

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 30 NOVEMBER 1961

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 30 NOVEMBER, 1961

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. D. E. Nicholson, Murrumba) took the chair at 11 a.m.

APPROPRIATION BILL No. 2

Assent reported by Mr. Speaker.

QUESTIONS

**LEGAL LIABILITY OF ROAD CONTRACTOR
USING UNREGISTERED VEHICLE**

Mr. DAVIES (Maryborough), for **Mr. TUCKER** (Townsville North), asked the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity—

“What will be the position if the unregistered International truck used by an Ayr contractor in contract work on the Stuart-Giru road is involved in an accident on the highway?”

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick—Minister for Agriculture and Forestry), for **Hon. E. EVANS** (Mirani), replied—

“In May last the contractor for this job was prosecuted and fined for using an unregistered International truck on the road. Enquiries have been instituted with a view to ascertaining whether such vehicle is being used again. If it is, action will be taken to enforce the law. The question regarding the position should the vehicle be involved in an accident should be addressed to the Treasurer as the appropriate legislation covering such matters is not administered by me.”

**SEALING OF ROAD SECTION, CLEVEDON
HIGHWAY, TOWNSVILLE**

Mr. COBURN (Burdekin) asked the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity—

“As the rough, unsurfaced section of the Clevedon Highway within the Townsville City area near Partington is invariably in a shocking condition and likely to cause damage to vehicles and possibly be the cause of serious accidents, will he kindly approve the bitumen-surfacing of this section and have the work put in hand as soon as possible?”

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick—Minister for Agriculture and Forestry), for **Hon. E. EVANS** (Mirani), replied—

“Action is in hand to complete the Clevedon Highway. One scheme was recently released and design on the balance is well advanced.”

SPEED-BOAT RACING ON BARRON RIVER

Mr. ADAIR (Cook) asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

“Owing to the numerous complaints from residents of Machan’s Beach who are concerned with the serious effect speed

boat racing is having on fishing grounds in the Barron River and also the inconvenience caused to fishermen in small boats operating in the area, will he have the matter fully investigated with a view to having speed boat racing prohibited in fishing areas?"

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth) replied—

"A permit to engage in water ski-ing and speed boat racing on the Barron River was granted by the Marine Board to the Cairns Sporting Power Boat Club on September 4, 1958. The experience has been that Power Boat Club members using this area have been well regulated by Club officials but some inconvenience to anglers could have been caused by non-members proceeding at speed well beyond the limits specified in the permit. The matter has been investigated from time to time and is being closely watched with a view to having these aquatic sports conducted with as little inconvenience as possible to others of the small craft fraternity."

REPAIR OF MULLIGAN ROAD SOUTH OF LAURA

Mr. ADAIR (Cook) asked the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity—

"(1) Has his attention been drawn to the bad state of the Mulligan main road south of Laura, which has been caused by the recent rain in the area?"

(2) Will he have the necessary repair work carried out as early as possible?"

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick—Minister for Agriculture and Forestry), for **Hon. E. EVANS** (Mirani), replied—

"(1) No; but main roads are under constant surveillance by Departmental officers and it would be absurd to expect that I should be advised of all details."

"(2) Necessary repairs to roads are carried out as normal routine."

ADDITIONAL CLASSROOMS AT EVERTON PARK STATE SCHOOL

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) asked the Minister for Public Works and Local Government—

"Has Executive Council approval yet been sought for the expenditure necessary to construct additional classrooms at the Everton Park State School? If not, when is it likely that a commencement will be made on this overdue and very necessary addition to an already overcrowded school?"

Hon. H. RICHTER (Somerset) replied—

"Expenditure has been approved for enclosing under recent additions to the Everton Park State School to provide two additional classrooms. This work will be put in hand in the near future."

QUALITY HOMES (QLD.)

Mr. BROMLEY (Norman) asked the Minister for Justice—

"(1) Is it necessary for firms connected with the building industry to be registered with any Government Department?"

"(2) Is a building firm operating under the name of 'Quality Homes (Qld.)' of 241 Brunswick Street, Valley, whose motto is 'Quality guarantees you a lifetime of happiness,' registered?"

"(3) Has he or his Department received any complaints about this firm's 'modus operandi,' and/or about the sales manager, Mr. J. H. Kilpatrick?"

"(4) If not, will he investigate the fact that this firm is accepting deposits from prospective purchasers of homes and on failure to fulfil their contracts refuses to refund their deposits when requested?"

"(5) What redress under existing legislation has a person under the quoted circumstances when he is desirous of obtaining a refund of his deposit from such unreliable and irresponsible operators?"

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong) replied—

"(1) 'The Registration of Firms Acts, 1942 to 1958,' require that any business carried on in a name other than the full name or names of the partners in such business be registered under those Acts."

"(2) The firm-name 'Quality Homes (Qld.)' was registered on July 23, 1960. It presently carries on business at 241 Brunswick Street, Valley, and the registered proprietors are James Herbert Kilpatrick and Arthur Edwin Jackson. No information is held regarding the motto."

"(3) From enquiries that I have made, it does not appear that any complaint has been made to the Department of Justice against Quality Homes (Qld.) or J. H. Kilpatrick."

"(4) If a specific complaint is made to the Department of Justice or to me, the matter will be considered and appropriate action taken."

"(5) It would be contrary to established administrative and Parliamentary practice for me to give an advisory opinion on a matter such as this affecting the civil rights of one person as against another."

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table—

Order in Council under the Schools of Arts (Winding Up and Transfer) Acts, 1861 to 1956.

Rescinded Regulation under the Prickly-pear Land Acts, 1923 to 1959.

CITY OF BRISBANE (NORTH PINE RIVER DAM) BILL

INITIATION

Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN (Landsborough—Premier): I move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill relating to the construction of a dam on the North Pine River to supplement the water supply of the City of Brisbane and contiguous areas, and for other purposes.”

Motion agreed to.

MAIN ROADS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. E. EVANS (Mirani—Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity): I move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Main Roads Acts, 1920 to 1960, in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

HAWKERS AND PEDLARS BILL

INITIATION

Hon. K. J. MORRIS (Mt. Coot-tha—Minister for Labour and Industry): I move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to hawkers and pedlars.”

Motion agreed to.

BABINDA TOWNSHIP (LANDS) BILL

INITIATION

Hon. A. R. FLETCHER (Cunningham—Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation): I move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill relating to certain allotments in the township of Babinda held under perpetual lease under and pursuant to the Sugar Works Act of 1911.”

Motion agreed to.

COMPANIES BILL

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Mr. Munro, read a third time.

LAND TAX (FURTHER ADJUSTMENT) BILL

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Mr. Hiley, read a third time.

SUCCESSION AND PROBATE DUTIES ACTS AND ANOTHER ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Mr. Hiley, read a third time.

RACING AND BETTING ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Taylor, Clayfield, in the chair.)

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth—Treasurer and Minister for Housing) (11.17 a.m.): I move—

“That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Racing and Betting Acts, 1954 to 1960, in certain particulars.”

The dominant purpose of the Bill is in relation to off-course betting. In 1954, Division 2 of Part 6 was inserted into the Racing and Betting Act. The essential feature of the 1954 legislation was that it authorised off-course betting by bookmakers in any part of the State provided that it was approved by the electors in that zone expressed by referendum. This meant that full off-course betting facilities were dependent on one thing and one thing alone—the wish of the majority of the electors expressed by referendum in each of the electoral zones.

It is idle to look backwards and try to assess why this legislation remained inoperative. It is sufficient to record that the flood of illicit off-course betting, which impelled the then Government to institute a Royal Commission, and in turn to bring down their 1954 amendments, has continued with only spasmodic and local checks. Contributing nothing to the industry on which it lives, breeding a habit of law-breaking in far too many of our citizens, and unquestionably the vehicle of some undesirable practices, the problem basically is the same as that which caused such concern to our predecessors in office back in 1954.

With the 1954 legislation an obvious failure, the Government are faced with the choice of allowing the present position to continue or seeking a better remedy.

The Government cannot accept a situation in which vast numbers of citizens knowingly break the law. If many of us regard gambling as unwise and excessive gambling as wrong, we all consider that widespread disregard for the law is completely evil. Consequently, we are seeking a way in which this illegal trade can be harnessed and carried on within the framework of the law.

Since taking office, the Government have studied the position very closely and have reached certain conclusions. They can see no suitable approach related to electoral zones. The electoral zones as they existed in 1954 presented a very great variety of

circumstance. For example, there was the metropolitan zone, in which no-one could seriously contend that he was unable to reach a racecourse where opportunity for legal betting existed.

On the other hand, other electoral zones presented an ever-widening pattern of distance and of dispersed population. In none of these districts was more than a small portion of its territory within convenient reach of a racecourse where meetings were regularly held; a good deal more was within reach of racecourses where meetings were very spasmodically conducted; while vast areas of the zone were beyond reasonable reach of any racecourse.

In the meantime, the electoral zoning system of the State was changed. The number of zones was reduced to three, but, more importantly, their physical character was altered. The metropolitan zone continued unchanged; but the electoral district in respect of the provincial cities was created an electoral zone, presenting a picture of a number of non-contiguous areas mostly limited to a few square miles, in most cases with the perimeter only a short distance from the point where the racecourse was situated in that provincial city. The whole of the rest of the State was caught up in the third zone, which was known as the country zone.

This opened all manner of possibilities. With the reconstituted country area, the actual racecourse for some provincial cities, being outside the city boundary, would have been in the country zone. The carriage of a referendum would have meant that off-the-course betting could have occurred right under the shadow of the fence of a racecourse where meetings were being held regularly. It could, for example, have been quite legal in Redcliffe, where race meetings are held regularly. It could have been legal everywhere on the South Coast, where, too, there are regular meetings. It would include Mt. Isa, where there are regular meetings. Still further, it would produce real complications in Cairns, where the racecourse lies outside the city boundary.

It was the Government's conclusion that, whatever else happened, this zonal approach was bad. They feel that the governing consideration should be the convenience of access to legal betting facilities. Where race meetings are held regularly, they feel that the opportunity is present; but beyond reasonable reach of where racing facilities exist, the Government consider that this should be the test in determining the availability of off-the-course facilities.

There can be no logical support for the argument that the law should acknowledge betting as something desirable and permissible within a racecourse and as totally offensive and prohibited outside. This convention was based on no fundamental idea. It was the product of two practical features—

- (a) The need for supervision; and
- (b) a desire to protect race club interests.

