

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.**

Wednesday, September 5, 1951.

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. Sir Robert Nicholls) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

**SUPERANNUATION PAYMENTS.**

Mr. **MACGILLIVRAY**—Has the Leader of the Government a reply to my recent question regarding the possibility of increasing payments made under the Superannuation Act?

The Hon. C. S. **HINCKS**—I regret that I have been unable to get the desired information. I will endeavour to do so and let the honourable member have it as soon as possible.

**POTATO SUPPLIES.**

Mr. **DUNKS**—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question regarding future supplies of potatoes in South Australia?

The Hon. Sir **GEORGE JENKINS**—The reports I have indicate that a ship commenced loading potatoes in Tasmania about September 1. It is expected that that ship will arrive here with 15,000 bags of potatoes about September 10 to 12. The chairman of the Potato Board reports that no further ships are available up to the present, but efforts will be made to secure a further consignment of potatoes from Tasmania. The first potatoes from Western Australia are unlikely to reach this State until the third or fourth week in October.

**MOUNT BARKER SOLDIERS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL.**

Mr. **SHANNON**—At present the very large subsidized Soldiers Memorial Hospital at Mount Barker is in the throes of trying to add an additional obstetric wing. I understand the Government has offered a pound for pound subsidy towards the cost of the wing, which, I believe, is the usual practice in making grants to subsidized hospitals, although I know of exceptions. Rising costs have made it almost impossible for the members of the local community to raise their moiety of the costs on a pound for pound basis. As this is one of the major hospitals within a 20 miles' radius of Adelaide and serves a large area with a large population, it is important that its maternity service be at least brought up to date. Will the Acting Leader of the Government take up with the Minister of Health the possibility of making this case also an exception by making the subsidy £2 for every £1 raised by the local community?

The Hon. C. S. **HINCKS**—I shall be pleased to take up the matter with the Minister of Health, although I point out that the two-to-one basis for the subsidy is unusual.

**RACING OFFENCES.**

Mr. **FRED WALSH**—In recent months, particularly in the last few weeks, there have been several horse-racing offences, including the doping of race horses, and culminating in the use of a battery at the Eudunda meeting last Wednesday. As the result of an inquiry by the racing authorities concerned, the principal person involved in the battery case has been disqualified for life. This disqualification actually means little to him because he did not get many mounts and is not a native of this State. In cases where doping and batteries are used to affect the stamina and speed of race horses other persons concerned in these offences usually escape scot-free because the racing authorities have no way of getting at them, and even if they had, those persons could only be disqualified for a certain period. The rule under which the recent battery case was dealt with reads as follows:—

174. The committee of any club or the stewards may punish—

(a) Any person who, in their opinion, has been guilty of any dishonest, corrupt, fraudulent or improper practice or any dishonourable action in connection with racing.

(b) Any person who at any time administers or causes to be administered for the purpose of affecting the speed, stamina, courage or conduct of a horse in any race any drug or stimulant whatever, except by permission of the stewards and subject to such conditions as they may impose, or who uses any electric or galvanic apparatus or other improper contrivance or means.

I consider that such a charge is most serious and should be dealt with by some persons other than the committees associated with racing clubs. The only way of cleaning up the racing game in this State to any extent is by the police taking action to prosecute the people behind the scenes. Will the Acting Leader of the Government ascertain if it is the intention of the Police Department to investigate, with a view to prosecution, irrespective of the decisions of the racing authorities, all allegations of fraudulent practices on racecourses by the use of drugs and batteries on race horses with the object of securing certain results?

The Hon. C. S. **HINCKS**—I agree that it is a deplorable practice and that some drastic action must be taken. On the evidence tendered I would say that part of the penalty would be passed on to the culprits. I shall be happy to take up the matter with the Chief Secretary with a view to having the position examined.

### MILK AND CREAM PRICES.

Mr. MOIR—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked yesterday about milk and cream prices?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—I referred the question to the chairman of the Metropolitan Milk Board, who reports that up to the present the board has received no request from any section of the industry and is therefore not considering the matter of any increase in the price of milk and cream.

### WHYALLA WEST PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. RICHES—The shortage of accommodation at the Whyalla South school has become so acute that the residents are anxious for an early start on the Whyalla West primary school which, I understand, has been favourably reported upon by the Public Works Committee. I have been informed that building materials are available, with the possible exception of flooring, and that contractors are ready to submit tenders for the work. I have been asked if the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Education, will obtain a report from the department on when it is expected that tenders will be called, and use his best endeavours to speed up the construction of the Whyalla West school?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The speeding up of the erection of one school, as compared with that of another, is obviously a matter of policy, particularly the policy of the Education Department, but I will obtain a report on when the department is expected to be in a position to call for tenders, and if the House is not sitting when I receive it I will forward it to the honourable member by letter. I point out that it has never been the want of plans or funds that has held up these works; in 99 per cent of the cases it has been the absence of materials. It is in most cases only a matter of robbing Peter to pay Paul to give one school priority over another.

### QUERIES ON LOAN ESTIMATES.

Mr. CHRISTIAN—Has the Minister of Works replies to the questions I put yesterday about various items on the Loan Estimates?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Those queries have been followed up. To give the information fully in *Hansard* would take up a great deal of space. I gave replies to the honourable member's questions on railway matters. I have the full replies as regards the other questions and I suggest that, now that the

Loan Estimates have gone through, I make them available to him, or send them to him in an epitomized form, and perhaps they can be incorporated in *Hansard* at the next day of sitting.

