

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 25 March 1992

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

## PETITIONS: GAMING MACHINES

Petitions signed by 358 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to introduce gaming machines into hotels and clubs were presented by Messrs Allison, Crafter, Quirke and Venning.

Petitions received.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: RACISM

The **Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Emergency Services)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER**: I refer to the report in today's *Advertiser* dealing with allegations of racism against a member of the South Australian Police Force. I requested an urgent report from the police. I have now received a report from the Deputy Commissioner and I now table the report in its entirety, except for the name and current location of the offending officer.

Deletion of the officer's name is consistent with the approach taken by the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement, which first publicly raised the matter. As the Minister responsible for the police in South Australia, I offer my unequivocal apology to all those who have been offended by this disgusting incident.

## QUESTION TIME

## GAMING MACHINES

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)**: My question is directed to the Premier. In view of the fact that the Premier now concedes that he was aware of Mr Stitt's involvement in lobbying for the introduction of poker machines and the establishment of the Independent Gaming Corporation, and since he was aware of the Minister of Tourism's association with Mr Stitt, why did he not insist on the Minister declaring her conflict of interest and withdrawing from Cabinet discussions?

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: I have explained the circumstances in which the Minister did not make a declaration. Whilst on reflecting on that matter I was aware in general terms of the situation as it involved Mr Stitt, as I said yesterday, I was not aware of any specific matters or what in fact that involved. That was not really relevant as far as I was concerned in relation to the matter. The responsibility did lie with the Minister. She has conceded that she did not discharge that responsibility, and that has been canvassed fully.

## ROYAL COMMISSION INTO ABORIGINAL DEATHS IN CUSTODY

The **Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier)**: Can the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs inform the House that a response to the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody

will be properly coordinated to ensure that Aboriginal people benefit fully? In recent weeks media reports from around Australia have highlighted the level of racism in Australian society. This morning's reporting of a racist crossword has rightfully attracted repugnance from all sectors of the community. I am aware that the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody is a key to addressing many of the issues facing Aboriginal people today.

The **Hon. M.D. RANN**: I thank the former Minister of Aboriginal Affairs for his continued interest in this issue. The recent media reports on racism have certainly renewed interest in the responses to the recommendations of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody. Today's reports concerning the racist crossword drawn up by an officer of the South Australian Police Force are certainly appalling, and I share with the Minister of Emergency Services in his disgust for this incident.

Of course, the majority of South Australia's policemen and women deserve praise for the positive way in which they approach a difficult and complex job. Indeed, I want to salute the Police Commissioner and his senior staff for their cooperation with officers of the State Department of Aboriginal Affairs in drawing up South Australia's detailed response to the Elliot Johnston royal commission report. However, the type of racist behaviour evident in the crossword incident is totally unacceptable anywhere in our community. This form of racism practised anywhere in our community is an insidious kind of treason and a cowardly treachery of one's fellow Australians.

Racism is not a problem that Governments alone can tackle. There is no quick fix; there never has been and never will be. The Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody emphasised the importance of addressing the underlying causes of injustice and of racism for Aboriginal people's too-high involvement with the law and justice systems in this country. The South Australian Government is strongly committed to addressing the issues raised in the final report. The tabling of our responses to all 339 recommendations will occur in this House on 31 March. Indeed, I understand that Parliaments around Australia, including the Federal Government, will release their responses to the 339 recommendations on that day.

However, all the goodwill in the world will get us nowhere if a real partnership does not exist between the Commonwealth, the States and the Territories in implementing the recommendations. This is where we can make a real difference to the disadvantage and injustice faced by Aboriginal people. I am very concerned at the Commonwealth Government's lack of consultation with the States over the Commonwealth's funding proposals in relation to the royal commission recommendations, which I have read in media reports have already been approved at least in part by Federal Cabinet.

The Commonwealth has the major responsibility in Aboriginal affairs, but the States deliver many of the basic services and are responsible for issues such as land rights and the legislation pertaining to land rights. The implementation of this very necessary initiative must not be allowed to become confused due to a lack of willingness on the part of the Federal Government to work collaboratively with the States. Certainly, I do not want a repeat of the so-called 'partnership' response to the interim Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody report in which the Commonwealth failed to embrace the Muirhead recommendations and left the States to pick up the bulk of the bill. The Commonwealth Government's one-off grant of \$300 000 compared miserably with South Australia's allo-

cation of around \$9 million in response to the Muirhead royal commission.

I have written to Robert Tickner, my Federal colleague, requesting consultation to enable a genuine national response and plan of action. In doing so, I am supported by the Ministers of Aboriginal Affairs from Queensland, Victoria and Western Australia, and later this week we will be meeting with the Federal Minister to see whether we can work out a concerted, coordinated plan of action for implementing these vital royal commission recommendations for the future of Australia and for the future of relationships with Aboriginal people. I am certainly pleased that he has agreed to call a joint ministerial forum at which this issue of Commonwealth/State cooperation and funding will be addressed. A number of other issues will also be canvassed around that date of 31 March.

One of the areas of the royal commission report that did not receive attention in the media was the criticism of media stereotyping of Aboriginal people and insensitive handling of Aboriginal issues in some parts of the media. I have written to all media outlets in South Australia requesting their cooperation in this area and proposing the establishment of a prize system to encourage journalists to write about Aboriginal issues in a positive framework and to reward excellence in this approach.

#### GAMING MACHINES

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** As the Premier does not consider the failure of a Minister to declare a conflict of interest in a matter before Cabinet a sufficiently serious matter to warrant disciplinary action, will he explain to this House what standards he now applies to ministerial accountability and say how many more lapses South Australians must endure before his Ministers are forced to accept the consequences?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** That is not correct. I do consider that such a failure warrants action. It is the extent of that action that is at issue. As I have explained both in this place and publicly thereafter, in the circumstances in which this particular issue arose, I would have thought that the suggestion that the Minister be dismissed from her post was quite outrageous, in view of all the surrounding factors that were involved, in view of the fact that no damage was or could have been caused and in view of the nature of the decision Cabinet was making. I put all that on the record very clearly—

**The Hon. J.P. Trainer:** And the humiliation she has been subjected to.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** That represents in no way a watering down of the responsibility that I have expressed. I might say, just picking up the comment made very appropriately by the member for Walsh, the Minister of Tourism has been subjected to the most outrageous campaign of vilification without substantiation. Yet the Deputy Leader suggests that there has been no penalty. I would have thought there has been a massive penalty exacted on the Minister quite out of keeping with the supposed or alleged offence. It is outrageous for the Opposition to continue this vendetta, a vendetta which is aimed, first, at trying to make the most out of the discomfiture of the Minister and, secondly and probably much more importantly, at trying to get themselves off the hook in relation to the differences between them over how the gaming machines legislation should be handled.

It is meant to be a conscience issue but they know they want to have it all ways and they are finding it a little

difficult to do so on this matter. It is quite unacceptable, as indeed one of their own number, the member for Hanson, put on the record last night in the context of the Gaming Machines Bill. I commend all members to look at what the member for Hanson said. At least he had the honesty to stand up and speak from his conscience, from his assessment of the situation. The Deputy Leader would be better to consult with the honourable member on that matter.

#### ORGAN DONORS

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** Will the Minister of Transport advise which countries have an opt-out provision *vis-a-vis* an opt-in provision in relation to organ donors? The Minister will recall that on 20 February last I expressed concern about the small number of organ donors who are prepared to indicate on their driving licence that they will donate organs. In response, the Minister said:

At some stage members of the community should have a look at what is done in some European countries where there is an opt-out rather than an opt-in provision and, provided all safeguards were there . . .

So it goes on. Hence my question.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I thank the member for Albert Park for his question. I think all members will recall that a few weeks ago, following his long-standing interest in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the member for Albert Park asked a question about how many people use the red dot scheme through their driving licence to indicate that they wish their organs to be used in the case of death. I thought the debate that followed that question was very poor because, in the answer to that question, I floated the idea—which is not a new one—that it may well be that Australia ought to follow the course taken in many other countries and, instead of having, as we have at the moment an opt-in system, perhaps we should at least have a debate on the merits of an opt-out system.

As I said, I was very disappointed with the quality of debate that followed, particularly from the *Advertiser*. The report of that question, to start with, was incorrect, and I suppose that set the tone, but what particularly disturbed me—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I know. What disturbed me was the editorial in the *Advertiser* a week or 10 days ago which castigated me in the strongest possible terms and suggested that I could not possibly be serious: that, if I was serious, it was offensive to people of South Australia and that, if I was not serious, likewise it was offensive to propose such a scheme. Well, I intended to respond to that letter, but I have had other things to do, and I did not get around to it. But I thought I would respond in the House.

Yes, I am serious. It was a very serious suggestion. In this State at the moment we probably have the lowest level of indication, through the driving licence scheme, that the people of South Australia wish to have their organs used, if required, after their death. I do not accept that South Australians are any less humane or intelligent than people in other States. I believe that our system is deficient, and I have had discussions with the Australian Kidney Foundation and the Motor Registration Division to achieve a more efficient system. I am pleased that steps have been taken to ensure that that comes about.

I also made the point, before responding to the *Advertiser*, of finding out which countries have an opt-out system, and those countries are very serious, because it is a serious issue. They are not offensive to their citizens, as the *Advertiser* accused me of being. I will provide the list to the House. I

am delighted to say, from a personal point of view—nothing to do with the Government—that this list of countries that have an opt-out system is growing, and at the moment those countries are: Belgium, Switzerland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Austria, Finland, France and Singapore. I would have thought that those countries have a reasonable record on civil rights, with perhaps the occasional lapse in Singapore but, by and large, they are Western democracies with the same values as we have, and I see absolutely no reason why we cannot have a debate about this issue without being called offensive by the *Advertiser*.

#### GAMING MACHINES

**Mrs KOTZ (Newland):** Will the Premier state whether he was consulted on the decision to refer documents and financial records of the Minister of Consumer Affairs to the Attorney-General for review and determination on the extent to which a conflict of interest had occurred?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Yes, I certainly was, and I concurred with that as the appropriate handling of the matter.

#### SOUTH-EAST COASTAL LAKES

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** Mr Speaker—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr FERGUSON:** Thank you, Mr Speaker; I could hardly hear myself talking.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr FERGUSON:** Will the Minister for Environment and Planning advise the House on the progress of the formulation and implementation of a strategy for the coastal lakes in the South-East of South Australia? I understand that the Minister approved the public release of a south-eastern coastal lake strategy on 15 October 1991 and that public submissions were sought. As I understand it, submissions closed on 31 January this year.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I thank—

*The Hon. M.K. Mayes interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister is out of order. The Minister for Environment and Planning.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** Thank you, Sir. I thank the honourable member for his interest in this matter. As members would be aware, the management of public access to the coastal lakes and the often conflicting needs of user groups has been a topic of debate for many years. Following the release of the coastal lakes strategy report, we received 24 submissions, and these responses ranged from minor observations on individual lakes to comments on the system in general.

Therefore, I have asked the Department of Lands to provide for me a collation of the responses and to submit recommendations on individual lakes so that we talk about not just the whole lake system but individual lakes. For example, I would like to inform the House that I have already approved a plan for the portion of land surrounding Lake Frome, where the strategy will involve the sale of Crown land to an adjacent landowner, provision for a drainage easement and the transfer of a significant portion of the lake into the adjacent Canunda National Park.

I believe that the process of consultation will produce solutions rather than continue, if you like, to exacerbate the conflicts of the past. This is an excellent opportunity to find

solutions and to satisfy the very diverse interests of the local landowners and the communities in the South-East.

#### GAMING MACHINES

**Mr MATTHEW (Bright):** Is the Premier aware of the lengthy meeting held between the Minister of Consumer Affairs and the Attorney-General yesterday morning before the Minister made her second ministerial statement on her conflict of interest, and how can he support the argument that the Attorney-General's review—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr MATTHEW:** If the honourable member cares to sit down, she might hear the rest of the question—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Bright will—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Bright will address his remarks through the Chair.

**Mr MATTHEW:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. How can the Premier support the argument that the Attorney-General's review and inquiry can in any way be considered impartial and credible?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** This is good. Someone whose credibility is in very severe doubt is asking about credibility. This is the person who has a particular position on legislation and is enjoying very much indeed stirring up a situation, holding on to documents and drawing inferences that those documents simply do not warrant from them, all in the interest of trying to ensure that a particular matter does not get dealt with in the way it should be dealt with. I find it quite unacceptable that that member then asks about the credibility of the Minister and the Attorney-General. I am expected to be shocked or staggered or dismayed.

**Mr MATTHEW:** Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I draw your attention to Standing Order 127, which deals with digression and personal reflection on members.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair does not uphold the point of order.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Murray-Mallee should watch his noise. Questions and answers in Question Time are traditionally very wide, and I do not uphold the point of order.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The honourable member who asks the question reflecting on credibility then expects me to be staggered, shocked or dismayed by the fact that, possibly the Minister concerned and the Attorney, to whom she intends to return the papers, actually had a meeting and even discussed things together. I find that quite staggering. The Minister would have all sorts of reasons why she should talk to the Attorney-General, not the least of which is to advise him of her intention to do just what she did.

The honourable member then goes on to ask, 'And what credibility could that exercise have?' I happen to believe in the integrity of the Attorney-General of this State, the most senior Attorney-General in the country, and a person who has been traduced in the most outrageous way within Parliament and outside; a person who has been subjected to the most gruelling, unacceptably long and harrowing inquiry which, in the end, said that all those allegations were absolute nonsense and that he had been the victim of malice, of mistaken identity and of a number of other things.

That is the individual who holds the post in this State, who has an international reputation for his work in crime prevention, with victims of crime and in jurisprudence, and the honourable member stands up, after the shabby exer-

cises in which he has been involved, and asks me about his credibility. I suggest that he take a leaf out of the Attorney's book and mend his ways, instead of trying to cast aspersions on him.

### EDUCATION SECTOR STRESS

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh):** Will the Minister of Labour inform the House as to the current level of stress claims in the State's school and further education sector?

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** I thank the honourable member for his question.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** When you were teaching, it must have been amongst the students.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister will direct his response to the Chair.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** The issue of stress has claimed a great deal of attention in the press recently, much of it sensationalised, inaccurate, distorted or simply hysterical. The Government has committed itself to reducing stress claims and, as such, the compensation burden on the taxpayer, by adopting new preventive strategies. In the particularly sensitive area of education this has paid off.

In the period July to December 1991 there was a 15 per cent reduction in stress claims in the Department of education when compared with the same period in 1990. This fall is attributable to a range of factors, but most effectively to the appointment of area personnel counsellors.

There have also been changes in personnel practices and the management style, with more personal staffing policies and greater consultation with staff, especially in the areas of transfers, promotions and skills development. Even more encouraging has been the dramatic fall in stress in the Department of Technical and Further Education, where recorded claims have been reduced by 65 per cent in the period July to December 1991.

Again, this is due to the presence of early intervention schemes and the establishment of a referral and placement service in the human resources division of the Department of Technical and Further Education. The scheme involves employee counselling with referrals to medical professionals where necessary, and better procedures for internal redeployment, where staff can be moved out of areas where they may be incompatible with the work or with their colleagues.

Of course, seasonal factors do influence the patterns of stress claims in the Department of Technical and Further Education, especially at the beginning of the new teaching year with, for example, changes in curriculum and course location. I table a document entitled 'Strategies Against Stress', which has been prepared by the Department of Labour in consultation with a number of people involved in the department and the trade union movement.

### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ECONOMY

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** Will the Premier confirm that the initial advice the Government has received from consultants it has commissioned to undertake an economic development strategy study for South Australia highlights the failure of his Government to implement policies to ensure that the South Australian economy is internationally competitive?

The Government has commissioned consultants, Arthur D. Little, to provide advice on an economic development

strategy for South Australia. I have in my possession a copy of Arthur D. Little's first paper, which I understand has just been submitted to the Government. It concludes that 'the South Australian economy is not geared to international competition' and warns 'that South Australia is becoming increasingly less able to generate the wealth necessary to support its current living standards'.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The statement that the honourable member quotes could be said of Australia as a whole, and indeed has been said of this country by many observers and commentators. It is a constant and important theme that we must become internationally oriented and export oriented in the way in which we approach manufacturing and anything we produce in this country. Arthur D. Little has been employed as an international consultant to look at the South Australian economy warts and all—to look at its strengths and weaknesses, and to identify what opportunities are there for South Australia.

In the course of that, Arthur D. Little is undertaking wide-ranging consultation. The report still has a number of stages to go through. A preliminary document—a snapshot, if you like—has been prepared, and in fact the findings are findings that I guess, in the nature of these things, any of us could have made about the way in which Australia, and South Australia of course is included in that, needs to take up opportunities.

We have some considerable vulnerabilities in our economy which these consultants have been hired to identify in some greater detail. However, I would say—unlike the Opposition which is delighted with vulnerabilities and weaknesses because it seems to aid its political purpose—that we also have a number of major strengths. We have a number of industries where there is a critical mass of activity in South Australia; for example, the wine industry, the automotive industry and the high technology and defence industry areas, where there are important and major undertakings whereby South Australia has a chance to contribute to our international posture.

We have all internationalised ourselves quite significantly in recent years, and the Government has played a major role in that. The fact is that before we came to office there was no major five-star international hotel in this city, no convention centre or capacity for that sort of activity, no high-profile event of the nature of the Grand Prix, no new manufacturing industries such as the submarine project, and one could go on.

**Mr Ingerson:** What about the State debt?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** State debt was higher than it is now, post the State Bank. Post the State Bank, the State debt was higher at that time than it is now. Indeed, we reduced it quite substantially through most of the 1980s, and if it were not for the impact of the State Bank, with the need to support the indemnity, it would be even lower. That also is an example of the way in which we have managed this economy through the 1980s, but there is no question that we have major challenges in the 1990s.

I want Arthur D. Little to tell us frankly what it is all about. I want it to consult and talk to those around this community who have to make the decisions that will get this State into international shape. These consultants are probably wasting their time talking to the Opposition, although we have invited them to do so. One always says that if you talk to the Opposition you have to expect that whatever you say will be brought up, distorted, the greatest possible negative value put on it and publicised as widely as possible. Unfortunately, that is the posture of the Opposition in South Australia—saboteurs of this economy.

### PENSIONER MEDICAL TREATMENT

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** Will the Minister of Health investigate allegations of discrimination against pensioners at the Royal Adelaide Hospital? Recently I was approached by a pensioner who alleged the following:

1. She was given a referral by a local doctor to the neurological clinic at the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

2. My constituent phoned the clinic last Friday to organise her appointment.

3. During her conversation with a clinic officer she was advised that she would have to wait until 5 May for her appointment.

4. The officer went on to say that if she had private medical cover she would be able to get an appointment immediately.

My constituent further stated to me that she and her husband are a pensioner couple and do not have private medical cover. She said she was offended by this particular statement and felt that she was being discriminated against. She further said that she was of the opinion that the Royal Adelaide Hospital was a public hospital where all people should be treated equally.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I fully agree with what the honourable member's constituent has said and with what the honourable member is saying. Not only is that statement over the phone, if correct, in breach of what I understand is the policy of the Royal Adelaide Hospital and certainly in breach of the policy of this Government, it is quite possibly in breach of the Medicare agreement itself, which makes it perfectly clear that there should be no such discrimination. It is on that basis that the hospital enhancement funds are made available to the States. Naturally I will have the matter immediately investigated.

### KAROONDA-PEEBINGA RAILWAY LINE

**Mr LEWIS (Murray Mallee):** When did the Minister of Transport agree under the terms of the Railways Transfer Agreement to the closure of the Karoonda-Peebinga railway line? Australian National has shunted rolling stock onto the Karoonda end of the line and has welded it to the tracks.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Mount Gambier is out of order. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. Now that I have the attention of the House, I am sorry I do not have that information. I will get it for the honourable member.

### NATIVE BIRDS

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** Will the Minister for Environment and Planning give consideration to allowing native birds to be trapped and sold instead of being culled? The suggestion of trapping native birds which cause damage to crops, and exporting them to overseas zoos and birdkeepers, has been proposed as an answer to the problem of controlling birds which cause problems, and also possibly reducing the incidence of smuggling.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** This is a complex issue. The export of native birds is controlled by the wildlife protection regulation of the Import and Export Act 1982. The State and Territory wildlife conservation agencies and Ministers at the latest meeting of Environment and Conservation Ministers in the Northern Territory considered the argu-

ments for and against the export of native birds. In fact, both the agencies and the Ministers are unanimous in their opposition to the relaxing of the present export controls.

I must acknowledge that the issue is not a simple one. Like so many things that we deal with in our community, it does have a number of complexities. I will refer to a couple of the points raised by the honourable member. For example, it is a common misconception that all Australian parrots, when they are exported overseas, command very high prices. On the contrary, most prices of Australian species in overseas trade are comparable to the prices that that particular species fetches in Australia. Only the rare—

**Mr Lewis:** Drivell!

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** Here we go again, Mr Speaker. You really wonder, don't you! We have a species of parrot on the other side, but I am sure he would not command a very high price anywhere. I will finish that part of my answer. Only the rare, vulnerable or endangered species can be expected to attract high prices, and these are not species which would be likely to be legally exported under any circumstances. A further common misconception appears to be that all birds in cages somehow magically live happily ever after. The stress factor of trapping a wild bird and placing it into captivity often causes considerable physical and psychological discomfort, which may lead to the death of the bird.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I take this matter seriously. I am the Minister responsible for animal welfare, as well as many other issues, and I am amazed that some members of the Opposition seem to think that the discomfort and sometimes death of a bird in captivity is of little consequence. I do not agree with that. The administrative costs of monitoring and trapping any trade in wildlife are unlikely to be recouped from such trade and the operation is unlikely to prove to be financially viable. There are a number of factors that the community and Parliament may well have to address, but it will have to be done across the country. We have a national position at the moment. Until further evidence can be presented, I certainly will not be changing the South Australian position on this matter.

### BUS SERVICES

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** What further measures is the Minister of Transport prepared to consider to ensure that late night and Hills bus services operated by the STA are not axed from 1 August? Yesterday both the Minister and the STA are reported to have stated that the rejection by bus and tram drivers of a union/STA wages and conditions deal did not mean the end of late night and Hills bus services. The STA says that it will have to discuss this matter further with the Government. Until yesterday, the only option pursued by the STA on behalf of the Government has been what drivers perceive as a draconian cut in their wages and conditions.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I have very little to add to what the STA has had to say on this. First, I reject totally the suggestion that the proposed agreement with STA bus drivers would have been 'a draconian cut in their wages and conditions'. It would have been nothing of the sort. It would only have brought their conditions into line with others in the 1990s rather than the 1950s, and I think that is in the long-term interests of bus operators. I believe that they are under threat from the private sector whilst they do not give the STA the same flexibility as drivers in the private sector. It is a very simple proposition. We are not

looking for low wages or for a lessening of conditions. We are looking for greater flexibility.

That agreement could not be achieved and, as I said, that is a great loss to the bus operators. I hope they reconsider that decision in a less emotion-charged atmosphere at some stage in the not too distant future. In the interim, we continue to have discussions with private sector bus operators. In fact, as late as yesterday evening, I had some brief discussions with one of the operators, who is to get back to the Office of Transport Policy and Planning today with another proposal. So, we continue to pursue it. As I pointed out in answer to numerous questions from the member for Heysen, who I believe principally represents this electorate—

*Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I always thought there were ethics in this game and one did not intrude on someone else's patch. Nevertheless, I welcome any interest in this matter, however belated. I point out to the member for Davenport, as I pointed out to the member for Heysen, that the subsidy on these routes is very high, something like three times the subsidy that is paid for the bus routes in the metropolitan area. It means around \$400 per passenger per year. It is inordinately expensive, and the Government ought to be commended for looking at alternatives, and we continue to look for alternatives. When that process is completed I will, as always, make a public announcement about the results.

#### SOUTH-EAST VINEYARDS

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** Will the Minister of Agriculture advise what development is occurring or has occurred in respect of vineyards in the South-East and the size of those plantings? Last Monday, whilst travelling from Mount Gambier through the Padthaway area, I was pleasantly surprised by the large number of vineyards I noticed, and hence my question.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I thank the honourable member for his question and note his interest in the developments that have taken place in the South-East. Certainly, it has been very exciting to see the increase in hectareage for vineyards over recent years in an area of the State that has had plantings for a very long time indeed. In fact, the first plantings took place in what I think was called the Penola colony back in the late nineteenth century, and the area became noted for its quality wine production in the first decades of this century. However, it then fell out of favour, partly because, in the first half of this century, the wine industry was not all that buoyant, and it looked as though the wine plantings of the area might disappear altogether by the 1950s.

There was a resurgence in the 1960s, the 1970s and particularly the 1980s. The situation now is that the current area of bearing vines in the South-East is 3 300 hectares or 14.6 per cent of South Australia's bearing vineyard areas. Of the non-bearing area of vines, the figure is 810 hectares or 30 per cent of the State's non-bearing area of vines. Essentially, that would mainly take up new vines that had been planted and will be bearing in a few years. That clearly indicates that the growth rate of vineyards in the South-East is faster than in other parts of the State. That raises an interesting point as to where a lot of that production will be directed. It is uncertain exactly what percentage of the South-East's production is going into exports; suffice to say that various estimates indicate that South Australia is clearly the pre-eminent State. The Wine and Brandy Pro-

ducers Association reports that South Australia accounts for some 70 per cent of Australia's wine exports, a figure which is higher than even that which is often quoted from the Government's point of view. Given that 16 per cent of our total vineyard area is in the South-East, presumably a large percentage of that will also be exported.

The terra rossa soil, being a particularly good soil for red wine production, indicates that we have the opportunity for very marketable red wines from that region for the export market. Personally, that is of some concern, and I hope that not too much is taken out of the domestic market. However, the wine and brandy industry is aiming to have a quintupling of wine exports from this country between now and the end of the century, taking our export value from about \$200 million to \$1 billion in today's dollar values. Clearly, that would have to see a significant opportunity for the wine industry located in the South-East of this State.

#### LAND TITLE SETTLEMENTS

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** Did the Minister agree to a decision to impose an extra fee of \$20 per document for land title settlements lodged on Fridays and the last day in every month and, if so, can she say what administrative procedures, including cancellation of flexi days, were considered as an alternative to this totally unacceptable fee, which will cause a further burden on South Australian home owners and landbrokers?

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I thank the honourable member for his question and, in answering it, I would like to refer to the honourable member's statements in this morning's *Advertiser*, where, as he so often does, he went right over the top on this matter. I found it rather amazing that a fairly senior member of the Opposition would actually have to resort to this kind of Public Service bashing. I would like to share with the House what he said. Referring to Mr Basil Kidd, the Lands Registrar-General, the article states:

He claims there are twice the number of settlements on Fridays than on other days while the figure for the last working day of the month is at least treble the daily average of just over 500, Mr Wotton said.

In answering the question, I would like to tell the House exactly what those figures were for the first two months of this year. In fact, I would like to go back one step and talk about the kind of consultation that went on with the industry before this decision was taken. Mr Kidd, when he was appointed Registrar-General, encouraged industry groups and established a consultative or reference group within the industry with which he has consulted on this matter during the past year.

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

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** He wrote articles about it for the industry journals. The reference group of industry representatives that he established over the past year discussed this problem at length, and I would like to share that problem with the House. In fact, rather than improving the situation, things seemed to have got worse. On Monday to Thursday, lodgments for January this year averaged 543 documents a day. I would like to share with the House what the Friday and last day of the month lodgments were for January: 3 January, 710; 10 January, 1 124; 17 January, 1 269; 24 January, 1 119; and 31 January, 1 705 lodgments.

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

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** The honourable member asked the question, and I am going to provide him with a full and frank answer. For February, the Monday to Thursday average was 569 lodgments, and I will not take up the

time of the House by reading the figures for every day. Suffice to say that on 21 February the figure was 1 364 and on 28 February—I hope the honourable member can absorb this figure—it was 2 539.

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

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** It is interesting that, while I was prepared to listen to the honourable member's question in silence, and because he knows it has been another straight over the top, knee-jerk reaction, which is his hallmark now—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. The Registrar-General, Mr Kidd, has behaved in a very responsible way and in fact has written to all land agents and informed them of the situation that currently exists in terms of trying to staff a particular department, whether or not there is use of flexi days, which of course are being looked at. Mr Kidd examined a whole range of options. It is not just a simple matter of processing those lodgments. Many legal implications arise if lodgments are not processed as quickly as possible, and it is important that we provide the most up to the minute and efficient service to the constituents and customers who come into the Lands Titles Office, and this is what we are doing. I would like to share with the House one short paragraph that Mr Kidd wrote to all land brokers in this State:

The proposal is to increase the fee, as from the [next] general fee [increase] in August . . .

