keno on average more than once a week.

Three-quarters of keno players reported only spending \$10 or less the last time that they played and 17% had spent \$11 to \$20. Men were more likely to have spent over \$20 (8% vs 4% of women), as were problem...and moderate-risk gamblers ...

Now, in relation to table games at the Casino:

The overall prevalence of SA residents betting on table games at a casino was 6%, which is the same as the 2012 and 2005 figures.

It seems that the popularity of the Casino has plateaued: it has not increased, and I imagine that the multimillion dollar Midas tower that is going up there is intended to increase that amount of money. The report continues:

The prevalence of gambling on table games at a casino analysed by a number of sociodemographic characteristics...[shows that] A larger proportion of men had bet on table games at a casino (10% vs 3% of women), and residents of Greater Adelaide were also more likely to gamble in casinos (7% vs 4% from the rest of SA). Playing table games at a casino decreased with age, from 14% of 18- to 24-year-olds and 13% of 25- to 34-year-olds, to 5% of 45- to 54-year-olds and 3% or less for 55 years or older.

Gambling on casino table games was more common among respondents who were employed full-time...or were a full-time student (11%), and among respondents with a household income over \$100,000 (20% for \$100,000 to \$149,999 and 13% for \$150,000 or more).

Most respondents who had gambled on table games at a casino had only played one to six times (91%), 5% had played seven to 12 times and only 4% had played more than 13 times...

Men were more likely to have bet more than seven times a year (10%) than women (1%). Moderate-risk and problem gamblers were additionally more likely to have bet more than seven times a year (23% and 21%), although only the difference among moderate-risk gamblers reached significance.

Interestingly, respondents had been asked how much they had spent the last time they had played a table game at a casino. The report states:

...21% of respondents had spent \$20 or less, 34% had spent \$21 to \$50 and 24% had spent \$51 to \$100. Twenty-two per cent of respondents had spent more than \$100. Men generally had spent more the last time they played, with 26% having spent over \$100 compared to 7% of women. The median amount spent increased by gambling risk, from \$50 for non-problem gamblers, \$100 for low-risk and moderate-risk gamblers to \$200 for problem gamblers.

I would like to share the following story. Even though I have not been to the Adelaide Casino for many years, in my role as an investigative journalist with the *Today Tonight* program I had cause to track down probably one of Australia's most notorious Casanova con men, called Joey Russell or Joey Slattery—he had so many aliases. He was also known as Blind Joey. Blind Joey had a ruse to attract vulnerable people, and also vulnerable women online. He used his apparent disability of being blind to attract vulnerable people who had money.

Mr Slattery would often spin them the most outrageous stories about himself, who he was and how much money he earned. At one point, he was a neurosurgeon or a heart surgeon, and then he worked for a high-flying finance company. He was worth hundreds of millions of dollars; he would hire Learjets to show what his worth was—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Will you bring it back to the bill?

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I am just going to get to table games. Anyway, we managed to track him down in Tasmania. We had to set up a ruse to get Mr Russell to—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Can you bring it back to the bill?

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I am bringing it back to the bill. I am just bringing it back to—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You are talking about con men.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Con men, exactly: men who play table games.

The Hon. T.J. Stephens: Mate, how about a bit of relevance? Get on with it.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Okay.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: A bit of relevance, yes. Well, let's go back to the table games. As it turns out—

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. D.G.E. Hood): The Hon. Mr Pangallo, I think the general comments on the floor, whilst out of order, are basically right. Please return your comments to the nature of the bill.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Pardon?

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. D.G.E. Hood): I would appreciate if you return your comments to the general topic of the bill.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I will. Thank you, Mr Acting President. I will just finish on betting on casino games and poker online:

The overall prevalence of SA residents betting on casino games and poker online was 1.1%, a slight increase from the 2012 prevalence of 0.6%.

The prevalence of betting on casino games and poker online by sociodemographic characteristics are shown in Table 50. A larger proportion of men (1.7% vs 0.4% of women) and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people (4.7% vs 1.0% of non-Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people) had bet on casino games or poker online in the last 12 months. Additionally, participation was higher among younger respondents (2.7% for 18 to 24 years and 2.3% for 25 to 34 years) than older respondents (between 0.8% and 0.2% for respondents aged over 35 years). Moreover respondents who were unemployed (3.6%) or employed full-time...and respondents who identified as single...participated more.

In contrast to betting on table games at a casino, which was more prevalent among Greater Adelaide respondents, betting on casino games or poker online was more prevalent among respondents who lived in the rest of SA [than those in the Greater Adelaide area].

The report also covers bingo and shows the prevalence of people who play bingo and other areas. What I will do, just because it is getting on here—

The Hon. T.J. Stephens: What about those bingo players, Frank? What about those bingo players?

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Since it has been requested, I will go back to the bingo players.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. D.G.E. Hood): The Hon. Mr Pangallo, the interjections are out of order and you will ignore them. I will ask you to stick to the nature of the bill or I will make a determination.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Okay, thank you very much. I just want to go to the conclusions, because I have gone through virtually the whole report here. I am sure that people who will read this report will actually find it quite fascinating. I will just go to the summary of problem gambling in South Australia, which states:

The overall prevalence of problem gambling in SA in 2018 was 0.7%, according to the PGSI, in-line with the 2012 result (0.6%). The prevalence of the other gambling risk categories in SA...[shows that] the only significant difference compared with 2012 was a slight decrease in the prevalence of low-risk gamblers (4.6% in 2018 vs 7.1% in 2012)...

Recalculating the prevalence of problem and at-risk gambling among last year gamblers (i.e. excluding non-gamblers) shows the following results:

- 1.1% were problem gamblers
- 3.4% were moderate-risk gamblers
- 7.1% were low-risk gamblers, and
- 88.4% were non-problem gamblers.

Looking at the SA adult population as a whole, there was a significantly higher prevalence of 'at-risk' (problem and moderate-risk gambling) among the following groups:

- men (4.1% were at-risk gamblers vs 1.8% of women)
- unemployed respondents (5.4%)
- the lowest household income bracket (4.3%)
- single respondents (4.8%) and those who were divorced or separated (4.0%)
- the youngest age group of 18 to 24 year olds (4.5%)
- respondents who spoke a language other than English at home (4.2% vs 2.8% who only spoke English)
- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people (5.6% vs 2.9% non-Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people)
- those who had gambled on the internet during the past 12 months (9.6% vs 3.2% of non-internet gamblers).

Across all activities, problem gamblers typically bet more frequently and for higher stakes than other gamblers. For example, a higher proportion of EGM problem gamblers played EGMs more than once a week (40% vs 4% overall) and frequently played higher value machines (28% played \$1 machines...

Moreover, three-quarters of problem gamblers...reported having a binge gambling session (where they bet far more than usual) in the last 12 months. Problem gamblers were more likely to have been alone...during this binge session, and less likely to be with friends...or a partner...This is a salient finding, suggesting that problem gamblers not only spend more money overall, but also tend to engage in binges, or display similar uncontrolled behaviour, leading to exceptionally large expenditure.

Problem gamblers were more likely to have withdrawn extra money either through an ATM machine or through EFTPOS during a gambling session and typically withdrew double (\$200) that of the overall median (\$100).

Problem gamblers were also much more likely to have a venue loyalty card (41% vs 12% overall).

Interestingly, the associations observed with regard to frequency of play, ATM withdrawals and loyalty cards imply that one can detect problem gamblers quite reliably using these behavioural indicators alone—without asking questions specifically related to gambling problems.

Problem gambling status was associated with having experienced a big win at the beginning of their gambling career (58% vs 30% overall). Interestingly, it was also strongly associated with having experienced a big loss when they first started gambling (42% vs 12% overall).

Just over a third (36%) of problem gamblers, according to the PGSI, had used a help service in the last 12 months. Fifteen per cent of problem gamblers had self-excluded from venues and four per cent had been excluded against their will. A much higher proportion (43%) of problem gamblers had excluded themselves from online betting sites, although it is important to note that online self-exclusions in Australia can include short time intervals such as a weekend or may include shutting down an account for a night.

Multivariate analyses were carried out to explore which variables were associated with problem gambling, after controlling for other factors. The analysis showed that after accounting for other variables, including gender, age and location, gamblers who played EGMs, or bet on novelty events or fantasy sports were more likely to be problem gamblers than those who did not participate in these activities...This finding is consistent with existing research on the forms of gambling that are most strongly associated with problems.

The same multivariate model revealed that there was a strong association between a person's own problem gambling status and having been personally affected by another person's gambling in the last twelve months. Gamblers who had been affected by someone else's gambling were 3.44 times more likely to be problem gamblers themselves. This highlights the importance of exploring and addressing the clustering of gambling problems in families, as well as other social networks.

Recalling a big win, or a big loss, during a person's early days of gambling was also strongly associated with problem gambling, with people being respectively 2.19 and 2.95 times more likely to be a problem gambler if they reported this.

The most striking relationship found in this modelling was between self-reported health and problem gambling. There was a very clear increase in the likelihood of problem gambling as health deteriorated. Compared with gamblers in 'excellent' health, gamblers in 'very good' health were 2.59 times more likely to be problem gamblers, and gamblers in 'good' health were 3.56 times more likely, while gamblers in 'fair' health were 8.87 times more likely, and gamblers in 'poor' health were 9.86 times more likely. This strong relationship is likely to be due to the fact that health problems function both as a risk factor for developing gambling problems, and also an outcome associated with harms from gambling. The association mirrors recent research findings on the strong relationship between problem gambling and self-reported health and wellbeing, and supports the notion of problem gambling as a public health issue.

The summary concludes:

In 2018, 13% of the SA population had bet through the internet (20% of last year gamblers). This is a significant increase from 5% in 2012 (8% of last year gamblers) and 1% in 2005.

Among last year gamblers (gambled on any activity within the last 12 months), the demographic groups who were the most likely to have gambled on the internet were:

- men (27% vs 14% of women)
- the youngest age brackets (33% of 18- to 24-year-olds, 34% of 25- to 34-year-olds and 23% of 35- to 44-year-olds)
- single respondents (24%)
- residents of Greater Adelaide (21% vs 19% from the rest of SA)
- higher income households (27% for \$100,000 to \$149,999 and 30% for \$150,000 or more)
- those who were employed full-time (27%), self-employed (27%) or full-time students (32%).

Online gamblers (including those who purchased a lottery product online) were more likely to be classified as at-risk (problem or moderate-risk) gamblers (9.6%) than gamblers who had not bet on the internet in the last 12 months (3.2%).

[So] the proportion of participants in each of the gambling activities listed who had gambled on that activity online (playing casino games online...). Fantasy sports and general sports betting had the highest association with online gambling...This was followed by novelty event gamblers [and others].

In summarising, this comprehensive report certainly indicates that, whilst the incidence of gambling is shown to be decreasing, there are still issues with electronic gaming machines. We also see there is a prevalence of online gambling, which is quite strong particularly among the young demographic. I think this points to the damage that note acceptors will do to the community, particularly those who suffer from problem gambling.