There can be no doubt that the public widely was not, and is not, prepared to be driven onto a racecourse for all its betting. In the remote areas, breaches of the law were constant and general. Even within easy reach of racecourses there are many who bet off the course. Policing is always difficult, and at the best only partly effective. Money fines have not provided a sufficient deterrent. Accordingly, the Bill repeals the old approach, which was based on zones and a referendum within the zones. Instead, it prohibits off-the-course facilities by bookmakers within certain prescribed distances of where race meetings are held regularly; it permits the registration of off-the-course bookmakers in other parts of the State and, to overcome the problem of where the racing opportunity is spasmodic, it directs that off-course bookmakers, who will be licensed for an area, must field on the racecourse when a meeting is held in their area.

Before I proceed to explain some of the further details of the Bill, I wish to say something to hon. members concerning the method of betting that will be adopted and to express some thoughts on the various alternatives that are open.

It is, I think, widely recognised that the two great wagering systems that are encountered throughout the world are, on the one hand, the system of personal bookmakers and, on the other, the pari-mutuel or totalisator system. In my judgment, the advantages of the pari-mutuel or totalisator system are overwhelming. The totalisator system ensures the payment in full of all winning wagers; it is virtually a mechanical monster and, as such, is not only itself incorruptible but incapable of corrupting others; and because it usually incorporates a considerable percentage to the race clubs, it is indeed significant that in those countries that are entirely on a pari-mutuel basis, you find, Mr. Taylor, the most affluent race clubs, leading in turn to notable prize money and a strong breeding, training and owning industry. On the other hand, in the experience of some countries which have not only been dominated by bookmakers, but largely unharnessed bookmakers at that, the racing industry has become impoverished, the tracks and other conditions neglected, and owning often confined to men who, because of great success in other walks of life, can afford to bear the heavy net outlay involved in breeding, owning and training horses.

Here in Australia there is a steady trend towards the totalisator. The most recent off-the-course development has been in Victoria where all reports indicate that, if there is still a great deal of the State to be served, the off-course tote is commanding a constantly increasing following and is working smoothly.

It is the conviction of the Government that, eventually, the off-course tote will sweep across the countryside and that as it is established and extends its operation, the off-course bookmaker will wither and disappear. However, careful inquiry has led

the Government to conclude that the off-course totalisator would be unsuitable to provide any immediate and complete answer. In those countries where it presently operates, there is a varying degree of delay in order to transmit and to process the information which is assembled over a vast countryside. Even in a pocket-handkerchief State like Victoria, where the service has not yet reached to the outer confines, there is a breathing time of 45 minutes between the acceptance of the last wager and the starting time of the race. Inquiries from the Post and Telegraph Department suggest that, within the next few years, the speed and efficiency of connections from country centres will be vastly improved. Teleprinters, and even more useful, the Telex Service, will, I believe, overcome the jamming of lines with personal calls and the possibility of error through the communication of the spoken word from person to person.

Accordingly, the Bill contemplates and authorises the establishment of an off-course tote service. The timing of its introduction, the progressive degree of its spread, will depend upon the racing industry itself. With the full authority of the Government, I bring this matter publicly under the notice of the principal race clubs and extend an invitation to them to prepare and to submit for our consideration detailed proposals in relation to an off-course tote whenever, in their judgment, such a facility would be of advantage to racing and race clubs.

And here may I say that I am already convinced that the Bill will be able to count its first dividend before it is brought down. There may be some racing experts in the Chamber but I am not one. With full deliberation I have conferred with the racing bodies and learnt their views. In turn, I have given indications of how the Government's thoughts were moving. As a result, over the past few weeks, the principal race clubs have sharply altered their attitude. A month ago, they had no thought of an early approach to an off-course totalisator. Now they show every sign of really prompt action.

In the meantime, the Government consider that those of its citizens beyond the convenient reach of a racecourse on the day should have the facility to place bets, with the full authority of the law, with bookmakers who will be registered for off-the-course operation. As the off-course totalisator is established and its area is enlarged, the off-course bookmakers' licences will be withdrawn.

Whilst off-the-course bookmakers will be required to hold a Government licence, the accrediting of off-the-course bookmakers, the number of licences which will be issued in each locality, will be within the control of the principal racing clubs. Bookmakers who were presently registered on 1 August, 1961, may elect to transfer to off-the-course registration for a single locality. Any remaining vacancies will be publicly advertised, the

applicants will be tested by the principal club to determine their credit worthiness and their character suitability and, if more than the required number apply, the vacancies will be filled by ballot.

Mr. Hilton: Is it mandatory on the clubs to issue licences in every centre where the population would warrant it?

Mr. HILEY: No, it will not be mandatory, but I do not think there will be any doubt about it.

Mr. Hilton: It is entirely at the discretion of the club?

Mr. HILEY: Yes.

Mr. Lloyd: They will place on their own limit?

Mr. HILEY: Yes, depending on the volume of business and how many licences an area is likely to stand.

Mr. Mann: And the number of bookmakers now registered will simply change to S.P. bookmakers?

Mr. HILEY: That could be so in any locality. They cannot wander all over the landscape.

Mr. Lloyd: They will want a special licence from the race club?

Mr. HILEY: Yes, I said that. After the race club has given them a licence we will give them a pocket to put on their blazer.

Mr. Bromley: How many principal clubs are there in Queensland?

Mr. HILEY: Four. The licence fee for an off-the-course bookmaker will be £10 instead of the fee of £50 which is prescribed in the present law. Hon. members will see later that we will have other ways of recovering revenue from off-the-course bookmakers. Off-the-course bookmakers may register clerks for the same fee as presently prescribed, namely, £2. In addition, they may register agents for the same fee and these agents may act for the registered off-the-course bookmaker in areas of scattered population where the principal club considers there will be insufficient support to warrant the issue of an off-course licence.

Off-course betting will be prohibited within a radius of 30 miles of the General Post Office in Brisbane and within a radius of 15 miles from any other racecourse on a day on which a race meeting is being conducted on that racecourse.

That means that there will be no betting premises anywhere in Brisbane nor in Toowoomba, Rockhampton, Southport, Redcliffe, Maryborough, Bundaberg, Mackay, Townsville, Cairns and Mt. Isa. The citizen in those towns has a chance to bet on a racecourse every Saturday and holiday. But towns which race only occasionally will have off-course facility, the licensee operating on a local race day from his office until an hour

and a half before the first race, and then on the track; and from his office when no local race is held.

Every off-course bookmaker must field at a race meeting held in his locality unless debarred for reasons which are accepted by the principal club for the area.

Off-course bookmakers will be directed to use betting books which will be printed at the Government Printing Office and issued by the Commissioner for Stamp Duties. Off-course bookmakers are to keep records similar to those kept by on-course bookmakers and send carbon copies of betting sheets to the Commissioner of Stamp Duties and to the principal club for the area.

Off-course bookmakers will be required to have a registered place of business where they may receive telephone bets and where clients may call and place a bet in person.

Mr. Hanlon: Does that apply on Wednesdays in Brisbane?

Mr. HILEY: No. The place of business must be an office in the business section of the town and it may be part of premises accommodating other bookmakers. No office shall be within a prescribed distance of a public house or near a church.

Mr. Mann: How are you going to manage that in country towns?

Mr. HILEY: There is provision for the Commissioner of Stamp Duties to go within those limits if there are no other suitable premises available.

The office may provide a window or counter but no seats or waiting space. There will be a prohibition of intoxicating liquors on the premises, children will be forbidden to be on the premises and care is taken to ensure that the present prohibition of betting by minors will apply equally to off-course betting. It will be a requirement that betting boards be displayed on the premises. Windows for the conduct of business shall not open on to a main street. While wireless sets will be permitted, there will be a prohibition on broadcasting that can be heard in any part of the premises to which the public has access or from the street and, should current telecasts of racing become available, they will be prohibited in the same manner. Loitering in the precincts will be forbidden and all premises must be approved by the Commissioner of Stamp Duties.

For the protection of the public, bets may be laid at fixed odds for win or place, starting price or totalisator odds, all at the option of the punter. No limit on odds will be permitted but the bookmaker will be authorised to refuse to accept a bet which would result in loss to him of more than £50. Where the bet is placed starting price, he must accept those odds to £5. The bookmaker will be free to decide whether he will accept any credit bets.

I might say that betting methods pose a nice question and a statement of the pros and cons deserves mention. The southern Queensland race clubs were unanimous in favour of confining off-course operation to starting price only. The race clubs from Central and Northern Queensland were equally unanimous in supporting the four-way option.

The advocates for starting price only point to the mischief of arranged withdrawals of a short-priced horse after money has been laid on other starters at a longer price. They describe this as a fraud on racing and contend that starting price destroys the opportunity for this fraud.

The supporters of the four-way option contend that the public prefers a choice and particularly the right to bet for a place; and that whereas the race-going public have an early opportunity to support a rapidly firming horse, starting price means that the off-course punter has to take the worst of the market.

On balance, the Government have decided in favour of the four-way option. But I propose to watch closely for any monkey business with withdrawals. If it should show out, we will have to find an effective way of dealing with not only the practice but also those who indulge in it.

All bookmakers licensed for off-course betting who will be fielding at an afternoon race meeting may accept bets by telephone or in person on the morning of the day of the meeting, completing these transactions in sufficient time to be on the course to field for the first event. No such off-course bet is to be made after 1½ hours before the first race. That will give him enough time to get his bag, get down to the course and take his stand.

Betting tickets must be written for all bets both off-course and on-course and, whether made by telephone or personally. The present classifications for betting tickets will be eliminated and all betting tickets both on-course and off-course will be at the common price of 2d. each. At present, the prices range from 6d. down to 2d.

As much of the off-course betting will be by telephone, the off-course bookmaker will be directed to enclose all the day's betting tickets which have not been handed in person to the public, in a sealed envelope which he must deliver to the custody of the local police shortly after the meeting closes. This envelope can then be opened if a dispute arises or a check is being made of the off-course bookmaker's transactions. I might say that I considered directing their posting to the client but the costs are high and the checking is better served if they are held in a batch in police care.

A turnover tax will be imposed at the rate of 1½ per cent for on-course bets, and bets which are taken during the morning of a race meeting by an off-the-course bookmaker who fields at that day's meeting. For all other

off-course bets, the rate of turn-over tax will be 2½ per cent. The tax in each case will be based on the aggregate of amounts bet on each race. Twenty per cent of the turnover tax received on off-course betting transactions will be paid to the principal clubs at the end of each quarter, divided in a manner which I will set out subsequently.