Does the honourable member bother to research his facts? To read the article in this morning's paper, one would think that all this has happened overnight. The letter continues:

. . . by a flat \$20 for every document lodged on a Friday or the last working day of the month. The expectation is that this will raise the level of awareness of the problem . . . and encourage settlement . . . on other days.

The point that the honourable member has obviously missed is that no-one needs to incur this fee. It can be avoided by settlement on any other business day of the week. In conclusion, I cannot believe the hypocrisy of this Opposition. Day after day we are told that we should be cutting the bureaucracy and cutting back on the number of public servants. The minute a department provides a service at an economically viable cost to the community, achieves the bottom line, and looks at ways in which it can provide that service and still meet the costs of doing so, what does the Opposition do? It goes right over the top by using such language?

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the Minister has been going for five minutes. I suggest that she have some regard to the traditions of Question Time.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order. However, the Minister did say 'in conclusion'.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** Yes, Mr Basil Kidd, the Registrar-General, did have discussions with me and yes, I did approve this, because I believed that every other avenue had been exhausted, including extensive consultation over a 12 month period with parts of the industry, particularly with the reference group that Mr Kidd had established. May I remind members opposite that he is the first Registrar-General who has gone to such lengths to involve, in the decision making, the industry itself. As I said, everyone can avoid this fee by using other business days rather than doing everything at the end of the month.

## PRE-VOCATIONAL TRAINING

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education advise whether he will lobby his Federal counterpart to obtain funding to continue in some form ongoing training for young people who have done one year of pre-vocational training? I have received numerous representations stating that, if young people do not obtain a job after their first year of pre-vocational training, they are left in limbo and, without ongoing training, may lose skills already obtained through their pre-vocational training.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The honourable member will be aware that in 1991 we secured millions of dollars in extra funding regarding that first extra pre-vocational money and, after the Federal Government was lobbied late last year and early this year, \$40 million was announced in the Prime Minister's One Nation statement of 26 February for additional pre-vocational training places across Australia from July 1992. This will mean an extra \$3.3 million for South Australia, which will provide extra courses in the second semester of this year.

I am pleased to announce that a proportion of this money will be used for follow-on programs for graduates of previous pre-vocational courses. I am sure that the honourable member will be interested to learn that six students of the Port Augusta college who finished their pre-voc last year are now doing a full-time stage 2 of their fitting and machining apprenticeship course. The stage 2 course includes theory and skill development plus industrial experience, both in house and in industry, and in the community. Of course, the extra apprenticeship support money also lobbied for extensively by South Australia should provide extra jobs for this year's graduates. In our funding negotiations with the Federal Government for 1993 funding, I have asked my department particularly to focus on this area.

It should be pointed out what was in the One Nation statement in terms of labour market programs, because some confusion has been expressed by members. In terms of the craft allowances, dealing with apprentices, over 1991-92 and 1992-93, an additional \$18.3 million will be provided to increase by \$2 000 the incentive to employers to retain each first year apprentice additional to a firm's intake at the end of September 1993.

For at risk apprentices, we have additional measures totalling \$16.7 million across the nation to 1993-94 to assist at risk and unemployed apprentices and trainees to complete their training. In the area of group training schemes, for which I know she has been a special advocate, particularly for the Spencer Gulf Group Training Scheme, the member for Stuart will be pleased to know that, nationally, additional expenditure of \$5.7 million to 1993-94 has been allocated for pilot projects, particularly in rural and remote areas.

In the area of Jobskills, there is a \$35 million enhancement to provide an extra 2 400 work experience places; in Jobstart, additional funding of \$110 million to 1993-94 will provide wage subsidies to employers for employment of up to 44 000 unemployed people; and, in special intervention, enhancement of \$22 million in 1993-94 will provide assistance in English language, literacy and numeracy for the most disadvantaged job seekers. Finally, under the Office of Labour Market adjustment is a \$12 million enhancement of regional employment initiatives to include non-metropolitan regions with high unemployment and increased assistance to the 15 regions already being assisted.

### WEST TORRENS FOOTBALL CLUBROOMS

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** My question is directed to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs. Who authorised the purchase last year of the West Torrens Football clubrooms by the Aboriginal Community Recreation and Health Service Centre for \$550 000 and who authorised its subsequent sale for \$380 000—a loss of \$170 000? Were the registered members consulted and was the sale in accordance with the constitution?

The Commonwealth Government originally purchased premises situated at 128 Wakefield Street as a community centre, but that property was sold for \$1 million. Out of this amount \$550 000 was spent on the West Torrens clubrooms. I have been told that the Aboriginal Recreation and Health Service Centre still rents and occupies the Wakefield Street property while receiving some \$200 000 a year in grants towards the running of the centre. The Aboriginal community wants to know why the West Torrens property had to be sold at a considerable loss to raise money, who authorised the sale and what funds remaining of the original \$1 million are still available for use by the Aboriginal people. Representatives of the Aboriginal community have complained to me that they cannot get answers to any of these questions.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I am most happy to take up this matter with the group involved. However, I understand from previous advice that it was a decision they made of their own accord, and that it was a private purchase and then a private resale. I will endeavour to get all the facts I can for the honourable member.

### RUSSIAN/AUSTRALIAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** Will the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology be supporting the newly established Russian/Australian Chamber of Commerce?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I can advise that not only is the answer in the future tense 'Yes' but in the past tense it is also 'Yes', because we have given it support to date in the preparatory work that led to its meeting last Monday evening. The very first chapter in Australia of the Russian/Australian Chamber of Commerce was established in South Australia on Monday night. A lot of interest was indicated by business in South Australia. In fact, the attendance of some 100 people was about double the number expected at the meeting, and that indicates a great deal of interest and enthusiasm for such a chamber to be established.

At that meeting a number of people spoke about the issue, indicating what kinds of opportunities would be there for such a chamber. Those people included Mr Vadim Kuznetsov, the Minister-Counsellor of the Russian Embassy in Canberra; the Officer-in-Charge of the Russian Desk at Austrade in Canberra, Richard Wilson; and Julie Selby, the South Australian Manager for Austrade. In addition, from the South Australian Government we had Dr Leon Gianeschi from the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology and Paulo Nocella from the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission. In fact, the meeting was chaired by Boris Balin, who is also a member of the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission.

I wrote to Boris Balin in February this year indicating the Government's support for the establishment of such a chamber, and I stand by that commitment. We look forward to providing it with some financial assistance to help it be

a conduit for South Australian business wanting to learn more about business opportunities in Russia, as we have done with a number of other chambers, including the Italian and the Netherlands chambers. Finally, I am pleased to note that G.H. Michell has now opened office for business in Moscow, and that provides opportunities for that company and other South Australian businesses.

### DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

**Mr SUCH (Fisher):** I address my question to the Premier. Will the Government undertake an urgent and comprehensive review of legal and other related procedures, including restraining orders relating to the protection of people, particularly women, who are subject to ongoing threats to their lives arising out of domestic situations?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I understand the thinking behind the question, in view of a recent very tragic incident. I imagine that most of us as members of Parliament are from time to time confronted in our electorate offices with situations where restraining orders have broken down or seem to be difficult to enforce.

Sometimes tragic consequences follow. For instance, I know of at least two cases in the past five years with which I have had some personal connection that involved fatalities. For every one of those, there must be hundreds of other situations where appalling harassment and disruption of living, etc., occur. I am sure all authorities would concede that it is a very difficult area to handle, because you are dealing very often with a high degree of irrationality, frenzy and unpredictability, against which the orders of courts and other normal sanctions that tend to facilitate orderly conduct seem to fall by the wayside.

I will certainly refer the honourable member's question to my colleagues the Attorney-General and the Minister of Emergency Services, both of whom would have some views in this area. In doing so, I repeat that it is a matter of which we are all conscious. I know that the authorities are very conscious of it, but unfortunately there will always be tragic situations because of the unpredictability, paranoia or whatever it has proved impossible to guard against. I appreciate the honourable member's question and will certainly refer it to the appropriate Ministers.

### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** This Government treats this place, us as members of it and the people of South Australia in general with contempt. It goes on day in, day out, week after week, year after year.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** Members opposite have just illustrated the point that I am making. The cacophony of interjection is the kind of thing to which I am referring. In addition, I am stating that the Government simply suits itself, having indicated when the House will sit, as to whether it will change those sittings and the reasons for making those changes. For instance, we are not sitting tomorrow—but we are sitting this week, having previously been told that we would not be.

*Members interjecting:*



**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair apologises for interrupting the member for Murray-Mallee, but I ask members to take their seats, leave the Chamber or do as they choose, but in the correct manner.

**Mr LEWIS:** As members on this side of the Chamber will tell anyone, we made arrangements in consultation with community groups who wished to have us participate in activities—

*Mr Hamilton interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** I thank the member for Albert Park for that inane statement.

**Mr Hamilton:** He did. He squealed like a stuck pig.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr LEWIS:** Again, that illustrates my point as to the sort of language used *ad nauseam* by members opposite, treating this place, including your authority, Sir, and us as members with contempt. As I was saying, before I was so rudely interrupted, we have had to break the arrangements that we made in good faith with our communities and constituents in agreeing to participate in conferences such as UFS section AGMs and other seminars during the course of this week, because the Government, for its own convenience, recently chose to have the House sit. More particularly, it has chosen to extend the sittings of the House right through April. Why could we not have been told about that at the outset? Surely the Government knows its own legislative program. Do Ministers not know what they are doing or talking about? I think they do not.

Other illustrations of the fact that they do not are to be found in *Hansard*. One only has to ask a Minister a straight question about a matter of importance in that Minister's portfolio, and the Minister cannot answer. Instead, they waffle; they tell fibs; they do anything at all but come to the point. When I questioned the Minister for Environment and Planning last week about the short and long-term risks associated with the hazardous waste dump which might be located at Taillem Bend or five other places, she ducked that question.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** What a load of nonsense!

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr LEWIS:** I was seeking an explanation of the risks of putting the repository anywhere. What are the short-term and long-term risks, I asked her. She did not mention what those risks were, not once in the five minutes that she stood over there and waffled. She filled the record with irrelevance. She does not know what the word 'risk' means, how to evaluate it or, for that matter, what the difference is between short-term and long-term risks. She does not care how that affects the anxieties of the people I represent and other people who are anywhere near one of those sites.

The Minister did not answer the question straight out. She waffled. She talked about the Mayor of Port Augusta saying she wanted the repository at Port Augusta; she talked about society at large producing the waste and therefore having to dispose of it; and she talked about the jobs it would create. However, she did not talk about risks and, before we even contemplate placing a waste repository anywhere, we should know, and the Minister of all people should know, what those risks are and she should be able to answer questions about them. That is one illustration of the point.

Today I asked a question of the Minister of Transport, who has the power under the Railways Transfer Agreement to prevent the closure of any railway line. At Karoonda at present, we have not one, not 10 but hundreds of trucks welded to the Waikerie and Peebinga lines, yet the Minister does not know that it has been closed down. He has to give approval for the line to be closed under the terms of the

agreement negotiated in the mid-1970s by the Dunstan Government. It is outrageous that they can come in here, waffle their way through Question Time when we ask them questions, yet give answers to Dorothy Dixers from the other side, while treating us all with contempt. They know nothing and pay no attention whatever to their duties and responsibilities which they have to this place, to the people of South Australia. It is about time they woke up.

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh):** I wish to comment on the way in which a decent and honourable person has had her name traduced because of cynical, ruthless opportunism on the part of members opposite. I am sure that many are ashamed at the position taken by their outgoing leadership and I use that word in the political sense. I do not mean that the Leader is an extrovert; I am referring to the fact that he is going out. Some members opposite have distanced themselves from the scurrilous stance taken by their Party leadership, particularly the member for Hanson, who last night expressed his views on the matter. He said that to accuse the Minister of some of the things that have been done is to introduce a red herring. He expressed his concern that we as a Parliament seem more concerned about whether a Minister did this or that than about the merits of the legislation being debated, and he thought it was an absolute disgrace to attack that Minister in this way.

It is increasingly hard to get good and decent people to participate in leading roles in community life. Parliament is not held in the highest esteem for a whole range of reasons, but it is certainly going to be an awful lot harder to encourage participation by those good and decent people who give some sort of contemplation to parliamentary life when they see what happens to those good and decent people who do. A decent and honourable woman, the most senior Tourism Minister in Australia, one who is dedicated to the development of tourism in this State, is being subjected to what is in effect a re-run of the Liberal Party smear campaign that was conducted against the Attorney-General, a smear campaign based on totally unfounded rumours which, in the end, led to the expenditure by the National Crime Authority of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money chasing those rabbits down holes. Much of it was instigated by the same journalist who is peddling the dirt about the Minister of Tourism.

*The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER:** The member for Napier might again tell the House at a later stage what this same journalist from the ABC did in relation to him. I draw members' attention to something about him that I believe should be read into the parliamentary record. It appears on page 1 of this afternoon's *News*, under the heading 'Police move on pokies journalist'. It reads:

Police today reported ABC radio journalist Chris Nicholls on two counts of false pretences concerning the confidential banking records of Mr Jim Stitt, companion of the Tourism Minister, Ms Wiese. Holden Hill CIB detectives arrived at the offices of the ABC at 11 a.m. after Mr Nicholls failed to keep an earlier appointment. He was interviewed for a short time, but it is not known if he assisted with investigations.

It also was not known if any documents were handed to or seized by detectives. The police prosecutions department will decide if enough evidence exists to charge Mr Nicholls. Detectives already have interviewed Mr Stitt, Ms Wiese and staff at a St Peters bank as part of their investigations.

I ask members to pay close attention to the next paragraph, which reads:

The inquiry arose after Mr Stitt complained to police that documents were obtained illegally from the St Peters bank.

**An honourable member:** It is outrageous.

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER:** It is indeed outrageous. The article continues:

Meanwhile, the Opposition says that it has no plans to release documents it claims will prove a conflict of interest involving Ms Wiese and the poker machines legislation except to an independent inquiry. Opposition Youth Affairs spokesman, Mr Wayne Matthew, said he had no confidence the documents would be given the consideration they deserved unless independently examined.

I find the gall of the member for Bright absolutely amazing. In effect, he is saying to the House, 'I have some allegations, and they are based on documents that I want investigated, but you cannot have access to them.' We on this side are not quite sure where they come from. Perhaps he got them from one of his 0055 phone calls.

When the Minister of Tourism handed over her private and personal records to the Attorney-General for analysis, the member for Bright then reflected on the integrity of the Attorney-General. We then saw the member for Bright take a point of order, because he thought that he himself might be reflected upon in some way in the Premier's response. What a big sook! Honestly, he reminds me of the child who murdered both his parents and then pleaded for mercy from the court on the ground that he was an orphan. I have not seen so much gall for a long time.

The Minister acted in good faith in what she did. She believed that everyone in the Cabinet was aware, but she erred; apparently some Ministers were not. But the circumstances were not those of a normal Government Bill, as has been pointed out. If the Minister erred, she has already suffered pretty severe consequences with all her personal, private, and financial arrangements being hung out in the public arena. That, in itself, should surely be enough for members of the Opposition. Are they really so vicious, cynical and mean as to carry on this shameless vendetta, which they seem to be doing? I ask you: are they really like that, or are they better people than they seem to be?

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** I rise to protest on behalf of a large number of parents, particularly in the electorate of Light. This issue passes into the electorate of Kavel and, I suspect, into Napier. Parents who elect to send their children to a school other than the nearest public school are now faced with massive increases in the cost of transportation. The persons to whom I refer never had access to free transport for their children which was made available by the Government for some time, but they benefited quite legitimately through some subsidisation of private bus services which allowed the transport of their children from Gawler to such places as Faith Lutheran School or Nuriootpa High School or children from the Valley who were transported down to Immanuel Lutheran School at Gawler or to Trinity College at Gawler.

There are some 400 movements of schoolchildren per day in both directions, with a number of children being sent to the Nuriootpa High School because they can take subjects there which they cannot take at Gawler High School. You have the position of some people, because of their keenness to have church-based schooling for their children, making use of the Faith Lutheran Secondary School at Tanunda, whilst others make use of reception through to year 12 at Trinity College. Those people have received notification that, from the first week of the second term, there will be an increase of more than 50 per cent in the cost of transportation of their children to those elected schools. They do not hesitate to provide additional funding for the education of their children by themselves going without, in many instances, or by going out and taking second jobs, but they protest when other children are gaining the benefit of STA transportation which will take them to a school of their desire in any direction at a concessional fee which is

much less than that which they have always had to pay on a private service.

They wonder what this Government believes it is doing in placing these further impositions upon them as parents and, indeed, whether the Government has thought through the consequences of these children having to elect not to go to the school of their choice but be deposited in term 2 at the nearest local primary school or high school. I know from discussions with people within the Minister of Education's department that the thought horrifies them that all these children who now go to Faith or Nuriootpa High should suddenly turn up on the doorstep of Gawler High School on the first day of second term. There are no provisions either of resources or staff to assist those people. The same circumstances can relate to a number of instances in respect of the primary schools that are also affected by this movement.

Parents who have only one child find it difficult enough to cope with a 50 per cent increase in the cost of transportation. Those parents who have two or more children find it a major impost, and they were informed by virtue of a letter that was sent out from the bus company—not from the Government, which did not have the courtesy to make contact with these people. The Government loaded the responsibility of sending out a Government document on to the bus company. People were invited to talk to a particular officer—a senior licensing officer of the Office of Transport Policy and Planning—using a particular telephone number.

I do not criticise that officer *per se*, but I indicate that all the information that parents have been able to get from him is 'Stiff cheese', because there is just nothing that the Government is going to change. The Government has made its determination, there is no negotiation and there has been no consultation with the parents themselves, and certainly no consultation with the schools involved.

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

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** I am happy to say that in my electorate there are many positive signs of planning for the future and for recovery. An indication of this is that one of Australia's largest life insurance organisations, National Mutual, is spending \$50 million on expanding and completely refurbishing the West Lakes Mall Shopping Centre. This far-sighted move is typical of National Mutual's confidence in South Australia with its property portfolio now exceeding \$250 million in this State. West Lakes Mall was originally established in 1973 but it is now being expanded to provide 145 specialty shops as well as five major stores. This means an additional 45 or so specialty shops and a great expansion for some major retailers, including Coles and Radio Rentals.

When completed in November this year, it will provide a world class shopping centre, setting a standard for others to envy and serving an area ranging from Outer Harbor in the north to West Beach in the south and covering the north-western suburbs. It is not the largest shopping centre in South Australia but, when completed, it will comprise a net lettable area of 50 000 square metres, providing emphasis on fashion and food. It has been designed to provide a complete variety of shopping experiences for its customers but yet is compact and uses space efficiently to facilitate easier access.

The extra shops will generate far greater employment than ever before in West Lakes. As well, it has provided employment for many tradespeople during the two-year project. Members will be surprised to know that about 2 000 persons

have gained work on the construction site. As far as shopping is concerned, there will be little need for anyone in the western suburbs to go to the city as all their needs will be available within or adjacent to the centre. Restaurants, medical and other health facilities, professional offices and a hotel, all are grouped between West Lakes rowing course and this major centre which in turn is adjacent to Football Park, the home of the Adelaide Crows.

The magnificent new Coles supermarket and upgraded Woolworths supermarket are both performing very strongly and successfully, complementing the specialty shops already operating in the new food area. Visitors can readily see what the centre will be like when completed, with its emphasis on wide uncluttered malls with clear access, and on natural lighting with an innovative use of teflon and glass in barrel vaults and domes throughout the centre. The fresh food area, with its wide variety of cuisines from around the world, is designed to seat more than 500 in light airy surroundings, created by the 12 metre high translucent teflon roof. There is a new escalator and spiral staircase near John Martin's, extra toilet facilities, and further landscaping for the grounds. The open car park which is being provided with upgraded lighting provides spaces for 3 500 cars at any one time.

An interesting point about this centre is its policy of helping the community. It is common knowledge that National Mutual has always been community oriented—after all it has been a major sponsor of Life. Be in it programs in this State for many years, and its policy is nowhere better exemplified than at West Lakes Mall. In that mall, community organisations, myself included, wishing to raise funds or get across a message can arrange to use a charity booth provided free of charge, or they can put up displays in the mall to show what they are all about. In the past few weeks there have been displays for the State Emergency Service, the fire services and the police. Local schools often conduct fundraising efforts from the mall.

In the past two years, West Lakes Mall has sponsored two entrants in the Miss South Australia Quest—a most worthy charity. Between them, these two entrants have raised \$217 000 for the Spastic Centre, and both were named Miss SA Fund Raiser. The West Lakes Community Club raises funds for local activities, including the senior citizens club, the bridge club, the darts club and the bowling club, which now has a top class bowls venue that it has put forward for use when Adelaide is chosen as the venue for the 1998 Commonwealth Games.

Football Park, of course, is proposed as the main venue for the 1998 Adelaide Commonwealth Games, the venue where the opening and closing ceremonies will be held. This first class facility will be used as the athletics venue. The magnificent rowing course, which is such a tribute to the work of the South Australian Rowing Association, also provides an international venue, which will be seen in many countries around the world. So all eyes will be on West Lakes in 1998.

Within walking distance, there are two 18-hole and one 36-hole golf courses, as well as the beautiful lake setting, the beaches, and the parks and gardens, all providing facilities for leisure use. The people of West Lakes are proud to live there.

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

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** Earlier today I asked the Minister of Lands whether she agreed with a decision to impose an extra fee of \$20 per document for land title settlements lodged on Fridays and the last day of the month

and, if she did agree with that, whether she could say what administrative procedures could be considered as an alternative to what I referred to as a totally unacceptable fee. Nothing that the Minister said in her reply changed my attitude to this situation. I am of the opinion that members of the public have an unfettered right to settle property whenever they wish.

The Minister suggested in her reply that I was attacking the Public Service, but that is not the case. I was certainly not attacking the Registrar-General, Mr Kidd. What I was doing was placing some emphasis on the need for the Government to consider issues such as this in ensuring that sufficient staff are on duty to meet the requirements of the general public. I am aware of the reference group established by the Registrar-General and of his wish to consult appropriately. He is to be commended for that initiative.

I also understand the practical reasons why people would want to settle on Fridays. I am sure that every member of this House has been in a situation of wanting to settle on a property transaction and, because of interest and because in many instances people wish to move house over the weekend, Friday is a legitimate and logical day for people to select to carry out these transactions. I wonder what would happen if people who ran supermarkets found that they had to put up the cost of goods on Fridays because more people were shopping on those days. It is exactly the same situation. I would presume, that being the case, they would consider how they could put on more staff. It is totally appropriate that that should happen in the private sector as it is in the public sector.

I asked the Minister whether she agreed with the decision, because I am not quite sure whether or not that decision constitutes a fine or a penalty. I would have thought that there may have been a necessity to consider enabling legislation if that were the case, and that is something I would want to consider on another occasion.

The practice of the Lands Titles Office is to deal with work in order of lodgment. Once a document comes over the assessment counter and past the cashier, it is processed in order of receipt, and that can take three to eight weeks depending on the office workload. I am not aware, and those to whom I have spoken from the industry were not aware, that the time of processing was an issue of complaint. I point out that the stamp duties assessors handle the same documents prior to settlement and they appear to allocate counter staff from other areas during peak periods. I suggest that that would be totally appropriate in the case of the Registrar-General.

I do not believe that the Minister's answer was satisfactory. There is considerable concern in the community about the additional cost to homeowners, and I hope that the Minister and the Registrar-General will reconsider the decision for the sake of all homeowners and the land broking industry in this State.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** I would like to place on record my thanks to the Liberal Party for appointing the member for Murray-Mallee to the Select Committee on Bushfire Protection and Suppression Measures, which I have the honour to chair. My thanks are also extended to the member for Eyre, but he is not the main reason for my making this contribution this afternoon. It has been a great disappointment to me to have noticed, since the Christmas break and the announcement of his dumping from the shadow ministry, that the member for Murray-Mallee has physically deteriorated. I have seen him come into this Chamber and move around the corridors looking completely dejected, and that has worried me, because the phys-

ical state of all my colleagues in this House—and yes, your physical state, Sir—gives me cause for concern. Sir, whenever you have any ailment, I am there wishing you well, as you well know.

However, I cannot speak for the mental state of the member for Murray-Mallee, because I am not a qualified doctor. I well recall that you, Sir, have taken me to task many times for urging the member for Murray-Mallee to take medication, and that is why I say that I am not qualified to make any comments on his mental state.

**The SPEAKER:** I think the member for Napier might be drawing a long bow here.

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** As per usual.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMING:** However, the appointment of the member for Murray-Mallee to the select committee has already resulted in a spring in his step, his contribution in general debate in the House has improved in leaps and bounds, and I have noticed that his cheeks have filled out and he no longer walks around with his shoulders stooped. In fact, the member for Murray-Mallee is a new man, and I am pleased about that. I will be very proud to present the member for Murray-Mallee to the public as a colleague in whom I have every confidence; shoulder to shoulder, man to man, we will face the public and tackle the complex task that the Parliament has given us in relation to bushfire suppression and control. I also notice that perhaps his appointment to the select committee has coincided with the fact that the member for Murray-Mallee has been promised, if there is a change of Government at the next election and if the Liberal Party is on the Treasury benches, that he will be appointed Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees.

That fills me with great joy and anticipation. It is not because I will not be here, because I shall be here. I will not be here behind this particular bench, but I will be hanging over that gallery taking in every word of wisdom that the member for Murray-Mallee utters. When that does happen—or if it does happen (mind you, Sir, it would be a tragedy not should the member for Murray-Mallee be appointed to that position but should the Liberal Party win Government)—it will be good to see such maturity sitting there and controlling the debates of this Chamber in Committee.

I see my task as twofold: not only to encourage the member for Murray-Mallee as a member of my committee, but to pass on my own wisdom during this two-year training period as a member of the select committee, so that that training, experience and advice that comes from me (being, I humbly submit, one of the elder statesmen of this House) will enable the honourable member to better serve the House in the years to come.

**Mr FERGUSON:** Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed.*

#### SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 31 March at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

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

That, for the remainder of the session, Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable standing committee reports (except those relating to subordinate legislation or supplementary development matters) on presentation to be dealt with in accordance with Standing Order 346.

Motion carried.

#### ROAD TRAFFIC (ILLEGAL USE OF VEHICLES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

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

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

This Bill amends section 44 of the Road Traffic Act 1961 ('the Act') to increase the penalties for the offence of driving, using or interfering with a motor vehicle without first obtaining the consent of the owner of the vehicle.

An amendment to the Act was considered an appropriate response to recent publicity regarding illegal use of motor vehicles and the alleged inadequacy of existing penalties.

Currently, the Act provides for a term of imprisonment of 12 months for a first offence. A subsequent offence attracts a term of not less than three months or more than two years. The Court may also order the defendant to pay to the owner of the motor vehicle such sum as the Court thinks proper by way of compensation for any loss or damage suffered by the owner.

Section 44 of the Act is used in cases where it cannot be shown that the offender intended permanently to deprive the owner of the vehicle where larceny cannot be proven.

The maximum penalty for larceny under section 131 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 is five years imprisonment.

It would not be appropriate for the maximum penalty under section 44 of the Act to exceed the maximum penalty for larceny. Therefore, it has been decided that the penalty for a first offence should be increased to a term of imprisonment not exceeding two years. This is accepted as the maximum penalty for a summary offence.

For a subsequent offence the penalty has been set at a period not exceeding four years (that is, a minor indictable offence which would involve the option of trial by jury). The minimum penalty for a subsequent offence is retained at three months to allow the Court to assess the circumstances of the offence. These increases would have the effect of doubling the present maximum penalties. Further, the amendment also adds as an additional penalty for an offence against this section a mandatory driving disqualification of six months duration. I commend this Bill to members.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the measure to be brought into operation by proclamation. Clause 3 amends section 44 of the principal Act which creates the offence of driving, using or interfering with a motor vehicle without first obtaining the consent of the owner of the vehicle. The clause amends this section to increase the penalty from the current level (imprisonment for a maximum term of 12 months for a first offence and between a minimum of three months and a maximum of two years for a subsequent offence) to imprisonment for a maximum term of two years for a first offence and between a minimum of three months and a maximum of four years for a subsequent offence. The clause also adds as a further penalty for an offence against this section a mandatory driving disqualification of six months duration.

**Mr S.G. EVANS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

**BUILDING SOCIETIES (SHARE CAPITAL)  
AMENDMENT BILL**

Second reading.

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

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

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

Leave granted.

**Explanation of Bill**

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Building Societies Act 1975 to permit the listing of permanent shares on the Australian Stock Exchange.