### POLIOMYELITIS: TREATMENT OF PARALYSED PERSONS.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Yesterday I asked a question in regard to the treatment of and facilities for poliomyelitis patients. Has the Minister of Lands any further information to give?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have received the following report:—

In the first instance, bathing facilities are adequate for toilet requirements. Those patients unfit by virtue of weakness or paralysis to go to the bath are blanket bathed in the usual manner. Therapeutic bathing or immersion baths are not considered to be part of the treatment for poliomyelitis by the doctors concerned and this opinion is indorsed by the State Advisory Committee for Poliomyelitis. No volunteers are needed to exhibit immersion treatment since this treatment is not ordered because of the reasons given above. If a paralysed patient requires to be moved from his bed, for example, for physiotherapy, he is placed on a special wheeled barouche, provided for that purpose. Heat treatment prescribed by the doctors is given electrically, viz., infra-red ray. The hot water system in each ward is fired by coke which is of inferior quality. This inferior coke is all but consumed; the boilers require more frequent stoking with this quality coke; nevertheless, I am assured that no hardships have been suffered by patients on this or any other account.

### SALE OF SCHOOL PROPERTIES.

Mr. MOIR—I ask the Minister representing the Minister of Education whether it is the intention of the Government to dispose of school properties which have been closed during the past two years. If so will the person next door be given first preference in purchasing?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—That is such a vague question that it is impossible to answer it specifically, but generally speaking the Government calls tenders if it disposes of any properties. The mere fact of being adjacent to a school does not give any priority in its allotment. If the honourable member will give me details of the inquirer and of the building he has in mind I can perhaps take the matter a stage further. Generally speaking, it is not and never has been the intention of the Government to dispose of properties, but

rather to acquire them. In the odd cases where we dispose of properties it is done by public auction or tender.

#### ADJOURNMENT FOR ROYAL SHOW.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Minister of Lands) moved—

That the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday, September 18, at 2 p.m., on account of the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society's Show.

Motion carried.

#### CONSTITUTION AND ELECTORAL ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. O'HALLORAN, having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act, 1934-1950, and the Electoral Act, 1929-1950. Read a first time.

#### INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL No. 2.

Second reading.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Frome—Leader of the Opposition)—Last week members had before them a Bill to amend the Industrial Code, which introduced some new and desirable principles to this legislation. I now have pleasure in presenting further desirable amendments to the Code. The purpose of my Bill is twofold; it seeks to give rural workers the right to approach the Industrial Court for the determination of their wages and conditions of employment and to reduce the number of employees required in any industry for registration in the Industrial Court. The first of these two reforms is of far greater significance than the second. It represents the correction of an injustice which has been imposed on rural workers from time immemorial. At present the Industrial Code, perpetuating that injustice, expressly excludes such workers from participating in the rights and privileges which are enjoyed by all other workers. This is in itself an argument in support of the proposal to grant rural workers those rights and privileges. There is no real reason why all workers should not be employed under similar industrial conditions. From time to time Labor members have endeavoured to achieve this desirable reform by introducing legislation to amend the Industrial Code, but on every occasion our efforts have been in vain because of opposition by an L.C.L. Government. I believe its excuse—it cannot be called a reason—has always been

that primary producers could not pay standard wages to their employees because they had to accept whatever price they could get for their produce and because they had no control over certain items of expenditure of overseas origin.

To the extent that the argument used has been *bona fide*, we may interpret it to mean that primary producers could not guarantee a living wage to their employees as they themselves had not a guaranteed price for their products. But while this argument may have been valid—in a purely economic sense—in the past, it certainly cannot be regarded as being valid now. During the last 10 years or so the wisdom of Labor's policy of orderly marketing and stabilization has been recognized, not only in Australia, but throughout the civilized world. The haphazard conditions which used to exist cannot be said to exist today. The fact is that producers are, within certain limits, now guaranteed a price for their produce, based on cost of production, and wages and conditions of employment are merely ingredients in that cost. I need hardly stress the depths to which our primary industries have descended during the last few years because of the Government's failure to recognize the necessity for placing rural employment on a fair and equitable basis. Production of all forms of primary industry has decreased, and the decrease is tragic and alarming. We are being informed by all authorities that unless something is done to repair the damage Australia will soon become an importer of foodstuffs. The shortage of butter, which has been a prominent feature of our everyday lives for some weeks now is no mere temporary shortage; it is an expression of the fact that production is not keeping pace with the additional demand arising from the rapid increase in our population and our export commitments. It is essential that we increase our production of all forms of foodstuffs, whereas, in fact, production is declining, and declining rapidly. Not only must we increase the production of all forms of foodstuffs for our own consumption, but we must increase production in the interests of the survival of the free countries of the world, with whom we are associated. We must play our part in the export market in order to feed the teeming millions of people in underprivileged countries where hunger is driving them towards ideologies in which we do not believe, and which we hope will never be established permanently in our civilized world.

Parallel with the decline in food production the country to the metropolitan area. I quote is the accelerated drift of population from figures indicating the drift:—

*Distribution of Population of South Australia.*

Year.	State Total.	Metropolitan area.		Country.		Metro- politan.	Increase.		Ratio.
		Popu- lation.	Per cent of total.	Popu- lation.	Per cent of total.		Coun- try.		
1920 . . .	491,000	253,000	51.64	238,000	48.36	—	—	—	
1935 . . .	586,000	315,000	53.68	271,000	46.32	62,000	33,000	2/1	
1949 . . .	687,000	407,000	59.17	280,000	40.83	92,000	9,000	10/1	

This discloses an alarming state of affairs and should receive the immediate attention of Parliament. Figures show that there has been a decrease in the number of persons engaged in main primary industries, principals and employees. The last year for which I was able to get figures was 1947, the census year. I would have preferred later figures, say for 1949. In 1921 the number of persons engaged in main primary industries was 47,755; by 1933 it had increased by 5,369 to 53,124. By 1947 the number had decreased by 8,824 to 44,300. The number of land holdings in 1935 was 31,123; by 1948 it had decreased by 3,526 to 27,597.