There is another aspect of this proposed legislation, and the Labor Party had proposed it in their list of what I can only call hollow amendments. You cannot really take them seriously. The Labor Party basically put up a bit of a smokescreen to hide the fact that they were in cahoots with the government in order to bulldoze this legislation through the parliament. Among some of the suggestions that were put forward by the Hon. Stephen Mullighan in the other place was the use of facial recognition technology. I would just like to read a little bit about facial recognition technology.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo, that is straying way off the bill.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Facial recognition technology?

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Point of order, Mr President: there has been a deal done with the opposition to implement facial recognition technology in exchange for accepting the note acceptors. It is absolutely the point of the bill, and it is raised in my second reading speech for that very reason. We have had no information from the Labor Party on facial recognition technology and what deal has been done here.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Point of order: I think the Hon. Frank Pangallo should refer to Stephen Mullighan by his title, not by his name.

The PRESIDENT: I take that point of order. Be careful with that. I will accept the response to my query from the Hon. Ms Franks.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I want to refer to facial recognition technology in an article that appeared in *The Age* on 1 November 2019:

Local and international research has raised doubts about the effectiveness of self-exclusion, especially when it relies on self-enforcement and manual photographic recognition.

Use of facial-recognition technology to enforce self-exclusion is common in Canadian casinos but its effectiveness is disputed. In recent years, it has been trialled at Crown with mixed results.

In June last year, as part of the sixth review of Crown's licence, the gambling commission recommended the casino introduce facial-recognition technology to cameras at all entrances by July 1...the commission confirmed that Crown had installed the technology as requested.

A Crown spokeswoman said the technology was being tested and refined and that it was too early to judge its effectiveness.

[The spokeswoman] said the casino was an Australian leader in responsible gaming and had recently implemented a third-party exclusion process, where family, friends and close associates could seek to have someone excluded.

The spokeswoman also said Crown would welcome 'any opportunity to work in partnership with governments, regulators and industry on examining an industry-wide approach to self-exclusions'.

Monash University's Professor Charles Livingstone—

who I have quoted extensively this evening—

said self-exclusion worked better in European casinos where personal identification had to be shown when entering. The ID is then checked against a central register of exclusions.

He said Australian governments and gambling regulators should look at a similar model for the local gaming industry.

'Given the plethora of gambling opportunities in Australia, self-exclusion without the use of central-account-based gambling, or verification of ID, is a smokescreen for industry to claim it's doing something about harmful gambling,' said Professor Livingstone.

Australian National University gambling researcher Dr Francis Markham said gaming operators needed an 'incentive' to make any self-exclusion system work...

'If there is going to be self-exclusion it needs to be enforced by a regulator that has some teeth.'

The ALH group owns more than 300 licensed premises nationally.

ALH corporate affairs head David Curry said that in the past three months, ALH staff in Victoria had recorded 85 self-exclusion 'interactions' with customers.

He said ALH gaming staff had enhanced-customer care training this year.

In the year to June 30, 2019 Victorians lost more than \$3.1 billion on pokies in pubs and clubs and in Crown's main gaming room.

Crown is currently under scrutiny following revelations by *The Age*, [*The Sydney Morning Herald*] and *60 Minutes* about its efforts to attract ultra-wealthy Chinese gamblers to its casinos in Melbourne and Perth, sometimes with the assistance of firms backed by powerful Asian crime gangs.

I would like to refer to a letter that we received from Shonica Guy, who is a reformed gambling addict and advocate here in Adelaide. This was sent to a number of interested parties around the country. I quote from the letter written by Shonica Guy:

I am completely astounded that the South Australian government is considering legislation that will undoubtedly increase gambling harm.

The introduction of note feeders for poker machines in South Australia would be an absolute step backwards in trying to reduce gambling harm in the state.

It's pretty simple really: it is a lot easier to lose track of your gambling when you are feeding a \$50 note into a machine instead of 50 \$1 coins.

Why does this matter? Because poker machines are machines of addiction, with their design incorporating features that trigger addiction in the brain. They are designed to manipulate people into losing more and more money so that the industry can win big, but not the person using the machine.

I speak from lived experience. My brain was hijacked by poker machines 24 years ago. It took me 14 years to overcome my addiction to them, and that's because the industry knows exactly what it is doing when creating the features, the lights, the music on poker machines.

Those 14 years are lost to me. I was milked of my money, and those years of my life.

Gambling harm literally takes food off of tables, causes people to lose their jobs and homes, it often plays a part in family violence and relationship break-ups, and it is inextricably linked with mental ill-health. Sadly, there is a chicken and egg situation when it comes to gambling harm and mental ill-health.

Why on earth would the SA government [and the Labor Party] want to make things worse for South Australians experiencing gambling harm? Why would they make it easier for people to lose more money, more often, and more quickly?

Why? Why would you do that? The letter goes on:

Some argue the introduction of poker machines was one of the worst decisions made by a South Australian government, and I agree with them.

That government, of course, was the Labor Party. The letter continues:

The harm these machines cause was well established in NSW, yet Victoria jumped on board and SA followed suit.

I don't understand why we are looking to the eastern states for inspiration here, when Western Australia is who we should be modelling ourselves on when it comes to poker machines. Over there they only have them in their casino, and funnily enough they have the lowest rates of gambling harm in Australia. That's because these machines are nothing short of dangerous.

I'll never get back the years of my life that I lost to gambling, but I have made it my mission to ensure others don't go through what I did. That's why I [have spoken] out about these changes, and am so disappointed the SA Government and the Labor Party seem to be ignoring people like me with lived experience, and instead pandering to the industry.

There is no real upside to gambling; it's an insidious, predatory business that needs to be reigned in, not given more opportunities to cause harm in our community.

I urge the South Australia Government to reconsider these changes as a priority. You can't undo gambling harm, but you can prevent it from happening in the first place.

I think I have spoken long enough. In closing, and just to follow up what Shonica Guy said, South Australia is actually leading the world in fleecing the most vulnerable people in our community. We have a government and an opposition that simply does not care nor has a social conscience.

I have to say that I am particularly disappointed in the ALP, the so-called party of the working class. I think they have long abandoned the working class of South Australia. They have been virtually mute in this debate. I think I have given them a head start on the number of words that I have spoken tonight, as opposed to what they have uttered in both the House of Assembly and in the Legislative Council, which is an indication in itself as to just how seriously they take the issue of problem gambling.

It is disappointing that they have been so mute on this and have just offered hollow, paltry suggestions for harm minimisation, and these are suggestions that are not even proven. They are not saying, 'Let's have a clawback of machines'—and not to oppose note acceptors? This is the same party that introduced EFTPOS and cash withdrawals and allowed gamblers inside gaming areas. It just seems to be that it is in both parties' interests. The gamblers lose their shirts, workers empty their wallets and pensioners' purses are emptied.

I would like to pay tribute here to Nick Xenophon. Nick championed the issue of problem gambling in South Australia for many years and I am sure if Nick was in this chamber tonight he would be absolutely appalled, firstly, at the lack of interest in problem gambling from both the Labor and Liberal governments. I think he would be totally disgusted that note acceptors are going to be accepted, if this legislation passes, and that they will be in operation. Nick fought valiantly for many people in South Australia, many problem gamblers, who came to him for help. He achieved quite a bit in the gambling sector but, unfortunately, I do not think anybody can defeat the money and muscle wielded in this town by the Australian Hotels Association.

You can try to stand up to them but they will come out and they will crush you. They will crush you with their money and their influence. I will call them tentacles; it is like an octopus. The tentacles are even hanging over this place; that is their influence here. I think of all the money they pumped into that election campaign to get Steven Marshall elected as Premier, and also the money that they pumped into the Labor Party to try to destroy Nick Xenophon, and all he was seeking was positive reform in this insidious industry. That was all he was seeking.

The policies we went to that last election with would have gone a long way to reducing the impact of problem gambling in South Australia, and also the impact that these hideous machines have. Nick was a great champion for the working class and a great champion for people who did not have a voice. I am sure that Connie Bonaros and I will carry on his work in trying to keep this industry not only honest but also in preventing it from destroying many more lives in South Australia. I would like to thank again the Hon. Tammy Franks and the Hon. Mark Parnell. I am just looking for the Hon. John Darley but he is not there.

The PRESIDENT: Point of order: you cannot reflect on the attendance of a member.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I will withdraw that. Thank you, Mr President. Again, I am not reflecting on him: I am actually thanking him for the strong support he has shown in the passage of this bill in speaking against it. That says volumes for the Hon. John Darley, so I wish to thank him.

I thank the Hon. Connie Bonaros for the work that she has done over the years with Nick Xenophon. She has worked tirelessly with people who have been impacted by problem gambling in our community. She has represented them in court. She has offered a lot of help and support. Some of these people I have met and some of them were close to suicide. I am sure the Hon. John Dawkins would attest to the fact that there are people who also either contemplate suicide or who have committed suicide because of the issues and evils of gambling. In closing I will say, as part of SA-Best, that we will not be supporting this bill.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (00:15): I thank honourable members for their contributions both short and long and the Hon. Mr Pangallo, who has just completed five and a half hours of deliberate filibuster, reading word for word from research reports into the *Hansard* record. We were all regaled with his articulation of deterministic algorithms and demand elasticity of EGMs, and I am sure we are all the much wiser for him having read those research reports onto the record.

I summarise by saying that I was reminded, in listening to the five and a half hours of contribution, of the dog howling at the moon: there is a lot of noise and it made the dog feel good, but ultimately it was a rather pointless exercise. I accept the fact that the Hon. Mr Pangallo, and indeed others, have a view different to the overwhelming majority of members in the parliament and in this chamber as well. They are perfectly entitled to put that point of view but, ultimately, five and a half hours of reading research reports, as I said, does not add much to the debate in this chamber.

The government and the opposition in the parliament is accused by the Hon. Ms Bonaros of applying a gag. I am not sure what the definition of a gag is: we have just allowed one member to speak for five and half hours, and if that is the definition of a gag then I am intrigued at that particular interpretation. The government allowed all members to speak for however long they wished to speak, some for shorter periods and some for five and a half hours, and that is certainly not a gag. We have allowed every member to speak as he or she would wish for whatever length of time they would wish on whatever particular aspect of the legislation they wished to incorporate into their second reading contribution.

This bill was introduced into the parliament in September and we are now in December; it was introduced into the Legislative Council three weeks ago in November, and we are now in December. So any notion that this debate is being gagged in some way or, to the contrary, that in some way it is being rushed through the parliament when it was originally introduced in the parliament in September is entirely erroneous.

In relation to briefings, I am advised by the Attorney-General's advisers that while some were accepted yesterday, there is documented evidence that those briefings were offered earlier than that but crossbench members were unable or unwilling to take those briefings until yesterday.

The second last point I will make in wrapping up the second reading is again the issue that the Hon. Mr Pangallo and the Hon. Ms Bonaros have raised on a number of occasions: the issue in relation to donations buying positions of political parties. I have rejected that absolutely on behalf of the government on many occasions.