The Hindmarsh Adelaide Building Society merged with the Co-operative Building Society on 1 January 1992. As a result of that merger, the capital adequacy ratio of the Co-operative Building Society has fallen from approximately 12 per cent to approximately 8 per cent. This has largely occurred because of substantial provisions and write downs to the assets of the Hindmarsh Adelaide Building Society, which has substantially reduced reserves.

The Co-operative Building Society has assets of approximately \$2 billion and represents approximately 95 per cent of industry assets in South Australia.

The society intends that a capital raising program be undertaken as soon as possible (March/April) to increase capital to more acceptable levels.

The society undertook its first capital raising in December 1989 and currently has approximately \$28 million of permanent shares on issue.

These permanent shares are currently traded on an exempt stock market which the society is able to operate, having registered appropriate rules pursuant to a ministerial council for companies and securities declaration.

However, a public listing, as opposed to exempt stock market trading, will make any offer of permanent shares more attractive to institutional investors, because market value will more closely approximate the asset backing of the shares.

The Co-operative Building Society has a significant and important position in the South Australian market as a repository for domestic savings and as a major source of housing finance. They are for many South Australians the secure, efficient and preferred alternative to the banking sector.

If the St George Building Society in New South Wales converts to a bank, which is their stated intention, the Co-operative Building Society will become the largest building society in Australia.

The South Australian Government is supportive of the aim of maintaining a strong and viable building society industry in South Australia. A public listing will assist the Co-operative Building Society to raise its capital adequacy ratio and this will afford protection to depositors.

The Bill is consistent with the Building Societies Act 1990 (not proclaimed) and the proposed financial institutions Legislation, which do not prohibit public listing. I commend the Bill to the House.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 47 of the principal Act by striking out subsection (13) which prevents shares in a building society from being sold, or offered for sale, on any stock exchange.

**Mr S.G. EVANS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

**GAMING MACHINES BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 24 March. Page 3553.)

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** The member for Hanson last night said that he thought the debate on this Bill had been a farce. I disagree. This is one of the few debates in my two years in this House in which we have been free of Party Whips. On this Bill there has been no Party line to follow, no draft speeches, no dot points to regurgitate. Each member has had to do his or her own research and come to a decision

on a Bill of 77 clauses. This is only the third debate in this House in which I have listened to every speech or read them in *Hansard*. It is the only debate in which I have been able to be open to the suggestions of all speakers. I will be sending my speech and the division lists to all constituents who have contacted me about this Bill and they can judge me accordingly. This is not a farce, as the member for Hanson claims; it is how Parliament was meant to be.

Poker machines in New South Wales and the ACT have improved the communal life and communal facilities of the towns and suburbs that have them. I lived in the ACT for six years when I was a law student and I travelled to Queanbeyan and Sydney from time to time. One of the things I enjoyed in those places was that people went out in the evening for a drink, for a play of the pokies and for a chat with their fellow citizens. I enjoyed the atmosphere of the Canberra Workers Club, the Southern Cross Club and the Queanbeyan Leagues Club. It seems to me that not as many Canberra and Queanbeyan families spend the evening at home huddled around the television set as do so many Adelaide families; I think that is good for Canberra.

The member for Henley Beach mentioned some of the facilities New South Wales clubs have been able to build and the services they have been able to provide with revenue from poker machines. That is a plus for New South Wales. I have nothing to add to his account except to say that I saw the same when I lived in the east. I believe South Australian clubs and hotels can look forward to similar benefits if poker machines are legalised by this Bill. What these observations of mine cannot realise, however, are the families ruined by addiction to this mechanistic and compulsive form of gambling and the welfare services required to rescue those families from poverty. That drama is played out well away from the conviviality of the clubs.

The members for Adelaide and Fisher ran the worn-out left-liberal line that people should be allowed to do their own thing and, if that included ruining their finances and their families through gambling on poker machines, who were we to keep them from temptation? Alas, I do not share the doctrinal certainty of their permissive liberalism. I believe that I was elected to this Chamber to pass laws for the good government of this State and, if that means our using the authority vested in us to curb vice and protect family life, then I will do it and present myself to the electors of Spence for their judgment.

Some members have referred to playing the pokies as a mindless pursuit and have commented that it is not to their taste. I recall the member for Playford, in particular, saying this. Some of my constituents have said the same. Although I will always prefer putting banknotes in the bookmaker's white bag to slotting coins in a machine, I want to make it clear that taste plays no part in my decision on this Bill. Unlike the member for Adelaide, I am quite prepared to vote in this place according to a moral code, but I will not impose my own tastes or aesthetics.

By the way, should the Bill pass all stages, I will certainly play the machines occasionally and I will be urging the West Croydon and Kilkenny RSL Club, of which I am an associate member, to install a few machines so that it can hold its clientele in the changed market. I am sure that, if the Bill is passed, hundreds of Spence constituents will play the machines, and that weighs more heavily with me than the presumptuous petitions of eastern suburbanites who say that they will not play the machines and neither should anyone else.

I have not received as many local representations on this Bill as I expected. I confess that I do not know whether public opinion in Spence is for or against the Bill. Indeed,

I expect that many people have no firm opinion or have not thought deeply about the proposal. The Bill would be an ideal subject for an initiative and referendum, a process I favour and which was a fundamental Labor Party plank from 1890 to 1963 when it was torn up by the rather elitist then member for Norwood. I will have more to say about initiative and referendum as time goes by.

The Spence ALP sub-branch is the biggest in the State and it has voted for poker machines and for the Independent Gaming Corporation. Motions of the Spence ALP sub-branch always receive my greatest respect, especially this one, because it is one of the few items of local guidance I have received.

*Mr Holloway interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** That is one reason. Apart from Ray Burns at the Halfway House Hotel at Beverley and Fred Basheer of the Woodville Hotel, who have been persuasive ambassadors for their cause, I have received no other representations from clubs and pubs in Spence, apart from a brief phone message from the Veneto Club. This is most disappointing and I can surmise only that they do not care enough. It is common for members of Parliament to be criticised for being ill mannered in the House or unresponsive to constituents but, after some of the representations I have received on this Bill, I think that a small number of lobbyists ought to conduct a self-examination.

The letter I received from the IGC yesterday saying that 'the hotels, hospitality and club industry watches with great interest the behaviour and conduct of members of Parliament in relation to this Bill,' was not a letter calculated to influence me favourably. I notice that the IGC has sought to explain that remark in a letter today, and that is to its credit.

One of the letters from the Secretary of the Public Service Association (Mr Kevin Crawshaw) ended, 'I trust you will use your vote responsibly.' Yes, I will, and it will not necessarily be to preserve or boost the coverage of the PSA at the expense of the Liquor Trades Union. The petition from Pilgrim Church imploring me 'to use your conscience vote in the forthcoming debate on the Gaming Machines Bill' is either a failure of English expression or an example of that Arian establishment's being so full of its own rectitude that it could not conceive of a member exercising his or her own conscience in favour of gaming machines. I use the term 'Arian' not in the sense of Nordic tribes but in the sense of the heresy that denies the divinity of Christ.

By contrast, the correspondence from the Rev. Graham Nicholls and the Woodville Uniting Church parish is well reasoned and lacking in presumption. I am also disappointed with the Catholic Church's approach, more so because the church is fundamental in the daily life of my family. The archdiocesan office sent each parish a standard-form petition opposing gaming machines, oblivious, I hope, to Caritas Pty Ltd holding one third of the shares in the Adelaide Casino on behalf of the church's Southern Cross Homes, a matter that the member for Davenport properly raised last night. I do not object to the church's investing her capital for maximum return, but she ought to be careful when that investment causes a conflict of interest.

Defeat for this Bill would leave the Adelaide Casino with a monopoly on gaming machines. I wish the church office had applied the same zeal to organising opposition within the major Parties to the Mareeba specialised late abortion clinic as it has applied to gaming machines. If another church official calls for another letter writing campaign on the abortion law, I will scream. There are better methods.

I deplore the avowed refusals of the members for Mit-cham, Adelaide, Custance and Coles to consider this Bill

on its merits because of an alleged impropriety by the Minister of Consumer Affairs. These members have paid no regard to the separation of powers that is such an important doctrine in our Constitution. An alleged impropriety by a Minister may lead to calls for her resignation or impeachment, but this purely executive matter has nothing to do with the law-making function of this House. As legislators, we should examine this Bill on its merits, not hold it hostage.

Several charities have written to me to oppose the Bill or to ask that a proportion of poker machines revenue be set aside to compensate them for the machines' superseding their existing gambling fundraisers such as bingo. I do not object to the hypothecation of taxes. Indeed, I think there should be more of it so that people come to understand how Government services are financed. Therefore, I would support an amendment to hypothecate tax revenue from gaming machines to affected charities and Gamblers Anonymous.

I reject the argument of the Lotteries Commission and the PSA that a public sector monitor of poker machines would be less vulnerable to corruption than a private sector monitor such as the IGC. Mr Crawshaw wrote to me to say, 'As you would know, the public finds private monopolies even more galling than public monopolies.' I do not know any such thing. Many of my constituents have first-hand experience of the public sectors in central and eastern Europe being the biggest rackets of the twentieth century. English political theorist George Watson wrote recently:

They know it to be a system of organised privilege which, in its very nature, favoured the rich . . . [this system] will be seen as right wing because any command economy favours those who command. The golden dog bowls of Bucharest are a natural outcome of concentrated power and not a perversion.

Mr Crawshaw's letter continues, 'The Lotteries Commission has supervised games of chance successfully for 24 years, contributing more than half a billion dollars to the public health system in the process.' I would add that so has Tattersalls, a private company that has been operating much longer in Victoria. Anyone can make a profit from gaming if he has a monopoly. I want to record that I resent the way in which the Lotteries Commission used taxpayers' funds and equipment to send letters lobbying and menacing members on this Bill. By contrast, the PSA has acted properly in its lobbying and is entitled to do what it has, using union funds, as the union representing public sector employees.

Government estimates tell us that poker machines could raise \$55 million in taxes for the State each financial year—voluntary taxes, as one member so aptly put it. Education and health could no doubt do with the money but the \$55 million could also boost the unrealistic expectations that some people have of those systems and our capacity to finance them. I think the \$55 million figure has been arrived at using mechanistic assumptions. In judging the effect of laws and taxes on our society, an organic model is more useful.

I believe that poker machines will hurt many other competing sectors of the economy. Horse racing will suffer and therefore revenue through the TAB and bookmakers will decline. The machines will hurt charities and the Lotteries Commission's market. They will also hurt the clubs and hotels which do not install machines. I am especially worried about racing. When I go to Cheltenham these days, most people seem to be elderly. Sky Channel and PUBTAB are killing a day at the races.

There are strong arguments for and against this Bill. This time I shall err on the side of caution and oppose its second reading. Nevertheless, should the Bill pass the second read-

ing, in Committee I will support the Independent Gaming Corporation and the subordinate detail of the member for Whyalla's Bill.

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition):** I will make a short contribution to this Bill and start by declaring an interest and indicating that companies which I have or with which I am associated have hotel interests and, when debating a Bill such as this and from what has gone on in the past week, I think it is very important that that interest be declared before I say anything else.

I think it is quite clear that the Minister of Finance understands and knows the position I am in when it comes to this Bill. I have always said that I am prepared to support the legislation, provided there are adequate safeguards to prevent corruption or organised crime becoming involved within the industry in this State, and that view has been expressed publicly. I believe that the issue of whether we should have electronic gaming machines in South Australia was decided as a moral issue when they were allowed into the Casino. Gambling as a moral issue was decided when we debated the Casino Bill and the Casino was subsequently allowed to open its doors in South Australia.

Therefore, I view this measure as an individual and as the member for an electorate in the South-East which, I might say, abuts Victoria, knowing that in the near future there will be poker machines in that State and that the businesses of many people in the South-East will be adversely affected by those machines. If it is good enough for electronic gaming and/or poker machines to be in the Casino, I really cannot see why it is not good enough for the people in my electorate to have that same opportunity in the South-East. I think I have made a sensible decision on a conscience issue as the member for Victoria.

People in that electorate have a contrary view, which they have expressed to me in writing, and other people in South Australia have a contrary view also. When this legislation was mooted, I was one of those who came out publicly and said, 'Yes, I would support a conscience vote on that issue', and I would add that one rider, that there should be no chance of corruption or organised crime becoming involved. Although not mentioned at the time by any of us who have a conscience vote and who are in favour of the Bill, that rider would also relate to that preparation of the legislation and its passage through this House at the hands of people who were above reproach. And there, of course, is the problem.

I started to become very concerned when the Lotteries Commission document that was published was, to put it mildly, doctored. Any reference to corruption was taken out of the document, and we have asked questions about that in this House. Why would the Premier allow that to happen? What was the reason for it? Of course, there was some suspicion about that. Then it was of great concern to me why the Police Commissioner was not consulted about the legislation before it was introduced. Why did we have to have the legislation on the table late last year and then have the revelation that the Police Commissioner was not consulted this year? The whole thing smacked to me of an absolute farce. In my opinion, the management of the whole Bill was disgraceful and, in fact, it has made it very difficult for those people who were prepared to support it, with these safeguards, to now do so.

After the events of the past four or five days the Premier has now admitted that he did know about the lobbying that was going on on behalf of the Hotels Association and that the Minister did not declare an interest in the Cabinet room. The fact that the Premier did not ask the Minister to push

back her chair and not participate in the debate in Cabinet merely adds further to the farce. It is absolutely ludicrous that, with the conflict of interest that was quite obvious to her, the Minister should not be stood aside, because she did not declare that interest. As I have said, it makes it very difficult for all of us now to conduct a sensible debate.

We asked the Government not to debate this Bill when it was introduced last week, when those allegations emerged in the public arena. All we asked for was an independent person to examine those allegations, for the Bill to be put aside and for the matter to be cleaned up, and then everyone in this House could debate the Bill, knowing that one of the problems involving those allegations had been removed. The Bill could then be debated in a sensible manner. It is quite clear to me that, knowing about the involvement of the lobbyist and knowing that the Minister was involved, the Premier was derelict in his duty by not bringing that matter before Cabinet. Therefore, some of us have been put in a most embarrassing situation.

In fact, I have stated publicly that I will not support this Bill unless there is an independent inquiry to clear up those allegations. I stand by that statement and will not be supporting this Bill on the second or third reading. Because of the mishandling of this matter by the Premier and the Minister in her role in Cabinet, one is forced into an untenable situation, and as a member of this House I will maintain my stance until the smell of this situation has been removed. I can understand other people having the same problem.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** I have listened to the interjections of the members opposite and to the cop out they make when they say, 'How terrible, why would you want an independent inquiry to clear up this matter?' Allegations have been made, and there is documentation showing quite clearly the money trail that went around. It shows quite clearly that money went into that joint account of the Minister and her partner. That is factual evidence. I draw to members' attention the scurrilous allegations the ALP made in April 1982 when the Casino Bill was being debated. I will read into *Hansard* part of a news report headed 'Casino cash rumour: ALP wants inquiry', stating:

The State ALP today called for an investigation of allegations that the Liberal Party was offered money to introduce Casino legislation—

the Liberal Party was offered money to introduce it—

Mr Wright [the same Mr Wright who now has something to do with the Lotteries Commission] said it was well known in political circles that a prospective Casino developer was offering a 'sizeable sum of money' for a Casino Bill to be introduced . . . Mr Wright said that if money did change hands . . .

Interestingly, we asked the Premier a question with very similar wording to that the other day, and he got up on his high horse screaming the words 'money changing hands'. The article continues:

Mr Wright said that if money did change hands, it was an extraordinary act of political impropriety. In Parliament on 30 March the Opposition Leader, Mr Bannon, asked the Deputy Premier, Mr Goldsworthy, if he could give a 'categorical denial' that any donation of money had been offered or accepted by the Liberal Party, or any Government members, to facilitate the introduction of a Casino Bill in the House of Assembly. Mr Goldsworthy said he 'most certainly' could give a categorical denial.

Compare what the ALP said then about this whole matter with what it is saying now in government. All we are saying is that to hold an independent inquiry would take two or three days and would get the matter cleared up and get the allegations out of the road, so that the people of South Australia will have confidence in the conscience decision that we make in this Parliament.

**The Hon. P.B. Arnold:** Things are different when they are not the same.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** Exactly. As the honourable member says: things are different when they are not the same. Anyone who wants to interject from the other side of the House or carry on like the Government has in the past few days knows that their claims are a load of rubbish with no substance. None of you can say anything that is factual compared with what you people were saying back then, and that involved just a scurrilous rumour, which was denied immediately, of course.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Interjections are out of order. The Leader is out of order using the term 'you people'. He will direct all his remarks through the Chair.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** All I am saying, Mr Speaker, is that the poker machine industry has the potential to be a very large money earner in this State. It has been claimed that the State of South Australia could earn up to \$50 million a year from that industry. I think that is far on the high side, because many people put too much relevance on what poker machines are going to do and who is going to play them. The take of the Government will be much less than people believe.

It is wrong for the Government to push the line it has taken until the matter is cleaned up. It has forced members such as me who, on conscience, would have supported the legislation, to vote against it. All I can say to the Government is that I think it has come out of this in shame. The handling of this matter has been disgraceful, and I think the people in South Australia, including the many who want poker machines, are now having second thoughts on the matter because of the handling of it by the Government.

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** At the outset, I would like to say that I reject totally any allegations by the member for Victoria that my vote can be bought in this debate. Basically, that is what the member for Victoria claimed in the little episode that occurred before my contribution. I totally reject the allegation in any way, shape or form. My decision, as with the decision of all members of this House, will be made based, I am sure, on the wealth of information that has been forwarded to me and to all members here, and also on consultations on my own behalf with members of my constituency, which is rightly what we should be doing.

Ultimately, it is a conscience vote and it is up to the individual members in this House to vote in the way that they see fit after having taken into account all of the voluminous information that has been forwarded to us. I have received numerous reports from various bodies, the Independent Gaming Corporation, the Lotteries Commission, unions, private individuals, groups and from the hotel sector in my electorate of Stuart. I have read most of that information as well as articles that I have found in the library in order to come to a reasonably informed decision on this debate. I do not believe that any extraneous situation should be taken into account, as has been indicated, and I agree with the comments of the member for Hanson concerning extraneous information that has been constantly brought up by members opposite.

I will now address myself totally to the Bill. As I pointed out, much reading has been done, a lot of information has been researched and many decisions have had to be made about the Bill. It has been difficult for me because I had a conflict in two directions about the legislation, and I will deal with those later. However, I did take the time and effort to consult with groups and individuals in my elec-

torate. I was lobbied by the hotels and clubs in favour of the proposition, and I was also lobbied by the churches against the proposition.

Having taken all that into account I made a conscious decision that I would support the legislation now before the House. As a country member I am aware of the problems facing my electorate. It is difficult to obtain employment in my electorate, particularly for younger people. Hotels and clubs are finding it difficult to operate and tourism could go ahead much quicker if there were incentives for people to come out into the country. Hotels and clubs see this legislation as providing some light at the end of the tunnel with respect to attracting employment and tourism to country areas. The second reading explanation states:

Revenue from the introduction of gaming machines will provide for an element of growth and stability within the club and hotel industry which forms a significant component of the State's tourism industry.

I would have to agree with that. It continues:

In particular, it will allow for clubs and hotels in areas adjacent to States in which gaming machines are to be or are already in operation to compete on an even footing.

I can verify that, in my own electorate of Stuart, I am aware of bus tours constantly going across the border to Broken Hill in order to take senior citizens to that venue to play the poker machines. But it is not simply to play the poker machines: it is for a trip away, and that is part of the attraction that causes them to take that trip across the border to Broken Hill. If those facilities were already here in South Australia, that money could be kept within the State, and I have a keen interest in keeping that money in my area of the State, which is in the north.

As I have said before, it is valid for all of the hotels and clubs in country areas to support strongly the introduction of this legislation, and I applaud the professionalism of those submissions that they gave me, and I was impressed by them. However, I do have a number of concerns about the introduction of poker machines into clubs and hotels. The major concern has been mentioned by a number of members, that is, the bribery and corruption aspects. Everyone knows of the problems that have arisen in New South Wales.

Two other States—Victoria and Queensland—have introduced legislation to allow gaming machines into hotels and clubs, and this has been assessed pretty thoroughly by our Police Department. I applaud the Police Commissioner for the work that he has done on the report that he sent to members.

The Police Commissioner expressed concern in two areas and said that he had held discussions with the Liquor Licensing Commissioner and was able to say that, as a result of his discussions, their views did largely coincide. However, he did have two areas of concern: first, the desirability or otherwise of direct contact between manufacturers or their agents with the purchasing clubs and hotels, etc.; and, secondly, whether the Independent Gaming Corporation or the Casino Supervisory Authority should be the monitoring or regulatory body. The Police Commissioner states:

(1) There should not be a purchaser/seller relationship between the machine manufacturers or agents and the club or hotels, and

(2) The Casino Supervisory Authority should replace the Independent Gaming Corporation as the monitoring or regulatory body.

I also share those concerns. However, I feel that the Minister would have taken that into account in framing this legislation. But I want to put on record that I have a real concern in that area.

One of the other two areas in which I have concern is that of addictive gamblers, people who have a real problem



with gambling. In the Victorian legislation I note that there is provision for one per cent of the profits to be allocated to a social account, to take account of those problems and to assist in helping those people addicted to gambling. It was interesting to note a comment in the *Sunday Mail* by Gamblers Anonymous, the group that was set up to look after those people who are addicted to gambling. That comment, under the headline 'Aid group: we are not opposed', reads:

Gamblers Anonymous did not oppose the introduction of one-armed bandits in South Australia, a spokesman said last night. A gambler would find ways to have a wager whether or not poker machines were allowed into hotels and clubs.

'GA is not opposed to gambling in any form', the spokesman said. 'There are many men and women who can gamble in moderation without it affecting their way of life or health. GA is in existence to help people who are compulsive gamblers.'

We should take account of those people who are compulsive gamblers, and I would support any amendments that suggested that some proportion of the profits from gambling should go to assist people in distress through gambling. My other area of concern, and I will be fairly brief on this, is that there is a real risk that charities will find it very difficult, with the introduction of gaming machines into hotels and clubs, to assist the people they currently assist by raising money through such things as bingo tickets. That is of great concern to me, and I have received a number of representations from groups who do that work and who are concerned about that aspect.

I would also support any moves to direct some of the money obtained through gaming machines to that aim. I ask members of the House seriously to consider that aspect of the introduction of these machines into clubs and hotels. Having said all that and expressed my concerns, I will support this legislation. I hope that, in supporting it, my concerns will be taken into account, and that every effort will be made to ensure that the criminal element is kept out of gambling in South Australia. As a Government, as a State and as a Parliament we cannot afford to let the criminal element into gambling in South Australia. In the past we have been very fortunate, and in the future we must be ever vigilant to ensure that that does not occur.

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** Like other members of this House, I have been intensively lobbied over a considerable period by clubs, hotels, organisations and individuals. The forms of lobbying have included petitions, letters, phone calls, delegations, personal approaches and invitations to clubs for them to discuss the issue and to make known their views. All this lobbying has been quite legitimate and I thank those lobbyists for having carried out their work in a proper and orderly manner.

I have appreciated the lobbying that has given me all the arguments for and against the introduction of gaming machines into this State's hotels and licensed clubs. I have put an enormous amount of energy and time into looking at all aspects of this very important issue. I have weighed up the advantages and disadvantages of the potential impact of the presence of poker machines here in South Australia and have decided to oppose the Bill.

Unfortunately for the people who want pokies, in all honesty I could find very few points in favour of their introduction but was able to identify many quite valid points against them. I am still not convinced that there is a great need for these gaming machines in the community. There is only so much disposable money to be spread around, and I feel that if pokies are introduced that money will be taken from other areas. No doubt, there will be some new money being gambled, but I fear that it will come from

needy families and people who really cannot afford to spend that money.

These are the unfortunate people who become addicted to the use of poker machines and, therefore, that would be a backward step. I believe that the licensed clubs and hotels will use the hardship of families to prop up their own operations, and this is quite unfair to the community at large. I also feel that there are enough forms of gambling now and, once these machines are in the State and in the community, we will always have them. Once they are introduced they will never be got rid of if there is a need to get rid of them at a later date.

I cite the example of New South Wales where, for many years, poker machines have been in existence. At various times there have been corruption problems, and New South Wales has continually updated and improved its monitoring and control. While the machines are fairly good and fairly clean now, I still think that they are not 100 per cent infallible as far as the potential for corruption and criminal activity is concerned. Even when monitored by computers, they are not 100 per cent foolproof and corruption free.

Computer crime is one of the world's fastest growing industries and, with various aspects of this industry, in my opinion there is too much scope for crime and corruption, and I cite the stages of the introduction of machines, their ongoing use, the scope for corruption at the manufacturing stage, the sale of the machines, their installation, the programming of the computers, the maintenance of the machines, the clearing of them and the planned and organised manipulation in relation to the technological part of the monitoring of the machines.

The Minister has a view that this modern technology is quite adequate to make sure that crime and corruption are kept out, and I respect the Minister's view. I have tremendous respect for the Minister, and he sincerely believes that those safeguards will ensure that the industry is kept very clean. While I respect his view in that regard, I do not have the same confidence. I feel that there is still scope for criminal activity and corruption, even with the most up-to-date technology. That is another reason why I oppose the Bill.

During the past 10 years in Australia, virtually every select committee and other major report brought down gives a very clear warning of the probability—not the possibility—of crime and corruption occurring within the industry. Poker machines are very addictive for many people. Some people are addicted only to poker machines. It is often quoted as an argument that people will gamble on whatever form of gambling is available, but it is a proven fact and there are figures to prove that some people in the community are addicted only to poker machines and not to other forms of gambling.

I have played pokies interstate but find that, after 10 minutes or so, it becomes a mindless activity. I have seen many people absolutely mesmerised by these machines. There is no judgment, no thought or skill; just a repetitious pulling of a handle or pressing of a button, and I believe that they are an insult to people's intelligence. It is documented that there will be a substantial increase in the *per capita* gambling dollar, and with that go all the resultant social implications. There is no doubt that it will increase hardship for many families. Wherever pokies have been introduced, the fact is that the welfare needs of the community escalate quite dramatically.

I believe also that they will become too accessible. I go along with the argument that people can go and use pokies, and support the fact that they are in the Casino. If people from my area of Port Adelaide or from other areas wish to

play the pokies, that is fair enough: they can make the conscious decision to get ready and enjoy a night out playing the pokies, but to have these machines accessible in every local pub and club is going too far.

People will no doubt go to their local hotel having made the decision to spend \$5 or \$10 on the pokies, but they will have a couple of drinks first and lose all sense of judgment, and go and lose all their money, leaving their family without any money on which to live.

Another argument which is quite strong is that there are too many licensed clubs in South Australia. This is of major concern to me. According to the Australian Hotels Association figures, Victoria has one club for every 7 724 people, New South Wales has one club for every 3 384 people but South Australia has one club for every 1 184 people. This latter figure indicates that South Australia is over-saturated with clubs and, if they all get poker machines, they will become too accessible, and that will cause a lot of problems. It will also be bad for many small clubs that do not wish or cannot afford to put in pokies, and a lot of those clubs will fall by the wayside and be forced out of existence.

Another aspect is the adverse effect that poker machines would have on the fundraising activities of sporting clubs and charitable organisations, and I am associated with such clubs in my electorate. There will also be an adverse effect on the TAB and horseracing industry, which is one of the State's biggest industries, and other forms of gambling, with a resultant loss of jobs. I realise that some jobs will transfer from one area to another if these machines are introduced, but I am convinced that there will be quite a substantial job loss, because poker machines are low in labour intensive terms.

Another area that concerns me is under-age gambling. I know that there are provisions to deal with this, but I ask who will police it. At present we see under-age drinking in hotels and the supply of liquor to under-age people, but that is very hard to police and prosecute. There is also the aspect of overuse of machines, and supposedly people who overuse machines will be told to move on, but who will police it. What is to stop people from going to another establishment and continuing their gambling, even though they cannot afford it? Most of the other issues have been canvassed by other speakers, and I will not repeat them. To sum up, I have too many concerns about the introduction of poker machines, especially in my electorate, to support the legislation. If I were a member representing a more affluent electorate, I might—I repeat 'might'—have decided to support this legislation but, given the problems facing people in my electorate, I have decided to oppose the introduction of poker machines. I have given the issue a lot of serious and honest consideration, and I have decided to oppose the Bill.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Finance):** I thank all members who have spoken in this debate. I think the debate has been excellent, but it is a great pity that one issue intruded into it and, I thought, spoiled it. I believe it was unnecessary that that intrusion took place, but nevertheless it did and so, for part of the debate, I was disappointed. Overall, it was an excellent debate. I thought that the quality of members' contributions, whether they were for or against the Bill was, by and large, excellent.