It may be argued that this reduction took place during the operation of a scheme designed to remove people from marginal areas where their holdings were either too small or unsuitable for the production of a family livelihood. However, while that desirable scheme operated the Government made no effort to re-establish those people who had to be moved from marginal lands to some other part of the State where conditions were more conducive to successful settlement on the land. The result has been that not only those persons but their progeny have been lost to primary production because there has been passed on to them their parents' bitter experience which will live in the memories of succeeding generations.

One of the chief reasons for the reduction in the number of persons employed in primary industries, and the consequent reduction in production, is the lack of the very thing which this Bill seeks to provide, the right of rural workers to have their wages and conditions of employment determined by an industrial tribunal. I do not say that this is the whole solution of the problem of production. There are other factors, such as the lack of ordinary modern amenities which would have been available to rural workers long ago if a thorough policy of decentralization had been pursued by the Government throughout the decades in which it has wielded political power

in this State. If such a policy had been followed rural centres of sufficient magnitude would have been built up to make the provision of amenities possible; but the policy of the Government has been the very opposite. It has apparently aimed to attract employees to the metropolitan area, thereby increasing the problems of that area as well as the problems of the country and, incidentally, creating a situation under which primary producers are unable to carry on without themselves working long hours and enduring other hardships, which should never have been necessary. Now we find the Premier anxious to take amenities to the country to serve sparsely populated areas. They are sparsely populated because of his Government's policy; and one is tempted to conclude that he does not care how overcrowded the metropolitan area becomes so long as he succeeds in removing from the country areas any threat there may be to the maintenance of the Liberal and Country League representation in Parliament. In the process, of course, working class families are leaving the country, and land is being re-aggregated because there is insufficient labour to work it, with consequent reduction in production.

As a result of this policy of denying decent working conditions to rural workers, landholders, especially in the dairying industry, are being compelled to carry on without assistance, relying entirely on members of the family (when they can be prevailed upon to remain) and a great number of these producers are beginning to give up hope and are abandoning their properties. The solution of their problem is essentially the encouragement of labour to go back to primary industries; and the only way that can be done is to give rural workers wages and hours of work comparable to those obtaining in other industries. In this regard, I point out that the Government of Victoria has already realized the need and obligation to adopt this reform in an endeavour to rehabilitate its own primary industries. Last year an Act was passed amending the Factories and Shops Act, which corresponds

to our Industrial Code, to remove the old provision excluding rural workers from the benefits of an industrial award. Under the provisions of that amendment the first wages board set up—for the dairying industry—has recently issued an award for dairy farm workers. The details of this award were published in the *Advertiser* on August 17. Among other things, it provided for the following rates of pay:—Adult general hand (male) £10 9s. per week, female £7 16s. 6d.; employee in charge of three or more other employees (male) £10 18s., (female) £8 3s. 6d.; male juniors (16 to 21 years) £4 14s. 6d. to £8 19s. 6d., female £3 10s. 6d. to £6 14s. 6d.. If the employee receives board, deductions of £2 for adult males, £1 12s. 6d. for adult females and junior males, and £1 7s. 6d. for junior females are made from the wages mentioned. In addition, the award provides for double time for public holidays, a fortnight's annual leave, six days' sick leave a year, an allowance of 3s. per week for protective clothing, a 40-hour week, and 10 per cent premium for casual labour.

I understand that the parties concerned are now taking steps to bring five other classes of rural workers under similar awards through the creation of the appropriate wages boards provided for by the amending legislation referred to. I also point out, incidentally, that this legislation passed both Houses of the Victorian Parliament without a division, although the matter was debated at length. Some members who feel disposed to vote against this Bill may attempt to justify their action by saying that, although a Country Party Government was responsible for amending the law in Victoria so as to make this award possible, its action was dictated by the Labor Party. However the Victorian Liberal and Country Party, as I believe it is called, offered no opposition to this measure. In fact, the Liberal and Country Party, when in office under the Hon. T. T. Hollway as Premier, placed an item in the Governor's Speech indicating its intention to amend the law along the lines subsequently adopted by the Country Party Government. There was considerable debate on the measure, but no division at any important stage. Apparently there was no difference amongst the respective members of Parliament or Parties on the wisdom of introducing this principle. The only division on the Bill in the House of Assembly was on the question whether employee representation on the wages board should be restricted to members of the Australian Workers' Union. The amendment,

strange to say, was moved by a Liberal member and although it had general acceptance by members because the A.W.U., not only in this State but in all other States, is the organization which covers this type of worker, it was felt that the specific prohibition should not be included in the legislation, although the Minister said it was obvious that under the present conditions the A.W.U. representatives would be those appointed because they would represent the only organized body of rural workers. That was not an attack on the principle of the Bill; as a matter of fact, it was something which came rather peculiarly from members of the Liberal and Country Party, at least in regard to representation on wages boards, namely, preference to unionists.

Mr. Riches—How did the measure fare in the Upper House?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—It passed, and is now the law of the land. The brief extract I read from the first award of the wages board is the law except that there is provision for appeal. The employers have appealed to the proper authority constituted under the Act against some of the determinations of the board and the appeal is being heard at present. Whatever the result, there will undoubtedly remain in Victoria a legal standard of wages and working conditions for those employed in the dairying industry. Steps are being taken to create five other wages boards to deal with various other types of primary industries. Members supporting the Government here cannot lightly disregard these facts. They cannot at the call of the Premier or the Government, blindly vote against this provision, for it is the accepted policy of their confreres in another State. If legal standards of employment and working conditions are established in Victoria what effect will that have on rural labour in South Australia, particularly in the South-East, if we do not establish similar standards here? We would have the spectacle of that small quota of rural labour left in the South-East migrating to Victoria to participate in the just conditions of employment established in that State. The result might easily be a considerable worsening of the already bad conditions existing in rural industries in South Australia, especially in the South-East.

Mr. Brookman—Not many would migrate for £9 9s. a week.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—The minimum for male labour is £10 9s. a week.