If I can quote the Hon. Ms Bonaros from an earlier debate, contrary to the Hon. Mr Pangallo's claim that millions of dollars were donated by the AHA, with the inference being in relation to buying the most recent election campaign, the Hon. Ms Bonaros claimed that the SA Liberals received \$12,500 on 8 March and \$12,500 on 14 March in the period leading up to the election.

I would assume there may well have been a range of other smaller donations also in the period up to March that she has not referred to. In her own words, those numbers are a long way short of millions of dollars in relation to donations to the Liberal Party.

I have absolutely rejected on any number of occasions that donors to the Liberal Party purchase policy positions. Indeed in the most recent debate on land tax, for example, a number of people in the community indicated how disappointed they were because they believed they had donated to the Liberal Party and we had not adopted the policy position that they would have wished.

It is again another indication that no-one purchases policy positions for the Liberal Party irrespective of the level of donation that they may give or the influence they think they might have in relation to these issues.

The final point I would make in relation to this whole debate—and I am sure we will get onto it in the committee stage of the debate—is the issue of problem gamblers. There is a shared concern from everyone in relation to the very, very small percentage of people who are problem gamblers. I think the Hon. Mr Pangallo, in amongst the five and a half hours of research reports he read onto the public record, referred in the end to prevalence surveys, the most recent one of which indicated that the percentage of problem gamblers was 0.7 per cent. I think he indicated the previous survey in South Australia was around about that order of 0.6 per cent or 0.7 per cent as well.

The point I have maintained in all my time in this parliament, as have other members, is that the overwhelming majority of people are able to gamble without being problem gamblers—more than 99 per cent. We need to do as much as we can in relation to that small percentage who are problem gamblers.

Indeed, as the Hon. Ms Bonaros has indicated, I have said on many occasions—and let me not disappoint her again on this occasion by saying—that problem gamblers would crawl over cut glass to get to their gambling option of choice. Increasingly, that will be online gambling. As the Hon. Mr Pangallo's oft-quoted research reports have indicated, fewer participants are participating in gaming machines or pokie machines now compared to 2012 and 2005, as the research reports he was quoting have indicated.

The issue here is that there has been no evidence proffered by anybody who is opposing the legislation that indicates, for example, in relation to the situation in South Australia that our level of problem gambling is significantly different to the level of problem gambling in other states as well. We have some differences in relation to aspects of our gambling options to other jurisdictions, and I am sure we will explore those in the committee stage of the debate.

With that, I indicate clearly the government's support for the second reading. We urge support for the second reading of the bill.

The council divided on the second reading:

Ayes 16
Noes 4
Majority 12

AYES

Bourke, E.S.
Hanson, J.E.
Lee, J.S.
Ngo, T.T.
Scriven, C.M.
Wortley, R.P.

Darley, J.A.
Hood, D.G.E.
Lensink, J.M.A.
Pnevmatikos, I.
Stephens, T.J.

Dawkins, J.S.L.
Hunter, I.K.
Lucas, R.I. (teller)
Ridgway, D.W.
Wade, S.G.

NOES

Bonaros, C.
Parnell, M.C.

Franks, T.A.

Pangallo, F. (teller)

Second reading thus carried; bill read a second time.

Standing Orders Suspension

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (00:27): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable the Gambling Administration Bill to be referred to a select committee.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (00:27): Government members will be opposing this particular motion.

The PRESIDENT: Does the honourable member wish to speak before I put the question?
The Hon. Ms Franks.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Thank you, Mr President. I note, as we did at the start of this speech, that the Labor opposition have come, in one case, with less than 400 words and no content to their speech and, in the other case, only a scant 131 words and no content to that speech. There are no details on the deal that has been brokered for note acceptors to be supported by the Labor opposition, with the trade-off being facial recognition technology—technology that much of the time does not even identify people and that works best for middle-aged white men but does not work for those of culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. It does not work in particular for people of colour.

There is just no detail on the privacy protections that will be afforded by this deal and the efficacy that will be afforded by this deal, and that is the main issue here. There is not a skerrick of evidence that this brokered deal will be a solution to minimise the gambling harm put before us by the Labor opposition. We think this issue deserves some further scrutiny. There was nothing put forward by the Labor opposition in defence of their amendments to this bill in the other place that will convince us that this has actually been done to minimise gambling harm, rather than create a fig leaf for the Labor opposition to buy into a deal that they always wanted to support anyway.

The council divided on the motion:

Ayes 5
Noes 15
Majority..... 10

AYES

Bonaros, C.
Pangallo, F.

Darley, J.A.
Parnell, M.C.

Franks, T.A. (teller)

NOES

Bourke, E.S.
Hood, D.G.E.
Lensink, J.M.A.
Pnevmatikos, I.
Stephens, T.J.

Dawkins, J.S.L.
Hunter, I.K.
Lucas, R.I. (teller)
Ridgway, D.W.
Wade, S.G.

Hanson, J.E.
Lee, J.S.
Ngo, T.T.
Scriven, C.M.
Wortley, R.P.

Motion thus negatived.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (LEGALISATION OF SAME SEX MARRIAGE CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENTS) BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (00:35):

I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

The PRESIDENT: Is leave granted?

The Hon. T.A. Franks: No, leave is not granted. Read on; that's how it works. The process works for a reason.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Statutes Amendment (Legalisation of Same Sex Marriage Consequential Amendments) Bill 2019 amends marriage-related provisions in 19 acts.

In 2017, the commonwealth parliament passed the Marriage Amendment (Definition and Religious Freedoms) Act 2017 (Commonwealth). Following the commencement of this act on 9 December 2017, the federal definition of marriage was gender-neutral and couples could marry irrespective of their sex or gender identity. Although the definition of marriage is a matter for federal law, many South Australian laws rely on or reference marriage.

The government has undertaken a comprehensive review of South Australian statutes to identify which laws require amending to properly reflect the new gender-neutral definition of marriage. The primary change proposed by the bill is to remove gendered references to marriage in South Australian legislation.

The bill changes numerous instances of 'husband' or 'wife' to 'spouse' and 'widow' or 'widower' to 'surviving spouse'. This ensures that the legislation matches the commonwealth definition of marriage. Fortunately, many South Australian laws already use gender-neutral language in relation to couples as a consequence of drafting conventions and previous reform.

The bill also includes amendments to the Family Relationships Act 1975 that will create consistent requirements in relation to parentage presumptions for couples who are not married. Previous amendments to the Family Relationships Act provided important parentage recognition rights to same-sex couples but also introduced a lot of complexity to the scheme. Since same-sex couples can now marry or register their relationship, the bill takes the opportunity to remove some of this complexity.

The bill creates a new, gender-neutral test for being de facto spouses for the purposes of four acts relating to superannuation, as the current definition expressly assumes that same-sex couples cannot marry. The bill will also modernise the law in relation to marriage by removing several references to obsolete doctrines about married women's property.

The bill repeals sections of the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1996 that allowed married persons to change their registered sex or gender identity, even though it would create a same-sex marriage. Now that commonwealth law allows same-sex marriages, this confirmation is no longer needed. The bill also fixes an anomaly, whereby a same-sex couple could be simultaneously married and in a registered relationship under the Relationships Register Act 2016, something the act was not meant to allow.

Finally, the bill removes a now unnecessary right to contact a same-sex partner when detained under the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act 2005, as same-sex couples are now fully covered under the rights to contact spouses or de facto spouses and do not need to be placed in a separate category.

This bill makes small changes, but it has an important purpose. The bill ensures that our laws in relation to marriage are modern, relevant and inclusive of all legally married couples. I commend the bill to members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1996

4—Amendment of section 29I—Application to change sex or gender identity

Subsection 29I(3) allows a person to apply to change their sex or gender identity despite the fact that if married they would, as a result of the change, be in a same sex marriage. Due to the legalisation of same sex marriage this provision is no longer required and this clause removes the provision accordingly.

5—Amendment of section 29O—Application for identity acknowledgement certificate

Subsection 29O(3) allows a person to apply for an identity acknowledgement certificate despite the fact that if married they would, as a result of the issuing of the certificate, be in a same sex marriage. Due to the legalisation of same sex marriage this provision is no longer required and this clause removes the provision accordingly.

Part 3—Amendment of Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935

6—Amendment of section 78—Bigamy

This clause removes gender specific language in relation to marriage in respect of the offence of bigamy.

7—Amendment of section 79—Defences in cases of bigamy

This clause removes gender specific language in relation to marriage in respect of defences to a charge of bigamy.

Part 4—Amendment of *Electoral Act 1985*

8—Amendment of section 70—Errors etc in roll not to forfeit entitlement to vote

Section 70 provides that a female elector is not to be disqualified from voting should her surname be changed by marriage. This clause broadens the section to apply to any elector regardless of gender.

Part 5—Amendment of *Evidence Act 1929*

9—Amendment of section 16—Parties and their spouses competent and compellable in civil proceedings

This clause removes gender specific language in relation to marriage in respect of giving evidence in civil proceedings.

Part 6—Amendment of Family and Community Services Act 1972

10—Amendment of section 6—Interpretation

This clause removes the reference to marriage being between a man and a woman and substitutes it with gender neutral language.

11—Amendment of section 104—Order for payment of preliminary expenses

Section 104 provides that where a woman is pregnant or has given birth she may sue for expenses if she can prove that she is pregnant by someone who is not her husband. This clause gender neutralises the section by replacing the word 'husband' with 'spouse'.

12—Amendment of section 140—Evidence of mother as to paternity of child born outside marriage etc not to be accepted without corroboration except in certain cases

Section 140 provides that the evidence of a woman that she is pregnant by someone other than her husband must not be accepted without corroboration, except in certain circumstances. This clause gender neutralises the section by replacing the word 'husband' with 'spouse'.

13—Amendment of section 211—Power to make provisional order against person resident in reciprocating country

This clause removes gender specific language in relation to marriage in respect of maintenance orders against a spouse.

14—Amendment of section 245—Evidence of spouses

This clause removes gender specific language in relation to marriage in respect of giving evidence for or against a person's spouse.

Part 7—Amendment of Family Relationships Act 1975

15—Amendment of section 8—Presumption as to parentage

Section 8 provides that a child born to a woman during her marriage (or qualifying relationship) will be presumed to be the child of the mother and the husband or domestic partner.

This clause changes the word 'husband' to 'spouse' to reflect that the woman's spouse may not be a husband. The term 'domestic partner' is also changed to 'partner' by this clause which reflects the fact that a qualifying relationship is, by definition, made up of 'partners' not 'domestic partners'.

The effect of this amendment is that whether a woman is married to, or in a qualifying relationship with, a man or a woman, that person will be presumed to be the parent of the child born to the woman in the circumstances prescribed in the section.

16—Amendment of section 10A—Interpretation

This clause gender neutralises language in relation to marriage by removing definitions of 'married woman', 'wife' and 'husband' and substitutes them with the term 'spouse'.

This clause also clarifies that a 'qualifying relationship' includes a relationship that is registered under the *Relationships Register Act 2016*.

17—Amendment of section 10C—Rules relating to parentage

This clause gender neutralises language in relation to marriage. The effect of the changes to subsection (3) is that where a woman who is married or in a qualifying relationship undergoes a fertilisation procedure with the consent of her spouse or partner, the woman's spouse or partner (whether male or female) will be presumed to have caused the pregnancy and will be taken to be the father (in the case of a male spouse or partner) or the co-parent (in any other case) of the child.