I have made something of a minor career out of introducing private members' matters—although this is not strictly a private member's Bill—in this and the other place over the past 17 years. I have always had the legislation treated on its merits and treated fairly, with all members taking an interest in it and, I think, by and large, enjoying

the freedom of tackling interesting and difficult issues in a sensible way. I have taken as much pleasure from that as I have taken over the past eight years from Government legislation—no doubt about that. So, I do congratulate all members.

My response to the second reading debate, members will be pleased to know, will be relatively brief, because I am in the fortunate position of having had the pros and cons of the legislation put prior to my speaking. The many points that were made by people in opposition to my Bill have been answered, I think, quite adequately by those who are in support of it. They have answered the various points as debate has progressed. So, again, I am not really required to go through the 40 individual contributions and answer all the queries individually. Therefore, I will stick to the main principles.

I begin by making the quite obvious point that this attempt to introduce poker machines in clubs and hotels is before the Parliament: there is no backdoor method being attempted to introduce poker machines in hotels and clubs in this State. I would have thought that there was nothing more public, nothing more open, than the introduction of a Bill into the Parliament.

I was a little upset with the member for Eyre when he, in his otherwise excellent contribution, suggested that video gaming machines had been introduced into the Casino by stealth. Again, that was a matter that came before the Parliament, and the Parliament had the opportunity over very many months to debate the issue. If the Parliament had not wanted video gaming machines in the Casino, it could have rejected the regulation, and that would have been the end of it as far as I was concerned.

There is a school of thought in this State that video gaming machines ought to and can be introduced by the Lotteries Commission anywhere it chooses without reference to Parliament, and that idea has been advanced. When it finally got to me, I told them quite clearly what I thought of it: if the Lotteries Commission or anybody else has found a loophole in the law, they are certainly not using me to exploit that loophole to introduce video gaming machines in any premises in South Australia without full parliamentary debate. I want to say to the member for Eyre, for whom I have the highest respect, that there was no backdoor method of introducing poker machines in this State: it has all be done through the Parliament.

There will be a conscience vote for all members, and it is clear to me that, without the intrusion of the difficulties that the Minister of Tourism is having, it would have been a genuine conscience vote. It is on this side: we are not concerned with that issue as regards this legislation. On the other side, it is unfortunate that some members have decided to link the two things and have suggested that they will vote on this Bill differently—that is, against, whereas previously they were for the Bill—because of the events surrounding the Minister of Tourism. I believe that that diminishes the conscience vote—and I believe we do not have enough of them in this Parliament—and it is very regrettable.

I do not think there is any point in my arguing the merits of this Bill to any great extent at this stage in the response to the second reading debate. It is clear from the way every member spoke—and all members had a carefully thought out position which they put to the House—that, even with all my powers of persuasion, I will not change one vote in the House with respect to the second reading of this Bill.

I do not intend to go into that at any great length, but I will put my own views on the record in about 30 seconds. I believe that, as was very well put by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, anyone who says they have

an absolutist view on individuals having the right to choose to do as they wish is some kind of anarchist. I do not believe that anyone believes that. I think we all believe the same thing: as to a Government's role in controlling or legislating people's behaviour, we all have a view on where the line is drawn. It is only a matter of opinion. For anyone to put it much higher than that, I think they have labels on themselves. I do not. The line that I draw is much further in the area of liberalisation. I believe it is not to be drawn before poker machines. The issue of poker machines is one that we can leave to individual choice, with obviously sufficient safeguards.

I believe that my position is consistent. I introduced the Casino legislation as a private member's Bill. With respect to the soccer pools legislation, I voted with the Government when I was in Opposition, and I make no apology for saying that, if somebody introduced a Bill to legalise SP bookmaking, I would certainly support it. I think the present near monopoly is quite wrong, and I have had that debate on numerous occasions with some of my colleagues. It seems to me that that is the kind of issue that I can quite safely leave to the individual choice of people in the community. They do not need me to tell them what to do.

Also on the question of monopolies, I do not believe that the Casino should have the monopoly on casino games in this State, and I would certainly support any measure to remove that monopoly. The same applies with lotteries, as said by the member for Spence. Again, I do not believe that the Lotteries Commission should have a monopoly on lotteries. I see no reason why a company such as Tattersalls in Victoria ought not be allowed to run lotteries if they choose, with Government control and regulation. I know that Tattersalls run 50 per cent of the poker machines in Victoria. I think that is fine. I have absolutely no problems with that, provided all the safeguards are there. However, I respect a person's right to draw the line differently. It is my view: I am not saying that I am right and they are wrong. I am just saying that that is my view.

The question of lobbyists is one that has occupied some members' thoughts during the debate. I do not want to say too much about that because, quite frankly, I do not know very much about it. I have not been subjected to a great degree of the efforts of these lobbyists. Quite frankly, I believe that people who employ these lobbyists, in the main, are doing their dough. I cannot see that they are a great advantage to them. If any reputable organisation in this State wants to know my view on anything, all it has to do is to pick up the phone and I will tell it, and I will do that for nothing, or my views can be read in the press or whatever. If its members want to come to see me, they can make an appointment to see me. They do not need to pay someone \$1 000 a day to organise that. It is very simple. I think they do their dough in employing lobbyists. It is one of the greatest con tricks of all time, but it is anyone's right to employ a lobbyist if they wish. The lobbyists around the place have given me little or no attention, but they have certainly not persuaded me to one point of view or another. I have listened respectfully to the odd thing they have said to me, taken note of it, and got on and done what I was going to do anyway.

I certainly want to put on the record that I have not been lobbied by the Minister of Tourism as regards the principal structure of the Bill. I have been lobbied very heavily by the Minister of Tourism on an issue that has not even been raised. I know that she has some grave reservations about this Bill—not so much about what is in it but what is not in it. I have held firm against the lobbying of the Minister of Tourism for certain things to be included in the Bill—

quite legitimate things, I might add—to assist (as she sees it) the tourism industry. But I do not see it that way and, since it is my Bill, that is the way it came out. No doubt she will have her turn in the Upper House if she feels it is worth pursuing.

The Minister of Tourism has at all times behaved in my presence, and to my knowledge, absolutely impeccably. There is not a member of this place for whom I have a higher regard. I would have thought that with the possible exception of the member for Bright—I am still charitable enough to qualify that—I would not think there was one person in this Parliament who does not believe that the Minister of Tourism is a completely honest person but, as she has said herself, with the benefit of hindsight, she feels that she did make an error. I do not know how many of us in our lives, with the benefit of hindsight, have not made errors.

**Mr Atkinson:** The member for Bright!

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Again, with the possible exception of the member for Bright, and we have paid whatever price has to be paid for that error, commensurate with the damage that was done by the error we made. That is how it is. There seems to be—even for someone like me without strong religious beliefs, to put it mildly—retribution around. I am not sure whether it is spiritual or whatever, but nevertheless it seems to happen. I know that the consequences of the error made by the Minister of Tourism have been devastating. If there had to be punishment for an error, I would have thought that the punishment to date far exceeds the crime. I just want to put on the record my enormous respect for that person and my complete confidence in her integrity.

The poker machine debate has changed radically over the past few years. The reason is simple: technology. The old New South Wales trick of a manager or someone else emptying the bin of the poker machines saying, 'A dollar for the club and a dollar for me,' or whatever the ratio was, is over. Those days are even over in New South Wales. I can only refer members to an article in the *News* a couple of weeks ago where the New South Wales police said that these days it is not an issue because of the technology.

As I said, the debate has changed and it has changed considerably. The opportunity for corruption is now very limited. I agree that there can be some small-scale, illegal payments made, but it is against the law for people to give undisclosed commissions, or whatever the term is, and I think that we are probably well able to deal with it with the additional measures in the Bill. I am not as concerned about corruption as I would have been before this technology was developed. That is not to say that the Bill or the structure that we are creating to dissuade anyone from corrupt practices ought not to be powerful. I believe it should be very powerful and that this Bill is extremely powerful. I will come back to that when I deal with the questions raised by the Commissioner of Police.

The Bill is powerful for this reason: all control—100 per cent of the control—lies with the Government. There is not one single element of self-regulation in the Bill. The industry has not asked for self-regulation and, even if it did, it would not have got it. But it knows that self-regulation in this area is not on. All the control, regulation, supervision and licensing remains with the Government. All that the industry is allowed to do is what the Government system permits, and that is not very much.

I want to deal now with a couple of the groups that have sought to intervene in this debate. I respect the right of the Casino to intervene if it chooses to do so, although I think it should have the decency to stay out of the debate. However, it has intervened on the question of security and

suggested that security in the Casino is greater than the security embodied in the Bill. I think that the Casino has a cheek. Security measures in this Bill are identical to those which apply to the Casino—no more and no less. That is because the measures in the Casino have proved so effective, and we know that because they have been tested. They have been tested by the crooks in this State who have attempted to bring corrupt practices into the Casino or do something illegal there. The security system at the Casino has not been found wanting.

Material signed by the Commissioner of Police has been circulated, and I will refer to that in detail in a moment. It says that the Casino's security system is first class and cannot be beaten. That is the system that the Commissioner has said ought to be introduced to control poker machines, and it has been. The Casino is a monopoly and, like all monopolies, eventually they go bad. A lot of them start off bad, but even those that do not eventually go bad unless they are carefully controlled. There are some natural monopolies, and one cannot do a great deal about that except to watch them very closely. That is not the case with the Casino. It is not a natural monopoly. It is a monopoly that has been created by Parliament and I believe it is time that people who are sufficiently interested in breaking the monopoly of the Casino have a look at that.

Interests connected with the Casino came to see me 18 months to two years ago pleading for poker machines in the Casino. They said that they were not making enough profit and asked me to assist them to get poker machines. These were people who benefit from the Casino. I said that I was in favour of poker machines, but that the agreement was that they could not have poker machines if they invested in the Casino. They knew the rules when they invested. Nevertheless, because I agreed with poker machines I said I would look at the issue for them. Some time afterwards, regulations were introduced into Parliament seeking approval for poker machines.

When it was suggested that we bring to Parliament a Bill to install poker machines in clubs and hotels, the Casino interests—the same people—came to see me again. They pleaded with me not to introduce legislation to permit poker machines in clubs and hotels because it would mean that it would damage their profit. What hypocrisy from the Casino! As I said, I hope at some stage that someone gets around to doing something about the monopoly in the Casino. They will have my support.

I think that the Casino would have been better served by staying out of the debate because the point they made on security was that the Casino has cameras watching people. So what? What has that got to do with anything? With poker machines, the equivalent of cameras watching people is a computer chip inside the machine which records every time someone lays a finger on it or puts money into it. That is the equivalent of the camera. I thought that point was pretty weak and that the Casino would have been better to stay out of the debate.

A much more substantial intervention was by the Police Commissioner. I must say that I was disappointed with his intervention, but not because he intervened or because he does not like part of the Bill. I think that is perfectly legitimate. I was disappointed because, before the Commissioner had seen the Bill, he wrote to the Minister of Emergency Services about a number of things. That material has been distributed to all members. The relevant points are on page 2, and read as follows:

The electronic gaming machine industry as a 'cash industry' has the potential to assist criminal groups of all levels to transfer money to their own benefit.

I agree with that. He continues:

Proper controls are needed at all stages of the process to ensure that the interests of all parties are protected, for example, manufacture, purchase, maintenance and resale.

I agree with that. He further continues:

These controls need to be seen to be independent of the operators of the machines.

I agree with that. The Commissioner continues:

Self-regulation in an industry of this type would represent an invitation to organised crime groups and corrupt employees.

I agree with that. He continues on page 2:

The level of control required at the Casino is considered adequate and should be the base standard for all machines in this State, that is, the Casino owns the machines. They are not rented or leased from the manufacturer.

I agree with that, except that for 'Casino' one replaces 'clubs and hotels'. He continues:

The Casino provides its own maintenance which is subjected to scrutiny by the on-site Government inspectors.

I agree with that; again, substitute 'hotels and clubs' for 'Casino'. The Commissioner also said:

The machines are alarmed and cannot be tampered with by patrons.

I agree with that, and that is occurring. He said:

The controlling electronic 'chip' is sealed with a Government seal. When a machine has a large payout, this chip is removed and checked against a master chip by a Government inspector.

I have no difficulty with that; I am not sure how practical it is, but I am sure that can be worked through. He also said:

All installations, maintenance and gaming operations are subjected to scrutiny by Government inspectors.

I agree with that. The Commissioner stated:

The recommended structure—

and this is from the Police Commissioner—

to ensure that adequate controls are in place and are effective is as follows: all selling, owning, operating and maintaining licences should be issued by the Liquor Licensing Commissioner.

It is in the Bill. Further:

All applications for such licences should be photographed, fingerprinted and subjected to thorough antecedent checks by the Commissioner of Police as is the case with persons employed at the Adelaide Casino.

It is in the Bill. He also said:

This system, which is the most stringent and therefore reliable in Australia, has identified and prevented organised crime family members from being licensed as casino employees. Numerous other persons with criminal convictions have been identified and excluded. The operational oversight of the gaming machine industry including revocation of licences, etc., should be exercised by the Casino Supervisory Authority.

That is all that is in the Bill. The Commissioner asked for that model, and that is the model we supplied. He goes on to say some other things; all members have it, so they can see that I am not selectively quoting or leaving out anything that is material. That could have been taken as drafting instructions, not because the Police Commissioner and I are particularly brilliant or have ESP or anything like that but because that is what we have done for the Casino, which the Commissioner said is the model he wants for the poker machines.

A second document from the Commissioner which, again, has been distributed certainly disappointed me, basically because I did not understand it. I make no claims to be a genius or anything like that but, by the same token, I do not think I am stupid. Given a little time, work and help, I can generally understand a lot of things, but I just did not understand this. All members have in front of them a whole list of comments that I will certainly not read out, although I am happy to make them available. However, on page 3, paragraph 2, headed 'Organised Crime and the Casino', the document states:

In addition to the concerns expressed in the above reports [all members have them], there have been instances in this State where family members of organised crime groups attempted to gain employment at the Adelaide Casino. These were identified during the strict antecedent checking process which required finger-printing and photographing of all applicants. The most notable example is contained in *R v Secker ex parte Alvaro* . . . Numerous other persons with criminal convictions have been similarly identified and excluded. There is nothing to suggest that hotels and clubs will not be equally attractive to criminals. It is therefore concluded that all persons required to be licensed under the proposed legislation should be photographed and fingerprinted as part of their application process. There is no other certain way of identifying applicants.

I could not agree more. On page 4 of the document the Commissioner states:

South Australia has a very proud record of eliminating attempts by organised crime groups to infiltrate the Adelaide Casino. This has been achieved by the establishment of the highest standards of applicant vetting in Australia. These standards were identified and recommended by this department in submissions and evidence given prior to the Adelaide Casino opening in December 1985. The licensing and regulatory structure—

and this is important; it is from the Police Commissioner—for the Adelaide Casino is considered to be very effective and has attracted little or no criticism during its years of operation. The regulatory authority, the Casino Supervising Authority, is therefore recommended as the most appropriate to be given responsibility for the key regulatory role instead of the Independent Gaming Corporation.

There is no regulatory role for the Independent Gaming Corporation, and this is where I started to wonder whether we were at cross purposes with the Commissioner of Police. Was I having some comprehension problem? I was away when this was released, but I made some comments about misunderstanding, and so on, and that resulted in a further document from the Commissioner of Police, in which he makes further statements. It is dated 4 March and has been distributed. I draw it to members' attention because I think it is extremely important that the Commissioner's view be expressed to the House. Among other things, he states:

I understand that there will be a release of my previous interim report of 13 February and my subsequent report of 24 February 1992 containing comments on the private member's Bill to all members of Parliament in the near future. Having regard to that, I have had discussions with the Liquor Licensing Commissioner and I am able to say that, apart from two areas, our views largely coincide. These are, firstly, the desirability or otherwise of direct contact between the manufacturers or their agents with the purchasing clubs/hotels, etc. Secondly, whether the Independent Gaming Corporation or the Casino Supervisory Authority should be the monitoring or regulatory body.

Again, I had to point out to the Commissioner of Police in our subsequent discussions that the Independent Gaming Corporation has no role in regulations. That was pointed out before to the Commissioner of Police, so this is where I am disappointed. The Commissioner continues:

My previously stated view on both issues is reiterated in that there should not be a purchaser/seller relationship between the machine manufacturers or agents and the clubs or hotels, and the Casino Supervisory Authority should replace the Independent Gaming Corporation as the monitoring or regulatory body.

Well, as regards the first, that is a matter of opinion, and we will debate that later. But the second one concerns me. I will read it again:

. . . the Casino Supervisory Authority should replace the Independent Gaming Corporation as the monitoring or regulatory body.

The Independent Gaming Corporation has certainly no role in regulation and, as regards monitoring the machine, I would have thought that the last group of people one could give it to was the Casino Supervisory Authority. That authority is not there to operate gaming machines or monitoring systems: it is the overall, overseeing body of the whole of the Casino legislation and this legislation.

The Casino Supervisory Authority is the ultimate watchdog of the system. It cannot be both a watchdog and an operator of the system. It just does not make sense (it did not make sense to me), especially as the Casino Supervisory Authority is the appellate body. Anyone aggrieved by a decision of the Liquor Licensing Commissioner, for example, goes to the Casino Supervisory Authority, states their case and an adjudication takes place.

One cannot have an appellate body that is also doing the work on the ground, so that did not make sense and that is what disappointed me. That was my disappointment—not the intervention of the Commissioner of Police but simply that it appears we were at cross purposes. I could not understand in many respects what the Commissioner was saying and, if anyone can explain it to me, I will be delighted to hear it. In any event, at the end of the Commissioner's final report to the Minister of Emergency Services he states:

In so far as the section of my previous report headed 'Concerns and Solutions' is concerned, I confirm that it is advisory in nature in an all encompassing sense and does not infer defects in the Bill.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I know that. The Police Commissioner continues:

The Liquor Licensing Commissioner agrees with the majority of those safeguards and together we acknowledge that most of the solutions have already been catered for in the Bill. The remainder may easily be achieved by regulations or administrative directions.

After all the trials and tribulations of the Police Commissioner's examination, I just ask members to consider what he finally has come up with. It would be a foolish person who unnecessarily got on the bad side of the Commissioner of Police. It is unfortunate that apparently there is some misunderstanding. All I can say to the House is: examine what the Commissioner has to say, examine the Bill, and I am sure members will see that all the safeguards for which the Commissioner asked in the first place are in the Bill.

I want to make a few comments on the intervention of the Lotteries Commission. The intervention by the commission has been totally destructive and I am staggered that a Government authority—a statutory authority—has behaved in the way that it has behaved. I would have thought that the commission would be able to make out a case for itself that it would benefit the clubs and hotels, the Government and the taxpayers of South Australia. I would have thought that the commission would be able to make out its own case without denigrating the case of other organisations and without denigrating, certainly by innuendo if nothing else, people who were opposed to the commission's expanding its monopoly by suggesting that such people were somehow corrupt or aiding and abetting corruption in this State.

I take the strongest possible exception to the Lotteries Commission saying, 'Because you do not agree with the commission, then you are aiding and abetting corruption in this State.' I take the strongest possible exception to any Government department or authority saying that to people. Obviously, the merits of the commission's own case were pathetic. The case had no merit and so the commission had to resort to innuendo against people in the private sector and members of Parliament whose integrity is equally as high as that of anyone involved in the Lotteries Commission.

**Mr Ingerson:** Hear, hear!

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Yes, but I had better not comment. The commission has dealt with the hotel and club industry through Club Keno. If it had not had Club

Keno and had not dealt with the hotel and club industry, it might have had a better show. If it had presented its case in a way that supported its case rather than knocking other people in the way that it has, it might have had a show, but the commission's contact with the hotel and club industry has convinced everyone who has spoken to me from that industry that they want nothing to do with these people.

They do not care how much Government control there is: whatever the Government lays down they are happy to comply with, and can members blame them for wanting nothing to do with the commission? Based on my experience and that of members on this side who have detailed their experience with the commission, one would not want anything to do with the commission. I believe the commission should not have that monopoly on lotteries and, if something comes before this House to break up that monopoly, I will support it because, as has happened with the commission, if it was not right from the start, I think what has happened is text book concerning what happens to all monopolies. It has been suggested that the commission is the most profitable company in Australia. How wonderful! Give me a monopoly over lotteries in this State and I will be profitable, too. It is hardly a capital intensive industry.

**The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore:** It is one of the most efficient in the world.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** It may be one of the most efficient but that does not make it right. It does not mean it has the right to denigrate people and it does not mean it has the right to imply that people who do not agree with its point of view are aiding corruption. The commission has no right to do that. I do not care how efficient it is. For a Government statutory authority to be allowed to get away with that is quite wrong.

I want to finish by referring members to the questions I have answered in the House as to why I support the IGC. There will be an extensive debate in Committee. I support the IGC for one reason. I support it only being given the right of first refusal to operate the system and not to control the system. All the controls, as with the Casino, are with the Casino Supervisory Authority, the Liquor Licensing Commissioner and all the safeguards that have been tested and found not to be vulnerable at all.

That is where the control and safeguards are, but I believe the industry is entitled at least to right of first refusal to see whether it can put up a proposition that satisfies the Police Commissioner, the Liquor Licensing Commissioner and the Casino Supervisory Authority that it can do the leg work and the donkey work. Can any member here tell me the names of the Casino operators over the road? I bet that there is no-one in the House who can tell me their names, and I do not know them either. That does not matter, because I can say who does know and who has checked them out and watched them—the Police Commissioner. He has their photographs and fingerprints. He checks out employees and their families and they are the cleanest group of employees in Australia.

No other business in Australia has a cleaner group of employees. The Liquor Licensing Commissioner also knows who they are, otherwise they would not get a licence—he does the checks—and the Casino Supervisory Authority knows who they are because it also does all the necessary checks and supervision. The view that just the daily operation of poker machines in South Australia cannot be performed by the private sector is the biggest load of nonsense I have ever heard.

They are quite capable of doing it under Government supervision. If this legislation is not considered strong enough for the operation of poker machines in this State, someone

ought to come in and change the legislation for the Casino, because I can tell the House that there is far more potential for corruption in the Casino than playing around with 10c pieces in poker machines. Over in the Casino they are winning and losing \$1 million a night in cash. That is not electronically wired to a central computer: you are relying on other methods of surveillance.

The member for Coles noted last night and read to the House a quote about casinos, and I agree completely with that quote. But in these days of electronic monitoring, it is the casinos that are vulnerable to corruption. If this legislation is not good enough for poker machines, the Government or private members should immediately start changing the legislation for the Casino. I refer members to the Commissioner of Police and his wishes on this Bill, based on what he knows of the Casino Bill. I commend the second reading to the House.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (22)—Messrs P.B. Arnold, Bannon, Becker, Blevins (teller), Crafter, Eastick, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Heron and Holloway, Mrs Hutchison, Messrs Ingerson, Klunder, McKee, Quirke, Rann, Such and Trainer.

Noes (17)—Messrs Allison, Armitage, L.M.F. Arnold, Atkinson, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker (teller), Blacker and Brindal, Ms Cashmore, Messrs De Laine and Goldsworthy, Mrs Kotz, Messrs Lewis, Matthew, Meier, Oswald and Wotton.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

**Mr MATTHEW (Bright):** I move:

That the Bill be referred to a select committee.

The events of the past few weeks, including the progress of this debate, have demonstrated that poker machines remain a controversial issue. Members have spoken on the Bill; they have cast their vote, and a majority have indicated in this House today that they want the poker machine Bill debate to proceed beyond the second reading stage.

I voted against that, because I have indicated my intention to vote against poker machines. Having lost that, and believing that the House needs to deliberate further, I now intend to concentrate my endeavours on ensuring that we have the best Bill possible to reduce the possibility of organised crime and corruption in the poker machine industry in South Australia.

I contend that Parliament does not presently have the necessary knowledge or expertise to be able to achieve such a Bill. I refer briefly to the recommendations made by the last Parliamentary select committee that examined the aspect of poker machines, that is, the 1982 Select Committee into the Casino Bill, which said in part:

The Licensed Clubs Association made the only submission seeking the introduction of poker machines. The committee finds that many of the bland arguments put forward are strongly denied by Detective Sergeant L. Hanrahan of the New South Wales police task force, whom the committee accepts as a witness of truth.

The committee further accepts his evidence that the rigging of poker machines in New South Wales clubs has resulted in an estimated \$20 million being skimmed from those machines.

For this and other reasons the committee finally recommended that clause 27 of that Bill be retained. Clause 27—a central clause to this debate—became section 25 of the Casino Act, and it provides:

No person shall have a poker machine in his possession or control either in the premises of a licensed casino or elsewhere. Penalty: \$20 000.

This Parliament will be considering the reversal of a recommendation made by a bipartisan select committee, and that is a very serious matter to consider. Therefore, it is absolutely vital that all members have the knowledge they

require to ensure that the Bill is considered fully and to ensure that they have no doubt at all that they are equipped to decide adequately what sort of Bill is appropriate.

In outlining the reasons for moving to refer this Bill to a select committee I should like to speak briefly to some important points members need to bear in mind in their deliberations. I turn first to the statements made to the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation when it looked at the Casino Act regulation change that finally resulted in video gaming machines being introduced into the Adelaide Casino. The Liquor Licensing Commissioner, Mr Pryor, gave evidence to that committee. It is interesting to note that as part of his evidence he said:

Machines these days are no longer barrel machines where you just crank a handle and a barrel goes round; they all work off a computer chip. For every machine there is a chip called an EPROM, measuring about 1.5 x .5 inches. The software that would be generated from that one EPROM would probably comprise a computer printout about 1.5 inches thick. That would require engineering/computer people to go through and analyse each line of the software to ensure that there are no hidden systems that if a person plays a particular sequence of numbers it will bring out a jackpot. So, we must check every line of software to ensure its integrity.

The Liquor Licensing Commissioner made two important points to the Subordinate Legislation Committee of our Parliament: first, that the EPROM chip is the important ingredient in a video poker machine; and, secondly, that every line of software must be checked to ensure that no foul play will occur.

I would like to turn briefly to the EPROM chip, because that has been an important ingredient of this debate and is something about which members must be sure they have adequate knowledge before passing judgment. I refer to the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee report of the Queensland Parliament that was tabled on 21 August 1990. A number of witnesses appeared before that committee in Queensland, and one such witness was Mr Noel Hall of the Casino Control Division. Referring to the EPROM chip, Mr Hall said:

The point is you can replace it. You can just take one off and put another one on.

In other words, the EPROM chip is quite easily removed and replaced. What sort of problem does that present us with? Let us look a little further at the evidence provided to that committee by Professor Caelli, who is the Professor in Computing Science at the Queensland University of Technology. Of the EPROM chip, the professor said:

We are talking about the ordinary EPROM chip today which will guard one million bits of information and we are looking at around the \$20 mark for that.

So, we have some computer equipment—a little chip—that can be replaced, and one costs \$20 to buy. In other words, it is not out of reach of the ordinary man in the street. The other thing about the EPROM chip that members should be aware of—and this is critically important—is as Professor Caelli says:

The cheapest is the EPROM, which is erasable under an ultra-violet light, by the way. So that is all you need to erase them. They have been erased just by holding them up against a fluorescent tube . . . They are absolutely unsafe; completely useless, that is the EPROM.

That is the chip that will control these machines. It is something about which all members of this Parliament must satisfy themselves that they have adequate knowledge before passing judgment on this Bill. Mr Speaker, I put to you that, if members feel they do not have an adequate knowledge, they can take advantage of the opportunity offered by a select committee to investigate those matters and to report back to Parliament in order that all members may have an adequate knowledge.

I briefly refer to the lobbying process to which many members of this Parliament have been subjected. All members, on satisfying themselves that they are equipped to vote on this Bill, must be absolutely clear in their mind that the lobbying process has been completely above board and appropriate, and that, as a result of that lobbying process, we, as members of Parliament, have all the information we require. It has been said by many speakers already that a number of lobbyists are involved. We have heard about Mr Mick Young being a lobbyist for Aristocrat and that Mr Jim Stitt is a lobbyist for the HIA. We have heard that those two gentlemen also support an independent gaming authority. We have heard that Mr Kevin Tinson is a lobbyist for International Gaming Technologies and that Mr Jack Wright, a former Deputy Premier, is representing the Lotteries Commission.

In all we have seen four people heavily involved within the ALP hierarchy divided in their views and lobbying members. Members must be absolutely sure that they have all the knowledge that is needed from all sides of the argument to be able to assess properly whether they support the Lotteries Commission, the Independent Gaming Authority or any other type of body to control the poker machine industry.