The thought behind the differential rate of tax will be clear. One of the evils of the present situation is that the illicit off-course bookmaker does not bear the expense which is borne by the on-course man. Fielding fees, betting tickets tax, registration fees—these commonly amount to between £50 and £100 per week. The higher tax for off-course fielding is designed to equal the total cost experience of both on-course and off-course operators. The present position gives too great an advantage to off-course fielders.

At present the law prohibits the release of pre-post betting information and all betting information from a racecourse whilst the meeting is in progress. The amendments to this will authorise the use of teleprinters to exchange such information from a racecourse to a racecourse in the manner that was contemplated in the Bill that I brought down but did not present through all stages some years ago. My reason for not proceeding on that occasion resulted from information that came into my possession which led me to mistrust the vehicle for assembling the information from at least one southern racecourse. My recent inquiries show that nothing has happened in the interim to support the fears which I then held. I have discussed this matter with the Minister in charge of racing in the State concerned and no irregularity or any undesirable feature has been brought under his notice. Accordingly, the Bill now contains provisions similar in effect to those which were contained in the Bill that was abandoned.

However, the previous teleprinter Bill gave special authority for its use. This Bill achieves the same object by removing the prohibition on the publication of betting information.

Thus, the present prohibition on the release of betting information that has prevented newspapers and wireless stations from conveying such information will be removed. If off-course betting is to be permitted, the remote public is entitled to reasonable information for its protection. Apart from that, the present law is being made to look rather ludicrous by the well-developed method used by most racing journalists when they refer to a horse being about one-third of double odds and another horse a point longer, and so on. It is possible for even the lay reader to interpret these veiled statements with tolerable accuracy. The Government believe that it is better to permit this information to be plainly published.

The off-course licences will not be transferable. The licensees will, at all times,

be subject to the jurisdiction of the principal race club for the area in precisely the same manner as the on-course bookmaker. The Government do not propose to interfere in any way in the autonomy of the racing industry to conduct and to supervise its own affairs. Accordingly, if a race club suspends or cancels a bookmaker's registration, then the licence issued by the Government will be inoperable.

The Government are convinced that there is a very great volume of illicit off-course operation and do not consider the problem can or should be met by wholesale policing, fining and imprisoning. As we see the problem, illicit off-the-course operation is the direct product of the prohibitions contained in the present law and the failure of the present law to provide, except at very limited points, a legal opportunity for betting. The present system of prohibition without alternative has given rise to a very considerable illicit industry which, to use a phrase that I have employed before, is like a cattle tick glutting itself on the rich blood of the racing industry to which it contributes nothing.

As the Government see it, it is illogical to maintain a convention that betting should be legally recognisable within the racecourse fence but something to be treated as undesirable outside the confines of the racecourse. To the extent that citizens should be able to command equal opportunity under the law, the Government consider the present system is unequal in its treatment of different citizens. Still further, the Government desire to attack the evil of illicit off-the-course operation by striking at its roots rather than by ineffectually trimming its branches. Once registered off-the-course operation is permitted, the Government believe that the illicit operator will speedily wither. We do not consider that the public will desire to continue to deal with the illicit operator once a legal opportunity is present. Quite apart from the fact that the average citizen would prefer to use the lawful rather than the unlawful method, dealing with the lawful operator presents real advantages in recovery and in the settlement of disputes.

But still more importantly, the Government look to the off-course totalisator to progressively provide the better answer in all those areas where it can be economically conducted. It should happen that, apart from the really remote areas, the legalising of off-course bookmakers will be only a temporary phase.

The Government do not consider that their proposals will bring about any material increase in the volume of betting. Indeed, having regard to the steady collection of the turnover tax, it could well be that the volume of money in racing circulation could slightly reduce. They have sought to avoid reducing attendances at race meetings because they recognise that gate money is an important factor in race club economy. The

Government propose to watch the early effects closely and if any adverse feature should emerge they will be prepared to take speedy corrective steps. They recognise that this is quite new and that unsuspected complications might emerge. If such should eventuate, they will be prepared to act speedily.

On the whole, the Government's view is that the race clubs may well emerge from this movement with some financial gain. They hold the view that, if racing is to exist, then those who make their living from the industry should make a fair contribution to its conduct. It is there that the Government consider the present system is wholly unfair. In striking a differential rate of tax for the off-course operator, the Government are recognising that portion of this extra amount is justly due to the race clubs who provided the racing opportunity. In turn, the Government are seeking to recover some of the extra cost which they would encounter in administering this new field of off-course betting.

In determining how portion of the off-course turnover tax should be allotted to the race clubs, the Bill contains the following proposals. First, it regards the on-course rate of $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. as the basic collection to be taken by the State. Then, with off-course operation, where the rate is $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., it proposes that half the extra 1 per cent. should go to the race clubs and the other half should come to the State in return for its additional task of supervising and policing. The race clubs collectively will, therefore, receive $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. out of the $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. off-course tax, and none out of the $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on-course tax.

Mr. Burrows: Does that mean that a man who bets in the morning will pay $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. and later in the day $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.?

Mr. HILEY: No. That is treated as on-course and that is $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. right through because he is fielding that afternoon.

Mr. Hilton interjected.

Mr. HILEY: No, an extra 1 per cent., half of which goes to the race clubs and half to the Crown to repay its cost of administration.

The amount will be distributed amongst the race clubs as follows:—first of all, 10 per cent. of the divisible amount will go to the principal clubs for their own use because it is on these clubs that considerable work will devolve. Eighty per cent. of this portion will go to the principal galloping clubs and 20 per cent. to the principal trotting club. I might say that these proportions of 80 per cent. and 20 per cent. reflect the aggregate prize moneys offered by the two codes on the most recent reading. As there are four principal race clubs, they will divide this administrative portion amongst themselves in proportion to the off-course licences granted in their area.

The remaining nine-tenths of what is to go to the clubs will then be divided between the two codes—galloping and trotting—pro rata to the prize money paid by each code. Each code will then be required to divide its share of the nine-tenths amongst the individual clubs, half on a basis which is pro rata to the prize money offered by the club and half on a basis which is pro rata to the number of meetings held by the club. The Bill lays down an annual distribution or such shorter period as the Treasurer shall direct. I contemplate a division at the end of each quarter based on the prize money and the number of meetings of the previous quarter.

Mr. Houston: What would be the area of the Brisbane clubs?

Mr. HILEY: The Brisbane clubs have no area. The only ones that have areas are the principal race clubs. There are four principal clubs in Queensland. There is the Queensland Turf Club, which has as its subsidiary body within itself, the Downs and South-western Racing Association; that is not a principal club in itself; it is an integral part of the Queensland Turf Club. Then the Rockhampton Jockey Club, the Central Queensland Racing Association and the North Queensland Racing Association. Their territories are clearly understood.

Mr. Houston: The Queensland Turf Club would be included as a principal club to cover the Downs club as well?

Mr. HILEY: That is right.

I feel that this method of division strikes a rough justice between the many competing arguments that can be advanced. As between galloping and trotting, it adopts the yardstick of relative prize money. As between the clubs themselves, it applies equal weighting to prize money and to the number of meetings. The first factor is calculated to reward the club that conducts a really worth-while meeting and offers substantial prize money. The second gives a special benefit to the tiniest club. A study of the number of meetings held and the prize money offered convinces me that it will offer considerable help to those bigger meetings that provide the real core of the off-course transactions for the whole State; at the same time it will be found to provide welcome assistance to the tiny country centre and will avoid a situation where the greater portion of the pool will be drained away from the West and the North to dominantly benefit the stronger metropolitan clubs.

It is inevitable that the steps that are proposed will excite wide controversy both within and without the racing industry. I have had the benefit of successive conferences with the principal race clubs and the Metropolitan Racing Committee. I have also had conferences with bookmakers' organisations and with a number of other people who are interested in racing in all its

forms. I am not, and never have been, a racing man, and I want to acknowledge the very great help that I have obtained from those conferences and also, might I add, from the observations of a number of racing journalists, with whom I feel this State is well served.

Inevitably, every racing bill causes deep concern to those people—and there are many in the community—who feel that all gambling is sinful. I do not doubt that any community which chose to have no horse racing at all would collectively command a better standard of living and would avoid the occasional personal tragedy that emerges round the betting ring and gambling arena. Whilst I do not bet on horse races, it is not because I conclude, on deep thought, that all betting is sinful. But nothing will ever shake my personal view that betting is a very great folly, and, because I so conclude, I do not bet. Indeed, I have always considered that the real derivation of that good old English word “horse-sense” lies in the fact that horses have more sense than to bet on humans. But neither I nor the Government take the view that betting should be prohibited. On purely practical grounds, our view is that any general prohibition would merely widen the present degree of illicit operation into something that would be completely uncontrollable and State-wide.

What the Government do earnestly hope is that the amending Bill will sound the death knell of illicit betting in many parts of the State. We recognise that there will still be a residue of problem in the prohibited zones. For that residue there is no answer other than rigorous policing and salutary punishment. The Government have been faced with something of a dilemma. They consider that selective enforcement of the law is a bad principle. They have felt unhappy at the thought of rigidly enforcing the law in the remote areas where no legal opportunity for betting at present exists; and, because of this, they have felt uneasy over the whole problem of policing the present law with such a variable background of underlying circumstance.

The passage of the Bill will change that picture completely. With off-course facilities legally available in the more remote areas, the Government will feel perfectly justified in rigorously enforcing the law in the prohibited zones and they intend to do so.

There is one residual problem that only the off-course tote will, I hope, quickly solve. To illustrate it, in the city of Brisbane alone there are tens of thousands of men who play cricket and football in season, who play tennis or golf, who go sailing or fishing, or even, as keen horticulturists, like to spend their time in their gardens and making their properties beautiful. Now, many of these men, and indeed women, want to bet. But they do not want to go to the racecourse, and there is no law that can drive them there. These are the people who provide the real background against which illicit

operators have flourished right in the metropolitan area and almost under the shadow of the racecourse fence.