Section 10C(3a) was introduced into the *Family Relationships Act 1975* at a time when the presumption for parentage in 10C(3) applied to a mother and her partner who had been cohabiting for at least 3 years. The 3 year requirement in subsection (3) was later removed and, as such, subsection (3a) is no longer needed.

Clause 19 of this Bill inserts transitional provisions in relation to the changes to subsections (3) and (3a) which is explained in that clause.

18—Amendment of section 10HA—Recognised surrogacy agreements

This clause gender neutralises language in relation to marriage. The effect of this clause is that the spouse or partner of a proposed surrogate, regardless of gender, is to be a party to the relevant recognised surrogacy agreement.

Clause 19 of this Bill inserts a transitional provision in relation to the changes to section 10HA which is explained in that clause.

19—Insertion of Schedule 1

This clause inserts three transitional provisions. The first provides that in the period between the legalisation of same sex marriage and the commencement of the amending Act, a reference to a husband in section 10C(3) will be taken to have been a reference to a spouse. The effect of this clause is that, where a woman has undergone a fertilisation procedure after the day on which same sex marriage became legal, a female spouse of the woman who underwent the procedure will be deemed to be the co-parent of the child born as a result of that procedure.

To avoid doubt, this clause also provides that a partner of a woman who was taken to be a father or co-parent of a child born as a result of the woman's pregnancy in consequence of a fertilisation procedure under existing section 10C(3a) will still be taken to be the father or co-parent (as the case may be) of that child after the subsection is repealed.

This clause also provides that a female spouse or partner of a surrogate mother may only be a party to a recognised surrogacy agreement if the agreement was entered into after the commencement of the clause. The effect of this transitional provision is to prevent a person who was a female spouse or partner of the surrogate mother prior to the commencement of this clause from unwittingly becoming party to a recognised surrogacy agreement.

Part 8—Amendment of Judges' Pensions Act 1971

20—Amendment of section 9A—Spouse entitlement subject to any Family Law determination

This clause includes domestic partners within the scope of section 9A.

21—Amendment of section 11—Minimum pensions

This clause removes the gender specific language in relation to surviving spouses. This clause also includes surviving domestic partners as being able to receive a Judge's pension upon their death.

22—Amendment of section 17B—Purpose of this Part

Part 2A currently only applies to facilitating the division of interests under the *Family Law Act 1975* of the Commonwealth between spouses who have separated. This clause amends section 17B to include domestic partners who have separated.

23—Amendment of section 17K—Pension not payable to spouse or domestic partner on death of Judge if split has occurred

This clause provides that a pension is not payable to the domestic partner of a Judge if a split has occurred. At present, the section only applies to spouses.

Part 9—Amendment of Law of Property Act 1936

24—Amendment of section 100—Assurance policy by spouses

This clause removes gender specific language in relation to marriage in respect of assurance policies.

Part 10—Amendment of Limitation of Actions Act 1936

25—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause removes gender specific language in relation to marriage.

26—Amendment of section 32—Further provisions as to application of Act to trusts

Due to the fact that married women can own property in their own right, this clause removes the concept of separate use by married women.

Part 11—Amendment of Parliamentary Superannuation Act 1974

27—Amendment of section 5—Interpretation

This clause removes gender specific language in relation to surviving spouses.

28—Amendment of section 7A—Putative spouses

This clause removes gender specific language in relation to putative spouses.

Part 12—Amendment of Police Superannuation Act 1990

29—Amendment of section 4A—Putative spouses

This clause removes gender specific language in relation to putative spouses.

Part 13—Amendment of Real Property Act 1886

30—Amendment of section 69—Title of registered proprietor indefeasible

This clause removes paragraph 69(g) which relates, inter alia, to a wife's prevailing title where a husband has been wrongly registered as a co-proprietor of land belonging to his wife.

31—Amendment of section 111—Transfer by registered proprietor to spouse etc

This clause removes gender specific language in relation to marriage in respect of transferring an estate or interest in land.

Part 14—Amendment of Relationships Register Act 2016

32—Insertion of section 13A

The *Relationships Register Act 2016* does not permit a person who is married to be in a registered relationship. This clause puts it beyond doubt that if a person was party to a same sex marriage that took place overseas before the day on which overseas same sex marriages were recognised as legal in Australia and was also a party to a registered relationship on or before that day, the registration of that relationship is revoked.

Part 15—Amendment of Settled Estates Act 1880

33—Amendment of section 44—Tenants for life etc may grant leases for 21 years

This clause removes reference to the concept of a person owning or acquiring property in right of their wife.

34—Amendment of section 45—Against whom such leases shall be valid

This clause removes gender specific language in relation to marriage and removes reference to the concept of a person owning or acquiring property in right of their wife.

Part 16—Amendment of Solicitor-General Act 1972

35—Amendment of section 9—Leave on retirement

This clause removes gender specific language in relation to surviving spouses.

36—Amendment of section 10—Pension rights of Solicitor-General and application of *Judges' Pensions Act 1971*

This clause removes gender specific language in relation to surviving spouses.

Part 17—Amendment of Southern State Superannuation Act 2009

37—Amendment of section 7—Putative spouses

This clause removes gender specific language in relation to putative spouses.

Part 18—Amendment of *Stamp Duties Act 1923*

38—Amendment of Schedule 2—Stamp duties and exemptions

This clause removes gender specific language in relation to surviving spouses.

Part 19—Amendment of Superannuation Act 1988

39—Amendment of section 4A—Putative spouses

This clause removes gender specific language in relation to putative spouses.

Part 20—Amendment of Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act 2005

40—Amendment of section 35—Contacting family members etc

This clause removes a now outdated reference to a same sex partner.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

MARRIED PERSONS (SEPARATE LEGAL STATUS) BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (00:38): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

The PRESIDENT: Is leave granted?

Honourable members: No.

The PRESIDENT: Leave is not granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: This morning, I introduce the Married Persons (Separate Legal Status) Bill 2019. The Married Persons (Separate Legal Status) Bill 2019 is part of the reforms the government is undertaking to ensure that South Australian law is fully compatible with the availability of same-sex marriage. It is complementary to the main bill which undertakes this reform: the Statutes Amendment (Legalisation of Same Sex Marriage Consequential Amendments) Bill 2019.

The Married Persons (Separate Legal Status) Bill 2019 is required due to the numerous outdated provisions about married persons found in the Law of Property Act 1936. The Law of Property Act has many sections that state what married women can do: hold property, for example, or effect a policy of insurance upon her own life. It also has laws about married men; for example, providing that a man is not liable for the torts or debts of his wife.

These laws might seem unnecessary and old-fashioned now, but at the time they were enacted they were vitally important. At common law in the late nineteenth century, married women did not have an independent legal identity. They were considered one legal person with their husband, and the husband was in control. This doctrine significantly impeded the legal rights of married women. For example, because a married woman had no legal identity, she could not hold property in her own right, or have a legal action against her husband. It also operated to make married men legally responsible for their wife's actions. Statutes like the Law of Property Act and its predecessors used legislation to override these common law rules.

As groundbreaking as the laws were at that time, the language used has become outdated and inappropriate to the modern law of marriage, particularly following the legalisation of same-sex marriage. The laws require updating to fit the egalitarian, gender-neutral form of marriage in Australia today.

The Married Persons (Separate Legal Status) Bill 2019 will create a standalone act that expresses in broad, gender-neutral terms that married persons are separate legally and equal to non-married persons as concerns their legal capacity. This ensures that the old common law doctrine of unity of spouses continues to be inapplicable. The bill then repeals the outdated portions of the Law of Property Act. The bill is not intended to alter the law of marriage as currently found in the Law of Property Act; rather, it will consolidate and modernise the provisions in standalone act related to married persons' legal status.

This approach is not unique to South Australia. Two other jurisdictions already have similar acts. New South Wales has the Married Persons (Equality of Status) Act 1996 (NSW) and Northern Territory has the Married Persons (Equality of Status) Act 1989 (NT).

I commend the bill to members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Separate legal status of married persons

3—Married person has legal capacity as if not married

This clause provides that married persons have separate legal status to one another in all circumstances.

4—Married person entitled to criminal and civil redress in respect of property

This clause provides that a married person may bring an action against their spouse in relation to the person's property notwithstanding the fact that they are married.

5—Married person has no authority to act as agent for spouse

This clause provides that a married person is not permitted to act as an agent for their spouse, unless another law or agreement provides otherwise.

6—Married person not liable for debts of spouse incurred before marriage

This clause provides that a married person is not liable for a debt of their spouse that was incurred before they entered into their marriage.

7—Housekeeping payments and allowances taken to be joint property

This clause provides that where a married person provides money to their spouse for the purpose of paying joint household expenses, anything purchased with that money, or any money not spent, will be taken to be the joint property of the person and the person's spouse (unless an agreement between the person and their spouse states otherwise).

Part 3—Miscellaneous

8—Regulations

This clause allows the Governor to make regulations in relation to the Act.

Schedule 1—Related amendments

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Amendment provisions

This clause is formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Law of Property Act 1936

2—Amendment of section 40—Conveyances by a person to self etc

This clause gender neutralises language in relation to conveying property to oneself jointly with another person.

3—Amendment of section 42—Covenants for title

Section 42(3) prescribes a concept relating to a wife being deemed to convey property on the direction of the husband where both the wife and the husband convey and are expressed to convey as beneficial owners. This clause removes subsection (3).

4—Amendment of section 82—Request by infant or person under disability

Section 82 provides that another person may be authorised to act on behalf of a married woman, infant, person of unsound mind or person with any other disability in certain circumstances, and in effect equates married women with persons with impaired decision making abilities. This clause removes the reference to married women in this section.

5—Repeal of sections 92 to 99

Sections 92 to 99 of the Act specify certain provisions in relation to married women that are no longer required in light of this measure, such as prescribing that, in relation to legal status in respect of property, a married woman is to be treated as though she were not married.

6—Repeal of sections 101 to 107

Sections 101 to 107 of the Act specify certain provisions in relation to married women that are no longer required in light of this measure, such as a married woman having the same civil and criminal redress in relation to property as if she were not married.

7—Amendment of section 108—Interpretation of terms

This clause removes outdated references to married women and otherwise gender neutralises terminology in relation to executors and administrators.

8—Repeal of section 109

This section deletes section 109 of the Act, which relates to wills of married women.

9—Repeal of section 111

This section deletes section 111 of the Act, which relates to acquisitions and dispositions of trust estates by married women.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS (FOREIGN LAWYERS AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (12:42): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

The PRESIDENT: Is leave granted?

Honourable members: No.

The PRESIDENT: Leave is not granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The bill I introduce this morning is the Legal Practitioners (Foreign Lawyers and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2019, which amends the Legal Practitioners Act 1981. The main amendments in the bill insert provisions to regulate the practice of foreign law by foreign lawyers in South Australia and to provide for their local registration and regulation.