I would like to turn to something I find far less savoury—the issue of the threat or the implied threat to members of Parliament. This is a very serious issue and one which, unfortunately, has crept into this debate. I turn first to a letter that was sent to all members yesterday by the Independent Gaming Corporation. I remind members of the last sentence of that letter, as follows:

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

*Members interjecting:*

Mr MATTHEW: I feel that that is an implied threat: some may argue that it is intimidation, but it was there. I and many other members were concerned about that. In this place last night, just five minutes before I got to my feet, a messenger delivered an urgent letter to me, copies of which have now been put in everybody else's box, as I understand. Once again, it was a letter from the Independent Gaming Corporation restating the industry's position. I will read it in full (it is only short) to remind members what it says. It states:

It has occurred to the undersigned that a letter to all House of Assembly members dated 24 March 1992 and including fact sheets 8 and 9 may be misconstrued in its intent. Our position is and continues to be that the Gaming Machines Bill should be judged on its merits. As we have publicly stated, the joint hotel/club proposal and the Bill deserve the attention of all members and the distractions created by what we believe to be misinformation and innuendo should be ignored. No threats are implied. We remain available to address any of your concerns.

I am pleased that the writer says that no threats were implied, but it is curious that this letter came out so fast and was delivered to me in particular so soon before I was to get to my feet in this Parliament. Regrettably, it does not end there because, before I received that letter, I and a colleague had a meeting with representatives of the Licensed Clubs Association and, during the course of that meeting, some very thinly veiled statements—statements that I regard as threats—were made to my colleague and me.

It was put to us that, if the Liberal Party did not stop pursuing the avenue that it is in relation to lines of questioning on matters that that organisation perceives to be associated with poker machines, it may be necessary for influence to be brought to bear to reduce the funding flow to my seat and that of my colleague, and it may be necessary to run independents supportive of poker machines against

me and my colleague in our seats. Needless to say, I do not approve of those tactics and I am aware that I could take further action on them. However, I do not intend to waste my time by doing so.

The last matter to which I want to refer—and this is in reply to the honourable member's comment that it cannot be proven—is in fact something in writing. It is a letter from a hotel—and I will not read out its name in this Chamber—addressed to one of my colleagues, and in part it states:

Given that we have been in concert with the clubs in this campaign, we are obliged and on this occasion happy to support their strategy. You may well be called to account for your actions before some very angry constituents.

The tone of that letter is similar right through and amounts to some of the standoff tactics that are occurring.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr MATTHEW:** I think it is important that all members of this Parliament, before casting a vote on the Bill, be absolutely assured that the information is there and the tactics employed by everybody on all sides associated with this Bill—be they for it or against it, or be they for Lotteries Commission control, Independent Gaming Corporation control or some other body—are above board. If they are not, a select committee provides that opportunity. I put to members that a select committee also provides the opportunity for the licensed clubs and hotels to distance themselves from what they see as an unsavoury political situation that has developed around the Bill and let members of Parliament in a bipartisan way put forward recommendations on the Bill.

It also allows them to make representations to that committee and put forward their views. I believe it offers the best way to sort out the mess that we currently have before us. We have seen a number of things occur, and members need to be sure that they have all the facts. We have heard allegations in this Parliament about publicity material put forward by the Lotteries Commission, material that originally referred to such things as:

... a means of circumventing the potential for corruption, the Lotteries Commission proposes that it acts as a central purchasing coordinator for all coin operated gaming machines. This would ensure that all machines available to the public have been certified to operate as specified, thus protecting the interests of players and operators alike from the possibility of machine tampering or corrupt practices.

That was the brochure that did not see the light of day because it was recalled and this Parliament has been told that the Premier ordered an amended version. We have also heard allegations made about deals done involving trade unions in exchange for membership being put their way.

Much has also been made of the Police Commissioner's involvement in this Bill. Indeed, it is important that all members be sure before casting a vote on this Bill, before it gets to the Committee stage, and that they are aware of all the facts surrounding it. I remind members that in 1982 the then Deputy Commissioner of Police (Mr David Hunt), now Police Commissioner, was called as a witness before the select committee. The evidence that the Deputy Commissioner gave on that occasion established him as a witness of credibility and knowledge, one who had a detailed understanding of crime and corruption in Australia, particularly in South Australia, and in the poker machine industry. It is fitting that all members ask themselves why the Police Commissioner was not asked to examine the Bill. Why was this man, who had established himself as an expert in the field, not called upon to give judgment?

Further to that, we have been told in this place that the Commissioner is happy with the controls in the Casino. I remind members of exactly what happens in the Casino and, in so saying, I remind them that I, too, opposed poker machines going into the Casino. In the Casino, there are 40 video surveillance cameras in the gaming machine area. We cannot possibly expect hotels and clubs to be able to offer that level of surveillance. There are seven Government inspectors on site at all times. Once again, that will not happen in hotels and clubs in South Australia. There are also 100 staff in the security and surveillance section of the Casino. Once again, that cannot happen in hotels and clubs. Therefore, I believe it is absolutely vital that this Parliament should be satisfied it has the knowledge to come up with a Bill that is strong and can guarantee there is absolute minimal opportunity for crime and corruption to infiltrate the industry, as it has in New South Wales.

Therefore it is in the interests of the clubs and hotels that they have something in place that will protect them and their interest, and not place them also at risk. Therefore, in the interests of the people of South Australia, and in the interests of the industries that are lobbying for poker machines, I believe it is vital that this Bill receives the consideration it deserves. If this Bill does not go before a select committee, the Parliament will have a rash of amendments put before it—I believe amendments that members are jointly ill-equipped to consider based on the knowledge we have before us.

I believe it is vital that this Bill should go before the select committee and, in considering their vote for or against, I ask members to consider whether they are satisfied that they have a knowledge regarding security, the processes surrounding the Bill and its drafting, and the processes surrounding the lobbyists who have been involved. I close by drawing to the attention of members one last item. I refer to Facts Sheet No. 8 that was circulated to each of us by the Independent Gaming Corporation. Item 3 of that sheet states:

International Casino Services Pty Ltd were subsequently engaged by the Licensed Clubs Association and the HHIA to provide technical expertise to the Independent Gaming Corporation Ltd, the joint club/hotel body.

International Casino Services has as its main contact a gentleman by the name of Mr Brian McMahon, a lawyer, whose business premises are situated at 437 St Kilda Road, Melbourne, Victoria. The telephone number of those business premises is (03) 266 1356. International Business Development Pty Ltd released a publicity brochure detailing as its consultant Mr Brian McMahon. The brochure states, in part:

Brian heads IBD's Melbourne office and brings with him a wealth of experience in company law and corporate financing.

Mr Brian McMahon of IBD is the same Mr Brian McMahon of International Casino Services. The address of IBD in Victoria is 437 St Kilda Road, Melbourne, and the telephone number is (03) 266 1356. The phone numbers of IBD in Melbourne and International Casino Services in Melbourne are the same. The Brian McMahon involved in both organisations is the same. International Casino Services engaged to look at the Independent Gaming Corporation is the same company.

Prior to the introduction of this Bill into the Parliament, I wrote to the Licensed Clubs and Hotels Association and indicated that I believed its model was far superior to that provided by the Lotteries Commission. I also wrote to the Lotteries Commission and advised it that I would not support its having control over poker machines in South Australia. I wrote to its staff members who contacted me in a similar way. The difficulty that I am presented with—and



I imagine many other members of Parliament are presented with also—is that I still do not want to see the Lotteries Commission have control of poker machines in South Australia.

I still believe that the model presented by the Independent Gaming Corporation has some merit, although I am concerned that that seems to have been tarnished, particularly by the consultants involved, and once again I believe that a select committee—and a very brief select committee at that—would have the opportunity to investigate that and make a recommendation to Parliament, away from the lobby. It could be a bipartisan select committee of Parliament recommending what is needed in this Bill. I believe that the people of South Australia could then be sure that they have a Bill of credibility, that they have something before them that is workable, and that no outside influences are brought to bear.

It is unfortunate the way some of the events surrounding this matter have occurred. I think many of those events have occurred because emotions have run high, particularly on the part of those who are desperate to have the machines included in South Australia to assist their ailing businesses. It is fair to say that their businesses are ailing because of the many State taxes and charges that they have and do not want. At the end of the day, it is important that all members have an opportunity to equip themselves with the knowledge needed to be able to debate this Bill properly and to be sure they can come up with the best Bill for the people of South Australia. Therefore, I commend this motion to the House.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** To add to the member for Bright's growing number of telephone calls, I place on record the telephone number of my aunt in London: 001144818642389. That highlights to the House the way that, within two short years, the member for Bright has reached the stage where he cannot differentiate between truth and fiction. In fact, my aunt's telephone number has more validity than all the information he has been giving us up to now in support of a select committee.

We have had a regurgitation of the member for Bright's second reading speech and of the 2½ hour diatribe of the Deputy Leader. We have been taken down a course in computer chips as a basis for his argument for a select committee. We have also been given a little sneak preview of the evidence of the allegations that he has in his possession. If I were to have a dollar for every time I have heard the member for Bright say 'and I quote' I would have no need to rely on my superannuation. What we have is a cobbled up excuse to delay a responsible decision by this House in relation to the poker machines legislation. We went through all the arguments in the second reading debate. Sure, we have a swag of amendments that we will have to go through slowly and laboriously until we come to some resolution, but it will be a resolution of 47 responsible members of this House.

**The Hon. P.B. Arnold:** There are 46.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** Yes, 46 members. The real agenda is to put this to a select committee and delay it for the life of this Parliament. I have seen select committees that have gone on for years, having been promoted by the Opposition and having got through this House with the support of Independents or through another place where the Opposition has the numbers with the support of the Australian Democrats. The select committee on energy is a classic example. It took three years.

**Mr Such:** It ran out of energy!

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** The member for Fisher said, by way of interjection, that it ran out of energy. That is very funny and the honourable member is quite right. Opposition members in the other place could not keep it going any longer. Even the Hon. Rob Lucas, with his vivid imagination (we have seen that with the allegations that have been made against the Hon. Barbara Wiese), could not think of anything more to delay that select committee. That is what it is all about.

Some of us in this place have had the will to get this Bill through the second reading. However, other members either do not have the will to make a decision and, by golly, they get paid enough of taxpayers' money to make decisions, or they do not have the guts to say 'yes' or 'no'. I do not think they have the guts to say 'yes' or 'no'; I think that is the real reason.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** Let's test them.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** As the Minister who gives me advice that I always follow says, let us test them. Let us see if they have the fortitude to make a decision this week or next, or do they want to drag it on for the life of this Parliament?

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** I rise to support the motion that the Bill be referred to a select committee. My belief that it needs to be referred to such a committee is now more than ever reinforced by what I have just heard from the member for Napier. Is that the level of his understanding of this subject and the technology involved in it? If that is the level of his decision making, quite clearly others amongst us need to take a more responsible view. It seems to matter not one jot that there are uncertainties about the fashion in which the legislation will function as well as the technology that is to be used by the machines that will be installed when the Bill becomes law. If we are to be responsible, it is our duty to better understand both aspects.

I do not share all the views expressed by the member for Bright, and it is as much for the reason that I do not share all his views that I believe it ought to be referred to a select committee for clarification. During the course of my second reading contribution I said something about the way in which the revenue to be derived from the operation of these machines ought to be dispersed, that in my judgment those so-called profits must go back into the communities from which they came. It is particularly important in rural communities such as those I represent, as the dollars gambled there will come in no small measure from the leisure dollars and entertainment dollars that would otherwise be spent supporting their sporting clubs and other community services. They will lose that revenue.

As it stands, the structure envisaged in the Bill goes some distance towards ensuring that money will get back into the community but it does not cover the concerns which I have raised. Neither does it provide for people, faced with the inevitability of the legislation, to have their say about how best to use that revenue. In addition to that, I bet that not many members in this place, including the member for Napier, understand the electronics and the computing technology that are involved.

**The Hon. T.H. Hemmings:** Of course I do.

**Mr LEWIS:** Then why was it that the honourable member in his remarks did not address the concerns raised by the member for Bright, using equally eloquent technological terms and thereby allaying my concern? The member for Napier made no attempt to do that. He simply set about

abusing the member for Bright and others among us who voted accordingly. He abused the arguments we placed before the House for not supporting the legislation.

*Mr Ferguson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr LEWIS:** It is indeed important for us to know and be satisfied, so that we can explain to the wider community, that the legislative model we use for the introduction of these machines is the best available, that the administration we use to ensure that they are safe from corruption is the best available, and that the way in which funds obtained from their operation are disbursed in the community meets with the desire of the community. None of those three concerns can be addressed by any of us now without consulting the general public through the process of a select committee.

I am anxious because of the way in which some members, during the course of their second reading contributions (which were made after my own), drew attention to the structure for control of the operation to ensure its integrity. During the course of my remarks I paid tribute to the licensed clubs and hotels for the structure which had been proposed by them and incorporated in the legislation, but I am not so sure, given the comments that have been made by other members, that the structure so proposed in the legislation is the best available to us. Whether or not we oppose the legislation, we ought to look at that very carefully. The concerns of members ought to give the rest of us, quite fairly and reasonably, reason to be concerned. In the course of a select committee, we would be able to seek out the evidence that will enable us to be satisfied that we have got it right, because, if we get it wrong, posterity will judge us very unpleasantly indeed.

I was initially satisfied, and I am still inclined to be satisfied, with the execution of the decisions of the Parliament by the Government through the Casino authority acting on behalf of the Government, and then through the Casino authority to the Liquor Licensing Commission, to which are attached the licensed clubs and hotels and, across all of which, in a lateral way from the other axis, the police have overall surveillance. I was satisfied with that at the outset, although other members had doubts about it, in particular the member for Bright. We ought to resolve those doubts through a select committee before continuing.

The other thing about which I am not satisfied and about which I wish to be satisfied is that the community's conscience on this matter is not at rest. That is not to say that those people who would want to oppose the measure ought to be given another bite of the cherry. I am talking now about those people who accept the fact that the House of Assembly has passed the second reading and that, in consequence of that, they ought to make a constructive contribution through the medium of a select committee—and only available to them through that medium—to examine the best way to make it operate. By this means, we do ourselves a service, because we will not only be doing the right thing and making the best job of it but we will be seen to be doing the right thing and making the best job of it. Accordingly, I am pleased that the member for Bright had the courage and the wisdom to move that we refer the matter to a select committee, and I urge all members to vote accordingly.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** I rise very briefly to say that I support the select committee, and I said last evening that I would support it. In deference to the member for Napier, who sought to ridicule the view of a select

committee on the basis that there are 47 people here who can make the decisions—

**The Hon. T.H. Hemmings:** There are 46.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Whether there are 46, 45, or 43, the point is that we can make decisions, but we do not have the opportunity to question the key figures in a number of the areas of the operation. We do not have the opportunity to call before us the Police Commissioner or his senior officers to flesh out the three reports which he provided. We do not have the opportunity to call in the management groups to crosscheck and check it out. Therefore, I have no hesitation in saying that there is great merit in the proposition that my colleague has presented, and I stand on that basis.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

### PITJANTJATJARA LAND RIGHTS ACT

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's resolution.

### STATUTES AMENDMENT (ILLEGAL USE OF MOTOR VEHICLES) BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 18 March. Page 3347.)

Clause 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Certain second and subsequent offences to be tried and sentenced in adult court.'

**Mr GROOM:** I oppose the clause. I outlined the reasons for my opposition to it during the second reading debate and I will not go over those reasons, except to say that the Select Committee on Juvenile Justice, which is well advanced, is dealing with matters of similar substance and, before this Parliament usurps the function which in a sense it set up, the committee should have the opportunity of taking evidence from the community on this matter before coming down with a position. That is the only reason why I oppose the clause at this stage.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I intend to accept the amendment of the member for Hartley. As I said last week, I, too, listened to the debate very carefully. I realise that members on this side were worried about this provision. I accept what the member for Hartley says about the work of the juvenile justice committee and would like to record my appreciation both to yourself, Mr Chairman, and the member for Hartley for the constructive part you have played in considering this Bill and in suggesting profitable amendments to it.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I remind the Committee that there is no amendment to clause 3. The member for Hartley simply foreshadowed his opposition to the clause.

Clause negatived.

Clause 4—'Using motor vehicle without consent.'

**Mr GROOM:** I move:

Page 2, after line 18—insert subclauses as follows:

(1a) Where an adult court finds a person guilty of an offence against this section, the court must (whether or not it convicts the person of the offence and in addition to any other order that it may make in relation to the person) order that the person be disqualified from holding or obtaining a driver's licence for a period of 12 months.

(1b) Notwithstanding the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act 1979, where the Children's Court finds a charge of an offence against this section proved against a child, the court must (whether or not it convicts the child of the offence and in addition to any other order that it may make in relation to the child) order that the child be disqualified from holding or obtaining a driver's licence for a period of 12 months (commencing, in the case of a child who has not attained the qualifying age for a driver's licence, not earlier than when the child attains that age).

(1c) The disqualification prescribed by subsection (1a) or (1b) cannot be reduced or mitigated in any way or be substituted by any other penalty or sentence.

In so moving, I quite clearly accept the principle enunciated by the member for Hayward, and I gave him due credit for bringing this matter before the House during the second reading debate. Just by way of brief explanation, proposed new subclause (1a) provides:

Where an adult court finds a person guilty of an offence against this section, the court must (whether or not it convicts the person of the offence and in addition to any other order that it may make in relation to the person) order that the person be disqualified from holding or obtaining a driver's licence for a period of 12 months.

That in itself is a very severe penalty that reflects the prevailing community wish that this Parliament increase penalties, in this instance by way of the addition of a specified period of disqualification of a licence. That is a fixed period of 12 months: it is not less than nor more than 12 months. It will bring about consistency in the courts, in that anyone who embarks on an illegal use offence, apart from the penalties that are already prescribed by way of fines or imprisonment, in addition faces a fixed period of disqualification for 12 months, which means consistency and certainty.

It means certainty in that the community knows that, if anyone embarks on an offence of this nature and is found guilty, whether or not convicted (because you can, of course, dismiss without recording a conviction), a period of 12 months licence disqualification will follow. In addition, proposed new subclause (1b) also specifies a period of 12 months—not less than nor more than 12 months—where the offender is a child. In relation to proposed new subclause (1c), the disqualification in respect of the licence is fixed and cannot be reduced or mitigated in any way, or be substituted by any other penalty or sentence. In other words, the courts cannot take the soft option.

The entire package in relation to this amendment constitutes a heavier penalty for illegal use, with the certainty and knowledge by the courts that this Parliament has signalled its intention that illegal use offences are too prevalent; that the community requires a tougher stand and that this Parliament is signalling to the courts to impose more severe penalties in relation to the illegal use of motor vehicles.

**Mrs HUTCHISON:** Just a minor matter: I presume that the last line of proposed new subclause (1a) should read 'for a period of 12 months' and not 'from'.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Yes, the Chair proposes to correct that as a typographical error.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I have no real problem with the general thrust of the amendment. My question relates more to proposed new subclause (1b) but could also be relevant to proposed new subclause (1a). In speaking to (1b), I find from my experience of those people whose vehicles have been damaged by young people using them illegally and from the subsequent court appearances that the problem of having a licence or not having a licence plays a very minor role. In fact, it is totally irrelevant and spurious to the person or persons who are illegally using the motor vehicle. Most of them have no licence. Mind you, the police say that they are very good drivers because

they have no fear for their own life or the lives of others, and they tend to take the risks—

**The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore:** You think risky driving is good driving?

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** No. Mr Chairman, I should not respond to interjections but, if that is what the member for Coles thought I said, I must correct it. I am saying that members of the Police Force in my electorate—which I still represent, Sir, as you well know—say that the youngsters who steal cars have no fear for their own life or the lives of others and, therefore, they take risks. I have been told by police officers who have been trained in high speed pursuit courses that sometimes they get left behind because these youngsters have no such fear. If the member for Coles and I were to exceed the speed limit, there would still be an inbuilt self-preservation principle. I am glad the member for Coles interjected, because I would hate to be seen to be accepting that risky driving is good driving.

How will this subclause act as a deterrent to stop youngsters, who are covered by the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act 1979 under which they appear before the Children's Court and who do not possess and have no intention of possessing a licence, stealing cars? I do not know whether I should address my question to the member for Hayward or the member for Hartley; I seem to think that the Bill has been taken over by the member for Hartley, and I congratulate him on that. They do not care a damn about property, their own lives or the lives of other people, so why would a court decision that they cannot get a slip of paper from the Department of Road Transport act as a deterrent?

**Mr GROOM:** In actual fact, there is a bit of realism in what the member for Napier has said. Notwithstanding that realism, this Parliament cannot be seen to be building those types of considerations into legislation. So, the Parliament has to be seen to be setting standards in the community and must assume that people do seek to obey the law and hold driving licences and, if they commit illegal offences of this nature, a disqualification will follow. It is true that many young people who do these sorts of things do not hold driving licences. In my experience, most of these people are eventually caught up with but, as I say, the Parliament cannot be seen to be building that consideration into legislation, even though everyone knows that it is a very practical point to make.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I thank the member for Hartley for accepting that it was a realistic question and an understanding of the subclause. I accept that the Parliament must not be seen to be doing that. I direct my next question to the member for Hayward, who introduced the original Bill. I understand that the member for Hayward will accept the amendment that has been moved by the member for Hartley.

I understand that there have been some quiet little chats, and I think that that is quite correct. I often think that the wisdom of members with more experience in this House, such as the member for Hartley, would be of benefit to new chums, such as the member for Hayward, who could quite possibly be the next member for Hartley. My question to the member for Hayward is: does he, as the mover of the Bill, see that these proposed new subclauses would take away the teeth that he so earnestly requested us to support in his magnificent second reading contribution?

**Mr BRINDAL:** Methinks the member for Napier doth flatter too much.

*The Hon. J.P. Trainer interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** Let not the pot call the kettle black. The member for Hartley has quite correctly proposed a serious

and sensible amendment to this Bill. The member for Napier made some carping comment to the effect that the member for Hartley had perhaps taken over the Bill. I should not need to remind him, after his time in this House, that, whilst a member might sponsor a Bill, when it is introduced into the Chamber it becomes the property of the House, and every member has the right to amend it. That is an important fundamental of this place.

Again, I commend you, Sir, and the member for Hartley for your input concerning this Bill. If it makes a better law for the people of South Australia, that is all I am interested in—not some ‘who proposed what?’ In answer to the honourable member’s question, rather than detracting and taking teeth away, the member for Hartley has given this Bill more teeth. A moment ago we accepted the deletion of clause 3. In Committee, I argued that we should consider that clause very carefully. For good reason, the Committee rejected it and, in rejecting it, the Committee has taken away a special provision relating to young offenders, because the Select Committee on Juvenile Justice will quite rightly look at that matter.

Quite correctly, the member for Hartley now proposes an amendment which does give some safeguard against juveniles who misuse cars. Whilst I accept what the member for Napier said, that perhaps it does not matter too much to some of them, I would remind him that the law is at least in part symbolic and, I believe, along with the member for Hartley, that this will add teeth to the Bill and that there are juveniles who might think twice. It might not occur to them whilst they are juveniles to worry about a licence disqualification: however, when they realise that, at the time they are eligible for a driving licence they face automatic disqualification for a period of another year, that might make them rethink their position and decide that perhaps it is not worth stealing a car, because they will be 17 or 18 years old before they can get a driving licence. Rather than detracting from the Bill, this amendment adds considerably to it. I congratulate the member for Hartley and accept his amendment.

**Mr GROOM:** I want to make quite plain that this is the member for Hayward’s Bill, and this Bill has been a vehicle for an amendment to which you, Mr Chairman, have been a significant contributor. Members should appreciate that the Chairman cannot move amendments. Consequently, I am moving an amendment to which the Chairman has been a significant contributor.

**Mr FERGUSON:** I am a bit confused now. I was quite happy with the proposition when it was first put but, given the answer to the question asked by the member for Napier, we now find that the amendment does not provide much of a deterrent, because, as the honourable member agrees, many of these youngsters who are stealing cars have no licence. On my recent visit to one of the establishments where these youngsters are incarcerated I was told that it is not unusual for a 12-year old to illegally use a motor car. If everyone is agreed that this proposition is not much of a deterrent for youngsters, why is it that the Committee seeks to include this measure in the legislation? That is a very deep question.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr FERGUSON:** There is no need for the member for Hayward to be insulting. I can be just as insulting. In fact, I can guarantee that, given enough time, I could be more insulting than he is. After all, I have had a lot of practice at it. However, there is not much point in going down that track. This issue raises the question of what should the deterrent be. What measure does the member for Hayward suggest should be put to Parliament to stop youngsters from

stealing cars, driving them and ramming police cars? If this is not the answer to the question, we are wasting everyone’s time. What is the member for Hayward’s answer to this problem? What deterrent should Parliament use to stop these youngsters from illegally using motor cars? I am sure that he does not believe that these youngsters should be incarcerated.

Mr Chairman, you were with me when I visited the institutions where these youngsters are incarcerated and we spent several hours talking to them. From our questioning of those youngsters, I determined that putting them in an institution was no use whatsoever. In fact, they told us that entering an institution was like entering a finishing school. If they did not know how to properly steal a car before they got in there, they certainly learnt how to hot-wire a car, how to blow a safe, how to get into an office and how to provide all the trappings that go with a robbery, and they were talking about armed robbery.

I was shocked and surprised to hear youngsters talking about armed robbery and about how they had been taught in the institutions about armed robbery. I will support this measure because I do not want to be put in a position where it can be suggested that I am doing nothing about car stealing. I am sure that other members on this side do not want to be put in that position, either. It seems to me that this might be a smidgin rushed. Not a lot of thought went into it and, in the fullness of time, I am sure it will do nothing about car stealing. It will do nothing in the long term.

*The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:*

**Mr FERGUSON:** I hope the member for Coles enters this debate because I will be delighted to hear her contribution. I want to know what her solution is to this problem. Does she think that these youngsters ought to be incarcerated? Does she think that taking from them a driver’s licence that they do not have will stop them being involved in the illegal use of cars?

I would be extremely interested to hear what the logic is behind all this, but what I am more interested in, and I am sure that every member in this Parliament and every person in South Australia is more interested in—and I have heard the member for Albert Park talk about this many times—is what this Parliament ought to be doing in order to prevent more illegal use of cars. This may well grab a headline or two around the place, but it will not solve the problem. I am more interested in a sensible suggestion to the Parliament, which I am sure we would all support in a bipartisan way, as to how this Parliament actually thinks it will reduce the illegal use of motor cars in this State.

**Mr GROOM:** I appreciate the member for Henley Beach’s remarks, but I think I ought to point out to him that he really would be quite wise to support the amendment simply because the Attorney-General introduced a Bill in the Legislative Council, and it has passed that Council, which has a similar amendment to it, except that the penalty is six months imprisonment whereas, in actual fact, this one is 12 months imprisonment, so it is a much more severe penalty than in the Government Bill. The considerations that the honourable member has expressed, as I indicated to the member for Napier, are very practical considerations, and they reflect a touch of realism about how young people are street smart in relation to the illegal use of motor vehicles.

It is a proper matter for debate, to be raised in this Chamber in the way in which the member for Henley Beach has, but, at the end of the day, notwithstanding those very strong points made by the member for Henley Beach, there is no other way that this Parliament can deal with young

offenders and adult offenders in relation to offences of this nature. I stress that the Government Bill has a six month penalty; my amendment, to which the Chairman has been a significant contributor, provides for 12 months.

**Mr FERGUSON:** I do not want you to think, Mr Chairman, that, because you are an author of the amendment, I am reflecting on you in any way. I think that it is a very sensible proposition that is before us.

**Mr BRINDAL:** On a point of order, Mr Chairman, my paper shows that the amendment stands in the name of the member for Hartley, not yourself.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Indeed, this is correct. The member for Henley Beach.

**Mr FERGUSON:** Unless there is something wrong with my ears—and I have had them tested recently for insurance purposes—I thought that the member for Hartley informed the Committee that he had had a lot of assistance from the Chairman so far as this proposition is concerned, and I merely said—

**The CHAIRMAN:** I suggest that the Committee focus on the amendment rather than its author.

**Mr FERGUSON:** Yes, I accept that, Sir, except to say that I wanted to ensure that you did not think I was criticising you in any way—because I have picked up this problem, which is really a problem. I do not think that I am letting out any secrets when I tell you that, in the Attorney-General's committee, I was one person who took up this matter extremely strongly, because we have not found a solution. Parliament, with all the wisdom of all its members—and I guess I can count about 150 years of experience, just looking to my right—has not been able to come up with a solution to the car stealing problem. With all due respect, Sir, and with all deference to you and your involvement in this proposition, what we have before us will not solve the problem. The member for Hartley agreed in debate earlier—and he is the person who is moving the amendment—that this will not solve the problem.