I have given deep consideration to this problem. At one stage it was in the mind of the Government that we should strike a further blow at the illicit off-course operator by allowing registered bookmakers to accept bets on the morning of the race. However, we now believe that the race clubs will make an early move towards the off-course totalisator, and we are prepared to wait a little longer in the hope that the off-course totalisator will provide the better answer. I say quite plainly that I am really unhappy at the knowledge that there are thousands of people every Saturday in Brisbane who do not go to the racecourse, who will not go to the racecourse, who still bet and in so doing break the law. An answer has got to be found to this as a very real social problem. If the race clubs do not act with reasonable speed towards the establishment of an off-the-course tote, I say quite plainly that this is a problem to which no Government will be able to leave as it is and do nothing about it.

A further principle of the Bill will deal with power to extend the declaration of a principal club to trotting. Section 31 of the existing law establishes principal clubs for the purpose of this Act and the rules of racing. In addition to the four principal clubs which are named in the Act, power is given to the Governor in Council to appoint other racing clubs to be a principal club for the purposes of this Act and the rules of racing. At first it had been considered that this would enable the appointment as a principal club of the Queensland Trotting Control League, but the draftsman has advised me that, as the term “Rules of Racing” used in the section applies only to galloping, a separate power will be required. Accordingly the Bill provides for the appointment of a principal trotting club or clubs.

I may say that when I first took over the administration of the Racing Acts, I quickly received deputations urging such a recognition. At that time, I had to tell the deputationists that I was not prepared to do so. I drew the attention of the trotting clubs to certain practices that savoured of professionalism. I also made it clear that there was far too much evidence of disunity in their ranks, and that I was not prepared to recommend any recognition until it was clear that the body so recognised would command a very great degree of support from the several trotting clubs.

Since then, the Queensland Trotting Control League has been formed. Its constitution has been reviewed and amended to meet the suggestions of the department. So far as I can determine, the undesirable element of professionalism has been completely removed, and if there is still an occasional squabble to mar the picture of complete harmony, it appears to me that the League has come through a period of testing with credit. If the Bill is passed,

the way will be clear for a principal club to emerge to exercise a supervisory and arranging power in relation to trotting similar to that which has been successfully carried out for many years by the several principal racing clubs.

Personally, I regard the part played by a principal club as quite critical. I do not need to tell hon. members that racing can be, and occasionally is, a very dirty business. If it were not for the stern supervision of principal clubs who, by their evolution of racing rules, by the supervision which is exercised through carefully chosen stewards, and by a courageous exercise of the disciplinary powers which are vested in a principal club, the bad elements of racing would be as common as they are relatively rare today. And here might I say something that will no doubt be controversial. The racing journals of Australia are generally strong in support of anything that will lead to cleaner racing, but I must confess that I cannot understand the recent publication of articles which glamourised and lionised a jockey who had just been awarded a lengthy suspension for interfering with a race by hanging on to another jockey's boot. That sort of thing might sell some more papers, it might lend some colour to journalism, but I venture to say that, when transgressions of that sort occur, it does a disservice when extensive articles are written which might lead people to consider that he was the victim rather than the culprit.

Opportunity is taken also to tidy up some ancillary features and to apply the same conditions to trotting, as now apply to galloping. For example, there will be clear power to control the number of trotting meetings and the dates of those meetings in any area. The same power will be taken in respect of coursing meetings. Then, too, in each case, power will be extended for the control of postponed meetings when the allotted meeting cannot be held owing to weather conditions.

Now that I have mentioned coursing, let me make it clear that there will be no off-course betting in relation to coursing, nor will bookmakers fielding at coursing meetings be entitled to accept bets on horse racing events. The Coursing Association has sought this latter extension. I am not without some doubts as to the real equity of allowing bookmakers at trotting meetings to accept wagers on galloping events. If there is little justification in principle, there is practical support inasmuch as it does provide a legal opportunity in many areas where otherwise no legal opportunity would exist. For this reason, I do not propose to disturb the existing power of a bookmaker at a trotting meeting to field on galloping events and vice versa. However, I do not propose to extend that privilege to coursing meetings.

Opportunity has also been taken to tidy up a very minor matter which arose from the provision which was inserted a year or two ago in terms of which a tote dividend was

guaranteed not to fall short of the amount of the investment. Certain anomalies arose in relation to horses which ran a dead heat. Under the terms of the amendment, the guarantee did not relate to any dividend in respect of a horse which dead-heated. There is no reason why the minimum should not apply when the dead heat does not increase the number of horses on which a dividend is payable and this Bill widens the application of the minimum dividend to put that principle into effect.

Still further in relation to existing totalisator practice, the Bill extends from fourteen days to twenty-eight days, the time within which winning totalisator tickets may be collected from the Stamp Duties Office. At the present time, they are forfeited after fourteen days. My conclusion is this is unnecessarily harsh and the Bill extends the period to twenty-eight days before the dividend is forfeited.

I think I have covered the provisions of the Bill.

Mr. Walsh: Have you any views on night trotting?

Mr. HILEY: It is not dealt with in the Bill at all.

It will not add to betting facilities in the areas which are presently well served. It will not mean a repetition of the undesirable city betting shops which were experienced in Adelaide and Perth; it will strike a strong blow, to use my earlier analogy, not at the branches of the illicit gambling tree but at its roots. It will provide the opportunity for and stimulate the racing clubs into a speedy approach to the off-course totalisator, an infinitely preferable system; and, finally, it will, I hope, put an end to an era that has persisted far too long during which thousands of our citizens have grown up in an atmosphere in which the law has been constantly broken. I regard it as extremely dangerous that large masses of the people should grow into the habit of a disregard of the law. If the impression is formed that it is all right with one law, the habit can easily extend to others.

Because the Bill is lengthy, because it is controversial, the Government propose to allow hon. members to study it over the week-end and to proceed with its further stages on Tuesday next.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (12.4 p.m.): The Treasurer, in finishing his speech, said that the Bill was lengthy and controversial, which justified further consideration of the measure being deferred until Tuesday next. Because we feel the same way about the matter it will not be necessary for more than a limited number of speakers on this side to deal with the general questions involved in the proposed legislation.

I wish to indicate, at the outset, that the Opposition propose to follow what I believe

to be, generally speaking, the correct pattern; that is, when a Bill, which profoundly affects the public interest and which embodies several principles, is being presented to the Chamber, the logical and sensible attitude to adopt is to have a look at it and see what principles are contained in it and what variations, if any, there are between what the Minister said in introducing it and what the Bill actually contains.

We have been accused of adopting an inconsistent attitude on that, but I think it is not only a sensible attitude but a consistent one that we have adopted throughout. The only variation to it is where there are only one or two principles in a Bill and they are obnoxious to us in their entirety. We have opposed such a Bill at the introductory stage. We exercised the right, the prerogative of the Opposition, in the landlord and tenant and other legislation. Today we have had a classic example of the Treasurer's using his silkiest, smoothest tones to introduce a measure, and in doing so he shed a lot of crocodile tears about his concern for the morality of racing and the fact that the great bulk of the people throughout Queensland who interest themselves in betting should have legal means available to them for betting on races. But nowhere in his speech, and this is rather significant, did he indicate that the purpose of the Bill was to garner into the Treasury £1,000,000 from the race-goers of the State.

I said some time ago that the Government were known as a booze-and-betting Government. If the Treasurer came in here and said, "We are concerned about the matter of getting revenue to finance the State's development and we feel at the present time there is a field of revenue from which we have a legitimate right to extract portion of the sum," I should have had a greater appreciation of his political honesty.

This is an extraordinary Bill for several reasons. I do not say it, but the Treasurer said it, not once, but at least two or three times, "I am not an expert on racing. I do not belong to racing and I do not know very much about it, but I have sought by way of deputation the views of racing journalists, principal clubs, bookmakers and others closely associated with this business."

Has the Treasurer as a result of the canvassing of those views brought in a Bill based on the recommendations of those bodies? He has admitted that he is not an expert in these matters. He has admitted also that he took the unusual course for a Minister of appointing a special committee from within the ranks of the Government parties to guide and help him in framing a Bill for presentation to his Caucus, and in this regard we have the unprecedented example of this committee's being asked by the Minister to sit in and be present when the deputation was held. If the grapevine is any reliable indication, the so-called experts constituting this committee when they

went to their Caucus had their recommendations reversed by the Caucus. Again, if the grapevine is reliable, the Treasurer tried to create a good atmosphere, by smoothing over the deputation, and he is noted for doing that with his great capacity for using words suavely, smoothly, succinctly—and we could use other adjectives—trying to convey the impression that the point of view taken, was a very reasonable one. As far as I gather, most of the things that he agreed to have been rejected by his Caucus.

The main thing is £1,000,000 in revenue, but not once have we heard from the Treasurer, the statement, "I intend to get £1,000,000 from the taxpayers." What silly piffle he goes on with. He is not convinced that people throughout Queensland are prepared to bet more prolifically and more often if the right is given the approval of law, yet on his own admission at the present time there are thousands of people in Brisbane alone who remain away from race meetings because they want to bet illegally! There seems to be a complete contradiction in those matters.

I want hon. members to examine for a moment the differences in the approach to this matter. When the Labour Government examined it, they set up two commissions consisting of men who had special qualifications in this field. They took evidence. The Treasurer might say it was not as satisfactory as it might have been, according to the declaration of some of the commissioners themselves, nevertheless it was a State-wide commission. It travelled widely and interstate. Its conclusion were placed before the Government before certain measures were introduced into the Assembly.

In 1954 an amendment was brought down, not for the purpose of legalising starting price betting, not for the purpose of getting substantially increased revenue from the public of the State, but to provide machinery whereby people in the various zones of the State if they wished legally to exercise the right of placing a bet, were given the opportunity of a poll if 10 per cent. of them produced evidence of their desire for it. In the event of that poll succeeding, provision was made for the general circumstances of administrative arrangements that would operate. The voter knew that if he voted for it, general machinery would be created, but no such step was taken on this occasion. There is no indication by the Treasurer as to how the administrative proposals will operate. He says he is concerned with the moral side. I am saying he is talking with his political tongue in his cheek and if he is not talking with his political tongue in his cheek I will show, and prove in a few moments' time that he talked with it in his cheek a few years ago. If the Government approach is to make this a moral issue, and not a question of law or revenue and they want to say that everyone should be treated equally in this matter, let us consider

what the Government did with the Liquor Act. They did not treat everyone equally. If it is good law for everyone to have a drink in Toowoomba on Sunday, then it is equally good law for the people in Ipswich or Redcliffe to have a drink on Sunday. I do not accept for one moment that the Government are concerned morally about this matter. The Treasurer has already been made aware of some monkey practices that he will watch carefully concerning the withdrawal of horses. What we really need on this occasion is not a Treasurer who does not know anything about racing, to watch the monkey practices, but the public to watch the monkey practices of the Government.