The foreign lawyers amendments originated from a request made by the presidents of the Law Society of South Australia, the South Australian Bar Association and the Law Council of Australia to amend the Legal Practitioners Act to include provisions for the registration and regulation of foreign lawyers practising foreign law in South Australia. South Australia is currently the only jurisdiction not to have these provisions in its legislation to regulate the legal profession.

The last round of major amendments to the Legal Practitioners Act came into force on 1 July 2014. The changes included abolishing the Legal Practitioner's Conduct Board and establishing the new office of the Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner, with expanded powers to deal with misconduct by legal practitioners. Four new schedules were also inserted into the Legal Practitioners Act to deal with incorporated legal practices, trust money and trust accounts, costs disclosure and adjudication and investigatory powers. These schedules were based on the legal profession model bill that is in force in all jurisdictions except for New South Wales and Victoria. The latter jurisdictions operate under the Legal Profession Uniform Law Application Act 2014.

Both the model bill and the uniform law contain provisions for the regulation and registration of foreign lawyers. A locally registered foreign lawyer is only entitled to practise foreign law in Australia. Overseas admitted practitioners who wish to practise Australian law must apply for admission in Australia and will then be regulated as an Australian legal practitioner.

The Law Society are of the view that the inclusion of the foreign lawyer provisions will facilitate the provision of legal services across South Australian borders and will also provide export

opportunities for South Australian legal practitioners and practices. The foreign lawyers provisions in the bill are modelled on the relevant provisions from the model bill so that South Australia remains consistent with the other model bill jurisdictions.

The other significant amendment in the bill is an amendment relating to trustee companies. Trustee companies are corporations regulated by the Corporations Act 2001 (Cth) that provide 'traditional trustee company services', which are defined in the Corporations Act as: performing estate management functions; preparing a will, a trust instrument, a power of attorney or an agency arrangement; applying for probate of a will, applying for a grant of letters of administration, or electing to administer a deceased estate; and establishing and operating common funds.

National Australia Bank (or NAB) has identified an issue with the Legal Practitioners Act that affects its subsidiary National Australia Trustees Limited, which I will refer to as NAT. NAB has identified that trustee companies such as NAT most likely fall within the definition of 'incorporated legal practice' used in the Legal Practitioners Act. This problem has also been identified with respect to legal profession legislation in other jurisdictions.

The advice received by the Attorney-General indicates that trustee companies do, in fact, fall within the definition of an incorporated legal practice under the Legal Practitioners Act, and so in theory must comply with the entire regulatory regime set out in schedule 1, which covers incorporated legal practices. This means that not only are trustee companies over-regulated as they are subject to both state and commonwealth regulatory regimes, it is likely that some of the provisions of the Legal Practitioners Act, as they apply to trustee companies, may be inconsistent with the Commonwealth Corporations Act and therefore invalid.

As a result of advice sought from the Crown Solicitor's office and extensive consultation with the Law Society, the Legal Practitioners Act will be amended to remove trustee companies from the ambit of the Legal Practitioners Act. The Attorney-General is satisfied that the relevant trustee companies are sufficiently regulated by the Corporations Act such that there is no risk to consumers of the trustee companies being under-regulated.

In order to achieve this outcome, regulations will be made under clauses 1(2)(c) and 1(3) of schedule 1 of the Legal Practitioners Act to exclude trustee companies from its operation; however, it is necessary to first undertake a legislative amendment to ensure that a court would not find the regulations to be in conflict with section 21(3)(s). Therefore, the bill contains an amendment to section 21(3)(s) to exclude trustee companies offering traditional trustee company services (as defined by the Corporations Act) from the operation of the Legal Practitioners Act. The relevant regulations will be developed in the usual way following the passage of the bill.

I note that an additional amendment was inserted into the bill via a government amendment in the other place. The amendment to section 77N of the Legal Practitioners Act allows the Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner to recover the costs of a cost assessment undertaken in a successful overcharging complaint from the legal practitioner who is the subject of that complaint. There is already a very similar provision in the same section which applies to fees which may be recovered from the legal practitioner; however, as the cost assessment is classed as a disbursement, an additional provision is necessary to allow the recovery to take place. I commend the bill to members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Legal Practitioners Act 1981

4—Amendment of section 5—Interpretation

This clause inserts a number of definitions required for the purposes of the measure.

5—Amendment of section 5A—Terms relating to associates and principals of law practices

This clause amends the definition of *associate* of a law practice so that the term includes—

- an Australian-registered foreign lawyer who is a partner in the law practice; and
- an Australian-registered foreign lawyer who has a relationship with the law practice of a class prescribed by the regulations.

6—Insertion of section 5B

New section 5B, inserted by this clause, provides a definition of *home jurisdiction*. A legal practitioner's home jurisdiction is the jurisdiction in which the practitioner's only or most recent current Australian practising certificate was granted. For an Australian-registered foreign lawyer, the home jurisdiction is the jurisdiction in which the lawyer's only or most recent current registration was granted.

7—Amendment of section 20AI—Refusal, amendment, suspension or cancellation of practising certificate—failure to show cause

Section 20AI is amended by this clause to give the Supreme Court the power to impose conditions on a practising certificate where the applicant for, or holder of, the certificate has provided a written statement as required under section 20AG or 20AH. Those sections require an applicant for, or holder of, a practising certificate to provide a statement to the Supreme Court if a show cause event in relation to the person has happened.

8—Amendment of section 21—Entitlement to practise

This clause makes amendments to section 21 consequential on the introduction of provisions into the Act relating to registration of foreign lawyers. Under the section as amended, the provision of the section that prevents a natural person who is not a local legal practitioner or an interstate legal practitioner from practising the profession of the law will not apply in relation to the practice of foreign law by an Australian-registered foreign lawyer in accordance with Schedule 1A.

As a consequence of additional amendments made by this clause, officers and employees of trustee companies and certain other bodies corporate will be authorised to undertake certain legal work (for example, preparing wills) even if they are not local or interstate legal practitioners.

9—Insertion of Part 3 Division 4A

Under proposed section 24A, which is included in new Division 4A of Part 3, Schedule 1A applies in relation to the practise of foreign law in South Australia.

10—Amendment of section 39—Delivery up of legal papers

11—Amendment of section 40—Authority of legal practitioner or foreign lawyer to act on behalf of person of unsound mind

12—Amendment of section 43A—Interpretation

The amendments made by this clause are consequential on the insertion into the Act of provisions relating to the registration of foreign lawyers in this jurisdiction.

13—Amendment of section 49—Supreme Court may grant authority permitting director to practise

Section 49 prohibits a legal practitioner who is or has been a director of an incorporated legal practice during the winding up of the corporation for the benefit of creditors from practising the profession of the law without the authority of the Supreme Court. The section as amended by this clause will extend the prohibition to Australian-registered foreign lawyers and corporate entities entitled to engage in legal practice in a foreign country.

14—Amendment of section 57—Fidelity Fund

Currently, money in the Fidelity Fund includes costs recovered in disciplinary proceedings against legal practitioners or former legal practitioners. This clause expands the relevant provision so that costs recovered in disciplinary proceedings against Australian-registered foreign lawyers and former Australian-registered foreign lawyers are also included.

15—Amendment of section 77N—Investigation of allegation of overcharging

Under section 77N(4), the Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner can arrange for legal costs that are the subject of a complaint of overcharging to be assessed by a legal practitioner. This clause amends the section so that, if the complaint results in a determination or finding that there has been overcharging or a requirement for costs to be reduced or refunded, the costs of the assessment can be recovered from the legal practitioner or former legal practitioner who is the subject of the complaint.

16—Insertion of Schedule 1A

This clause inserts a Schedule that sets out provisions that apply to the practise of foreign law in South Australia.

Schedule 1A—Foreign lawyers

Under Schedule 1A, a person is prohibited from practising foreign law in South Australia unless the person is an Australian-registered foreign lawyer or an Australian legal practitioner. An Australian-registered foreign lawyer is a locally registered foreign lawyer or an interstate-registered foreign lawyer.

Under Part 3 of the Schedule, an overseas-registered foreign lawyer may be registered as a foreign lawyer. An overseas-registered foreign lawyer is a natural person who is properly registered to engage in legal practice in a foreign country. Part 4 of the Schedule sets out provisions relating to the granting or renewal of registration as a foreign lawyer. Application is to be made to the Law Society. Unless there are grounds for refusing an application, the Society must grant an application for registration as a foreign lawyer if the Society—

- is satisfied the applicant is registered to engage in legal practice in one or more foreign countries and is not an Australian legal practitioner; and
- considers an effective system exists for regulating engaging in legal practice in one or more of the foreign countries; and
- considers the applicant is not, as a result of criminal, civil or disciplinary proceedings in any of the foreign countries, subject to—
 - any special conditions in engaging in legal practice in any of the foreign countries; or
 - any undertakings concerning engaging in legal practice in any of the foreign countries, that would make it inappropriate to register the person; and
- is satisfied the applicant demonstrates an intention to commence practising foreign law in this jurisdiction within a reasonable period if registration were to be granted.

The Society may refuse to grant or renew registration if—

- the application is not accompanied by, or does not contain, the information required by Schedule 1A or prescribed by the regulations; or
- the applicant has contravened the Act or a corresponding law; or
- the applicant has contravened an order of the Tribunal or a corresponding disciplinary body; or
- the applicant has contravened an order of a regulatory authority of any jurisdiction to pay any fine or costs; or
- the applicant has failed to comply with a requirement under the Act to pay a contribution to, or levy for, the Fidelity Fund; or
- the applicant has contravened a requirement of or made under the Act about professional indemnity insurance; or
- the applicant has failed to pay any expenses of receivership payable under the Act; or
- the applicant's foreign legal practice is in receivership (however described).

Clause 24 sets out additional grounds for refusal to grant or renew registration.

Under Part 9 of the Schedule, registration as a foreign lawyer is subject to conditions imposed by the Society, statutory conditions imposed by the Act, conditions imposed under the legal profession rules and conditions imposed under Part 6 of the Act.

Provisions relating to amendment, suspension and cancellation of registration are also included.

The Society is required under the Schedule to keep a register of the names of locally registered foreign lawyers.

17—Amendment of Schedule 2—Trust money and trust accounts

This clause amends Schedule 2 to insert a definition of 'law practice' that applies for the purposes of the Schedule and includes an Australian-registered foreign lawyer who practises foreign law on the lawyer's own account and a partnership consisting of one or more Australian-registered foreign lawyers or one or more Australian legal practitioners, or both.

18—Amendment of Schedule 3—Costs disclosure and adjudication

This clause makes a number of amendments to Schedule 3 to ensure that the costs provisions in the Act apply to Australian-registered foreign lawyers.

19—Amendment of Schedule 4—Investigatory powers

This clause amends Schedule 4 to insert a definition of 'law practice' that applies for the purposes of the Schedule and includes an Australian-registered foreign lawyer who practises foreign law on the lawyer's own account and a partnership consisting of one or more Australian-registered foreign lawyers or one or more Australian legal practitioners, or both.