I hope that this legislation and the Attorney-General's proposition meet somewhere in the middle, so that we can get some sort of composite legislation to tackle this problem. The Attorney's Bill contains a lot of good measures, one of which relates to another series of penalties for car stealing. This Bill is now going off at a tangent and down a separate track. I asked the member for Hayward a question, but it must have slipped his mind because he did not answer me. The member for Hartley, very kindly, joined in and probably tried to answer the question for him. But the member for Hayward did not answer the question I put to him, namely, 'What should the Parliament actually do?' We have already agreed that this proposition does not solve the problem. By taking away a bit of paper, which these youngsters do not have in the first place and which would not worry them, will not solve the problem. The question I pose is, 'What does the member for Hayward see as being the solution to this car stealing problem?'

**Mr BRINDAL:** Unlike the member for Henley Beach, I will try to be succinct. If the member for Henley Beach wishes to know what I believe the penalties should be, he has only to read my second reading contribution. However, I go back to my earlier point that this Bill is now in the hands of the Committee. A worthy amendment has been put forward, although I would not necessarily have chosen it first or indeed it would have been in the Bill. So, rather than asking me what I would rather see happen, I point out to the member for Henley Beach that he, like every member in this Chamber, has a perfect right to introduce his own amendments.

If he thinks that this amendment is inadequate and that some other penalty would have been more adequate, I suggest that he should have done his homework over the past three months and put forward his own amendment. However, I do thank the honourable member very much for his indication that he will support the Bill. I express some disappointment that the Attorney-General, the chief law officer in this State, should get things so wrong, since the member for Hartley is really only following the Government's example in this matter.

**Mr GROOM:** I want to put the record straight. I did not suggest that this amendment would not act as a solution to the problem. It is not an entire solution: nothing ever is. In relation to driver's licences, this amendment provides for a heavier penalty and is a signal to the courts that this Parliament requires the courts to get tough with offenders who commit offences of illegal use, to impose heavier sentences. We know from experience in the system that there are only two reasons why one obeys a law: one is because of one's own internal moral attitude that it is a just and proper law and that it should be obeyed and the other is because a punishment is attached to it, and when that punishment is made heavier it does act as a deterrent.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I have listened with a great deal of attention to what has been said. The member for Hartley's amendment provides that a person is disqualified from holding or obtaining a driver's licence for a period of 12 months. I take up the point raised by the member for Henley Beach: if one does not have a licence, what is the point? I would have thought that one of the issues that the member for Hartley may have been addressing—

*Mr Groom interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** I listened to the member for Hartley without interjecting, and I think I should be afforded the same courtesy. I think it would be better for the Parliament to demand—as it has been doing for some time—that parents be held responsible for children between the ages of 10 and 15 years, that compensation be paid. That is the sort of thing that we should be looking at. I suggest that it is very easy for this Parliament to seek simple solutions.

One of the realities of life over the years, as I have said in this place, is that it is easy for members of Parliament to say, 'Yes, let's lock them up and throw away the key.' But do we address the social problems? I suggest that this is the real difficulty that we have when we discuss Bills of this nature. It is very easy to say that we should impose stiffer and stiffer penalties. However, I do not believe that is necessarily the answer. Conversely, what do we say to a person who has had his or her car stolen, wrecked, torn to pieces, burnt and left at the back of Osborne or some other place? I do not think that there is any simple answer. It would be very easy for us to stand here and be political opportunists and talk about simple answers.

We are taking evidence out in the community through the select committee of which the member for Hartley is the Chairperson, and he has received tremendous support within the Labor Party Caucus to set up this select committee—which he will not deny—to address these problems in the community. Those are the sorts of issues at which we should be looking.

I must to be frank about this. I am in much the same dilemma as the member for Henley Beach. If we do not support this proposition, it will be used against us out in the community. Let us not pussyfoot around. Political opportunism, in my view, reeks throughout this amendment. Political opportunism is there.

*The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** I do not care whether or not the member for Coles wants to try to cause divisions. In the past I have always believed her to be an honourable person. But when we hear interjections such as she has just thrown across the Chamber, it does nothing for the debate about this issue that occupies not only this Parliament but all Parliaments throughout Australia and, indeed, overseas. She may well laugh and turn to her colleague the member for Hayward for some support.

Last year, in my own Party forum, I was talking about stolen cars and the problems that arose in Western Australia. I warned my colleagues about the difficulties that we could experience in South Australia if similar incidents to those which occurred in Western Australia took place here. I believe that some sections of the media were dying to whip up a storm about stolen motor vehicles; they were only too keen to whip up that story about the tragedies of people being killed in stolen motor vehicles in Western Australia. We have seen opportunism here.

Members of Parliament have problems when they try to introduce rational debate on this issue, because people are looking for simplistic solutions. I do not believe that there is a simple answer to the problems involved in stealing motor vehicles. I have been on the receiving end and I can understand the anger of many people who have had vintage cars that they had faithfully restored stolen and destroyed. It is a difficult problem about which I wanted to put my views on record.

**Mr BRINDAL:** The answer to the honourable member's question is contained quite clearly in proposed new subclause 1(b). In answering his question I would commend the people of South Australia who read *Hansard* to look at the second reading speech from last week by the honourable member who has just spoken. Never have I heard two expressions of opinion that are more conflicting. If the Government wished to discuss these amendments purposefully I applaud it; if it merely wants to filibuster, it sets the rules.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** This debate has taken a rather distressing turn. It may well be that, as the author, the member for Hartley ably assisted by you, Mr Chairman, as has been established, may feel that everything is okay because it has been worked out by you. I am not implying anything by that. It has been eagerly picked up by the member for Hayward that the response by the author of the Bill is that we are doing nothing but filibustering. I am not filibustering; I happen to represent an electorate which adjoins yours, Sir, and which the member for Hartley covets, where this is a daily occurrence. It may not happen in the electorate of Hayward, it may not happen in the electorate of Coles and it may not happen in the electorate of Davenport, but it happens on a daily basis in my electorate.

I for one will not have the charge and threat put over my head because I am not adhering to what the member for Hayward wants in relation to the time that will be allocated for this debate, what the member for Hartley feels is a reasonable time to discuss his amendments, or whether it will upset the Opposition Whip because he wants to go through a certain program tonight. To be quite frank, none of those issues worries me one jot. Under the Committee clauses, this is my last chance to stand up on this amendment. I hope, Sir, that when I finish talking on this, I can then talk to clauses 4 and 5 with this insertion.

When I sit down you, Sir, could give me your guidance on this, because, as a result of what the member for Hayward has said in response to what the member for Albert Park said, threats were made, which I find rather distressing, that it is already in that clause. So, in that, I read that we

have a division 5 imprisonment for a first offence and, for a subsequent offence, not less than a division 7 imprisonment and not more than a division 4 imprisonment. I wish to ask questions on this as well as the questions I am allowed on this proposed new subclause.

However, it seems to me that it is the combined view of the member for Hayward, the member for Davenport and the member for Hartley (and I do not know whether I am getting negative vibes from you, Sir) that, because we have taken this debate to 8.15 p.m. with some damned fine questioning, we are looked upon as filibusterers. In my time here I have never been accused of that, and I find it rather distressing. The member for Hayward has threatened us if we do not like this amendment, but it has been generally accepted by a very able lawyer, the member for Hartley, a man whom I admire immensely, even though he is coveting my seat. Its author has said that this is not a realistic amendment, and the response of the member for Hayward to a question by my colleague, the member for Henley Beach, is that, if we do not like it, we should move another amendment.

I feel tempted to move an amendment so that, if anyone is caught under the proposed new subclause, they are not banned for 18 months but for life, because that would prove a true deterrent. Clearly, 18 months is not a deterrent, as the member for Henley Beach said. Most street kids are stealing cars at 12 years of age and they cannot lawfully obtain a licence until they are 16.

Both you and I know, Mr Chairman, based on our discussions with Elizabeth police, that when most of these kids get out and go home they steal another car. Are we going to give them concurrent sentences? Will we say that they cannot obtain a licence for the first offence and they cannot obtain a licence for another 18 months for the next offence? These are valid questions. Further, Sir, I seek a ruling from you that, whilst I have asked three questions, I can still ask general questions on the clause.

**Mr BRINDAL:** On a point of order, Mr Chairman, I ask what the member for Napier's question was.

**The CHAIRMAN:** That is not a requirement of Standing Orders. The member for Napier simply speaks to the clause.

**Mr FERGUSON:** I cannot let the answer from the member for Hayward go unchallenged. The trouble is that, when one tries to ask a polite question in this Committee, one gets a reaction of anger and bad manners from members on the other side. I have read the Bill and the member for Hayward said that his answer was contained in proposed new subclause (1a). That was the first question I asked, because the penalty in that new subclause relates to imprisonment.

Obviously the member for Hayward's answer is that those youngsters who are caught car stealing are to be put in prison, which is the point I made when I first raised this matter. Based on your experience in the juvenile justice area, Mr Chairman, you would know that putting youngsters in prison for car stealing not only does not solve the problem but also puts them on the road to further crime. That is why I asked the question of the member for Hayward.

What is the real solution to the problem of car stealing? If his answer is, as I assume it must be from his suggestion to me, that incarcerating youngsters is the solution, we all agree that that is not the solution to the problem. True, it will gain a cheap headline and cheap cheers here and there. Doubtless a press release has already gone out on this and we will see in tomorrow's *Advertiser* on page 3 that the member for Hayward has increased penalties concerning car stealing and is suggesting imprisonment, but imprisonment is not the solution.

If the member for Hayward is to come up with a solution, he has to come up with something better than this proposition. Normally I would have sat here and taken it, but the performance by the member for Hayward in answering the question was extraordinary and I could not let that go. Therefore, I leave this with the Committee: there is no point in asking questions of the member for Hayward again because incarcerating youngsters for car stealing is not the answer to the problem. It might get the honourable member a headline in tomorrow's *Advertiser* and help him win pre-selection for Hartley, but it is not the solution to the problem. This Parliament needs true directions on where we should be going with juvenile crime, particularly with car stealing, and not the cheer chasing and headline hunting we have had proposed.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I would like to ask the member for Hayward what evidence he can provide to this Parliament that these increased penalties will decrease the incidence of stolen motor vehicles. Over the years I, like many others in this Parliament, including the member for Stuart, the member for Henley Beach and the Hon. Ron Roberts in another place, who accompanied me to Western Australia where we talked with people about the problems of juvenile crime, have been concerned about the incidence of crime, of vandalism and graffiti. I have not heard tonight from those who have contributed how we address the problems involving the social needs of the community. It is very easy to lock up these kids, to build more gaols and more remand centres, but I really do not believe that is the answer, when you look at the background of some of these kids.

Let me say from the outset that I do not in any way condone the actions of these juveniles in stealing motor vehicles, nor do I condone their vandalism or graffiti, but if they are incarcerated these kids will learn from others many other ways in which to commit crimes. Very few of us in this society have not at one time or another strayed from the straight and narrow. Some have been caught; some have not. Some are lucky enough to come from well-to-do families; others come from very poor families.

I suppose that one of the best illustrations of the problems of car stealing was demonstrated to me some years ago when I was coming back from Western Australia. I was sitting alongside the manager of a company, who asked me my occupation. I told him, and he asked me what sort of problems I experienced as a member of Parliament and as a parent raising children; what sort of difficulties I experienced. I related some of those difficulties as a trade union official and in this job as a member of Parliament. He told me about some of the problems he had with his one son, whose name I recall was Christopher.

He told me how he came home one evening at about 9 o'clock and had not been there long before a police officer knocked on his door. The police officer asked whether he could come in and talk about his son, who was locked up in the local police station. This man said, 'I don't believe it would be my son you have locked up.' He said that the police officer asked him to accompany him to the police cells. When he got there, he said to his son, 'What is the misunderstanding?' The police officer said, 'He's up for stealing a motor vehicle.' This chap said, 'I laughed like hell, because it was only months ago that I had bought him a brand new car for his birthday.'

When the father challenged the son on this issue the lad said, 'Yes, that's right dad.' The father said that he felt like belting him around the ears because it reflected on him in his position. He said to his son, 'Why the hell did you do that?' The son said, 'Dad, you think you can buy me off with goods, but when I look for a bit of love and attention

you won't give me anything.' That is the reason why I raise it in the context of this Bill. It may be that there are members here who want to ridicule me or laugh about it—and I am not talking about my colleagues who sit on the left of the Chamber—because they think they know it all. None of us in this place knows it all. I do not believe that there is a simple answer to this problem; I only wish there were because I do not believe that we would be here tonight talking about this issue if that were the case.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 7) passed.

Title.

**Mr GROOM:** I move:

Page 1, line 7—Leave out 'the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act 1979'.

Amendment carried; title as amended passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MEMBER'S REMARKS

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I rise to make a personal explanation and, although it may well be that the mechanism I use is not the relevant one, it is the only one I have available to me. During tonight's debate I was threatened by the member for Hayward who called across the Chamber, 'You wait.' By that, Sir, I implied that there would be an attempt to gag me or inflict some form of physical violence on me. The reason I make this explanation, whether or not it is a breach of privilege, is that I want it clearly placed on the record that if I do suffer some physical harm it will be known exactly from whom it came.

#### GAMING MACHINES BILL

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Matthew (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 3580.)

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Transport):** I oppose the motion. The member for Bright, when moving the motion, suggested that some more information was required. Apart from obviously looking for information of a scandalous nature, I could not make out from his speech that there was anything else to find out. It appeared to me that the member for Bright, in his inimitable way, seemed to know all about it and all about everything else. I cannot imagine that the member for Bright genuinely requires any more information.

After listening to the second reading debate and commenting on the quality of that debate, I believe that all members who spoke knew precisely what they were talking about, understood the issues and expressed their views in a manner to which we have become accustomed in this place on conscience issues of that nature—and that is in a very straight and well-informed way. So, I cannot see any justification for the motion whatsoever.

It is often said of parliamentarians that they have an inordinate ability to procrastinate. That charge can be levelled at us fairly on occasions. This issue has been before the Parliament in one way or another since April last year when we first passed the resolution that the House was in favour of poker machines being introduced into clubs and hotels in this State. I would have thought that, in that 12

months, any member of Parliament who felt that his or her knowledge was deficient in this area has had a year to bring themselves up to date.

Judging by the quality of the second reading debate, MPs have by and large taken that action. I detected nothing in the second reading debate that indicated to me that there was any confusion in anyone's mind in this Chamber. In putting his motion the member for Bright in effect gave another second reading speech. We all know that the member for Bright is against poker machines. That is his right. I disagree with his view but I respect it. The proper course of action for someone who is opposed to the legislation is to vote against it.

The honourable member will have a number of friends on both sides of the House who will vote against the Bill. In the vote that was taken on the second reading, we saw where that division was. There will be many more divisions before the night is out and before this Bill is completed. There will be many opportunities to ask questions and exchange ideas and views. I believe that this House is quite capable of doing that.

The member for Bright also suggested that because of the large number of amendments on file the Committee would not be able to cope. I can certainly cope with it, with some difficulty, and, granted, there are a number of amendments, but we will get through them. We have got through complex Bills before. We will manage on this occasion, as well. The chairing of the Committee will be in expert hands and the Minister at the table will do his very best not to confuse the Committee. I urge the House to reject the motion.

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Clearly, this House has more information before it than any other Parliament in the history of the western world. We have had volumes of reports from across the globe and across Australia. I appreciate that computers are subject to failure, just as they fail for banking systems. For almost all applications, there will always be some possibility of failure. There will also be some occasions when they will be manipulated, and members have heard a great deal about hackers. I do not believe that this Parliament needs another select committee to gather more information. I believe that the information before us is more than adequate to allow us to make up our mind. I do not believe that delaying the Bill by this means is an appropriate use of our time. I reject the motion.

**Mr MATTHEW (Bright):** Those members who have spoken against this motion have put forward the argument that there is plenty of material available, almost to the point of overburden, and they are quite satisfied they have enough information at their fingertips. Others have said to me, 'Let's not bother with the select committee. Let's bring it to the vote quickly and just knock the Bill out.' I moved this motion in recognition of the fact that a majority of members want to see the Bill passed. I would like a select committee to ensure that any Bill that is passed is the best available.

I maintain the stand that this Parliament is not informed enough about the processes that have occurred and I put it once more to the House that, if members are absolutely satisfied that they have an intimate knowledge of the processes surrounding the drafting of this Bill and lobbying for it, that they have intimate knowledge of the implications for the Lotteries Commission, the Independent Gaming Corporation or a combination of both, or some other process controlling the machines, and that they have an intimate knowledge of the problems that can occur with poker

machines and the mechanisms needed to control them, by all means they should be satisfied that they are equipped to debate this Bill and should accordingly vote against the motion.

However, I do not believe that members are in that position and, for that reason, this motion is before the House to give members an opportunity to become informed and to give the hotel industry, the Licensed Clubs Association and others the opportunity to put their evidence forward in a completely bipartisan way, putting aside the motion, innuendo and lobbying that has occurred in recent weeks. I commend the motion to the House.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (9)—Mr Blacker, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Eastick and Goldsworthy, Mrs Kotz, Messrs Lewis, Matthew (teller), Venning and Wotton.

Noes (27)—Messrs Armitage, P.B. Arnold, Atkinson, S.J. Baker, Bannon, Blevins (teller), Brindal, Crafter, De Laine, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Heron, Holloway and Hoggood, Mrs Hutchison, Messrs Ingerson, Klunder, McKee, Oswald, Quirke, Rann, Such and Trainer.

Majority of 18 for the Noes.

Motion thus negated.

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I move:

That Standing Order 364 be suspended during the consideration of clauses 3 and 23 of the Bill.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** The obvious question is: should the Bill be passed in this session of Parliament? When is it intended that it be proclaimed?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** As soon as is practicable. Clause passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I move:

Page 2, after line 28—Insert new definition as follows:

'linked jackpot equipment' means any fitting or device to be used for, or in connection with, the linking of two or more gaming machines for the purpose only of recording all or part of the winnings from each of those machines;.

As I said previously, one of the problems with the Bill is that it is skeletal; it provides a minimal amount of detail. On many occasions, I have said that any person should be able to read and understand an Act and, as yet, we do not seem to have reached that stage. If the Bill is to contain terminology that is not self-evident, that should be explained by the definitions provided. There is a deficiency. Under 'gaming equipment', a bland reference is made to 'linked jackpot equipment'. My amendment clarifies what 'linked jackpot equipment' means.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I oppose the amendment. First, it is unnecessary and, if it were necessary, I would want an even broader definition of 'linked jackpots'. There are other definitions that are broader. In any event, I do not believe it is necessary to have a definition. I was not persuaded by the argument of the Deputy Leader. I understand what he is trying to do. As I said, I believe it to be unnecessary and, anyway, it would be inadequate; a broader definition would be available if one were thought to be required.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I am disappointed that the Minister has taken that stance. I believe that the legislation should stand on its own two feet. It should be easily interpreted by any person who reads it. I suggest that 'linked jackpot equipment' means something perhaps to 1 per cent of the



population and that 99 per cent would not have a clue. At least my amendment attempts to provide a definition which is satisfactory to the average reader and which attempts to define what it is. This is a very important item in the Bill, as the Minister will appreciate. Otherwise, he should have left that item out and just said 'any prescribed equipment'. Then we would have gone through the process of asking the Minister as to what exactly he meant.

I draw attention to the Victorian Gaming Machine Control Act 1991, on page 4 of which there is a definition:

'linked jackpot arrangement' means an arrangement whereby two or more gaming machines are linked to a device that—

- (a) records, from time to time, an amount which, in the event of a jackpot or other result being obtained on one of those machines, may be payable, or part of which may be payable, as winnings; and
- (b) for the purpose of recording the amount referred to in paragraph (a), receives data from each gaming machine to which the device is linked; and
- (c) is not capable of affecting the outcome of a game on a gaming machine to which the device is linked.

That is an extensive definition. On advice, I have given a much simpler definition which, at least to my amateurish eye, seems to encompass the detail.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I think that a definition is required, but there are far more important things in the Bill. If I lose on the voices I certainly will not be dividing.

**Mr LEWIS:** I share the view expressed by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition about the necessity to have a better definition of the meaning of 'linked jackpot equipment'. During the debate on the Casino Bill, we amended that legislation to exclude poker machines. I went to Parliamentary Counsel to have that amendment drawn. I asked for the amendment to state explicitly that it had to be all gaming devices, whether electronic or mechanical. I was told by the Premier and others that it was not necessary to be so explicit and all-embracing; all we had to do was to ban poker machines. That would cover it, because everybody knew what a poker machine was.

However, it was not long—indeed, it was not even 10 years—before the Government of the day decided to allow gaming devices, called video gaming devices, which are really about poker or any other sort of game where one puts coins in a slot, the game plays quickly, and one does not necessarily recover the payouts from what is undertaken in the course of the bet; it is just credited to one's account in the machine. No more insidious, invidious and destructive device for somebody prone to become a compulsive gambler could be invented.

That was the very sort of device that I wanted to have banned in law. Yet the Government found that, since the Casino Act did not refer to such devices, it had the right, by regulation, to introduce the operation of those machines in the Casino, and the Government did it. It is for that reason that I believe we cannot trust this outfit. It is the same bunch. Therefore, it is necessary for us to be explicit. In my judgment, it is prudent and sensible to tell the electorate at large what we mean by 'linked jackpot equipment'. At present that is not clear. I commend the member for Mitcham for the trouble that he has taken to draft the amendment in this form.

Amendment carried.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The member for Murray-Mallee has a circulated amendment to clause 3, page 2, line 6. Unfortunately, the member was not here when the matter came forward. Clearly, in a Bill like this, with a large number of circulated amendments, this degree of confusion may arise in the course of the proceedings; but Standing Orders require that I take the amendments as they relate to the Bill. However, as there was some confusion in relation to the start

of this matter, the Chair feels that it is appropriate now to turn back to the amendment circulated by the member for Murray-Mallee, even though it is now out of sequence because of that earlier confusion. I would seek the cooperation of the committee in making sure that, in the case of the remainder of the amendments, we can proceed with them strictly in the order in which they appear, in accordance with Standing Orders. The member for Murray-Mallee.

**Mr LEWIS:** I move:

Page 2, line 6—Leave out 'Liquor Licensing Commissioner' and insert 'person for the time being holding or acting in the office of Gaming Machine Commissioner'.

Thank you, Mr Chairman, and I thank other members for their indulgence in this regard. My amendment relates to whether or not it is necessary to have the Liquor Licensing Commissioner being one and the same person as the commissioner in this gaming machines legislation. I really believe that, whilst it is intended that the premises in which these machines can be installed shall be those premises that are currently run by owners and operators of liquor licences of various kinds, it is not because they have liquor licences, it is because they are the sorts of premises in which it is appropriate for people to pursue this kind of leisure activity.

In my judgment we ought to make a distinction between the Liquor Licensing Commissioner and the Gaming Machines Commissioner and accordingly I have moved that we do that. By doing so we will not need to amend the Act further in the event that we wish to change the Liquor Licensing Act in any way that relates to the office of the Liquor Licensing Commissioner. That remains as a separate prerogative without complication. If we allow it to be so complicated we are linking two activities that are not the same; they are quite different, in my judgment, and it is appropriate for us to have two offices, and maybe two officers—two people. Most certainly, the person responsible for this legislation ought not necessarily be one and the same as the person who is appointed as the Liquor Licensing Commissioner under other law.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I oppose this amendment. I see it as entirely unnecessary. Again, my comprehension may be a bit slow tonight; I am sure it will perk up as the night goes on, but I really cannot see any point at all in doing what the member for Murray-Mallee is suggesting. It seems to me that it would add some words to the Bill without adding anything else. It would not put any statutory powers on anybody, give anybody the right to do anything or anything at all. It would just confer an additional title and if the honourable member would prefer one name to another then I suppose that is all very well but I would have liked some more substance as to why. With respect, I do not believe that there is any substance here and therefore I would urge the Committee to reject the amendment.

**Mr LEWIS:** The Minister is pretty thick in that case. I explained the reason. It may be necessary for us at some time to change the liquor licensing laws. The member for Henley Beach prates along with his mate the member for Napier about deregulation. If we want to deregulate the liquor laws in this State, we cannot abolish the office of the Liquor Licensing Commissioner without its affecting this Bill, and that is why I am saying that there ought to be two separate offices so that we can to some degree deregulate or change the structure of the Liquor Licensing Act without interfering with this legislation.

As it stands at present, we cannot do that because the Liquor Licensing Commissioner under that Act is one and the same person holding the two offices and there is no differentiation. I am saying, 'Make it possible; do not tie the two together and do not complicate the matter.' If you want it to be possible to deregulate either—one way or the

other—there ought to be separate functions and separate titles. Why do you not make it the Housing Commissioner, or any other Commissioner? You have made it the Liquor Licensing Commissioner, and I am suggesting that, notwithstanding the fact that it happens to be going to those premises, it is not appropriate. It is okay for the Liquor Licensing Commissioner for the time being to be the same person as is appointed the Gaming Machines Commissioner, but it does not necessarily follow that it must be so.

Amendment negatived.

**Mr GROOM:** I move:

Page 2, after line 29—Insert new definition as follows.

'the Lotteries Commission' means 'the Lotteries Commission of South Australia.'

This amendment is fundamental, but not fatal, to other of my amendments to the Bill. If the definition was simply left in the Bill, it would have no work to do if other amendments were defeated in respect of the gaming monitor's licence. Consequently, it is proper to raise the issues in relation to the Lotteries Commission now as it would avoid repetition on later clauses and it might affect a number of later clauses because it is fundamental to my amendments.

By inserting this definition, which is clearly linked with other clauses, it would effectively follow a public inquiry by the Casino Supervisory Authority that the Lotteries Commission, subject to certain terms and conditions as would be specified by the Casino Supervisory Authority, would end up with the monitor's licence. The structure in relation to utilisation of the Casino Supervisory Authority is the same structure as in the Casino Bill.

I move the amendment so as effectively to enable the Lotteries Commission to have the monitor's licence because of the matters that I outlined in the second reading debate. Although I will not be repetitive, I want to make a couple of points. I have been persuaded by the Police Commissioner's report and other inputs that a Government agency should hold the monitor's licence. The monitor's licence is fundamental to the security and integrity of the system. The Police Commissioner's report in relation to the need for Government control states:

Overseas reports reiterate that criminality and organised crime involvement is very difficult to exclude from the poker machine or gaming machine environment unless strict Government controls are introduced as a preliminary measure.

He went on to state:

The most recent States to enter the gaming machine market are Victoria and Queensland, both of whom have chosen to introduce Government authority-owned machines into an environment strictly monitored and controlled by a Government authority.

My amendments provide not for Government-owned machines but for machines owned by, for example, a licensed club or hotel.

The Police Commissioner went on to say:

The provisions of the proposed legislation, [that is, the Bill before the House] which refer to the Independent Gaming Corporation, provide little safeguards and, together with the statements made, suggest self regulation. This is fraught with danger.

In relation to that proposition put by the Police Commissioner, I come down in favour of that concern, namely, that there are a little safeguards should the Independent Gaming Corporation have the monitor's licence, because the Licensed Clubs and Hotels Association nominate persons to be directors. It is a joint venture company. But the monitor's licence is so fundamental to the security and integrity of the system that, with little safeguards in the Bill in relation to the Independent Gaming Corporation, the Licensed Clubs and Hotels Association and, indeed, the

Liquor Trades Union would, I suspect, become targets for takeover by organised crime.

At the very least, elections for those bodies would become a matter of serious disputation. I suspect that money would be poured into those bodies at election time, because whoever controlled the officials and office holders of those organisations would ultimately nominate people to serve on the Independent Gaming Corporation which, under the Bill, would hold both the dealer's licence and the monitor's licence. In that way, the concerns of the Police Commissioner would really come to the fore. So, I have come down in favour of a Government agency to hold the monitor's licence, following a public inquiry. The Police Commissioner said:

International experience has shown historically that the gaming machine industry is incapable of self-regulation. This is entirely due to the involvement and influence of organised crime groups and personal criminality. The Australian experience, particularly in New South Wales, is the same, but it is extended with the examples of high public office holders being corrupted . . . South Australia has a very proud record of eliminating attempts by organised crime groups to infiltrate the Adelaide Casino. This has been achieved by the establishment of the highest standards of applicant vetting in Australia.

I will not go any further in relation to the need for governmental control in relation to the monitor's licence because, as I said, it is fundamental to the security and integrity of the system, and I really believe that members of the public want to see a Government agency holding the monitor's licence. I should also explain that, in giving the gaming monitor's licence to the Lotteries Commission, I have ensured in my amendments that the Independent Gaming Corporation would hold a dealer's licence.

As I indicated during my second reading speech, I believe that the legislation will not work without the support and involvement of the Licensed Clubs and Hotels Association. Under my amendments it must be given a dealer's licence, subject to complying with terms and conditions. It will therefore retain a predominant position in the industry because of its relationship with the clubs and hotels. It will clearly be an influential player—and rightly so—in relation to this industry.