Mr. Brookman—I don't think the South-East would lose many workers.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I wish I shared the honourable member's optimism. Of course, there is always a tendency for people like the member for Alexandra to view present conditions as permanent. I realize that at present the wages of rural workers are adequately protected by the law of supply and demand. Probably rural workers in this State are today enjoying at least the same standard as workers in metropolitan industries, in some cases perhaps a little higher; nevertheless I recall the time when they had no standard at all and were carrying their swags throughout the country looking for work, and good men had to accept employment at 5s. a week and their keep.

The Hon. Sir George Jenkins—At that period the producers themselves had a very low standard.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I admitted that in my early remarks. The primary producers had no guaranteed price for their products and no attempt was made to provide them with a profitable return for the great wealth they produced to feed the people of this country and other parts of the world. I and my Party have fought down through the ages for the stabilization of the prices of primary products so that the primary producer would at all times receive a payable price for his production. In return for that support my Party is entitled to ask that employees in primary production be similarly treated. I shall refer to a decision of the conference of the International Labour Office recently held at Geneva. The International Labour Office is an organization constituted in association with the old League of Nations and is one of the few useful organizations connected with that body which have survived. The purpose of the organization, which is subscribed to by all the free countries of the world, including Australia, is to hold periodical conferences and consider the conditions of labour throughout the member countries and also the position in non-member countries where workers are oppressed. In considering conditions in member countries the organization examines the legal standards and protection afforded the workers and their opportunities of getting just and peaceful redress for their grievances. In the non-member countries there is a continual urge for the power and might of the free nations to be used to lift the standard of living and spread education so as to lay the only permanent basis for

enduring and peaceful conditions to be established throughout the world. At the last gathering of the International Labour Office a former member of this House, Mr. Shard, who is secretary of the United Trades and Labour Council of this State, was one of the Australian delegates representing the workers of this country. On his return he made the following statement which appeared in the *Advertiser* on August 21:—

A decision of the International Labour Office to call on member Governments to set up wage-fixing tribunals for agricultural workers is of particular importance to South Australia. If the State Government gives effect to the decision, it will be most beneficial to employees in the agricultural areas of this State, where no such tribunals exist at present. I commend that report to members because it comes from an authoritative source, one which, I suggest, we should give even more attention than we are giving today. The extension of the provisions of the Industrial Code in this State to rural workers is justified, not only on the grounds of expediency—as a means of restoring our primary industries—but also on humanitarian grounds. Rural workers have a moral right to the benefits and amenities which the community has pronounced as basic for all other classes of workers.

The second amendment in the Bill provides for the reduction of the number of employees required for registration with the Industrial Court from 20 to 10. Twenty has been found to be too many in some instances. There may be 20 or more employees in the same type of industry, but they may be scattered over a wide area of the State, rendering organization and contact difficult. Several years ago there was a case in which union officials had succeeded in securing 20 employees in the typewriter industry. Their case was before the court when one member died, and it had to be withdrawn owing to the present provision in the Code. My proposal to reduce the number from 20 to 10 is eminently fair and can only apply to certain specialist industries, but the people engaged in them ought to be able to secure the protection afforded by our industrial law in the same way as those engaged in the more numerous industries; in fact, their claim is even greater. I particularly commend this amendment of the Code to members.

In conclusion, I urge members not to lightly brush the Bill aside. Last Monday I had the pleasure of hearing the Prime Minister open the annual convention of the South Australian Agricultural Bureau movement. He claimed, in most eloquent terms, that more should be

done in regard to rural production in Australia. He even said that people should be directed into rural production and added that he, like many others, feared the consequences of our failure to recognize the right to produce foodstuffs in a world where the spectre of hunger was being increased because production was not keeping pace with population. In this morning's press the South Australian Director of Agriculture, Dr. Callaghan, put forward a five-point programme to increase food production in South Australia. Amongst other things he spoke of amenities required for rural workers. The first amenity which should be provided for them is the protection of the law in relation to establishing and maintaining their wages and working conditions which is afforded to all other types of employees engaged in industry in this State. I move the second reading.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS secured the adjournment of the debate.

**BETTING CONTROL BOARD RULE:  
MINIMUM BET.**

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Tapping—

That paragraph II. of the amendments of rules of the Betting Control Board made under the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1949, on November 30, 1950, and laid on the table of this House on June 27, 1951, be disallowed.

(Continued from August 29. Page 483.)

Mr. WHITTLE (Prospect)—I suppose most members will be surprised at my speaking on a matter affecting betting, for probably not one has less personal knowledge of betting than I have. It is because Mr. Anthony, chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, was in England at the time the rule came before it for consideration and I was therefore the acting chairman that I rise to speak. I oppose the motion. The Subordinate Legislation Committee was appointed for the specific purpose of analysing all regulations and any by-laws affecting councils which would ordinarily be laid on the table of the House, and the committee decided, after hearing evidence, that no steps should be taken to disallow the rule.

Mr. Stephens—Did it make inquiries as to what it meant?

Mr. WHITTLE—Yes. It was felt that the Betting Control Board's suggestion that 1s. bets be eliminated and a minimum of 2s. substituted was justified on the evidence. The board is not waiting until Parliament votes on this motion before it puts the rule into force.

Mr. Stephens—It is in operation now.

Mr. WHITTLE—A regulation is different from a council by-law and operates from the time it is first presented. The abolition of a minimum bet of 1s. has been in operation since early last December. If the motion is carried we will, instead of breaking new ground, be back where we were prior to it. The secretary to the Betting Control Board, Mr. Alexander, presented reasons to the committee for the alteration to the rule. After both Houses agreed to the winnings tax legislation its administration was placed in the hands of the Betting Control Board.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Will there be any amendment to that legislation?

Mr. WHITTLE—I do not know, but I know that the honourable member and most members of the Opposition were opposed to the winnings tax.

Mr. Frank Walsh—No; I opposed the amount of the investment being taxed.

Mr. WHITTLE—The rule is largely the outcome of the legislation passed by Parliament.