Let us see what some members of the Government Party had to say about the moral question, when they were in Opposition. When the Racing and Betting Bill of 1954 was introduced, the present premier said, in Volume 210 of "Hansard" at page 1495—

"The Minister"—Mr. Walsh—"spoke of the State's responsibility. It has a great responsibility. When this legislation is passed the Government will be responsible for having introduced an anti-social evil. The Minister almost had us crying about alleged poverty and misery in the past. What could create more poverty and misery than the extension of gambling facilities making it easier for people to place bets on the races. The Government cannot be very proud of themselves particularly when they represent themselves as a Government who stand for the workers and whose legislation is designed to protect the women and children of the community."

Now, he proposes to take £1,000,000 from them, but our legislation did not provide for the taking of anything from them. That is the first thing. Then he continued—

"Who is going to suffer most by the extension of gambling facilities in this State? The worker, of course, and the women and children . . . The parents of this State who have any regard for their responsibilities will not regard this legislation with favour because it will be exposing their children to unnecessary temptation."

Then, at page 1496, he said—

"This Bill . . . has one main object, namely to give the sanction of the law to a moral evil which will provide a considerable amount of revenue for the Government. If the Government want to raise additional revenue for purposes of State, why do they not do it in a decent way. . ."

Mr. Walsh interjected and said—

"You know that the Liberal-Country Party of Victoria advocated the legalising of S.P. shops?"

In reply, Mr. Nicklin said—

"I would attack the Liberal-Country Party in Victoria if they did the same thing as the hon. member's party is doing."

Then, on the same page, we find him saying—

"This legislation legalises a moral evil by giving the sanction of the law to the licensing of betting shops. I do not consider this a political question. It is a matter of great moral principle, and as the leader of a political party on this side of the Chamber I am not going to ask any hon. member to vote against his conscience or against his principles on such a question."

What did he do? What has happened? He wants all Government members to be here next Tuesday to vote. He is not worried about their consciences; he is worried about their staying away. He has sent them a message calling them back here next Tuesday because some may absent themselves. He says, in effect, "We cannot afford to expose ourselves to the danger of defeat." Yet, a few years ago when similar legislation was introduced, his attitude was quite different. He said that it would be a matter of conscience for the members of his party, but on this occasion it is not left to their consciences, for the Government Whip is sending out messages saying, "Come back, or else your endorsement will be affected for the next elections." In 1954, the present Premier moved an amendment and at a later stage, he said—

"I am not speaking on this politically; I am approaching the issue from the moral, social and economic point of view. My concluding words are that if we in this Parliament have any regard whatsoever for the future citizens of this State, we will not subject them to the risks and dangers to which they must inevitably be subjected if we establish licensed off-the-course betting facilities in this State."

What does he propose to do? He proposes to license all those who are operating today and as many more as the principal clubs are prepared to say are necessary in certain areas. He proposes to let them have the shops and let them use their windows. What is a window for if not to display something? It is an invitation to come inside. He proposes to make provision for pre-post information to be broadcast over the radio and otherwise circulated. Who will bother to go along to the race tracks if he can get all the information from the comfort of his own home and can make arrangements for a bet at these various places? I will have more to say about that, if not today, at least on Tuesday.

Let us turn to what the great defender of moral principles, the present Deputy Premier, said in 1954. He said—

"If you have a belief and conscience that is directing you towards the betterment

of the people and the upholding of democracy and you vote for this legislation, you are voting not only against your conscience but against all common sense. If you believe in something that will harm a great number of people, then and then only can you support the Bill."

He went on to say—

"As long as I exist, I will fight the introduction of off-course betting in this State. It is a damnable thing and could ruin thousands of young people. Parliament has a moral responsibility to lead the people on a matter such as this. The Government have sold their birthright in taking the action they have, and I hope they are eternally damned."

I will spare the hon. member for Barambah because on this occasion we have a few bigger fish to fry.

The present Deputy Premier went on to say, at page 1499—

"It is because I believe that (the proposed) law is completely immoral that I am 100 per cent. behind the amendment and I will support it to the hilt."

He is supporting it a long way to the hilt now all right. He went on to say—

"The Government are condoning the introduction of an evil into this State which will probably damn hundreds and probably thousands of the youth of this community in the future."

Then he went on to talk about what happened in New Zealand, in Western Australia and in South Australia. He spoke of these terrible things and said he was going to fight to the last ditch.

Mr. Coburn: Those things did happen there, too.

Mr. DUGGAN: I agree that they did, and of course, it is all recorded in "Hansard" that these people referred to them and said they were going to fight to the last ditch and leave the vote to the conscience of hon. members.

But what are they doing now for a few miserable pounds? They are not concerned about conscience and about moral principles just as with Mt. Isa they are not concerned about the sinking fund. They were after a quick quid for a few beef roads and a quick quid by way of increased liquor fees, and they are after a quick quid here. The Treasurer has said that he and the Government believe a totalisator system should be introduced. Why do they not go on with it now? They expect to get £1,000,000 out of this but the Treasurer has not mentioned much about it. I understand such a totalisator in Brisbane would cost about £300,000. Why do they not do what the Victorian Government did—guarantee the the clubs the provision of funds for the purpose? If they are going to get this sum of money they will certainly be able to redeem very quickly the cost of providing a totalisator.

Why the haste in this matter? The Treasurer was concerned about the time factor. Has there been a general deterioration? In the last report of the Commissioner of Police, dealing with immoral influences in the community, it was reported that in 1957, the last year that Labour was in office, there were 739 prosecutions involving fines for breaches of the gaming law. Last year in Queensland there were 343 prosecutions, or less than half the number we had in 1957, despite an increasing population. Only one or two conclusions can be drawn from that. There has been a decline in illegal betting in those areas or there has been an instruction by the authorities to ease up on the supervision of illegal betting or there has been corruption on the part of those administering the law. There can be no other interpretation.

Mr. Sherrington: Ease up in certain areas.

Mr. DUGGAN: Exactly. The so-called racing experts—one or two on the committee appointed for the purpose—are all concerned about their own little areas and how they will be affected, particularly the South Coast and certain other areas. The Treasurer's only concern is about how it will affect the State's finances.

Let us turn now to the Minister himself, the man who does not know a great deal about racing but who posed as one with some authority in 1957 because then he had a great deal to say. Let me quote the following from "Hansard" Volume 210, 1944-1955, page 1576 onwards—

"And it is a Bill to authorise telephone betting and betting by post. Nowhere does it impress me as being a Bill to limit betting in general. It certainly is a Bill to extend betting facilities. It is a Bill to set the seal of State approval on more betting occasions, on more betting places, and on more betting methods."

He went on to say—

"I have not the slightest doubt that one of the results of this Bill will be that more young people will be lured away from the glorious Australian tradition of participation in sport in order to attend betting shops, which, if the referendums are carried, will be set up with the seal of governmental approval on their doorsteps."

All the Treasurer is concerned about now is that they will be a few yards away from a church. He went on to say—

"I propose to draw the widest possible distinction between betting on the course, with all its carefully worked out safeguards, and betting off the course, with all its tendencies to create rackets for monopolies."

He said that seven years ago. Now he says that there will be some practices that will have to be watched. He said seven years ago that people would want to involve themselves in these rackets and that they would have to be watched very carefully.

He will have to watch the position more carefully than he has so far if the public is to be protected. He went on to say—

"The whole question of gambling is wrapped up with the old biblical doctrine of covetousness. It is because men are greedy for their neighbour's possessions that they indulge primarily in the gambling instinct."

He also said—

"I suppose when the working people of this State are crucified by the betting shops the members of the Cabinet will, like Pontius Pilate, wash their hands."

"Mr. Hilton: That analogy is rather blasphemous.

"Mr. Hiley: Good heavens above! What the Government are doing is blasphemous."

He then went on to say—

"Having in mind the cases of men who have made a complete and utter mess of their lives, I must confess that I approach this matter with a bias against any further extension of facilities for betting. That state of mind is based on my experience of broken lives and ruined fortunes."

Later he said—

"Just as we have a slogan in war-time that if necessary it shall be 'guns before butter', so do I give as a slogan for peace at this stage of our national development, 'higher pensions before more gambling', and 'more houses and factories before betting shops'. If we have any rhyme or reason, if we have any sense of priorities left in our assessment of what is good for the nation, we cannot deny the truth of those sayings."

Of course, there are priorities now. Mr. Menzies is not going to increase pensions; but Mr. Hiley is going to provide betting shops, although he said on that occasion that pensions should have a higher priority than betting shops.

The Minister for Transport, Mr. Chalk, also spoke in that debate, but he is one of the smaller fry and I shall not deal with his remarks.

The Minister for Justice, Mr. Munro, has expressed concern about variations in conditions within the State and said that laws should apply uniformly throughout the State. He mentioned in the particular debate to which I am referring that there should not be laws operating within certain geographical boundaries or certain restricted areas. However, in introducing the Liquor Acts Amendment Bill he adopted the very opposite principle. On this occasion 17 members of the Opposition, including the gentlemen I have mentioned, voted against these and other proposals.

The Treasurer became quite irate the other day and said, "It is all very well for the Leader of the Opposition to quote what somebody said here or outside." The position

is that the public wants to know whether it can trust the Government, and I say that they cannot be trusted.

Much has been said about the principal clubs. I believe this legislation could ruin them. We have heard a great deal to support that belief, and we have no proof that the law will be strictly policed. I make no accusations against the Police Force, but I should like to refer to an article that appeared in the Sydney "The Daily Mirror" about two years ago. It mentioned the evidence given before a Royal Commission by Inspector Healey in relation to the operations of the Gaming Squad in Victoria. The Inspector said that he considered 50 per cent. of the police charged with gaming duty were doing a reasonable job, 30 per cent. were corrupt, and 20 per cent. were inefficient. The article went on to say—

"The Royal Commissioner also heard allegations of corruption of P.M.G. telephone branch employees by illegal bookmakers."

Now we have the Treasurer saying that some time in the near future we will have totalisator betting in this State because of all sorts of dramatic technological developments that have taken place. He says that the person to whom the call is made will hear it 100 or 200 miles away. It is within the realms of possibility that that will occur, but it may be next year, it may be in the next 10 years, or it may be in the next 100 years. We do not know when it will be. We have no indication when. We are told that there is to be a rigorous tightening up of the law. As I said before, in the last year of the Labour Government there were 739 prosecutions as against only a little over 300 under this Government last year, despite the expanding population. Then we have had all the talk about the clubs benefiting by the legislation. If they are to benefit, why have they been so vociferous about the matter?