The net result of my amendments is a better balance, a balance more in line with the Police Commissioner's report, to provide stricter Government controls, with a Government agency holding the monitor's licence. However, in the same way as the Casino operates, there would be a mixture with private enterprise through the involvement of the Independent Gaming Corporation. I believe that is the correct mix. I believe that is why the Police Commissioner could say in his report that:

. . . South Australia has a very proud record of eliminating attempts by organised crime groups to infiltrate the Adelaide Casino. This has been achieved by the establishment of the highest standards of applicant vetting in Australia.

The standard that I am setting by moving this definition, which has its consequences in other sections, is a standard much higher than that contained in the Bill. In the light of experience internationally and the experience of other States, a Government agency should hold the monitor's licence, and the definition is fundamental to that, but not fatal. Notwithstanding anything that might happen with the definition clause, I will still be moving the clauses dealing with the gaming machine monitoring licence. However, I stress that if the definition itself remains in the Bill, and if it passes, and if other amendments are defeated, it will have no work to do; and it is proper to have that debate about the Lotteries Commission and the Independent Gaming Corporation at this point.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair agrees with that interpretation of Standing Orders by the member for Hartley.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I oppose this amendment. I appreciate the Chair allowing the debate on this principle to be dealt with on this particular amendment. If this amendment is taken as a test at this stage, particularly so early in the evening, I think it will save us all a very long night. I thank the Chair for its very wise ruling and also thank the member for Hartley for suggesting it.

The issues around this critical part of the Bill were extensively canvassed in the second reading debate. I appreciate the fact that the member for Hartley summarised the debate around this issue rather than going into every detail, and I intend doing the same. When I saw the amendment from the member for Hartley to give the monitoring licence to the Lotteries Commission, I asked myself why: what purpose does it serve? Why is it suggested that the Lotteries Commission is inherently more honest or more superior to the Liquor Licensing Commissioner, the Commissioner of Police and the Casino Supervisory Authority? All those individuals and bodies at present supervise the monitoring that occurs by the private sector in the Casino. The insertion of the Lotteries Commission will not add one additional skerrick of security to this system. If it did, and I thought it was worth while, then I would support it, but it does not.

The Lotteries Commission has had an opportunity, and has taken the opportunity, to sell its case on its merits. I regret that it did not restrict its activities to doing that—to selling its case on its merits. The fact is that the Lotteries Commission, for a whole range of reasons, has not been able to persuade the industry that it has any merit, and it certainly has not been able to persuade me that it has any merit, as I see it on behalf of the taxpayers of South Australia. Let us look at what the industry has proposed. All this Bill is doing is giving it a right of first refusal for its proposal. It is not saying that it can have it; it is only giving it the right of first refusal.

**The Hon. J.P. Trainer:** First option.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** First option. What it has to do is persuade the Liquor Licensing Commissioner, and through the Liquor Licensing Commissioner the Commissioner of Police and the Casino Supervisory Authority, that it is fit and proper to conduct this particular operation. There is no regulatory role at all for the Independent Gaming Corporation—none whatsoever. It has absolutely no powers of regulation or anything else: power does not lie there. It is merely the arms and legs of the system—nothing else. But, what it will mean is that the industry will be its own arms and legs; there will be no third body with no experience or very limited experience in the industry, and what limited experience the Lotteries Commission has in the industry has been a very unhappy experience because it does not and cannot be expected to understand the hospitality industry. The industry will operate its own affairs under the strictest possible controls.

It seems to me that any industry—I do not care if it is the hospitality, tourism or any other industry—essentially has a right to operate its own affairs under the control and the rules laid down by the State, whether it is in this measure, the securities legislation, or legislation regulating the private sector. I see no reason why a public sector body should unnecessarily interfere in that industry. I think we tend to do it far too often. I am a strong supporter of the public sector. I believe that the public sector has a role to play in many areas. I just do not believe that this is one of them. I did not believe that the public sector had any role in being the arms and legs in relation to the Casino. I cannot see any reason why it should. That is why it was

never in the Bill—because there was no need for it to be in the Bill.

The Police Commissioner said a number of things, and I referred to that in my reply to the second reading debate. Some of them I agree with completely; some of them, quite frankly, I do not understand because it seems to me that, in some of his statements, whoever drew up those documents did not understand that there was no regulatory role within the IGC proposal. I was disappointed that the document that the Police Commissioner forwarded to the Minister of Emergency Services kept referring to a regulatory role for the IGC. The Commissioner believed that the regulation, licensing and supervision, etc., should be with the Liquor Licensing Commissioner, and the ultimate controlling body ought to be the Casino Supervisory Authority. I agree with the Police Commissioner, but when he starts moving into these areas of assuming there is some regulatory role, quite frankly I do not understand it.

The member for Hartley said that, within his set of amendments, there is a role for the IGC. The role allocated to the IGC is to say that it can apply for a dealer's licence. Big deal! The ability to apply for a licence does not have to be provided for in the Bill. Anyone can apply for a licence. Whether or not you satisfy the system is a different matter. There is nothing to stop the IGC, or Frank and Doreen Blevins Incorporated Ltd for that matter, from applying for a licence. So, to suggest—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Well, we did once; it was a marriage licence. So, to suggest that there is anything in this set of amendments by the member for Hartley that gives the IGC a role is a truism, because it gives everyone a role. It does not give them a specific role. It ensures that their ability to run their own industry within the constraints laid down by Parliament—the strongest constraints in Australia, according to the Police Commissioner—is diminished, for no good purpose and with no additional security at all.

We all know why the Lotteries Commission wants involvement in this. In my view, it is empire building; it is an attempt to maintain a monopoly. Alternatively, when one can see that a monopoly is being eroded, one makes an attempt to corner a great deal of the activity where some of the funds might flow. One can see some logic in the Lotteries Commission's standpoint, but I believe it is very much the role of Parliament to ensure that monopolies do not expand unnecessarily.

If we determine that the industry ought not to be its own arms and legs, for some reason that escapes me, and we hold a public inquiry, I would have more sympathy for this particular set of amendments if the amendments said that, after the public inquiry, the monitor's licence would be awarded to the best applicant. But that is not the case. The amendment seeks to hold a public inquiry and then give the licence to the Lotteries Commission. It seems to me that the verdict has been delivered before anyone has heard the evidence. If it is to be a public sector body, why not the TAB? I am not suggesting for one moment that it ought to be the TAB, so I hope no-one draws up an amendment along those lines. I would have to make the same speech to oppose that amendment, too.

**Mr Ingerson:** Why not the Casino?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Indeed, why not the Casino? Why not IBM? Because there is no reason for those people to be involved. Within the Bill there is the most stringent, effective and tested set of security regulations and statutes that prevails anywhere in Australia, and that was stated clearly by the Commissioner of Police. I urge the Committee

to reject the amendment and to reject unnecessary interference by a public sector body in the private sector. I stress that it is unnecessary interference. If it were necessary, I would be the first one interfering, as everybody in this Chamber knows. I believe there is a strong role for the public sector, but I happen to believe that it is not here.

**Mr LEWIS:** I agree with the member for Whyalla on this point. It is not often that I find myself in agreement with him but he makes sense to me on this point. I do not see why there would be any greater measure of integrity of operation provided by the Lotteries Commission than the Independent Gaming Corporation. It does not make sense to suggest that. I would have liked to have cleared the air with respect to remarks that were made in the second reading debate about the manner in which the legislation was drafted, who got what from whom and why. But that is behind us now. We leave the stink relating to that with the people who created it.

What we are looking at now is the prospective function, and in my mind it is absolutely ridiculous to give the public sector total monopoly. A monopoly of that kind is the sort of thing that has resulted in the excesses of the State Bank and the State Government Insurance Commission, where they ran away with the notion that, for some reason or other, because they were established by statute to engage in commercial operations, they could do no wrong. In fact, they screwed up. It is better for the public interest to be served by an Independent Gaming Corporation which is accountable in the fashion in which it has been suggested, and I believe that the people proposing the Independent Gaming Corporation did their homework very thoroughly in putting it all together.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I rise to support the amendments moved by the member for Hartley. This is an important issue, as the Minister has acknowledged, as far as the Bill and the administration of gaming machines is concerned. I, too, believe that it is appropriate that we deal with it in this way, because a principle is involved, and the Committee can either accept or reject that principle in this heading, and I think that will facilitate matters because, at base, it is vital that we get this matter resolved and that we get this legislation through and on its way. I perceive that that is the mood of the public, of those in the industry and elsewhere, and there should be no delay or quibbling around on that. As a consequence, I do not intend to delay the Committee long in this matter, because I know that the case has been stated well, if not eloquently, by the member for Hartley in support of the scheme that he proposes.

I must say that, in looking at this, there are a number of ways to approach it, but we have these three components: the role of the Licensing Commissioner; the monitoring function; and the function of the dealer's licences, the purchase of machines and so on. I think that they are three quite separate functions, and I believe that a division of responsibility is a healthy thing. One has checks and balances, and I believe one has better control in this area, both in fact and in perception, and I do not think we should underrate perception in this area. It is important that there is a feeling of confidence about the system as it is introduced, and I am sure that that can be well achieved.

Of course, the Minister points to the Casino as the example of the way in which this can be done, and I think he is correct in saying that the Casino model has worked extremely well. It is the best of its type in Australia, and it is obviously something that can be used as an exemplar for the way one controls these things. But, unlike the Minister, I do not believe that this is a situation on all fours with the Casino—a single location with particular types of surveillance and

all the other things that relate to it—as opposed to a system where machines are installed in a whole range of locations. People will say, 'Yes, but there is central control monitoring and electronics has changed the nature of that' and so on. To an extent, that is true, but I do not believe that that in any way cuts across the principle behind these amendments which is, as I say, to have that reasonable division of responsibility, those checks, those balances and those controls.

Unfortunately, the issue is coloured a bit by the progress of events and the lobbying that has led to this measure coming before the Parliament, and certainly there have been some unfortunate chapters in that, which I do not believe should colour honourable members' attitudes as they consider the legislation before us. In the case of the Lotteries Commission, first, let me say that the commission has a very legitimate interest in all forms of gambling and its role in relation to forms of gambling. I do not agree that it is a case of empire building, as the Minister describes it—I believe that there is a legitimate interest there. Having said that, I might say also that I believe that there have been some fairly negative approaches to putting a case: indeed, a fairly highly-publicised matter on which I required the Lotteries Commission to revise certain material it intended to distribute.

An attempt was made to suggest that this was some kind of undue interference on my part, some manipulation of the debate, perhaps the implication being that, as Minister in charge of the Lotteries Commission, I was attempting to muzzle the Lotteries Commission in some way in terms of it. But, in fact, it was quite the opposite.

While defending the right of the Lotteries Commission to make its case in this situation where a conscience vote is what is called for, where Government direction is not involved as such, I also did not approve of the Lotteries Commission's entering into some sort of slanging match or making unfair and unreasonable allegations about any other party in the field, and I thought its material tended in that direction. Let me say that the fault is not entirely on one side. But, be that as it may, I do not believe that that should colour this, and I think that the Lotteries Commission does have an administrative set-up, the expertise and the ability to carry out this monitoring function in an appropriate way.

Another thing, of course, that has coloured the attitude of the Lotteries Commission has been the experience of the hotels and clubs in relation to Club Keno. I do not quite know the ins and outs or the rights and wrongs of it, but there certainly have been problems and resentments, and expectations have not been filled. All that has caused, as I perceive it, some considerable tension, and desire very much on the part of the industry—almost a drive on its part—to say, 'If we are going to be involved in something like this, please don't let the Lotteries Commission have control of it.' It is for that reason, not without some considerable consideration, that I do not take any further step than to support the member for Hartley's amendments which relate to that monitoring function.

I am convinced by the arguments from the industry, the Minister and elsewhere, which I think are quite compelling, that the success of these machines will depend on a number of commercial decisions being made, as is put quite appropriately in facts sheet No. 5 of the hotels and clubs submission on the Independent Gaming Corporation relating to the venue, the type of machines, the way in which they are promoted, and so on. There has to be that kind of stake and involvement by the industry, and I think it is appropriate that it should do so. The Minister says, 'Well, acknowledging that really does not say anything; you are

allowing the Independent Gaming Corporation to be granted a dealer's licence.' That is not much different from, say, Frank and Doreen Blevins Pty Ltd applying for such a licence, and so on.

That is not quite true; the Independent Gaming Corporation does have status within the Act. If it satisfies certain decisions, it does have the right to be granted a machine dealer's licence, and it does have a very legitimate and central role. I am not seeking—and I do not believe that these amendments are seeking—to interfere with that aspect of its role. It is not a case of saying to the industry, 'Well, bad luck. You're going to have the Lotteries Commission foisted on you or thrust down your throat, and you're just going to have to cop it.' On the contrary, I am persuaded by the argument of the industry and, in doing so, I abandon what was my definite starting point, which was a public sector model for the administration of these machines in all respects.

The case has been made, and I think on examination the objections that have been raised can be overcome, and there are many controls there which I believe make that appropriate to support. But I do think that in some specific area of monitoring it is appropriate that it be done by an authority other than the Independent Gaming Corporation—the creation of the industry itself—some other body, the Liquor Licensing Commission or the Casino Supervisory Authority. All of them have their role and influence. The Lotteries Commission is the body constituted for it. In fact, one could make a case for the TAB in some respects; perhaps it could follow the Tattersall's model, or something like that in Victoria. The Lotteries Commission is better geared and more appropriate to carry out this function. Therefore, I commend the amendments to the Committee.

**Mr INGERSON:** I do not support the involvement of the Lotteries Commission in this area, principally on the ground that, if the Lotteries Commission is to fulfil a monitoring role, it has to obtain the support and cooperation of the people with whom it has to work. The history of support for the Lotteries Commission with the clubs and hotels in particular in the past 12 months has not been the sort of record about which to write home.

The Lotteries Commission does not enjoy a terribly good reputation with the clubs and hotels in South Australia. There are many reasons for that, the principal one being Club Keno. We need to look back at the involvement of the Lotteries Commission in the setting up of this exercise to see why it has gone wrong. I was involved in those early days in encouraging the introduction of Club Keno in the clubs and hotels. I supported the argument put forward by the Lotteries Commission over that put forward at that time by the TAB.

I believed that the argument put forward by the representatives of the Lotteries Commission was justified and that they were in it for two reasons: first, because it was necessary that it was properly monitored and because they were able to give the best possible machinery and back-up to Club Keno; and, secondly, and by far most importantly, because there was quid in it for the clubs. Unless there is something in it for the people who are to make the whole operation work, very quickly there are questions and arguments as to why things are going wrong and there is consequent loss of support. Many examples have been put forward as to why the clubs are unhappy. Making a quid, as I put it, or making a profit that can be distributed to their members is the fundamental reason why clubs want to be in any gambling situation. They believe it is in the best interests of their club and consequently their members.

I will illustrate why the clubs are cross with the way that the Lotteries Commission has administered Club Keno in particular. There is a country town with Club Keno in a licensed club with annual sales at a dollar per game of \$132 000. Of that, \$77 000 is paid back in prizes to the players. That is a 58 per cent return. Some 6 per cent, or \$8 000, of commission goes to the club. Out of that it has to pay the employee \$12.50 per hour, plus 45c Club Keno allowance. Worked out over the year, the return to the club is zero. The return to the Lotteries Commission from that one country town was \$47 080, and all that it provided was a terminal that the club had to rent. The club provided the staff, the menu, the facilities and the audience. Some \$47 000 went out of that town to the Lotteries Commission and, at the end of the day, not one dollar was available for distribution within the clubs system. That is what it is all about—an unfair distribution of profit.

Going back to the negotiations—and I was involved in those negotiations at the very beginning—the clubs were promised many dollars out of it. Is it any wonder that the clubs and hotels in this State say that they would like to set up their own monitoring system? They do not believe that the Lotteries Commission can do that without ripping them off. They do not question at all the integrity of the Lotteries Commission in terms of doing the monitoring job, and neither do I but, at the end of the day, this is a private sector-public sector operation in which the dollars that the club makes is what it is all about—no more and no less than that.

The Premier talked about the three important issues of control, monitoring and the machines. It does not matter whether it is the Lotteries Commission, the Independent Gaming Corporation or the TAB, or whatever is the final monitor; all those systems are under the control of the Liquor Licensing Commissioner, the Casino Gaming Authority and the Police Commissioner. It does not matter who is asked to do the monitoring if at the end of the day the rules under which the Casino operates today are the rules that will apply under this system. So, we have to come back again to making the system work. Why would we as a Parliament ever consider introducing a system in which one of the partners has to do all the work and get no dollars out of it while the other partner makes the dollars? That is what it is all about.

Why is it that, when one goes into the western country towns of New South Wales, one can see that the clubs are flourishing? They are not flourishing because there are no dollars in the system at the end of the day: here they are not flourishing because they will get nothing out of it at the end of the day. At this time, regarding the involvement of the Lotteries Commission in Club Keno in particular, which is the game in which it is involved in a direct monitoring role, there is nothing in it for anybody other than the Lotteries Commission itself. To clarify my position as to where the Lotteries Commission money goes, I have no concern at all about the fact that that money goes into our public health and hospital system. That is where it is agreed that it will go. That is good. On the other hand, if one enters into a contract with people legitimately to say that they will get some benefits, they have to get the benefits, and that just is not the example of using the Lotteries Commission as is being put before us.

There are two other issues which I want to take up and which have been raised with me in correspondence from the Lotteries Commission, and I question them. First, the Lotteries Commission says that there is a strong public perception that it should be responsible for the overall control of coin operated gaming machines in this State. I

would like to know who did those surveys, because I have not heard anybody say this, and I have spent a lot of time in the past month trying to find out what the community, the clubs, the hotels and everybody else want, and that statement is just not right. There is no evidence that there is a strong public perception that the Lotteries Commission should have overall control.

The public perception is that the system should be controlled properly by the Government which sets the rules and which has the required involvement of the police and the Liquor Licensing Commission, or whoever this Parliament determines; that is what it is all about. It is not about the Lotteries Commission standing up and saying that it has the God-given right to do all this sort of thing. That is just absolute nonsense; it is not true.

The second point, which I talked about for some time last night in my second reading contribution, relates to the statement about the Lotteries Commission's unblemished record of honesty and integrity, together with the expertise in the conduct of gaming (and I have talked about its effectiveness with regard to Club Keno) to provide the level of trust and respect required by the public. There has been as much dirty lobbying on behalf of and by people directly involved in the Lotteries Commission as by anybody else in this debate. As I said last night, I am sick and tired of these people who stand up behind the cloak of the public sector and say that they are honest and have integrity and that anybody in the private sector, for example the Independent Gaming Corporation, automatically does not have that sort of integrity. Of course, there are others, such as the Liquor Licensing Commission, with integrity, as the Minister said.

This sort of implied statement that it is only the Lotteries Commission and only the public sector that can have any integrity and honesty is just beyond belief. The people that the Lotteries Commission are having a go at are successful South Australians, people we should be proud of and not people that a statutory authority should be slandering. That is just not on. That is the single most disgraceful and despicable aspect that has come out of this whole exercise. Successful people of integrity are prepared to put an option to this Parliament and, as the Minister rightly said, we are giving them the right to decide whether they want to do it. If they do not, someone else will get the opportunity. That is all this is about, yet we have had the despicable conduct of the commission running people down.

I refer to the letter in the *Advertiser* by the commission staff. Who are the lotteries management trying to kid? We know, because we have heard it all around this State, who is behind that sort of stuff? This whole exercise is the power game of little men who just want to get more control over the gambling dollars of this State and I do not believe that we as a Parliament should accept that any longer. As I said earlier, the guidelines and security—everything—are set out to be controlled well and truly by the Government. There is no question about the integrity of board members, because they will have to go through exactly the same licence and police test as any member of the board of the Lotteries Commission if they were given monitoring rights.

It would be fascinating if we put this in and the Lotteries Commission should win this monitoring role and then should go before the police and someone's integrity is questioned. We are going to make sure that that occurs. It is wrong for any statutory authority, and particularly the commission, to have the gall to come before this Parliament after the way it has acted in the past few weeks and say it is lilywhite and expect the support of this Parliament.

**Mr QUIRKE:** This debate is probably one of the most interesting in which I have been involved so far. I find it unusual to be supporting some of the comments of the member for Bragg and I find it even more interesting that the member for Murray-Mallee and I appear to be on the same side on this issue and, indeed, that I intend to be against the Premier on this issue. The member for Bragg made what I think is an extremely good analysis of the position in respect of the role of the Lotteries Commission.

I do not disagree with his comments and in my second reading speech I made it clear that in my opinion the knights in shining armour have soiled that armour in recent months. Based on my reading of the amendment, two things should be brought before the Committee. First, there is confusion in the minds of many people when they approach the issue of control and monitoring. In the Bill it is clear that the control and regulatory powers are clearly within the hands of the Government. Irrespective of who monitors the system and who fills in that tier, the regulatory powers and powers of control are in the hands of the Government.

The second point is this: since this debate began about 12 months ago, the Lotteries Commission has spent a great deal of time debating only one issue. That is the thing that has hung up its entire proposal. In fact, some six months ago in written correspondence and in discussions I had with the Lotteries Commission I warned it that it needed to focus its mind on the very question of whether or not Parliament would give it the monitoring role, the essential role that must be undertaken properly. It is essential that the public, the clubs and pubs, the Government and everyone else feel confident that whoever is fulfilling that role will do it properly.

The Lotteries Commission spent its time debating the ownership of machines. Its first position was that it would own everything and lease them out. That was the first mistake it made, because that brought up the spectre of Club Keno at its worst. That was the issue that brought all the clubs in, I am sure, every electorate in this State round to see their local MP. The Lotteries Commission retreated from that position. It had not developed the other necessary functions to my satisfaction or to the satisfaction of other members. It did not have a vision of how it would fit in as a monitor, and its whole concern was ownership of the machines. Its second position was that it would buy the machines and then sell them to the clubs. In fact, the Lotteries Commission made suggestions as to how many clubs could have machines, and so on.

Its last position—and I can say this only from what I have seen in the media, because the last discussions I had with the Lotteries Commission were some months ago—was that it was still harping on about the central purchasing role it wants to play in this whole exercise. At the end of the day, the problem was that it had not focused its mind on the role that it would be given, if the member for Hartley's amendments are carried, of monitoring this very important legislation.

I must say that, from my discussions with the Lotteries Commission, I do not have the confidence that it is prepared for that role. It may well be that the TAB or other agencies could fulfil that important monitoring function, but the two bodies that have come before Government to make out their case, the IGC and the Lotteries Commission, are very different. The IGC proposal from the very beginning had a clear vision of where it was going. It had the issues worked out.

The minimal intervention regime on the electronic surveillance and computer systems was clearly thought out by the IGC, whereas the Lotteries Commission had no idea

where it was going except that it may put the system onto the existing Club Keno lines. Not only would it take many years before those Club Keno lines would be expanded to a whole range of other clubs that have not had the dubious benefit of that system to date, the reality was that the Lotteries Commission quite clearly had not thought out the full implications of the potential role this Parliament could give it.

This debate tonight was absolutely essential. I must say that I, as a member of this place, am not at all happy to give that important function to the Lotteries Commission. I do not believe that at the third reading stage—and I signal this now—I could in conscience support the Lotteries Commission in that role, because to date I have seen no evidence that the Lotteries Commission can fulfil that role with what I believe is the necessary confidence I as a member would need to have before I could give it that important position.

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

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

Motion carried.

**Mr OSWALD:** I would like to make a small contribution to the debate tonight, particularly in relation to the IGC. Ever since this proposal was first floated in the public arena we have received presentations from the IGC and other bodies. I must state for the record that I believe the IGC was thorough and had done its homework extremely well; that the information it provided was clear and succinct; and that its presentation was put before us by people with integrity.

I am surprised at some of the statements that were made by the member for Hartley. He has shifted the emphasis away from the presentations that were put by the IGC. Although I did not hear the first two or three minutes of his speech I heard most of it on the monitoring devices we have upstairs, and I was able to write down a couple of the points he made. I will refer to them and then bring the debate back to some of the statements that have been put out by the IGC which no-one in the public arena has yet sought to dispute. As we have been discussing this Bill for some months I would assume that those facts are still correct.

First, I refer to a statement made by the member for Bragg about the reputation of the Lotteries Commission as regards Club Keno. I will not repeat everything he said, but the honourable member was absolutely right. All members have received complaints in their offices over the years about the administration of Club Keno by the Lotteries Commission. That being on the record, I will now refer to some of the remarks that were made by the member for Hartley. He made great play of the fact that the Lotteries Commission should hold the monitor's licence. Referring to the Police Commissioner's report, he claimed that criminality and organised crime means that a Government authority should be the monitor, the inference being that he believed criminality and organised crime could flourish unless his amendments passed.

I think that is a most outrageous allegation for anyone to make in relation to the personnel that I predict will be involved with the IGC. Also, the member for Hartley said that there were few safeguards if the IGC acted as the monitor of the licence. What sort of public assurance is that? If we take that on face value, it is enough to make anyone say that we must not touch the IGC with a barge pole. The member for Hartley asked who would control

office holders, and he went to great lengths to explain the implications for the IGC and liquor trade unions in this respect. He talked about the graft and corruption that could creep in and the buying off of various individuals.

Once again, that is an outrageous allegation and is something to which I think he should respond later during this debate. The member for Hartley claims that the public want to see a Government agency holding the monitoring licence and that his amendment was more in line with the Police Commissioner's report to provide stricter Government controls with a Government agency holding the monitor's licence. This one theme ran all the way through: that the IGC was not capable, qualified or competent to play a role.

The honourable member then produced an amendment which I thought had two bob each way by giving the IGC some sort of minor role—as he said, to be a blend of private and public enterprise through involvement with the IGC. At no stage did I hear him mention the Liquor Licensing Commission and its role. He may have mentioned it earlier in his opening remarks, but I thought the role of the Liquor Licensing Commission and where it sits compatibly with the IGC was a major part of the IGC's presentation to us in the documents we have received. If the honourable member did not mention the role of the Liquor Licensing Commission, then I believe his amendments are designed slightly to mislead the public debate.

The honourable member claims that the standard he is setting by moving the definition is much higher than that currently in the Bill. He claims that, in the light of experience internationally and in other States, a Government agency should hold the monitor licence. Once again the honourable member kept conveniently skirting around the existence of the role of the Liquor Licensing Commission.

I heard the Minister say in his response that there is no regulatory role for the IGC. There is an effective set of security regulations in the Bill to give a public reassurance. The presentation by the member for Hartley could put panic into the public arena, if some of his statements were taken on face value. On that basis, we should carefully consider his remarks when we vote to reject his amendments.

There is no reason for the public to have any concern about the proposals that have been put forward by the IGC, as they fit compatibly with the Liquor Licensing Commission. We each received fact sheets from the IGC. As I said in my opening remarks, none of these has been disputed publicly. People have had ample opportunity to say that they are totally inaccurate. I will refer very briefly to a couple of the facts that are brought out in those sheets. This information needs to be put on the public record for later debates, because I am sure that this matter will keep coming up again. Sheet No. 1 states:

Who should control machines?

IGC has never suggested control should rest with the corporation. IGC has never suggested industry self-regulation. IGC has always advocated that the appropriate Government department should be the Liquor Licensing Commission.

Therein lies the protection for the public. We do not need the additional amendments that have been moved by the member for Hartley. Therein lies the protection. It is there, and the drafting of the Bill has been quite competent. The presentation by IGC over many months has been competent and the reassurances are there, without his amendments. The document continues:

Why the Liquor Licensing Commission?

1. Licensing Act. The commission has the role of administering the Liquor Licensing Act. The commission approves all management/directors. The Liquor Licensing Act controls the activities of all licensed premises, their management and owners.

One would not think so, considering the amendments that are to be moved. It continues:

The Liquor Licensing Commission approves all licensed venues and maintains extensive records on activities relating to the operation of those premises. The Liquor Licensing Commission is responsible for the collection and reconciliation of State liquor licensing fees.

2. Casino Act. The Liquor Licensing Commission administers the Casino Act on behalf of the Casino Supervisory Authority. The monitoring and security arrangements are the most stringent in Australia.

Further, it states:

No other Government agency or department has this extensive experience in licensed premises or electronic gaming.

Members may be sceptical and say that that information was put out by the IGC. Obviously it would want that statement put out. The cynics would question it, but no-one has yet questioned any of that information. There has been ample opportunity, but no-one has questioned it. A paragraph from Facts Sheet No. 2 states:

The Gaming Machine Bill recognises the need for strong Government control, yet allows individual hotels and clubs to make legitimate business decisions relating to marketing, training and machine choice, etc., that affect their viability. Those business decisions are influenced and controlled by the Liquor Licensing Commission. The HHIA and LCA support this approach because it recognises that private enterprise is best placed to make the business decisions that will ensure the profitability of gaming machines whilst not compromising the security and safeguards demanded by the community.