In a report the Betting Control Board states:—

The amendments to rules 76 and 77 raise the minimum amount of a bet on metropolitan races (in the derby stand enclosure and on the flat) from 1s. to 2s. or, in the case of a win and place bet from 1s. each way to 2s. each way. The reason for raising the minimum from 1s. to 2s. is twofold. Firstly, it concerns the enactment of legislation as from December 1 imposing a tax on winning bets. The tax is 3d. for each 10s. or part thereof. The 2s. minimum bet will reduce the possibility of bettors in the minor enclosures from evading the tax by "splitting" their bets on short priced runners. A man desiring to invest 5s. on a horse at, say, 3 to 1 or 7 to 2 could, under the old rule, make five bets of 1s. and evade payment of the tax at the expense of the bookmaker who would be called on to issue five betting tickets. It is believed that this practice was adopted on numerous occasions in betting premises when the tax was 3d. in the pound or part thereof for all payments of 5s. and over.

Mr. Fred Walsh—There were no betting shops when the winnings tax was introduced.

Mr. WHITTLE—According to the evidence the practice was to avoid the tax by splitting bets into small amounts. The Betting Control Board further said:—

Statistics show that the average amount of each bet has increased from 17s. 2d. in 1933-34 to £1 6s. 6d. in 1949-50. Recent records show that few bets of 1s. or 1s. each way are made nowadays and this knowledge, combined with the fact that the minimum bet on a totalizator is 2s. or 2s. 6d., was also a deciding factor in influencing the board in reaching its decision.

Several meetings of the Subordinate Legislation Committee were held to deal with this matter. At my suggestion a representative of the board was called to give evidence. Mr. Alexander, the secretary, attended and he largely substantiated what had been submitted previously by the board.

Mr. Stephens—Did you ask a member of the public or a bookmaker to give evidence?

Mr. WHITTLE—The bookmakers were not considered. The public was represented by the members of the committee. Mr. Tapping was an excellent advocate for the man who wants to make a small bet. Mr. Alexander in his evidence said there were several reasons for the board's decision to amend the rules. He added:—

The board had experience in betting shop days with the winnings tax when smaller punters split their bets in order to evade payment of the winnings tax. This could happen if the minimum bet remained at 1s. If a punter had 2s. on a horse which started at 2 to 1, split his bet and made it two single shilling bets, he would escape payment of the tax.

Mr. Fred Walsh—The winnings tax came into operation only last year.

Mr. WHITTLE—I hardly think that a man with the experience of Mr. Alexander would make such a statement without being able to substantiate it. He was referring to betting shops. He went on:—

He might also divide a 5s. bet into five separate bets. The smaller bookmakers on the flat would have to pay the 4d. duty stamp on five bets instead of on one. The value of money has altered considerably and 1s. today was only worth 6d. before the war. That is why the board considered no harm would be done in fixing a 2s. minimum. The board has found that since the war, and especially during recent years, the number of 1s. bets are small. Bookmakers' betting sheets show very few straight-out 1s. bets. Not many 1s. each-way bets are made if a horse's price is under 7 to 1 or 8 to 1. For that reason we could not see any harm in raising the minimum bet, coinciding with the totalizer, and we have had no complaint since.

Later he said:—

With money values as they are today a man who cannot afford to put 2s. on a horse should not be betting at all. Two shillings is only the equivalent of what 1s. was before the war. After all, the lowest denomination in the totalizer is 2s. and we had that in mind when we fixed the minimum. I do not say that the statement I made just now that a man who could not afford to bet 2s. should not bet at all was our strongest argument in fixing the 2s. minimum, but it is the question of the protection of the winnings tax as much as anything else.

It has been suggested that the decision to increase the minimum bet to 2s. came from the

bookmakers. That was supported by Mr. Fred Walsh.

Mr. Fred Walsh—I did not say that.

Mr. WHITTLE—The honourable member said:—

It makes one wonder what was the motive behind the decision of the Betting Control Board. Was it instigated by the bookmakers? By the elimination of the 1s. bet they save ½d. on every ticket, and over a period they would save a considerable amount.

Mr. Fred Walsh—I inquired what was the motive.

Mr. WHITTLE—I do not hold any brief for the bookmakers. I should say that the bookmaker on the flat has the hardest time of any, if any bookmakers have a hard time, because if a bet were split he would have to pay a ¼d. tax on each 1s. ticket, whereas the same tax is paid on a £5 ticket. Mr. Tapping said he would be unpopular with the bookmakers for bringing this matter forward. I do not oppose the motion in the interests of the bookmakers, but because the board considered it was taking the proper action to make its rules conform to legislation passed last year. Other members of the Subordinate Legislation Committee knew Mr. Tapping intended to move this motion, so there is no "hole in the corner" business as far as he is concerned. I think he misread Mr. Alexander's remarks, because he said there would be a tendency for a man who wanted to back four or five horses in one race to split his bets, but Mr. Alexander did not say that. He said there would be a tendency for a man wanting to back one horse in a race to split his bet in order to avoid payment of the tax.

Mr. Hawker—Did you say that the board said there were few bets of 1s.?

Mr. WHITTLE—There are not many of them, but it was considered to be in the best interests to eliminate 1s. bets. One member has told me that the object of the minimum of 5s. on which winnings tax would be paid was to help the small investor and therefore conforms with this motion, but I point out that that tax is payable only on the winnings and not on the amount invested. A man may invest 2s. on a 6 to 4 winner, yet pay no winnings tax. The Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation is only human, but it has by a majority decision decided to allow this regulation, which has operated successfully since the first week in December and been the subject of little complaint. In fact, some people who might have placed a 1s. bet have been unable to do so and thereby saved losing

that amount. I am told that punters attending the course with 5s. to invest could more profitably put that amount on one horse—an "extra special" of which they have been told, instead of spreading it over a number of bets. I hope members will not be carried away by any false sense of sympathy. I oppose the motion.