I have overlooked a point to which I desired to draw attention. I think the Treasurer has been guilty of extreme discourtesy to Parliament. On 23 November he gave a series of replies about the proposed Bill to Mr. Tom Foley, a "Courier-Mail" sporting writer. I have nothing against Mr. Foley. He is entitled to seek information wherever he can get it. He sought information about the Treasurer's intention in the amending legislation. What is the good of having Parliament in those circumstances? The Treasurer apparently convinces Caucus that certain things should be done, irrespective of what might be said about the Bill in Parliament, the place where the law is made. I make a strong protest on that score. It is a gross discourtesy to Parliament when information of that kind is prematurely released to outside bodies.

It is not my job to state a case for the bookmakers. They are much smarter than I am in their particular field. Whether they

succeed or fail depends on their own knowledge, skill and understanding of the racing game and the risks they take. I think it is true to say that a leading paddock bookmaker with five clerks would pay expenses in the vicinity of £6,000 a year. With a fielding fee of £31-odd, admission charges for himself and five clerks, race books, taxi fares, 1,600 to 1,800 betting tickets at 6d. each, plus the other incidental expenses including the Q.T.C. fee and the Government fee, he would pay out roughly something like £6,000 a year. With 50 paddock bookmakers fielding on local events and 23 operating on southern events, in one club alone, hon. members have some indication of the amount of revenue they provide. They play a very important part in the financial operations of the clubs.

I have before me a copy of the balance sheet of the Toowoomba Turf Club. It shows that the bookmakers in that area paid to the Toowoomba Turf Club last year £16,426 6s. in betting fees and £1,259 10s. in service fees, a total of £17,685 16s. During the same period, from 33 race meetings, the club received £12,793 in gate fees and £2,207 in membership fees. It means that £2,685 less was paid by the members of the public to go to the Toowoomba Turf Club meetings than was paid by the bookmakers.

Because of those and other reasons we are obliged to examine the implications of the Bill very carefully. I say very definitely that I should have had more respect for the Treasurer if he had said bluntly, "I am not concerned about moral principles; what I am concerned about is dough. I want a million quid. I want it quickly. I am not prepared to wait six months, 12 months, or however long it will be until these new-fangled ideas will be introduced, to adopt the ideal system. I want dough now." But he shelters behind the Bill and says, "We want to protect the members of the public who want to bet but are afraid to do so because it is unlawful." I think that is a lot of poppy-cock.

(Time expired.)

Hon. P. J. R. HILTON (Carnarvon) (12.29 p.m.): The first thought that enters my mind this morning is one of apprehension for the future of the publication known as "Hansard". From time to time there has been talk about the cost of printing "Hansard" and whether the expenditure is justified. From what we have heard this morning, coupled with what we heard in the Chamber a few years ago, I think that there might be a very determined effort made by the Government to eliminate "Hansard" entirely and all that goes with it.

Mr. Nicklin: They would not be able to make any speeches from that side if we did.

Mr. HILTON: In these days of advanced science small pocket-sized tape recorders can

be carried conveniently. If "Hansard" were abolished in order to avoid the predicament that the Government now find themselves in, it would not do them any good because tape recordings could be taken quite conveniently. They could be played back very readily, of course, with the permission of Mr. Speaker or the Chairman as the occasion warranted it. I have been thinking this morning that if tape recordings had been taken when the debate to which the Leader of the Opposition referred today was in progress in this Chamber, and they were now played back, the Premier, the Treasurer, the Deputy Premier and many others on the Government benches would not be game to sit there and take it.

It is quite true that a good deal of hypocrisy has been spoken in this Chamber on the subject of racing and off-course betting. Be that as it may, the Government cannot undo what they have done in the past and they cannot unsay what they said in the past.

I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that more credit would attach to the Government if the Treasurer, in addition to all his very nice platitudes, had said that they were deeply concerned to obtain the revenue which they badly need. I think the public would then say, "Well, at least, they are honest in their approach to the question this time. They admit they have to swallow the sentiments that they expressed a few years ago, but they are being honest now in telling us that because of the dire financial position of the State they are forced to bring this legislation down."

I repeat that people would have had more respect for them if they had been candid, or if the Treasurer had high-lighted that aspect of it in introducing the legislation today. I know that off-course betting has been the subject of much disputation and debate, time and time again. In our day as the Government it was strongly debated in our Caucus meetings; it was strongly debated at our Labour-in-Politics Convention in 1953. I recall "The Morning Bulletin" in Rockhampton, after the debate at the Labour-in-Politics Convention there, referred to a man who took a prominent part in the debate and said that the utterances of this particular member of the Labour Party were the greatest miracle since the conversion of St. Paul on the road to Damascus.

One gets all sorts of conflicting ideas on this subject. I shall speak personally and, I hope, objectively. We have to face up to a position that would, at least, give the same civil rights to all sections of the community throughout the State. I am not a betting man. I might go to the races if I am in Brisbane over a week-end, once or twice a year, but long, long ago I realised that any body who thought he could make a fortune out of racing was just a fool with his money.

Despite all the claims made by the Treasurer today that racing is much cleaner

than it used to be, I do not think he is so innocent or so inexperienced as not to know that in every race there are many horses that are not triers, and that those who know a little about the game know perfectly well that only fools try to pick a winner in each race.

Despite that, and so many other aspects of racing, it is known as the sports of kings. The sport seems to be inherent in English-speaking people and others throughout the world, and it has been for many years. I know that there is a small percentage of men who love animals. They love horses and they like to go to the races to see horses engage in a racing combat. Of course, most people by far, go to bet. They like to pit their wits against those of the bookmakers, the owners, the trainers, the jockeys and everybody else.

Mr. Hanlon: The more tax the Government can drag from them the less chance the punters have of winning with the prices coming down.

Mr. HILTON: The tax is on the bookmakers but, of course, the bookmakers rely on the punters for the number of bets they write. As the bookmaker pays the tax, of course, that will not affect the punter directly. The bookmaker knows full well that on every occasion a ready army of punters will be there to make the necessary donations to keep him and the racing game going. On that point perhaps too much attention is directed to the role played by racing clubs. We must have racing clubs and some semblance of legality associated with racing, but it is the average punter who keeps the racing game going. I think some members of those clubs are high and mighty, autocratic, and dogmatic in their views on too many occasions, and perhaps too much notice is taken of them. No-one can argue that on all counts they have done the right thing by the racing public.

Getting back to the extension of the right to bet to citizens in country areas and remote parts of the State, the big aspect that registered in my mind during the Treasurer's introduction is that although the Treasurer said the Government want to face up to the position, that they want to stamp out illegal off-course betting, that they want to do this and other things for country people, he admitted that the legislation threw the whole responsibility onto the racing clubs. The Government are enacting legislation that will create a big monopoly, and that is entirely to their discredit.

The Treasurer has intimated that racing clubs will have the sole right to determine what centres will be licensed and who will be licensed. That will create a great deal of patronage, a great deal of favouritism and, if I have interpreted the Treasurer's remarks correctly, it is not going to work out to the satisfaction of the people in the country.

There has been quite a spate of rumours as to who is to be licensed, how those licenses will be granted and under what conditions they will operate. It appears that the racing clubs are to be given the sole right to determine who will be licensed. According to the Treasurer's remarks and from what we have heard and read, preference is to be given to registered bookmakers. Although a dateline is set for registered bookmakers, there is no obligation on the clubs to license anybody immediately or at any time. Therefore racing clubs that want to indulge in a little favouritism can tip off a registered bookmaker, that is, a bookmaker registered before 1 August, to take up residence in such-and-such a town by saying, "There is no racing there and no registered bookmaker there. Go along there and of course you will obviously get priority in a licence." That can happen. After the bookmaker who was not formerly a resident of the town goes to it and gets his license, he can after a few months leave the town and leave someone to carry on his business. He may employ agents to carry it on for him.

The sole right to issue licenses will rest with the principal clubs. In Southern Queensland I assume the Q.T.C. will take the recommendation of the Downs and South West Queensland Racing Association. The position is going to be most unsatisfactory because of the patronage that I can foresee.

Much criticism has been levelled at men who have operated illegally as off-the-course bookmakers for many years. It is said of them that they make no contribution to the upkeep or conduct of racing. It is true that they did not make any contribution because they were not permitted to do so. They had been operating illegally. It goes back many years really, prior to the advent of a Labour Government in this State. S.P. or off-the-course betting has been in operation since racing commenced in any substantial way in Queensland. In many areas where there are no racing clubs, or a club that races once or twice a year, there are no registered bookmakers living in the towns, some of which have very substantial populations. For many years, in those centres, decent, reputable men, have acted as S.P. bookmakers to meet the needs of the people who wanted to bet. As I understand the measure, because these men were not registered as bookmakers prior to 1 August, it is quite competent for any racing club to allow registered bookmakers to come to those towns and horn in on the preserves of these decent, reputable citizens, and take away what has been their livelihood for many years. I only hope I have not misinterpreted the Treasurer's remarks about this. I asked whether it was mandatory for racing clubs to appoint or recommend licences for the off-the-course operators or S.P. bookmakers in any particular town, and the Treasurer informed me that there was no particular obligation on any club to do so. I believe

that if the Government are sincere in this legislation to give people the right to bet in country areas, they should lay down stringent conditions for clubs for the granting of licences. The Government should formulate some basis, perhaps on population, whereby one or two licences may be granted. Why should an important matter like this be left to the sole discretion of the clubs? Why are the Government passing the buck in this matter? I quite agree that it may be advisable for the Government to get a recommendation about the character of a man who applies for an off-the-course bookmaker's licence. However, if a club does not like the colour of the eyes of a particular person, or has some other grudge against him, it can rob him. The officials of the club can foist one of their own favourites into a very lucrative business. That should not be tolerated under any legislation. The Government should have stipulated the necessary elementary principles to be considered in licensing bookmakers in the various areas, and the methods by which such licensing may be carried out.

Until we read the Bill in detail, and have an opportunity to analyse its financial aspects more closely, the turnover tax, and betting tax, and all that goes with it, we cannot speak with any great degree of certainty about the financial aspects of the measure.