Schedule 1—Transitional provision

1—Transitional provision

This clause provides that the amendment to section 77N made by clause 15 applies in relation to a complaint of overcharging received by the Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner after the commencement of the amendment irrespective of when the final bill to which the complaint relates was delivered to the client.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS MANAGEMENT (DESIGNATED AREA) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (00:49): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to insert the second reading explanation into *Hansard* without my reading it.

The PRESIDENT: Leave is sought; is leave granted? Leave is not granted.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I am very pleased to introduce the Genetically Modified Crops Management (Designated Area) Amendment Bill 2019. The bill will enable the government to pursue an important reform that will give South Australian farmers on the mainland the choice to take up the opportunities that genetically modified food crops can provide them now and in the future.

The Genetically Modified Crops Management Act 2004 provides for the designation of areas of the state for the purposes of preserving, for marketing purposes, the identity of certain food crops according to whether they are genetically modified or non-genetically modified crops, and to provide for the segregation of genetically modified food crops, and to provide certain protections with respect to the spread of genetically modified plant material.

The act therefore is in place for marketing and trade purposes and has been used to prohibit the cultivation of genetically modified food crops. This is commonly referred to as the moratorium on genetically modified food crops and currently applies to the whole of South Australia. I would like to stress that this legislation is not in place for the protection of human health and the environment, as these matters are dealt with through the national regulatory schemes and are not grounds for retaining the moratorium.

This government came to power with a clear commitment to undertake an independent expert review of the moratorium to determine its true economic merits and enable a decision on its future to be made, based on evidence. The government has undertaken an exhaustive process to fulfil this commitment, which I would like to explain to demonstrate that we have been open and transparent and have provided stakeholders with ample opportunity to provide their views. An independent review was commissioned within six months of forming government. Public submissions were invited during the review, which was completed in February 2019.

In summary, the review found no evidence—I stress, no evidence—that South Australia enjoys better access to the European Union non-genetically modified grain market. It also found that there has been no premium for South Australian non-genetically modified grain when compared with neighbouring states and, importantly, that the moratorium had cost South Australian grain growers at least \$33 million since 2004 and, if extended to 2025, would cost the industry at least a further \$5 million. The review also found the moratorium had discouraged public and private investment in research.

The only exception that was identified by the review was Kangaroo Island, where there are some canola producers who have a specialised market in Japan based on its non-genetically modified status. In considering farmers who wish to continue to access non-genetically modified and organic markets, the review also found that the experience in other states shows that segregation protocols ensure successful coexistence of genetically modified and non-genetically modified crops.

The government released the findings of this review shortly after receiving it for public comment to assist the government to determine the next steps. After considering this feedback and the findings of the review, the government decided to lift the moratorium across all areas of South Australia, except Kangaroo Island. The government sought to implement this decision by following the process prescribed in section 5 of the Genetically Modified Crops Management Act 2004. The government undertook extensive statutory consultation, a process required by section 5(3) of the act, on the proposal to amend the Genetically Modified Crops Management Regulations 2008 to lift the moratorium in all of South Australia, except Kangaroo Island.

This third round of public consultation included releasing draft regulations and provided for public notice to be given on the Primary Industries and Regions South Australia (PIRSA) website and for a public notice in the newspaper, as required by subsections 5(3)(a)(i) and 5(9) of the act. It invited the public to make written submissions to the government over a six-week period, as required by subsection 5(3)(a)(ii) of the act, and convened two public meetings in areas to be affected by the proposed regulations, one in Kingscote and one in Adelaide, as required by subsection 5(3)(a)(iii) of the act.

The government also consulted the GM Crop Advisory Committee, as required by subsection 5(8) of the act. The majority of views expressed in the statutory consultation supported the proposed regulations. A total of 218 submissions were received in response to this consultation, of which 128 submitters were in favour of the proposed regulations. One submitter, being Livestock SA, favoured lifting the moratorium across the whole of South Australia, including Kangaroo Island; 75 submitters were opposed to the proposed regulations; and a further 15 submitters were opposed to the proposed regulations, referencing matters outside the scope of the act.

The GM Crop Advisory Committee also supported the proposed regulations. The lifting of the moratorium has been strongly supported by grain growers, their representative organisation, Grain Producers South Australia, and the wider grains industry, as well as by Primary Producers South Australia, Livestock SA and the South Australian Dairyfarmers Association.

Kangaroo Island farmers have supported the proposal to lift the moratorium on the mainland but retain it on the island, with some stressing the importance of having mechanisms to access any new pasture and crop varieties in future which may benefit local growing conditions.

Submissions from many of our state's highly regarded research institutions have also clearly highlighted the moratorium's negative impacts on research and development investment in South Australia. The independent review findings, the feedback from the consultation undertaken following this review and the advice of the expert advisory committee do not provide economic grounds for retaining the moratorium.

This process has instead shown the moratorium has resulted in costs to producers and the state, barriers to research and investment and, if it continues, will mean that our farmers do not have access to current and future important innovations in crops and pastures. It is also clear that the experience of other mainland states demonstrates that coexistence is possible and that the sale of non-genetically modified food crops can continue where there is no moratorium in place.

The government therefore progressed this reform and made the Genetically Modified Crops Management (Designated Area) Variation Regulations 2019, which amended the area where genetically modified food crops were prohibited to just Kangaroo Island. This simple amendment was intended to retain the structure of the act, which makes it clear that the area where the moratorium is to apply will be designated by regulations.

As a disallowable instrument, the parliament had the opportunity to scrutinise, debate and vote on these regulations. This occurred on 27 November 2019, when the regulations were disallowed by resolution of this council. During the debate in this council, members expressed views

that the areas to which the moratorium applies should be designated in the act and not the regulations.

The government was invited by members in this chamber during the debate to bring forward a bill to provide the parliament with an opportunity to consider and debate the merits of lifting or changing the moratorium. To fulfil the wishes of this chamber and the parliament, I introduce this bill into the chamber today to enable this to happen.

The bill is not inconsistent with the recommendations of the recent parliamentary select committee into genetically modified crops in South Australia, with two of the committee members stating here that there was overwhelming evidence that lifting the moratorium on the mainland would benefit the farming sector.

The bill gives effect to the government's position that the moratorium should only apply to Kangaroo Island. The bill removes the powers of the Governor to designate by regulation the area for which the moratorium on the cultivation of genetically modified food crops may apply. The bill also respects the wishes of the 2017 parliament in applying 1 September 2025 as a sunset date for the moratorium.

It is past time that South Australian farmers are provided with the same choices as their neighbours in other Australian states to use new and improved crop varieties and agricultural technologies to tackle the challenges they face. South Australian farmers should have access to choice in crop varieties that build resilience, both financially and in their production systems, to drought, climate variability and change.

Farmers who do not choose to grow genetically modified crops will be able to continue to sell to non-genetically modified and organic markets, as farmers have successfully done in other states, using segregation protocols that have proven to be successful and reliable.

The Marshall Liberal government has a strong reform agenda to strengthen and grow the state's economy. The bill will enable the growth of our agriculture and food sector. We are committed to supporting the grains sector to be vibrant, productive and competitive. I commend the bill to the council and look forward to the debate.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

This clause is formal.

2—Commencement

The measure commences on 1 January 2020.

3—Amendment provisions

This clause is formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Genetically Modified Crops Management Act 2004

4—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This amendment is consequential.

5—Amendment of section 5—Designation of areas

The power to designate by regulation areas of the State in relation to the cultivation (and prohibition of the cultivation) of genetically modified food crops is repealed and substituted with the provision that Kangaroo Island is designated as an area in which no genetically modified food crops may be cultivated.

Provisions related to the making of regulations referred to above are also repealed.

6—Insertion of section 7A

New section 7A is inserted:

7A—Expiry of Part

This section provides that Part 2 of the Act expires on 1 September 2025.

7—Amendment of Schedule 1—Transitional provisions

These amendments are consequential. One of them provides a power to make transitional regulations connected to the measure. Such regulations may operate from the commencement of the measure, or a later day.

Schedule 1—Repeal and revocation

Part 1—Repeal

1—Repeal of Genetically Modified Crops Management Regulations (Postponement of Expiry) Act 2017

The Genetically Modified Crops Management Regulations (Postponement of Expiry) Act 2017 is repealed as a consequence of the amendment to section 5 of the Genetically Modified Crops Management Act 2004.

Part 2—Revocation

2—Revocation of Genetically Modified Crops Management Regulations 2008

The Genetically Modified Crops Management Regulations 2008 are revoked as a consequence of the amendment to section 5 of the Genetically Modified Crops Management Act 2004.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

At 00:59 the council adjourned until Wednesday 4 December 2019 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***LOCAL HEALTH NETWORKS**

152 The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (30 October 2019).

1. On what date were proposed/draft service level agreements for 2019-20 first presented to local health network governing boards, LHN CEOs and/or board chairs?
2. Has each local health network board established a register in accordance with s 33D of the Health Care Act 2008 regarding board members' interests?
 - (a) If so, where are these registers accessible to the public?
 - (b) If these registers are accessible in different places for different boards, please detail the location of each register.
3. Has the Minister for Health and Wellbeing complied with his responsibilities under schedule 3, section 3(2) of the Health Care Act 2008 to publish the remuneration and allowances of the board members? If so where is this website published?
4. How many employees of the Rural Support Service have a total remuneration package of over \$100,000 per annum? And if the minister believes this information is contained in previous answers, what is the reference for those answers?
5. What is the current FTE of the Rural Support Service?
6. How many FTEs of the Rural Support Service have their primary office location in the Adelaide CBD? How many in each of the six country local hospital networks?
7. What is the current office location of the Rural Support Service? What is the rental cost of the premises?
8. When will the headquarters of the Rural Support Service open in Nuriootpa?
9. What will be the location of the Rural Support Service in Nuriootpa?
10. When will the majority of staff in the Rural Support Service be based at its headquarters in Nuriootpa?
11. Noting that contracts under the Patient Services Panel commenced in July 2019—on what specific dates in July did contracts start with the 13 private hospitals for elective surgery and emergency patient care following the new central government contract?
12. Notwithstanding the regularity of consultation with LHNs—on what date were the local hospital network boards consulted about the new contracts with 13 private hospitals?
13. Do any members of LHN boards have interests, shares, directorships or other conflicts with private hospital providers—and if so which board members and what are the natures of the conflicts?
14. Noting that this level of detail is not currently publicly available—which private hospitals are contracted to conduct elective surgeries on public patients, and for which elective surgery procedures? When do these contracts conclude? How is the funding broken down by hospital? Will the government publish the amount of work performed under these contracts, broken down by hospital? If so, where and how often will this information be published?
15. Notwithstanding the level of similarity to other contracts in place, what provisions do the new contracts with 13 private hospital providers contain about:
 - (a) the safety and quality of care?
 - (b) nursing staff levels?
 - (c) reporting of critical incidents?
 - (d) dispute resolution?
 - (e) minimum throughput numbers?
 - (f) availability of private beds for public patients when demand is high for private patients?
 - (g) use of public sector medical officers?
 - (h) privacy of patients and medical records?
16. Noting that this information is not available in budget papers, annual reports, dashboards or other public information—as a total percentage amount—what percentage of the funding allocated to SA Health for 2019-20 will be spent in regional South Australia?