The SPEAKER—I have the names of a number of members who intend to speak on this motion. I ask them to notice what its purpose is—the disallowance of paragraph II. By interjection and discussion the debate has widened out perhaps a little beyond the limits intended by the member for Semaphore. His motion seeks only to disallow paragraph II., which relates to betting on the flat.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—I support the motion. Like the member for Prospect I have little knowledge of the betting game. I do not believe in betting, and have never encouraged people to bet, because I believe that in betting itself there are certain evils, the greatest of which is that people may bet beyond their means. I speak on this motion mainly because I know a number of people in this State have ingrained in their make-up a desire to have a little bet for their amusement in order to get some relief from life's monotony. I know of no law which could be enacted to prevent those people from betting. On this occasion I take my stand in the interests of justice because, if the regulation is permitted, certain people will be forced to bet beyond their means. The fact that a person cannot afford a 2s. bet does not discourage him. This was proved when bookmakers' shops operated in the thirties. Then people who were unfortunately on the rations had a little bet by contributing 3d. each to make up a 1s. bet. I submit that the reason for the number of small bets made in betting shops as mentioned by Mr. Alexander was the desire of those bettors to bet up to and sometimes beyond the limits of their means. It was stated in evidence to the committee that the value of 2s. today is only equal to that of 1s. in pre-war days, and this afternoon we have been told that these are not normal times. I am afraid that if this regulation is not challenged punters will have to operate under it for ever. After paying for the essentials of life today the basic wage earner has little left for enjoyment. If his only form of amusement is attending a race meeting and having a 1s. bet he should not be deprived of it.

Mr. Whittle—How has he been getting on for the past nine months during which he has been unable to place a 1s. bet?

Mr. HUTCHENS—By betting illegally. He has bet within his limits only by joining with another punter in a 2s. bet. I have been to the races and seen how this regulation operates. I urge members to allow less fortunate people who desire to enjoy this sport the right to bet within their limits and thus retain sufficient to supply the needs of their families and themselves. They should not be encouraged to bet beyond their means.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—This regulation was promulgated within a week of the passing of the winnings tax legislation. At that time the Betting Control Board knew that Parliament had decided that some winning bets of 5s. and less should be tax free. When it passed the legislation Parliament knew that punters could legally bet in small sums. The member for Hindmarsh said that two punters may each contribute 1s. so as to have a 2s. bet, but I do not think that is illegal. They cannot be fined by a court for agreeing to share a wager on a horse. I have the highest regard for the members of the Betting Control Board and for Mr. Alexander, and find some difficulty in believing that the board is concerned with the loss of revenue to the State as a result of the exemption of small winning bets from the winnings tax. Mr. Alexander told the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation that very few shilling bets were made. He probably also knows that the "silver" bettor usually backs long shots, wishing to win 10s. or £1. Any licensed bookmaker in Adelaide will confirm that such a bettor is not concerned with small odds. If successful on the long shot he pays winnings tax. The consideration of the loss of revenue to the State by the exemption from the winnings tax of small winning bets seems to me a paltry one in regard to the promulgation of this regulation. If I were adamantly opposed to betting and considered it an unmitigated evil I would treat it as the sport of kings and make it only the wealthy man's prerogative to bet. I would fix the minimum bet so high that it would be impossible for the small man to back a horse. All the regulation in question does is to fix the minimum bet a little higher than the amount some people would normally invest. The regulation will mainly affect women. I do not often attend race fixtures, but when I do I find my wife and her friends banding themselves together and contributing 6d. or

1s. each on a horse in order to have their little bit of fun and an interest in the races. It does not matter one iota whether or not we disallow the regulation. What the board is attempting to do is small and paltry. I am amazed that we have been asked to consider this matter, especially in view of the major issues which the board should be considering. It could be advising the Government on major matters that have been raised during this session. For instance, I see no reason for having more than one country race meeting a week. I often have to drive through race traffic in my district three times a week. This is causing many people, including myself, great concern.

Mr. Whittle—The chairman of the board has given some advice.

Mr. SHANNON—He merely made some statements. Recently a totalizator licence was refused for the Snowtown Club because of certain factors. If the board refuses a totalizator licence it is practically refusing a racing day.

Mr. Fred Walsh—The board only refuses to give an interstate betting service.

Mr. SHANNON—Then that race meeting is virtually out. I think the board has power to limit country race meetings, which are a plague on society. The member for Prospect pointed out there will still be bettors who will not pay winnings taxation. Anybody betting 2s. on an even-money favourite obviously will not pay taxation. If the board desires to bring everybody into the winnings' taxation field it should draft a regulation that all winning bets shall be subject to a tax. Why should the person who bets at long odds and takes a greater risk pay taxation when those who bet at short odds evade it? Obviously, the man who takes the longer price takes the greater risk of losing his stake. We, in our lack of wisdom, have provided that some people shall pay taxation but not others. I was not necessarily swayed by the remarks of the member for Semaphore. Some of his arguments did not carry any weight with me, but I am concerned that we have an important body of men tinkering around with tiddlywinks rather than doing something that may be of value to the community.