The Treasurer referred to the establishment of off-the-course totalisators. Of course they may come. However, there is no mandatory provision for it, although the Treasurer said that if the racing clubs did not do something definite within a certain time the Government themselves would have to take action. If off-the-course totalisators are desirable why have not the Government laid down a certain time within which the clubs must take action within a certain radius of the cities concerned? Why leave all this power for the development of the plan in the hands of the racing clubs? Why are the Government side-stepping so many issues with this legislation? I hope that the Treasurer in his reply will give a clearer indication on these important aspects. He certainly left us somewhat in mid-air on the introduction of the Bill. Until I learn definitely what it contains about these important matters I will reserve my decision on how I will vote on it.

I repeat that the Government would have emerged with much greater credit from the measure if they had been honest and indicated the real and pressing motive for its introduction. Be that as it may, I believe that people in the country are entitled to the same civic rights as people in the cities. I hope that under the Bill they will not be denied those rights and that it will be for them not just a snare and a delusion or something designed to placate them while not serving them.

Mr. MANN (Brisbane) (12.46 p.m.): Firstly I should like to say that the Bill is very ill-conceived and badly drawn.

Mr. Knox: Will you repeal it?

Mr. MANN: I will tell the hon. member what I will do when I get along a little. Very definitely I believe the Bill will do incalculable harm to racing in the metropolitan area. I base that statement on the fact that the Treasurer has decided that S.P. betting will operate legally within 30 miles of the G.P.O. In these days of travel by motor-car it is quite easy to get to the races from 80 or 100 miles out of Brisbane.

The Treasurer should have given more consideration to the views of the race clubs. Let me here say that I have had no dealings with the race clubs whatever in connection with the legislation. All I know about their attitude is what I have read in "The Courier-Mail." But I have read the 1954 report of the Royal Commission on Off-the-course Betting and in all phases of that report the commission and responsible members of race clubs and responsible citizens of the community in the southern area expressed the belief that 100 miles from Brisbane would be a fair limit for the establishment of S.P. totalisator betting.

Mr. Pizzey: Have all the workers got motor-cars today?

Mr. MANN: Mr. Taylor, did you ever hear such an idiotic statement coming from a responsible Minister? The Minister for Education should know that only 10 per cent. of the people in the community go to the races.

Mr. Pizzey: You say they all go by motor-car.

Mr. MANN: Certainly most of those who go to the races go by private motor cars or by taxi.

Mr. Pizzey: Workers, too?

Mr. MANN: The Minister for Education should know better. It ill becomes a man entrusted with the portfolio devoted to educating the community to ask such a stupid question.

Mr. Sullivan: What about the man digging spuds up at Gatton who wants to have a bet on Saturday afternoon? Are you going to deny him the right?

Mr. MANN: I should like to protect the man digging spuds up at Gatton from having a bet. Let me tell the Committee that anybody who says betting is an amenity is a fool.

Mr. Sullivan: Take your tongue out of your cheek.

Mr. MANN: Betting is not an amenity at all. I do not intend to argue about it. It makes no difference to me if anyone wants to argue otherwise. Whether betting is morally wrong does not enter into the matter. I am not concerned with the morals

of the people in the community who bet. I am talking about the people who bet and gamble. I am talking about the 10 per cent. of the people and their right to do what they want to do and how the Bill will affect them. I do not care if other people say it is wrong to gamble. I have my own way of life. I live my life according to my own rights and I think other people are entitled to live as they choose as long as they live within the law. That is the attitude I adopt. Morals do not come into it at all.

If you want to keep racing going—and I am one who would like to see racing kept going—I think the Bill is wrong in that respect.

On the other hand, when I study the report of the Royal Commission and when I travel through the country and know what goes on in the Far North, in the Far West, in the South-West and in the West generally, I think some provision should be made to give those people an opportunity to bet. I make no bones about that. I think that the Government might well have considered many aspects of the report of the Royal Commission that was appointed by a former Labour Government, because parts of it are very sound.

I believe that the Bill was originally called for by members of the Country Party to give some relief to people in the outback areas who are betting illegally now. The whole matter has got out of hand and the Government have tackled it incorrectly. The Treasurer should have taken careful note of the map at the back of the report. An area within a 100-mile radius of Brisbane is shown on it, and there is another area marked round Rockhampton.

Mr. Hiley: If that is so, why did your Government provide no shelter radius when they brought down a Bill after receiving the report of that Commission?

Mr. MANN: We did. We laid down different areas in which a referendum could be held, but there was no demand from the betting public for a referendum. I challenge the Treasurer, the Premier, or any other member on the Government benches, to say that there has been a demand from the public for the legalisation of S.P. betting. I am realistic in my approach. I believe that in the Far North and the Far West it is not a matter of morals but a matter of custom and practice. In almost every town in the western districts and in the Far North there have been S.P. operators, and the people have become accustomed to that practice. In my opinion, the Treasurer should have adopted a different attitude altogether. From Mackay right through to Brisbane, from Rockhampton right through to Brisbane, from Toowoomba and Oakey right through to Brisbane, the opinion was that there should be no S.P. betting. Sir William Gunn, a man of substance in the community, a man whose word anyone would take, said, there should be no S.P.

within 120 miles of Brisbane. I want the hon. member for Condamine to take notice of this.

Mr. Pizzey: If you had a 100-mile radius in Tasmania, you would have no S.P. betting.

Mr. MANN: That is another silly interjection from the Minister. He has never been to Tasmania. He does not know anything about racing in Tasmania. Let me tell him that betting on races in Tasmania is infinitesimal. All the people there bet on the mainland races. If Tasmanian bookmakers were compelled to operate wholly and solely on Tasmanian races, there would be very few bookmakers in Tasmania.

Mr. Sullivan: You never want to stand against Gordon Chalk in Lockyer. Those fellows bet a bit up there.

Mr. MANN: The hon. member for Condamine had better not come and stand against me in Brisbane and contest an election on the issue of licensing S.P. bookmakers. I challenge him to do it.

Mr. Sullivan: You come out to Condamine.

Mr. MANN: The hon. member has issued a challenge to me. I will issue one to him.

I should like to quote this passage from the report of the Royal Commission—

“That the problem was a difficult one became more evident as our inquiries proceeded, because the conditions in Southern Queensland differed from those in Central and Northern Queensland, and as between the principal cities. For example, the pastoral areas are vast, but the centres of population dependent upon it are not large. Conditions there are different from those in the more compact sugar areas stretching along our tropical coastline as far as Mossman, a comparatively small but important and thriving township 1,100 miles from Brisbane. The conditions of both these industries are the antithesis of those in the great silver-lead mining industry of Mt. Isa, or the gold and copper mining industry of Mount Morgan, or the pastoral industry in the more closely settled areas of the South-West.”

I wish to draw the attention of the Treasurer and other hon. members, particularly the hon. member for Condamine, to this sentence—

“It is therefore impracticable to devise a uniform set of conditions for the whole State.”

That is the point that the Treasurer lost sight of in introducing the Bill. He is trying to meet the requirements of the whole of the State, but this Commission, which was composed of practical men who took evidence from all interested persons, said that it was impracticable to devise a uniform set of conditions for the whole State. I think that the whole set-up is wrong. I have no objection to the Government's

licensing bookmakers in the North or the West of the State or setting up a totalisator system there, because off-the-course betting is part of the life of the people in those areas. I have been in Longreach and I have made bets in Longreach.

Mr. Sullivan: And you can bet on the Downs or anywhere else.

Mr. MANN: Those on the Downs can get to Toowoomba or Brisbane. The people in the Far-West cannot get here.

Mr. Sullivan: Do you think that the people in Toowoomba who want to bet will want to come down to the race clubs in Brisbane every Saturday?

Mr. MANN: Anyone in Toowoomba who wanted to make a bet on the Brisbane races would be able to place a bet up there with a bookmaker or find someone else to put a bet on for him. I make no bones about it—if the Bill comes into operation and we get S.P. betting within 30 miles of Brisbane it will do racing in Brisbane incalculable harm. I defy anybody to contradict that statement. The Government should redraft the Bill, at least that aspect of it. For the life of me I do not know why they did not accept many of the recommendations contained in the report of the Royal Commission on Off-the-course Betting. As I proceed I shall indicate to the Committee the value of much of the evidence that was presented to the Commission. Many of its findings were very sound.

Dr. Delamothe: It is out of date.

Mr. MANN: The hon. member is out of date.

Mr. Hiley: If you are taking that report as your Bible now why did not the Labour Party accept it in 1954? They did something quite opposite.

Mr. MANN: I know they did. I am giving my opinion about it now. My party may adopt a different attitude after they have looked at the Bill. I would support my party's decision. I make no bones about that. But at the moment I am giving my ideas about what I think should be done and what I think is wrong with the Bill, as we have heard it explained. I am not worried about the bookmakers. They will look after themselves. I am concerned about racing generally in the metropolitan area, and those who live on racing.

Mr. Sullivan interjected.

Mr. MANN: I do not know how the hon. member made a success of farming. It must be easy because he talks such silly rubbish.

In the Royal Commission's report that was submitted to the Labour Government it is freely conceded that S.P. betting went

on extensively throughout the State. That is admitted on almost every page. On page 31 the report states—

"From the evidence placed before us, largely that of illegal off-course bookmakers themselves, we are satisfied that it is carried on extensively throughout the length and breadth of Queensland. Even small townships have one or more off-course bookmakers and a witness deposed to there being three in Julia Creek."

Fancy three in a small place like Julia Creek! I tried to tally up the number of S.P. bookmakers whom I knew. I have made it seven in Innisfail, 22 in Townsville, three in Hughenden, 19 in Mackay—

Mr. Pizzey: How many in Spring Hill?

Mr. MANN: None.

Dr. Delamothe: How many in Brisbane?

Mr. MANN: About ten that I know.

Dr. Delamothe: In Brisbane?

Mr. MANN: Yes. One of the biggest operators in Australia was operating in Brisbane, and had been for some time. He is underground and only takes phone bets. He will be able to bet in the open and have a much bigger clientele now.

A Government Member: You have not studied the Bill.

Mr. MANN: I have not got it. I know Tom Foley had it and some hon. members opposite have had it. We have only what the Treasurer has told us. From what I gather they are going to have S.P. bookmakers within 30 miles of Brisbane.

Mr. Hiley: Not within 30 miles of Brisbane.

Mr. MANN: Outside the 30 miles—it is all the same.

A Government Member: You will have to be a Houdini to get out of that one.