17. Noting that this information is not available in budget papers, annual reports, dashboards or other public information, what percentage of the funding spent by SA Health in 2018-19 was spent in regional South Australia?

18. Noting that this information is not available in budget papers, annual reports, dashboards or other public information, what percentage of SA Health FTEs were based in regional South Australia in 2018-19?

19. Following the minister's statement to parliament that a report was prepared, on what date was the Women's and Children's Hospital task force report received by the minister?

20. Noting the Premier stated to parliament that the government has received preliminary cost estimates for the new Women's and Children's Hospital, on what date did the minister and the department first receive these preliminary cost estimates?

21. Noting the Premier has stated to parliament that the government has received preliminary cost estimates for the new Women's and Children's Hospital, what is the range of construction cost estimates for the new Women's and Children's Hospital that the government is so far in receipt of?

22. What is the total cost per annum of the five additional FTEs added to the minister's office over the past two financial years—including salary, super and work-related benefits?

23. Noting that this information is not available in current annual reports of the Central Adelaide Local Health Network or other public information, for 2018-19 what expenditure occurred at Hampstead?

24. Noting that this information is not available in current annual reports of the Central Adelaide Local Health Network or other public information, for 2019-20 what is the budgeted expenditure at Hampstead?

25. Noting that this information is not available in current annual reports of the Central Adelaide Local Health Network or other public information, for 2018-19 how many FTE were based at Hampstead?

26. Noting that this information is not available in current annual reports of the Central Adelaide Local Health Network or other public information, for 2019-20 what is the FTE planned for Hampstead?

27. When is the planned closure date for Hampstead?

28. What will happen to the Hampstead site following its closure?

29. When is the planned closure date for St Margaret's?

30. What will happen to the St Margaret's site following its closure?

31. What will the number of paediatric assessment cubicles be in the Lyell McEwin Hospital emergency department following the redevelopment?

32. What will the number of resuscitation bays be in the Lyell McEwin Hospital emergency department following the redevelopment?

33. Noting that maintenance of SA Dental Service clinics is managed by the Department for Health and Wellbeing capital funding process, how many SA Dental clinics have a remaining building life of five years or less and what are the locations and titles of each of those clinics?

34. Noting that this information is not available in current annual reports of the Central Adelaide Local Health Network or other public information, what is the recurrent cost and the total FTE of the SA Dental Service—both actual from 2018-19 and budgeted for 2019-20?

35. Noting that this information is not available in budget papers, annual reports, dashboards or other public information, what was the total waiting list for public restorative dental services as at each of the following dates:

- 1 March 2018
- 1 April 2018
- 1 May 2018
- 1 June 2018
- 1 July 2018
- 1 August 2018
- 1 September 2018
- 1 October 2018
- 1 November 2018
- 1 December 2018
- 1 January 2019

- 1 February 2019
- 1 March 2019
- 1 April 2019
- 1 May 2019
- 1 June 2019
- 1 July 2019
- 1 August 2019
- 1 September 2019
- 1 October 2019
- 1 November 2019

36. Noting that this information is not available in budget papers, annual reports, dashboards or other public information, what was the average waiting time for public restorative dental services as at each of the following dates:

- 1 March 2018
- 1 April 2018
- 1 May 2018
- 1 June 2018
- 1 July 2018
- 1 August 2018
- 1 September 2018
- 1 October 2018
- 1 November 2018
- 1 December 2018
- 1 January 2019
- 1 February 2019
- 1 March 2019
- 1 April 2019
- 1 May 2019
- 1 June 2019
- 1 July 2019
- 1 August 2019
- 1 September 2019
- 1 October 2019
- 1 November 2019

37. Noting that this information is not available in budget papers, annual reports, dashboards or other public information, what is the current wait list time for restorative public dental care in each SA Dental Service clinic?

38. Can the minister confirm whether the 2018-19 dental services statistics published in the budget were correct or incorrect? If incorrect, what are the correct statistics for dental care provided in 2018-19? If correct, why was there such a large reduction in services?

39. Noting that this information is not available in budget papers, annual reports, dashboards or other public information, how will the \$4.5 million per annum in savings to hotel and catering services for hospitals be broken down across LHNs and across the forward estimates?

40. Noting that GPs are private doctors, as at October 2019, which public hospitals in regional South Australia did not currently have a local GP providing services within the hospital?

41. Noting that this information is not available in budget papers, annual reports, dashboards or other public information, what was the total expenditure on locums for country hospitals and health care in 2018-19?
42. Noting that this information is not available in budget papers, annual reports, dashboards or other public information, what is the budgeted expenditure for locums in country hospitals and health care in 2019-20?
43. Noting that this information is not available in budget papers, annual reports, dashboards or other public information, with regard to SA Pathology:
- What was the 2018-19 expenditure?
 - What is the 2019-20 budget?
 - How many FTEs were there in 2018-19?
 - How many FTEs are budgeted for 2019-20?
44. Noting that this information is not available in budget papers, annual reports, dashboards or other public information, with regards to SAMI:
- What was the 2018-19 expenditure?
 - What is the 2019-20 budget?
 - How many FTEs were there in 2018-19?
 - How many FTEs are budgeted for 2019-20?
45. Noting that this information is not available in budget papers, annual reports, dashboards or other public information, with regards to SA Prison Health Services:
- What was the 2018-19 expenditure?
 - What is the 2019-20 budget?
 - How many FTE were there in 2018-19?
 - How many FTE are budgeted for 2019-20?
46. Noting that this information is not available in budget papers, annual reports, dashboards or other public information, with regards to DASSA:
- What was the 2018-19 expenditure?
 - What is the 2019-20 budget?
 - How many FTEs were there in 2018-19?
 - How many FTEs are budgeted for 2019-20?
47. Noting that this information is not available in budget papers, annual reports, dashboards or other public information, with regards to BreastScreen SA:
- What was the 2018-19 expenditure?
 - What is the 2019-20 budget?
 - How many FTEs were there in 2018-19?
 - How many FTEs are budgeted for 2019-20?
48. Noting that this information is not available in budget papers, annual reports, dashboards or other public information, with regards to SA Cancer Service:
- What was the 2018-19 expenditure?
 - What is the 2019-20 budget?
 - How many FTEs were there in 2018-19?
 - How many FTEs are budgeted for 2019-20?
49. Noting that this information is not available in budget papers, annual reports, dashboards or other public information, with regards to SA Pharmacy:
- What was the 2018-19 expenditure?
 - What is the 2019-20 budget?
 - How many FTEs were there in 2018-19?
 - How many FTEs are budgeted for 2019-20?
50. Noting that this information is not available in budget papers, annual reports,

dashboards or other public information, with regard to SA Eating Disorder Service:

- (a) What was the 2018-19 expenditure?
- (b) What is the 2019-20 budget?
- (c) How many FTEs were there in 2018-19?
- (d) How many FTEs are budgeted for 2019-20?

51. Noting that this information is not available in budget papers, annual reports, dashboards or other public information, with regard to SA Biomedical Engineering:

- (a) What was the 2018-19 expenditure?
- (b) What is the 2019-20 budget?
- (c) How many FTEs were there in 2018-19?
- (d) How many FTEs are budgeted for 2019-20?

52. Noting that this information is not available in budget papers, annual reports, dashboards or other public information, with regard to Statewide Sterilisation Services:

- (a) What was the 2018-19 expenditure?
- (b) What is the 2019-20 budget?
- (c) How many FTEs were there in 2018-19?
- (d) How many FTEs are budgeted for 2019-20?

53. Noting that this information is not available in budget papers, annual reports, dashboards or other public information, with regard to Statewide Forensic Mental Health Service:

- (a) What was the 2018-19 expenditure?
- (b) What is the 2019-20 budget?
- (c) How many FTEs were there in 2018-19?
- (d) How many FTEs are budgeted for 2019-20?

54. Noting that this information is not available in budget papers, annual reports, dashboards or other public information, with regard to Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services:

- (a) What was the 2018-19 expenditure?
- (b) What is the 2019-20 budget?
- (c) How many FTEs were there in 2018-19?
- (d) How many FTEs are budgeted for 2019-20?

55. Noting that this information is not available in budget papers, annual reports, dashboards or other public information, with regard to the Pregnancy Advisory Service:

- (a) What was the 2018-19 expenditure?
- (b) What is the 2019-20 budget?
- (c) How many FTEs were there in 2018-19?
- (d) How many FTEs are budgeted for 2019-20?

56. Noting that this information is not available in budget papers, annual reports, dashboards or other public information, with regard to SA Mental Health Triage Service:

- (a) What was the 2018-19 expenditure?
- (b) What is the 2019-20 budget?
- (c) How many FTEs were there in 2018-19?
- (d) How many FTEs are budgeted for 2019-20?

57. Noting that this information is not available in budget papers, annual reports, dashboards or other public information, how much of the budgeted \$3.3 million in palliative care support for 2018-19 was spent, and on what? Why wasn't the full 2018-19 funding utilised?

58. Noting that this information is not available in budget papers, annual reports, dashboards or other public information, when will the full palliative care 24/7 service be fully operational?

59. Noting that this information is not available in budget papers, annual reports, dashboards or other public information, when will the full palliative care 24/7 service be fully operational?

60. Noting that collated/historical data is not available on the SA Health emergency department dashboard, and that the AIHW does not report on monthly information, nor is it available from any other public source, how many patients waited more than 24 hours for a bed in a public hospital emergency department in each month as per below:

- January 2019?
- February 2019?
- March 2019?
- April 2019?
- May 2019?
- June 2019?
- July 2019?
- August 2019?
- September 2019?
- October 2019?

61. Noting that collated/historical data is not available on the SA Health emergency department dashboard, and that the AIHW does not report on monthly information, nor is it available from any other public source, how many mental health patients waited more than 24 hours for a bed in a public hospital emergency department in each month as per below:

- March 2019?
- April 2019?
- May 2019?
- June 2019?
- July 2019?
- August 2019?
- September 2019?
- October 2019?

62. Noting that collated/historical data is not available on the SA Health emergency department dashboard, and that the AIHW does not report on monthly information, nor is it available from any other public source, what was the longest wait (in hours) recorded for a patient in emergency for a bed for the following months:

- January 2019?
- February 2019?
- March 2019?
- April 2019?
- May 2019?
- June 2019?
- July 2019?
- August 2019?
- September 2019?
- October 2019?

63. Noting that collated/historical data is not available on the SA Health emergency department dashboard, and that the AIHW does not report on monthly information, nor is it available from any other public source, what is the number of mental health admissions in metro Adelaide public hospital emergency departments in the following months:

- January 2019?
- February 2019?

- March 2019?
- April 2019?
- May 2019?
- June 2019?
- July 2019?
- August 2019?
- September 2019?
- October 2019?

64. Given that no historical information is published on SA Health dashboards, between 1 July 2018 and 30 June 2019 on which exact days did the following at some stage reach Code White:

- (a) RAH emergency department?
- (b) Flinders emergency department?
- (c) Lyell McEwin emergency department?
- (d) Modbury Hospital emergency department?
- (e) Noarlunga Hospital emergency department?
- (f) Queen Elizabeth Hospital emergency department?
- (g) Women's and Children's Hospital emergency department?