Mr. DAVIS (Port Pirie)—I support the motion. I was surprised to hear the member for Prospect say he had little knowledge of the matter he was discussing. Before long I realized he knew nothing about the subject at all. He even said that some people backed

horses both ways at 6 to 4. They would be foolish indeed to do this and I hope he is not opposing the motion, because it would be of benefit to the person unable to invest more than 2s. on a horse. Many go to race meetings with only 5s. to invest on the day's racing. The most they can afford is 1s. on each race. I live in Port Pirie, where there are betting shops. No-one goes into a betting shop for the purpose of investing 2s. by taking out two tickets. The queues are so long that it would be impracticable to take two bets. On a race-course, too, it is difficult enough to get one bet, let alone two. As the member for Onkaparinga said, people who take out bets each way rarely consider a horse at less than 8 to 1. If the horse won he would receive more than 10s. and have to pay a tax of 6d. No member desired, when the winnings' tax legislation was before the House, that a man winning less than 10s. should pay a tax. Members would be doing something wrong in passing legislation to increase the amount of money invested in gambling. I had the privilege of giving evidence to the Betting Control Board on the desirability of continuing betting shops in Port Pirie. Those who gave evidence against the establishment of betting shops and the licensing of bookmakers claimed that too much money was invested in gambling. I agree with the opinions of some of those people, for we should not encourage gambling, but try to reduce it to a minimum, and support of this motion will be a step in that direction. Why should anyone be forced to invest 4s. whereas his usual bet is 2s.? Many who go to races, particularly women, even have 3d. bets; often four combine in a 1s. bet. They really have no desire to gamble, but get a thrill out of having a small investment—possibly just as big a thrill as the member for Mitcham would if he bet in his thousands. Indeed, I know women who get great enjoyment merely from having a tipping competition amongst themselves, without any money involved. I sincerely hope this House will realize its responsibilities to the people who have no desire to make more than 1s. bets. We should not legislate in favour of one section of the community against another and I feel sure we will be doing the right thing if we carry the motion.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River)—I do not pose as a betting expert, but I do say that disallowance of the regulation will tend to lower production. The member for Semaphore said that allowance of the regulation means that the Government approves of the extension of gambling,

and the member for Thebarton said that a country race day was recognized as a local holiday and the people made a day of it, not for the purpose of gambling but for pleasure, and that being so, how could it interfere with production. I am entirely in favour of country people having their race days. What I am opposed to is that country race meetings anywhere near the metropolitan area draw, not country people, but city people. By way of interjection I asked the honourable member if he had ever had to drive to Adelaide on a country race day against the traffic coming from Adelaide. I have had that unfortunate experience on many occasions, and I agree with Mr. Shannon that it is dangerous to drive against the continuous flow of fast traffic.

The SPEAKER—I think the honourable member is scarcely dealing with what is before the House.

Mr. HEASLIP—I was replying to something reported in *Hansard* and attributed to me in week-end press. I say that the considerable number of city folk who are attracted to nearby country race meetings must affect the flow of production.

Mr. Quirke—If it is left at 2s. will it alter that?

Mr. HEASLIP—No regulation should encourage easier betting, for any increase must cause a further drop in the production of goods which are so essential.

Mr. O'Halloran—Do you think that those who drive to country race meetings in motor cars are the kind that are affected by this regulation?

Mr. HEASLIP—Their absence from work must cause a drop in production. Moreover, in every manufacturing shop or public building of any kind immediately a race starts starts everything stops while people listen to the race broadcast.

The SPEAKER—I cannot allow the honourable member to continue in that strain because someone else will want to reply to it, just as he wants to reply to something else, and it has nothing to do with the matter before the House.

Mr. HEASLIP—I propose to link up by saying that anything we allow under regulations that will encourage betting must interfere with industry. The member for Hindmarsh said that the regulation forces bettors to bet beyond their means, but there is no force whatsoever; it is purely a voluntary action whether they bet 2s. or 1s. and no hardship if they cannot invest 1s. I disagree with anything that will

make a start on betting easier. In any walk of life nothing can be achieved without first making a start, and the easier the start the better the hope of achievement. If by disallowing this regulation we make it easier for people to bet it must result in increased gambling. Mid-week racing and gambling definitely interfere with production and I cannot support a move to make 1s. instead of 2s. bets legal.

Mr. STEPHENS (Port Adelaide)—The motion deals with only one clause of the regulation which says:—

No bookmaker betting on the flat in the metropolitan area who is offering odds against a horse shall accept a bet of less than 2s., or in the case of a win or place bet of less than 2s. each way.

Outside the metropolitan area they can bet 1s.

Mr. Whittle—No they cannot.

Mr. STEPHENS—I listened very attentively to the member for Prospect, and when he said he did not know much about betting I thought he would not talk about it, but he seems to know a lot more than I do. I admit I do not know much about betting on racecourses, but I know something about it on the flats at trotting races, and it is from that angle I wish to speak. I was betting supervisor and had to control all the betting on the flat with bookmakers. Since the Betting Control Board appointed its own supervisor to deal with disputes I do not deal with that part of it, but I do deal with the bookmaker in carrying out the law as far as the Trotting Club is concerned. This request has not come from the bookmakers or the public; both are much opposed to it. The first night on which this regulation was brought into operation bookmakers asked me if they had to refuse 1s. bet on each way, and I found on inquiry that they had to do so, and that if a person wanted to bet each way he was forced to invest 4s. instead of 2s.

The Hon. Sir George Jenkins—Can they bet 1s. each way on the tote?

Mr. STEPHENS—No. On the tote two people who want to bet 1s. each way combine.

The Hon. Sir George Jenkins—This does not stop two people combining.

Mr. STEPHENS—I fought very hard in this House some years ago against illegal betting and I venture to prophesy that if this regulation is carried out it will bring back illegal bookmakers; we can all recall the experience years ago of the butcher, the baker and the greengrocer, on their rounds, collecting 1s. bets from their customers.

The law should be carried out as it stands. Before the board made the rule it should have called representatives of bookmakers and racing clubs to give evidence. I know the members and secretary of the Betting Board well, but feel that they have made a mistake on this matter. I am prepared to take any member on to the flat at trotting meetings to see the position for themselves. Punters already pay a tax on betting tickets. It is a bad principle to say that if a man wants to invest a large sum in betting he can do so, but a small bettor cannot. This is class legislation and is taking away from the working man his right to a small bet. I trust that the motion will be carried.