I have spent hours reading the material that has come to me. I have no reason to doubt for one second the validity and the assurances in it, nor do I have any reason to doubt the assurances that have been given by the Minister in his contributions thus far in this debate. I do not believe we need to go down the track suggested by the member for Hartley in these amendments and I do not believe that we need to get the Lotteries Commission involved in any way. We do not need the duplication that that could bring about. I urge members to reject the amendments and to let the IGC and the Liquor Licensing Commission, working in tandem, administer this legislation.

**Mr FERGUSON:** I do not support the amendments, but my reasons for doing so do not relate to any criticism of the Lotteries Commission because I have no criticism of it. I have listened very carefully to other members and their complaints about the Lotteries Commission, but we are in the game of politics and there has been nothing more political than this Bill. As far as I am concerned, all tactics on all sides are fair, and I will make my decision irrespective of the pressures that are applied to me.

I took the opportunity to look at the industry in New South Wales and, as I said in my second reading speech, my motivation in voting for this Bill is not the taxation that the Government will get out of it, nor is it necessarily the profits that the hotels will get out of it. I am supporting it for the amenities that the clubs will provide, particularly in working class areas. I have seen the benefits that this form of gambling has provided to people in working class areas, but I will not go through those benefits again. I agree with the previous speaker. I have seen the Southern Cross Club in the ACT, which I believe is the best club in Australia. It is a branch of the Roman Catholic Church. I do not think there is any secret in that.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr FERGUSON:** Even though this is causing great laughter, I must say the church's connection with the Southern Cross Club in the ACT is no different from its connection with the Casino, as has been pointed out in this debate. I cannot understand the humour in that. The facilities that that club has provided for the people of Canberra are nothing short of wonderful. Those working class people are enjoying the same facilities that members of the Adelaide Club enjoy. It is the day-to-day decisions that are made by

the management of those clubs on behalf of the members that makes them successful.

They are the people who own the premises, who provide the rents and who pay the taxes. They are the people who get all the facilities and who run the place. If they did not have a say in the day-to-day running of those organisations, they would be open to bankruptcy and failure. This is the problem that I see if we allow an organisation other than Independent Gaming Corporation Limited to conduct the day to day running of those organisations.

It is not easy to run one of these clubs. I heard the suggestion during the debate that these poker machines will last for five years. Poker machines in New South Wales last nowhere near five years: they last for something like three years, and the reason for that is not the technology or that they become worn out, but that there is a management decision to move in a new gaming machine in order to keep people interested so they will continue coming to the club. Those decisions must be made on a day by day, year by year basis, and whether a new machine is to be installed, what gaming device it is, and everything else, is a decision that should be made in the first place by club members, who then take the matter to their managements. Those managements would then have the opportunity to take the matter to the Independent Gaming Corporation Limited, concerning which they have an interest—it belongs to them. That is the reason that I cannot support this amendment.

The reason for moving the amendment—and as far as I can see it is the only reason—is that there will be bribery and corruption if we do not agree that the Lotteries Commission is to be involved. No evidence has been tendered to this place as to why there will be bribery and corruption. We have been told about something that has happened overseas. I cannot see any logical reason why what has happened in America will automatically be transferred to Australia—I just cannot see it. If I am to support the amendment, I want to know how the bribery and corruption will occur, because anyone who has seen these machines working and who has had the opportunity to see the electronic surveillance that takes place knows that there is no way that the integrity of these machines can be interfered with.

There was a very vague suggestion from the member for Bright, when he was trying to convince this House that we ought to have a select committee, that software can be changed in the machine and, with that software, some skimming, bribery and corruption can take place. However, if one sees these machines operating, one knows that immediately the machine is opened it registers with the central organisation that opens it, and a question is immediately raised as to why that machine has been opened. Whoever is trying to fiddle the system must get over that particular problem straight away. If they get the machine opened and put a screwdriver in it to take out the chip to replace it with this software, the machine immediately alarms central control that somebody is fiddling with the computer chip; central control immediately telephones the police, and there is a police inquiry straight away.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** And the machine shuts down.

**Mr FERGUSON:** And the machine shuts itself down, and there are other safety measures as well. If someone can explain to me how the integrity of these machines can be interfered with, with the Lotteries Commission taking over, I might be able to vote for the amendment. As a person who has come from the union movement, I resent the suggestion that there will be corruption and bribery in the Liquor Trades Union. There is absolutely no evidence of that. It was part and parcel of the proposition which was



put to us that bribery would be involved in the Liquor Trades Union—

*Mr Groom interjecting:*

**Mr FERGUSON:** Perhaps you will be able to tell me when you have the right of reply. The proposition that I heard was that there could be a possibility of bribery and corruption in the Liquor Trades Union. The integrity of that organisation has been called into question when there is not one shred of evidence to back it up.

Suggestions were also made, concerning elections for the Independent Gaming Corporation Limited, that huge amounts of money would be spent on trying to get up offices in that organisation but, again, there is absolutely no evidence to back that up. That is just a smokescreen by the mover of the amendment to try to score a point. If there is a way that the mover could suggest to me that that could happen, he would have a better argument. However, merely to say that this is what might happen is something I am afraid I cannot accept.

I did harbour some resentment when the member for Hartley indicated in the newspapers that he was moving an amendment and that his amendment was the way that we would stop bribery and corruption. I resent the fact that he believes that he is the only one who is concerned with bribery and corruption in this Parliament. That was the indication in the article appearing in the *Advertiser*, and it has not been denied by the member for Hartley that his amendments would save this Bill and stop bribery and corruption in South Australia. That casts a slur on anyone who had anything to do with drafting this Bill. All the speakers so far have suggested that it would be difficult for anyone to become involved in bribery and corruption with the Liquor Licensing Commissioner having overall control. I cannot support the amendment.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** This debate just shows that truth is stranger than fiction. I am delighted to see that the member for Hartley and the Premier have made up after a difficult period. One could be forgiven for thinking that the Premier did not attend the Cabinet meeting in which the Bill was discussed and approved. He suddenly had a change of heart, and I wonder why. Nothing has changed from the amendment that the Minister of Finance—

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** What nonsense is that?

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Obviously, the Premier was part of the Cabinet that actually approved the legislation put forward by the Minister of Finance. The premier no doubt studied the Bill in detail—

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Where have you been?

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** The Premier is asking, 'Where have I been?' I am fascinated by his apparent change of heart. I am delighted that he has participated in the debate. I raise the issue of lotteries because I know my colleague the member for Bragg has given a very coherent outline of the problems faced by clubs and hotels regarding Club Keno. I believe that those difficulties extend into the lottery licence system. As we are all aware, the Lotteries Commission is demanding larger and larger fees for its services. Someone recently wrote to me saying that in the change of a business a certain percentage was being applied by the Lotteries Commission for the right to continue to conduct the lottery service within the establishment that he was buying. In effect, the first year's profits would be non-existent, because the Lotteries Commission was going to cream the lot.

It is not just Club Keno; it is across the board. The Lotteries Commission has no understanding of the people who play a key part in the system. It believes that it is some sort of taxation agency—an agency that is perceived by some to be undertaking an appropriate task by providing

moneys for hospitals. For the customers, the people dealing with the Lotteries Commission, the people who have Club Keno and lottery licences, it is not a fair system. It has not improved and there are rorts in the system. I understand that a Bill on that subject will be introduced during this session.

The Lotteries Commission has not endeared itself to the people with whom it is dealing—the people who I believe are fair judges of how well it can operate an electronic system. I do not need to tell the Committee what is wrong with the electronic system. Club Keno, as I mentioned earlier, is the simplest form of lottery of which we can think, yet the Lotteries Commission cannot even control that. Therefore, what hope has it of controlling something far more sophisticated like poker and video gaming machines which would come into clubs and hotels in South Australia if this proposition were eventually accepted?

I would comment on the lobby that has been mentioned several times during the debates, including the debate on this amendment. There is a supposition on the part of the mover of the amendment that the Lotteries Commission somehow deserves to be rewarded for its efforts. Other members have pointed out that the commission has been playing dirty pool. Of course it has been playing dirty pool, because the stakes are high. I can only assume that some people who support the Lotteries Commission also support the obvious advantages that will be enjoyed by Messrs Mick Young and Kevin Tinson should the Lotteries Commission be successful.

Confidence in the system is vital. My confidence has been tested somewhat by the events of recent days. I know that what I saw I liked. I have confidence in the individuals involved—not the lobbyists—and their integrity. I believe that they have the capacity to make it work, and importantly they will make it work for the industry, not for their own self aggrandisement, as is the case with the people who are involved in the Lotteries Commission. The people to whom I have referred would have the industry at heart. They would understand that certain people cannot afford and would not want these gaming machines. Obviously some advice would be provided to the industry, unlike the situation that would prevail if the mindless Lotteries Commission were in charge of the system.

Despite recent events, I profoundly believe that the private sector, in the form of an Independent Gaming Corporation—or it may have to go by another name, because this has not gone particularly well—is the right way to go. I said that during my second reading contribution and I confirm it during consideration of this amendment. I am wholeheartedly opposed to the Lotteries Commission controlling just about anything, let alone sophisticated poker and video gaming machines.

**Mr GROOM:** I want to make a couple of remarks at this point. If we are looking for a Government agency to hold the monitor's licence, the Lotteries Commission is the most appropriate Government agency and is an agency that is capable of doing the job. I said in my second reading contribution that from my own information gleaned from the industry—from the clubs and hotels—it is quite clear that the Lotteries Commission has to lift its game in its relationship with the clubs and hotels, and I place that once again on record. However, let us look at the structure that is being proposed. The structure that is being proposed is for the Independent Gaming Corporation to hold the monitor's licence which authorises the licensee to provide and operate an approved computer system for monitoring the operation of all gaming machines operated pursuant to gaming machine licences issued under this legislation. This is

absolutely essential and vital to this legislation—absolutely fundamental to security and the system. That is tier one.

Tier two is that the Independent Gaming Corporation also holds the dealer's licence, and the legislation provides that, subject to the Act and the conditions of the licence, a gaming machine dealer's licence authorises the licensee to manufacture gaming machines and prescribed gaming machine components and to sell, supply or install approved gaming machines, prescribed gaming machine components and gaming equipment. This is another tier of involvement. In addition to that, the constituency of the Independent Gaming Corporation can hold gaming machine licences. That is the classic recipe of vertical and horizontal control. It is not at arm's length. It is classic to have all these tiers under the control of the Independent Gaming Authority, but one just does not structure things in this way.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** Well, it is both. We can say it is vertical if we like; it depends how we want to set it out. The fact of the matter is that it is complete control. Members cannot ignore that; no matter how we paint the argument and no matter how we put the political position, we cannot ignore the Police Commissioner's point of view that this is the classic recipe through which organised crime is able to infiltrate. I stress that the Police Commissioner's report states that it does not matter how good our office holders are, and I know the office holders of the Licensed Clubs and Hotels Association and that they are all people of integrity, but they may not always be there. The Police Commissioner said in his report—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** I will explain why. The Police Commissioner said that the Australian experience, particularly in New South Wales, is the same, but it is extended with examples of high public office holders being corrupted. One does not set up such a structure; it is not at arm's length. One does not set up a structure that accelerates the risk of corruption and the risk of high public office holders being corrupted. As a matter of preference (and I indicated that in my second reading contribution), I come down on the point of view that these things ought to be segmented out because of the views expressed by the Commissioner of Police. One separates the functions, one closes the door or, at the very least, one minimises the risk of organised crime infiltrating in the poker machines area.

We should not kid ourselves that this will not be a multi-million dollar industry. I think the member for Henley Beach ought to listen to my remarks and read the papers more carefully. I have never said that I had the sole answers as to how to keep organised crime out of this industry. In fact, what I said to the newspapers was that I do not think the Bill has adequate checks and balances. That is highlighted by the fact that there are amendments on file to improve the checks and balances, in other words, to minimise the risk of organised crime infiltrating. The Police Commissioner says throughout his report that gambling and organised crime are linked. Again, I refute the assertion of the member for Henley Beach when he said that I made some suggestion of corruption and bribery in the Liquor Trades Union. I said nothing of the sort. What I said was that those organisations will become targets, whether they are—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** The honourable member can stretch it and put whatever construction on it he likes because, in raising that issue, that is obviously uppermost in his mind, because he knows that it is a genuine fear. They will become targets of organised crime, and whether or not they are successful

depends on the checks and balances placed in the legislation by this Parliament. As I said in the press, I did not think the original checks and balances in the legislation were adequate, and that is why there are amendments on file.

In the final analysis, as a matter of preference I come down on separating the monitor's licence from the dealer's licence. The Minister of Finance has an amendment on file that would stop the holder of the monitor's licence, if my amendments got up, from holding any other licence under the Act, and I indicate that I would accept that, consistent with the argument that I believe a Government agency should, as a matter of preference, hold the monitor's licence.

You do not design legislation in this way where control is at every level. Self-regulation is fraught with danger, as the Police Commissioner said. I would say to the Committee that I have come down, as a matter of preference, on the side of the input of the Police Commissioner. You just do not design legislation in this way as a matter of preference.

I do not want to see the Independent Gaming Corporation locked out of the industry. I have made the point that it should, it will and, under my amendments, it must hold the dealer's licence. The Minister of Finance said that other people such as the Minister and his wife could apply for a dealer's licence. Although he might be dealt with in his capacity as the Minister, it would not do him any good. In reality, to take the analogy to a more commonsense level, the reason why the IGC in holding the dealer's licence will predominate in this industry and will supply, install and manufacture for the clubs is precisely that it is a joint venture company of the Licensed Hotels and Clubs Association, and it will obviously predominate and be the dominant player, and rightfully so, in relation to this industry.

As a matter of preference—I stress it no higher than that—when it comes down to my public duty as a parliamentarian (never mind any other interests that exist), at the end of the day when I search my conscience and ask myself what is my public duty in relation to the gambling industry and organised crime, I would have to give proper weight to the Police Commissioner's report, because he is close to crime. The Police Commissioner and the Police Department have access to files and materials that we do not have and, as a matter of preference—

*Mr Quirke interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** Do not draw an analogy with Terry Lewis. The member for Playford does not want to draw an analogy between our Commissioner of Police and Terry Lewis in Queensland. That is quite absurd. In terms of our Police Force, despite any problems, we have the best police of any State in Australia, and our Casino is a credit to South Australia as to how it has been run. However, as a matter of preference and conscience, I cannot ignore in my public duty the position put by the Police Commissioner in his report.

As I stressed, the Lotteries Commission has to improve its relationship with the licensed clubs and hotels. I know the difficulties that the licensed clubs and hotels are encountering. They have to lift their game: there is no question of that. But when it comes down to looking for a Government agency consistent with the Police Commissioner's report and those concerns, it is the only agency that is equipped and capable of carrying out this function. In the final analysis, I stress to the Committee that as a matter of preference you do not design legislation in an industry such as this that is notorious for the linkage between gambling and organised crime under which the one organisation holds the monitor's licence, and the dealer's licence, and its constituency holds the gaming machine licence. You do not design legislation that way as a matter of preference.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** Although this is a small amendment, it is really the test case as to whether or not the Lotteries Commission is involved in the exercise, so it takes a little while to debate it, because that is the test before the Committee. There will always be faults, and something will always go wrong whichever organisation has control of an exercise such as this. As an example, last Wednesday night my office was broken into. Security was told that the police inspected my office, an audible alarm was sounding and they were there within eight minutes. By the time the message got to me, I did not worry, because it was too late. I called in at 1.40 in the morning when we finished here. There was a hole in the plate glass window. I do not have an audible alarm in my office as most members have: it is a silent alarm.

The report was that my office was secure, even though files were thrown everywhere and some money was missing—and there was no audible alarm. So, something has gone wrong with the Police Force. There will always be some things going wrong, no matter in what organisation you put your faith. I wrote to the Police Commissioner about that, because I thought it was bad news. The second patrol was all right.

I want to speak a little about the Lotteries Commission as a monitoring organisation in which we are asked to put our faith. Have people ever thought about X-Lotto tickets? When they are slipped into the machine to see whether or not people receive a pay out, there is no display window to show any amount, because other people would see it. I understand that that is for security reasons. But people do not get a slip telling them what their pay out is, because that slip is pinned to the winning ticket and kept as a record by the Lotteries Commission to balance its books.

But if the stated pay out figure is less than the actual pay out figure, and if there is a shonky attendant who wants to keep the balance, we would never know unless we followed the game closely and looked at the numbers to see the sort of win we should receive. Has anyone ever thought of that? Take note of it. Another point relates to scratch tickets. Many elderly people buy them—and I know that one or two of my colleagues think that I am too old and ought to move on, but I can still race them over five kilometres.

The characters on the scratch tickets are changed every few weeks, possibly for security reasons, but it is nearly impossible for a person who does not have excellent eyesight to tell what the symbols are or whether they have a win. A large amount of money is never claimed, but the Lotteries Commission never tries to think why it is not claimed. Winning tickets are lost or thrown away because people think that they are not winners. It would be quite simple to have on the ticket 'Win' or 'Lose' or '\$5' or '\$10' and to change the colour, but they should be in large enough type for people to read them.

Members should try to read the instructions on the back of a scratch ticket. And this is the organisation that is saying to us—apart from the Club Keno argument—'Trust us: we do everything 100 per cent down the line, and there is no chance of anyone missing out.' If private enterprise operated as the Lotteries Commission does with scratch tickets and X-Lotto in the pay out area, it would be in big trouble from Consumer Affairs. I ask members just to think about that. I am a private enterprise person and I know that private enterprise goes wrong at times, but so does the public sector. I will not go through the recent quasi-organisations which are really public and which have gone bad—

**Mr S.J. Baker:** The State Bank.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** I am not going to name them: people know what they are. In the end, we have to trust people.

The important thing is to remember, when considering the structure that the Minister is proposing under this Bill, which we all are dealing with as a conscience vote, is that there must be, in the end, proper supervision. If a future Government finds that there is not, it has the opportunity to change that. It is always in the hands of this Parliament, regardless of who is elected.

The hour is late and I could say more, but I finish by repeating what I said in a recent speech. I received a letter from the union involved which stated that it expected me to make a responsible decision. However, I repeat: if I do not vote the way it wants and vote the way I have said, it will say that that is irresponsible: if I agree with it and vote the way it says, it will say that that is responsible. The inference in the letter was that, if I make a conscious decision and say give private enterprise a chance, that is irresponsible. I think the letter was irresponsible. I will not be supporting the amendment.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** If I have ever heard a set of convincing arguments against gambling and gaming machines, it has been the arguments that have been put forward in support of and in opposition to this amendment. Virtually every speaker has linked the risk of organised crime with gambling of any description, and that risk in itself should, in my opinion, be sufficient to deter anyone from voting in favour of the Bill.

Nevertheless, if the Bill is to pass I want to ensure that the most effective mechanism for control is established. Members may recall that during the second reading debate I acknowledged my dilemma in trying to decide which would be the most effective mechanism for control. Having heard the debate, I must say that I find the arguments of the member for Hartley the most convincing. Many members have been extremely critical of the Lotteries Commission. I can only say that, although I know nothing firsthand from the Lotteries Commission or gaming of any description, I was impressed 18 months ago when I was in Hong Kong and, in conversation with a Director of the Royal Hong Kong Jockey Club, found that in a year the club would turn over almost twice as much as our entire State budget.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** \$5 billion?

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** In the region of \$9 billion. The Hong Kong Chinese are very dedicated gamblers. The Director said that the Lotteries Commission of South Australia was internationally acknowledged as being one of the most effective and efficient such organisations, and he went on to describe the esteem in which it is held by some of the biggest gambling bodies in the world. I was impressed by that. I have not been impressed by the arguments in favour of the Independent Gaming Corporation. Because I intend to vote in favour of the member for Hartley's amendment, I believe it is appropriate to put on the record the reasons why. Having done so, I hope that the Committee supports it.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I want to respond to a couple of the things that have been said, particularly by the Premier and the member for Hartley. You know what they say about fools rushing in; this is a very delicate situation. However, we have been in delicate situations before and have navigated them safely. The Premier said that the public had to have confidence when it was dealing with the question of poker machines. I would have thought that there was no lack of confidence when people walk into the Casino. As far as I know, they do not have any fears about the structure, controls and operations of the Casino.

As I have said *ad nauseam*, that structure is here. That structure is identical to the structure in the Bill, and I was surprised when the member for Hartley said that the structure in the Bill was vertical integration and open sesame to being attacked, etc. It was the member for Hartley who, in this House, piloted through the Casino legislation, so I just cannot understand that, if it was good enough then, why is it not good enough now? It is exactly the same structure; there is no difference.

As I said earlier, if these areas are avenues for corruption, and there is no doubt they are, then the structure of the Casino has to be changed. If this structure is not sufficient for playing around with poker machines, with buckets of 10c pieces and all the fancy electronics that go with it, then it cannot control the Casino, because that is hundreds of thousands of dollars and, on some occasions, millions of dollars per night in cash. So, I would suggest to the member for Hartley and the Premier that there is absolutely no lack of confidence in the Casino.

It is suggested that the Casino is somehow easier to do because it is a single location. It makes absolutely no difference. If one thinks that argument through, one can only come to the conclusion: so what? I will go through the physical structure of what will happen. Obviously the poker machines will be scattered around the place. They will all be electronically linked to a computer located in a building here in the CBD. In that building, the Liquor Licensing Commissioner will say exactly the same words to the operators as he says to the Casino operators: I want this, I want that equipment. I want this room here; I want A, B, C and D—supply it at your expense. My space, my equipment at your expense.

I invite everyone to go to the Casino and see the security system. The Liquor Licensing Commissioner will be doing exactly the same thing. The Liquor Licensing Inspectors will be there in the room with them, if necessary. If the Liquor Licensing Commissioner feels that it is appropriate, he can do that. It is completely unrestricted. It is important that anyone who has not seen the security of the Casino and the way it works should do so. I am sure they would be totally reassured.

The member for Hartley and the Premier said that, under this set of amendments, the IGC have some special status. That is simply incorrect. The member for Hartley keeps referring to the dealer's licence. There is no such thing in the Bill as the dealer's licence. There are any number of dealers' licences. There is no restriction on the number of dealers' licences. There is no single dealer's licence as there is a single monitor's licence. There is only one. There is no single dealer's licence.

To imagine that the IGC or anyone reading these amendments would be the slightest bit fooled to think they have had any special treatment by the member for Hartley is just nonsense in the extreme. People are not stupid; they can read and understand. It is perfectly clear that, if the IGC were not mentioned in this set of amendments, it would have exactly the same rights as it would have with its name in. Please do not keep saying that there has been any special privilege or status afforded to the IGC because that is simply not the case. There is absolutely nothing added to the IGC that it does not have.

Let me make one or two more minor points. Whilst I have had my differences with the Lotteries Commission about the way it has behaved, the reason that I do not support the commission in this instance is not because the clubs and hotels do not like it. I could not care less whether or not the clubs and hotels like the Lotteries Commission. If I thought it was appropriate for the Lotteries Commission to do the job, I would support it, and, if the clubs did not

like it, they could go jump. It does not bother me in the slightest what they think about the Lotteries Commission and that is not the reason that I am opposed to this amendment.

My reason is very clear. Including the Lotteries Commission does not add one iota of security to the proposal. The member for Hartley quoted the Police Commissioner. I could quote him and I did quote him in my second reading reply. I will not go through those quotes again but I recommend that all members read the Police Commissioner's document of 13 February, in which, in effect, he gave to the Minister of Emergency Services his drafting instructions; in other words, what he wanted in the Bill. I invite members to tell me where there is any difference between what appears in the Bill and what the Police Commissioner asked for. Anything else the Police Commissioner said and the ambiguities and contradictions in some of the things he said are for the Police Commissioner to sort out. In this Bill I have given the Police Commissioner everything he asked for. This is a test amendment and I recommend to the Committee that it votes against it to ensure that the industry does what it is entitled to do under the very, very strong, central control of the Government.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (12)—Mr Bannon, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Crafter, De Laine, Eastick, Goldsworthy and Groom (teller), Mrs Hutchison, Messrs McKee, Meier, Peterson and Wotton.

Noes (29)—Messrs Allison, Armitage, L.M.F. Arnold, P.B. Arnold, Atkinson, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, Becker, Blacker, Blevins (teller), Brindal, S.G. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Gunn, Hamilton, Hemmings, Heron, Holloway, Ingerson and Klunder, Mrs Kotz, Messrs Lewis, Oswald, Quirke, Rann, Such, Trainer and Venning.

Majority of 17 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I move:

Page 2, after line 31—Insert new subclause as follows:

(2) For the purposes of this Act, a person occupies a position of authority in a body corporate if—

- (a) he or she is a director of the body corporate;
- (b) he or she exercises or exerts, or is in a position to exercise or exert, control or substantial influence over the body corporate in the conduct of its affairs;
- (c) he or she manages, or is to manage, the undertaking to be carried out in pursuance of a licence;
- (d) where the body corporate is a proprietary company—  
he or she is a shareholder in the body corporate.

My advice is that the definition in this area needs to be more explicit. I believe the amendment does that. It is self-explanatory, and I am sure that it will create no controversy.

**Mr GROOM:** I also support the Minister's amendment. It is exactly one of the checks and balances that I foreshadowed was necessary in this legislation to ensure that organised crime is kept out and minimised. I support the amendment because it widens the situation and is one of those checks and balances that takes us down the path of greater control.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I, too, support it because it is a necessary addition to the Bill.

Amendment carried.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I have a number of questions relating to the definitions, or lack thereof, in the Bill. How will they be catered for? Under the Victorian Act, I notice a definition of 'computer cabinets', and that is not a minor part of the Bill, because we find that, in relation to the sealing of gaming machines, clause 57 provides:

A person other than an authorised officer or the holder of a gaming machine technician's licence must not seal any gaming equipment or the computer cabinet or any other part of a gaming machine or break or in any way interfere with any such seal.

Mention is made of the computer cabinet in the Bill. It happens to be an important part of the whole device. It has been separately identified in the Victorian legislation yet I see no definition in the South Australian legislation.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I am advised by those who assist in drafting legislation that there is no need to include such a definition, as it is readily identifiable. Therefore, the person who assisted in drafting believes that it would be a redundant requirement.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I can only ask that the Minister have a look at that matter while this Bill is between the two Houses, because it happens to be the key to the whole machine and the whole system. It relates to when people interfere with that computer cabinet, and they can do many things that would not necessarily be in the best interests of the players or those who are trying to monitor the system. I presume that we will have a central system, but the Bill contains no clear definition of the electronic monitoring system. Will the Minister explain how that will be catered for?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Again, I will consider that question in the intervening time between the Bill's leaving this House and arriving in the other place.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** The Victorian and Queensland Acts also are more explicit as to where these machines can be placed, and they have definitions of gaming machine areas. A description is contained in the main part of the Bill as to where machines can be put, but again it lacks that definition at the front of the Bill.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I will examine this matter, but my advice is that, because the Liquor Licensing Commissioner is the person responsible in this area within the Liquor Licensing Act itself, there are provisions for the layout of clubs, hotels, what is an appropriate place and what is not, and so on. The people assisting me in drafting this legislation feel that the question is adequately covered, but again I undertake, now that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has raised some queries, to get a fuller response prior to consideration by the other place.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** There are other definitions, 'restricted area' and 'restricted sequence', which I would also ask the Minister to examine, because they are important to the whole functioning of the legislation. For example, the Victorian Act has a meaning of 'associate'. Nowhere in this legislation do we have any reference to anybody who may be related to a licence holder, whereas in the Victorian Act that has been made very explicit. I find it a little perplexing that we have not had this because, as we know, there can be conflicts of interest. I wish to know how these conflicts can be avoided. In the Victorian Act, for example, there is a meaning of 'associate' in section 4 and there are definitions of 'relative' and 'relevant financial interest'. That is very important, as members will recognise. It also has definitions of 'relevant position' and 'relevant power'. How does the Minister intend to deal with those in this legislation?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Ours is broader than anything that has been stated. We are guided very much by the Commissioner of Police. In practice, the Commissioner of Police roams far and wide checking antecedents and so on. The system has been tested by people who wished to do wrong in the Casino and they have never got past the Commissioner of Police.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** My only defence in the circumstances, being well aware of what the Casino system provides, is that we are now expanding the system to include literally thousands of people from varying walks of life and with varying degrees of diligence. Of course, some will be dishonest and others will not play the game. Therefore, it is important that we make the legislation as tight as possible.

Clause as amended passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 11.9 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 31 March at 2 p.m.