65. Noting that this information is not available in budget papers, annual reports, dashboards or other public information, for each of the following months, how many public elective surgery patients received treatment in a private hospital at the expense of the state government:

- July 2018?
- August 2018?
- September 2018?
- October 2018?
- November 2018?
- December 2018?
- January 2019?
- February 2019?
- March 2019?
- April 2019?
- May 2019?
- June 2019?
- July 2019?
- August 2019?
- September 2019?
- October 2019?

66. Noting that this information is not available in budget papers, annual reports, dashboards or other public information, for each of the following months, how much money was spent by the state government to private hospitals for the treatment of public elective surgery patients:

- July 2018?
- August 2018?
- September 2018?
- October 2018?
- November 2018?

- December 2018?
- January 2019?
- February 2019?
- March 2019?
- April 2019?
- May 2019?
- June 2019?
- July 2019?
- August 2019?
- September 2019?
- October 2019?

67. Given the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare does not publish monthly breakdowns of the total number of elective surgery operations by jurisdiction and the information is not available in any other public source, how many elective surgery operations on public health patients were performed in public hospitals for each of the following months:

- July 2018?
- August 2018?
- September 2018?
- October 2018?
- November 2018?
- December 2018?
- January 2019?
- February 2019?
- March 2019?
- April 2019?
- May 2019?
- June 2019?
- July 2019?
- August 2019?
- September 2019?
- October 2019?

68. Given that no publicly available statements reference the exact amount of flu vaccinations in SA Health storage as at Friday 26 April (and the information is not available in any public source), what is the number that were available on 26 April 2019?

69. Notwithstanding the general frequency of conversations between the minister and the chief medical officer, clinicians and management responsible for influenza vaccinations—on what precise dates were updates or briefings (written or verbal) provided to the minister on flu vaccinations this year?

70. Given the public weekly updates provided by the Communicable Diseases Control Branch of the Department for Health and Wellbeing do not provide a breakdown of unfulfilled GP orders—during 2019 how many orders from GPs for flu vaccines were not fulfilled with the full number of vaccines requested?

71. Given the public weekly updates provided by the Communicable Diseases Control Branch of the Department for Health and Wellbeing do not provide information as to the details of each individual vaccination order, on what date in 2019 was the first order provided to a GP with less vaccines than was ordered?

72. Given the public weekly updates provided by the Communicable Diseases Control Branch of the Department for Health and Wellbeing do not provide information as to the details of each individual vaccination order, on what date in 2019 was the last order provided to a GP with less vaccines than was ordered?

73. Given the public weekly updates provided by the Communicable Diseases Control Branch of the Department for Health and Wellbeing do not provide information as to the details of vaccination orders broken down by individual GP practice, what are the postcodes of GP practices where during 2019 less flu doses were provided than were ordered?

74. Given the public weekly updates provided by the Communicable Diseases Control Branch of the Department for Health and Wellbeing do not provide a breakdown of unfulfilled GP orders, during 2019 what was the largest gap between the number of doses ordered by a GP for the flu vaccine and the number of doses provided?

75. Noting that this information is not available in the state budget papers, in annual reports or dashboards, what is the 2019-20 expenditure budget for the Country Health Rural Support Service?

76. Noting that this information is not available in the state budget papers, in annual reports or dashboards, for 2018-19, how many patient separations were for patients utilising private health insurance at each of the following:

- (a) Royal Adelaide Hospital
- (b) The Queen Elizabeth Hospital
- (c) Modbury Hospital
- (d) Lyell McEwin Hospital
- (e) Flinders Medical Centre
- (f) Noarlunga Hospital
- (g) Women's and Children's Hospital
- (h) Country Health hospitals

77. Noting that this information is not available in the state budget papers, in annual reports or dashboards, for 2017-18 how many patient separations were for patients utilising private health insurance at each of the following:

- (a) Royal Adelaide Hospital
- (b) The Queen Elizabeth Hospital
- (c) Modbury Hospital
- (d) Lyell McEwin Hospital
- (e) Flinders Medical Centre
- (f) Noarlunga Hospital
- (g) Women's and Children's Hospital
- (h) Country Health hospitals

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

1. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
2. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
3. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
4. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
5. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
6. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
7. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
8. Staff will be in place by early 2020.
9. Rural Support Service will be located at Beckwith Park 30-38 Tanunda Road, Nuriootpa. The Country Primary Health Network and the newly established Barossa Campus are also co-located in this building.
10. The Rural Support Service has increased by one to approximately 223 staff. 12-15 of these will be based at Nuriootpa at any one time, the remaining staff are located across the state.
11. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
12. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
13. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
14. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.

15. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
16. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
17. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
18. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
19. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
20. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
21. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
22. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
23. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
24. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
25. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
26. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
27. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
28. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
29. The Marshall Liberal government is continuing the former Labor government's plan to transition care from St Margaret's.
30. The Marshall Liberal government is continuing the former Labor government's plan to transition care from the site of St Margaret's.
31. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
32. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
33. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
34. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
35. The average wait time for restorative dental care is provided annually in the state budget papers.
36. The member is referred to the previous answer.
37. The average wait time for restorative dental care is provided annually in the state budget papers.
38. The member is referred to public statements made on 15 July 2019.
39. The \$4.5 million target relates to 2020-21.
40. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
41. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
42. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
43. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
44. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
45. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
46. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
47. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
48. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
49. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
50. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
51. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
52. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
53. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
54. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
55. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.
56. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.

57. \$1.525 million was spent in 2018-19 to deliver on this government's election commitment to invest in palliative care to more effectively support people in the final stages of their life.

In metropolitan Adelaide this funding has contributed to improving multidisciplinary care by increasing community registrar and nursing hours. Specialist palliative care services have utilised the funding to explore the redesign of their existing services from a five-day model to a seven-day model.

In country South Australia, the funding has helped increase access to end-of-life care at home through extended end of life care packages. Telehealth infrastructure has been improved to increase access to consultation with metropolitan specialist palliative care services. Funding was also allocated to the purchase of appropriate equipment to support people in the community and facilitate earlier discharge.

The paediatric palliative care service based in the Women's and Children's Health Network also received funding in 2018-19 to improve telehealth, strengthen their after hours on-call service and improve psychosocial support for clients and carers.

The remaining \$1.852 million from 2018-19 has been carried forward.

The funding allocated to fulfil the election commitment will be fully spent to improve access to palliative care services in South Australia.

58. The Marshall Liberal government will deliver on all its election commitments.

59. I refer to my previous answer.

60. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.

61. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.

62. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.

63. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.

64. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.

65. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.

66. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.

67. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.

68. The member is referred to previous answers.

69. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.

70. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.

71. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.

72. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.

73. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.

74. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.

75. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.

76. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.

77. The member is referred to previous answers provided in the House of Assembly.

APY LANDS

155 The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (12 November 2019).

1. In correspondence dated 12 October 2019 you stated that, 'I am advised that SA Water complies with all requirements of the act with the exception of fluoride and you further advised that, as a result, bottled water is currently being provided to residents on the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara (APY) lands. The Premier in a letter 16 October 2019 provided different advice, saying, 'SA Water supplies water to the main communities on the APY lands. The supply complies with the requirements of the Australian Drinking Water Guidelines 2011 and the Safe Drinking Water Act 2011.' Of the advice provided, which is correct?

2. Does the government hold any other concerns regarding the quality of water on the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara (APY) lands—in particular, high levels of salts, minerals or heavy metals such as uranium?

3. Are staff of the department instructed to drink bottled water on the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara (APY) lands?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

1. As indicated in my letter of 12 October 2019, except for groundwater supplied to the small community at Nyapari, drinking water supplied by SA Water to residents in the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara (APY) complies with the Safe Drinking Water Act 2011 and hence meets the requirements of the Australian Drinking Water Guidelines. Bottled or cask water is being supplied to residents of Nyapari as a temporary measure prior to installation of a new water treatment plant. Installation of the treatment plant was completed on 1 November 2019 and subject to confirmation by water quality testing the supply of bottled water will no longer be required.

2. There are no other concerns about the quality of drinking water managed by SA Water on APY lands including concentrations of salts, minerals or heavy metals such as uranium.

3. There are no department-wide instructions to drink bottled water on the APY lands. Following successful commissioning of the new treatment plant at Nyapari there will be no need to use alternatives such as bottled water in any of the communities.

CORONIAL REPORT

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (17 October 2019).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been provided the following advice:

1. Mr Martyn Campbell, Executive Director, SafeWork SA, wrote to seek views on how the Coroner's recommendations may impact operating practices, impact or improve safety on worksites or any additional considerations.

A number of responses were received, all of which were considered by the government.

Concerns about the mandatory use of spotters were raised in submissions received from the Elevated Work Platform Association, Access Training Centre, AI Group, Badge Constructions, Built Environs, Construction Industry Training Centre, the Local Government Association, the Master Builders Association, Electrical and Communications Association, SA Power Networks, Sarah Constructions and the South Australian Wine Industry Association.

2. None of the persons or organisations that made a submission made any statement as to any actual or potential conflict of interest.

NATIONAL PARKS ZONING

In reply to **the Hon. M.C. PARNELL** (31 October 2019).

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services): The Minister for Environment and Water and the Minister for Planning have provided the following advice:

Under the current planning system there are a number of different zones that apply to national parks and other protected areas. The implementation of the new planning system, including the development of the new Planning and Design Code, has provided an opportunity to apply a consistent planning policy approach to our parks.

The Department for Environment and Water and the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure have jointly developed an approach that will see the conservation zone applied to national parks and other protected areas that are proclaimed under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 and the Wilderness Protection Act 1992.

This position has been well described in the engagement material for the code and is supported by the State Planning Commission.

SA HEALTH

In reply to **the Hon. C. BONAROS** (31 October 2019).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has provided the following advice:

To date the Central Adelaide Local Health Network has paid \$21,380,271.55 (excl. GST) to KordaMentha.

PSYCHIATRIC IMPAIRMENT ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (14 November 2019).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been provided the following advice:

1. 45 impairment assessments for psychiatric injury have been undertaken in the registered scheme since 1 July 2015. 36 of those people assessed have not reached the 30 per cent whole person impairment threshold and nine have. Two assessments found that the individual's condition had not reached maximum medical improvement.

2. Of the 36 assessments that did not reach the 30 per cent threshold, 10 were between 25-29 per cent.

KORDAMENTHA

In reply to **the Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN** (28 November 2019).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I am advised:

SA Health approved a variation to extend the expiry date of the KordaMentha contract, from 25 November 2019 to 9 December 2019, at an additional cost of \$715,000.00. This allowed CALHN to seek relevant approvals for a contract variation from the State Procurement Board and cabinet.

The South Australian government has now extended KordaMentha's contract by two months until 9 February 2020, at a cost of \$3.466 million.

This short-term contract extension will ensure that Central Adelaide Local Health Network can continue to work towards its savings targets while ongoing contract negotiations are underway.