Mr. QUIRKE (Stanley)—I hope the House will disallow the rule. Racing has been called the sport of kings, but today it is the sport of everybody, even down to the "bob" bettor. The member for Onkaparinga said the motion was probably one of the least important which could possibly be brought before the House, but I do not agree. I am not a betting man. Racing is a "mug's game," but thousands of people are content to be classed as "mugs" and are prepared to lose their money at races. Racing, classed as a business, is the greatest revenue producer that the Government has today. On one occasion the member for Flinders asked me "Can you get something for nothing?" At the time I was not smart enough to think about the betting game, which is one source from which the Government gets thousands of pounds a year for nothing.

Mr. Macgillivray—It is a tax on people's stupidity.

Mr. QUIRKE—I have said that it is a "mug's game." The member for Rocky River started to fulminate about the number of people who were kept out of production by attending country race meetings, but not one person will be kept away from racecourses if the amount is increased from 1s. to 2s. The rule can only create much resentment. Mr. Heaslip is prepared, under the proposed new betting rule, to implement an injustice. He contends that the way to keep people away from racecourses is to make it more difficult for them to invest money when they get there. It is an injustice to people who cannot afford more than 1s. to say that the minimum bet shall be 2s., but that is the essence of this rule. The only argument that has been used in favour of the 2s. bet is that people can club together, put in four sixpences and have a 2s. bet, but that does not relieve us of the

responsibility of forcing an individual to increase his bet from 1s. to 2s. The only reason for the rule appears to be that it will make it possible for the Government to collect more money. Although some members will probably say that betting is morally wrong they are prepared to justify the increase and say it is morally right for the Government to take a cut out of it. They are supporting the best revenue producing agent the Government has. That action cannot be justified. I said previously that I would remove all the penal clauses from the Lottery and Gaming Act and let a person bet with whoever he liked. If that were done in the average country town things would be no different from what they are today. I would not register bookmakers, as that gives a monopoly to only a few. Betting has been elevated to an industry and I cannot support anything which will increase the Government's ability to extract that type of revenue from the people. I do not agree with it, and will support the motion to allow the amount to remain at 1s.

Mr. DUNKS secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### BUSINESS AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH (Albert—Minister of Works)—The Business Agents Act, 1938, provides that every business agent is to be licensed by a local court and must obtain an annual licence. Until 1949 the licensing period was the period of 12 months ending June 30. In 1949 the licensing period was altered to the 12 months ending March 31. This was done in order to make the licensing period coincide with the licensing period under the Land Agents Act, as licences under the two Acts are sometimes held by the one person and one fidelity bond is then accepted for the purposes of the two Acts. Section 18 of the Business Agents Act sets out the fees which are payable for a licence under that Act. The section provides that if a licence is taken out between December 31 and June 30, that is, during the second half of the previous licensing period, then one-half of the fee otherwise payable is to be paid. When the Act was amended in 1949 and the licensing period altered, the corresponding alteration was not made in section 18. The purpose of this Bill is to repair this omission and it provides that the period during which half fees are to be payable is

to be from September 30 to March 31, that is, the second half of the present licensing period. I move the second reading.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### SWINE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS (Newcastle—Minister of Agriculture)—The purpose of this Bill is to extend the definition of "disease" in the Swine Compensation Act. That Act provides for the establishment of a fund from the proceeds of stamp duty payable upon the sale of swine. From this fund compensation is payable where swine are destroyed or carcasses of swine are condemned because the swine are suffering or are suspected to be suffering from disease. At June 30, 1951, the balance outstanding in the Swine Compensation Fund was £51,944. During the last financial year £8,550 was paid as compensation under the Act. Section 4 of the Act defines "disease" to mean tuberculosis, swine fever, swine plague, swine erysipelas, and swine paratyphoid. The Bill proposes to alter this definition by including swine dysentery as a disease and by inserting in the definition in place of the term "swine plague" the term "infectious pneumonia of swine (including swine plague)."

The diseases to be brought within the definition are, of course, infectious diseases and occur frequently in the State. These diseases are akin to the diseases now included in the definition and it is obvious that they should be included within the purview of the legislation. I move the second reading.

Mr. O'HALLORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS (Newcastle—Minister of Agriculture)—The Cattle Compensation Act enacts a scheme under which compensation is payable if cattle are required to be destroyed because they are suffering or are suspected to be suffering from disease as defined by section 4 of the Act. Compensation is also payable if carcasses of cattle are condemned because of disease. The fund from which compensation is payable is raised from the proceeds of a stamp duty imposed upon

the sale of cattle. Disease is defined to mean pleuro-pneumonia contagiosa, tuberculosis, actinomycosis and Johne's disease. It is proposed by the Bill to extend this definition to include trichomoniasis and to extend the term actinomycosis to include actinobacillosis and other affections with club formations. Trichomoniasis is a very serious and infectious disease which is not at present in the State but which, if an outbreak occurred, would require severe remedial measures. The disease particularly affects bulls and there is no known cure for the disease occurring in these animals and thus, if the disease were found, it would be necessary to destroy bulls found to be affected with the disease. Actinomycosis is associated with a fungus growth with a club formation and the purpose of extending the scope of this disease is to bring within the definition affections of that nature which have club formations. This group of diseases is infectious and frequently occurs in the State. It is considered most desirable that the new diseases included in the definition should be brought within the scope of the Act. At June 30 last, the amount outstanding in the Cattle Compensation Fund was £48,098. During the financial year ending June 30 compensation was paid from the fund to the amount of £5,658. For two or three years the Government has considered it would be easier to include contagious diseases for which compensation is payable in the schedule to the Act by the issue of a proclamation. Legislation to this effect was passed in this House, but was opposed by the Legislative Council, and consequently was not proceeded with. Therefore, it becomes necessary to introduce a Bill when another contagious disease is to be added to the list. I move the second reading.

Mr. O'HALLORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### LAND SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### LIGHT SQUARE PRODUCE WORKS EXTENSION.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the final report of the Public Works Standing Committee on the Light Square Produce Works extension.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.39 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 18, at 2 p.m.