Mr. MANN: Thirty miles from the G.P.O. The evidence that was given to and the recommendations made by the 1952 Royal Commission on Racing indicated that provision should not be made for S.P. betting under 100 miles from Brisbane. I looked through that report and I found that in South Australia a war measure banning betting shops was introduced. The 1952 Commission got in touch with the Premier of South Australia and asked him what was the public attitude to the opening of betting shops after the end of World War II. They asked was there a public demand for the opening of the shops. The answer of the Premier of South Australia was that betting premises in the metropolitan area were prohibited during the war and there had not been any expressed desire for their reinstatement. Even habitual bettors had said they hoped they would never be reopened.

That proves that, in the metropolitan area of Adelaide, betting shops were banned and there was no demand to reopen them. The Premier of that State was pleased to report to the Racing Commission that the public, even habitual bettors, felt that the shops should not be reopened in the metropolitan area of Adelaide.

A lesson can be learnt from that in regard to the proposed 30-mile radius here. I feel it is too close to the city and that it could do racing much harm. On the other hand, I feel that there is no objection to licensing bookmakers in the Far Western, Far Southern and Northern parts of the State. I have no objection to that at all. I believe S.P. betting is a practice and a habit that has grown up amongst citizens of those areas and that they look upon it as their right. Although only a minority of them bet nobody in those areas looks down his nose at an S.P. bookmaker. As a matter of fact, he is generally regarded as somebody of standing and substance and, if he is fined for breaking the law in that regard it is looked on as just a matter of paying a fine to the Government.

The Government have approached the matter wrongly in trying to draw an overall picture for the whole State when the problem should have been divided and handled under two separate identities. This report indicates that people within a radius of 50 miles were convinced that S.P. should have been allowed for people north of Mackay, west of Dalby, and out from Longreach and Mt. Isa. Even the chairman of the Mt. Isa Jockey Club felt that it should be allowed at Mt. Isa although the practice should not be extended.

When my party look at the Bill we might have some other comments to make. My chief comment as I said earlier, and as I repeat, is that it might harm racing in the metropolitan area. When reports of this Bill were first released there was some suggestion that the Government would allow bookmakers in the metropolitan area to bet on the morning before the races. I am glad of the Treasurer's assurance that that will not be so as it would have done grievous harm to racing in the metropolitan area.

In 1936, when the late W. Forgan Smith was Leader of the Labour Party, an inquiry was held into S.P. betting, as a result of which it was considerably cleaned up by the then Treasurer, now the hon. member for Bundaberg. Many people criticised the legislation introduced by the Treasurer on that occasion because they said it was totalitarian legislation. When people are breaking the law as they were in this matter, stern and drastic measures must be taken in relation to it and I make no apologies for supporting that legislation introduced by the then Treasurer although we did have some arguments about the penalties. It did much good in eliminating S.P. betting.

I am not very interested in the Treasurer's statement about turnover tax. That is a matter for bookmakers and I am not putting

up a case for them. I am putting up a case for the race clubs and the people who want to go to the races and bet there. The 1952 royal commission had this to say on turnover tax—

"We examined the possibility of imposing a turnover tax on betting tickets but after a thorough investigation came to the conclusion that as there are so many difficulties in its practical administration we would be unable to make any recommendation. We had evidence before us which disclosed that where a turnover tax has been imposed it has been evaded to a considerable degree, particularly in respect to telephone and credit betting. In the circumstances we are of opinion that a tax on the betting ticket is the more practicable."

The Treasurer and the Government will have to get over that difficulty if they hope to get the full benefit of a turnover tax.

The majority of people who go to the races know that the Bill will become law because the Government have the numbers. They will agree that in betting they should have the four-way option proposed in the Bill. They would not be in favour of legislation that would compel all punters to take starting price. That would be a wrong attitude for the Government to take. If the Bill has to be introduced and is passed, most people would prefer the four-way option in betting, a set price, a quarter of the odds, tote or S.P. Having decided to introduce the Bill, the Government have adopted the best attitude in that respect, but I disagree with the proposal that an off-course bookmaker will have to take to the police after the races the tickets written for bets placed over the telephone. That is a ridiculous situation, and if I were a bookmaker I would resent it very much. I think some scheme other than taking the tickets to the police should be devised.

The broadcasting of prices and general racing information will have a detrimental effect on attendances at race meetings. That was one matter that the Labour Government inquired into in 1936. We thought that the broadcasting of prices after each race, the names of jockeys and other information that will be possible when the Bill is passed encouraged those who wanted to bet off the course as well as illegal S.P. bookmakers. It is true that in those days certain S.P. betting shops were recognised by the police, although they were raided every few months and the bookmakers paid the fines which were regarded as the licence to operate. But the practice crept in of people betting in hotel bars, down laneways and in alleyways. We thought in 1936 that by withholding this information we would give people less opportunities to bet and we would thereby encourage them to go to the racecourses.

I listened attentively to the Treasurer, although I must confess to a limited ability

to grasp all the explanations that he gave. He sometimes fascinates me with his flowery speeches. Summing up, I think the Bill has been drawn up wrongly. S.P. betting should be prohibited within 100 miles of Brisbane. I am not against the licensing of bookmakers in western and far distant districts, and in saying that I am giving my own personal opinion. The Government would have been better advised to charge a license fee of say £500 or £1,000 a year. They should have said, "We want to get £1,000,000 out of the unregistered bookmakers." They could have fixed a fee, payable quarterly, half-yearly or yearly. I think that would have been a better way to get the revenue that they require.

The Treasurer has said that no S.P. betting shop would be near a hotel. In such places as Longreach, Muttaborra and Barcaldine, where could a bookmaker have a betting shop that was not near a hotel. The Treasurer said that that was a matter for someone to look into. I agree with him. There is only one main street in Longreach and one main street in Barcaldine. It may be a little different in Rockhampton, but there again they have these places right next to hotels. I worked in one of these establishments in Rockhampton right next to a hotel but it never made any difference to the punters or the bookmakers. That is another matter that should be looked into. If we say that no licensed betting shop shall be within a certain distance of a hotel, it will be unfair. The bookmaker will think that if we take the betting shop away from the hotel, what is the use of having one at all? The Bill should stipulate a 100-mile radius from Brisbane. It is wrong to try to legislate for the whole of the State. The Treasurer may say that we objected to the sectional taxation on liquor, but this betting practice has grown up over the years and it is accepted in the West. It is a habit out there, and it is accepted as such. Some other method should have been adopted to apply the findings of the report of 1952. The suggestion could have been adopted by the Government to license bookmakers in the West and in the North. I would have had no objection to that.

I am afraid that this legislation will kill racing in the metropolitan area, and if that should happen it will be bad for the whole of the State, because the metropolitan area is the key to racing.

I know what the Minister said about Tasmania, but people in Sydney bet heavily there, and so do people in Melbourne. People in Brisbane get information. Bookmakers get information from Tasmania. There is a turf agency that sends information all through this State from Tasmania about what horses to lay, and what horses not to lay. We cannot stop it. It goes on all the time.

(Time expired.)

Mr. PILBEAM (Rockhampton South) (2.27 p.m.): I rise to support the Bill. I am particularly interested in the Rockhampton Jockey Club, a very active and well conducted racing body in the City of Rockhampton. Before I deal with the Bill I shall deal with the unfounded attack by the Opposition on the Treasurer. We have been attacked because it was said that he did not announce the Government's intention to derive revenue from the Bill. I remind hon. members opposite there was an item in the Budget showing the revenue to be obtained from this measure, and it even went to the extent of showing the amount that would be obtained for the half year, and for a full year. That item was debated at length and it received great prominence in the Press. There was no secret of the Government's intention to derive revenue from this Bill.

I was particularly interested to hear hon. members opposite say that this matter will not be debated on moral issues. I myself will leave that to men who are better able to do that than I. What I do say is that we must take things as they are and human nature as it is. Betting is inherent in human nature, so much so that it is substantially introduced into the commercial life of this country. When we talk about betting we should not exclude the Stock Exchange, and we certainly should not exclude certain forms of insurance, because insurance is legalised wagering, particularly those types of insurance with single premiums. I do not think we need concern ourselves with the moral issues of the Bill.

Mr. Walsh: You would not say that life insurance was wagering?

Mr. PILBEAM: Rain insurance is, and, in particular, insurance against twins and similar insurance is a form of legalised betting.

I think the main purpose of the Bill is to rectify certain injustices that prevailed under the existing legislation. One of the main injustices is that people living in the city have the right to make a bet and have every enticement to do so. They have the added amenity of going to the racecourse to see the races, which gives an added interest, whereas people in the West have no such facilities. That is why I welcome the introduction of the Bill. People who try to place a bet in the West have to commit an illegal act. That is not right and that is one reason why I support the Bill.

Another grave injustice lies in the treatment of registered bookmakers as compared with that of unregistered bookmakers. I could quote figures from the balance sheets of the Rockhampton Jockey Club to show that the revenue derived from registered bookmakers almost carries the club. If it were not for the registered bookmakers in Rockhampton—and I suppose it applies equally throughout the State—we should have no race club,

yet those people have to pay £25 or so each Saturday to field at the Rockhampton Jockey Club, while just as great a volume of betting is done in other areas without the payment of tax. That is not justice and that is a further reason why I welcome the introduction of the Bill.

To take too great a radius around a racecourse would mean another injustice. Despite what the hon. member for Brisbane said, some people cannot travel 100 miles to a racecourse. In my opinion the Bill will not force one more person onto a racecourse. If we made the radius greater that would not force a greater attendance. Many people, including the poorer people and perhaps age pensioners, enjoy a small bet. They have their 2s. 6d. and 5s. bets. They study the paper and listen to the radio and they derive real pleasure from it. I do not think they should be forced to travel unreasonable distances to racecourses. True, the clubs must be given some protection. If a radius were not fixed racing would be killed. But I still hold the view that the radius within which off-course betting is to be prohibited should not be too large. In the legislation we must seek to eliminate injustices. If we make the area too large we might defeat the object, which is to eliminate unregistered betting. If the area were too large we must be unable to control it and so defeat that object of this Bill.

The Rockhampton Jockey Club particularly asked me to represent their views to the Parliament and I am very happy to do so. They are in a somewhat unique position. They are not only a racing club; they are also an administrative body. As from 3 December, 1936, the Queensland Government decided to recognise the Rockhampton Jockey Club as a principal club under the Racecourses Acts and Other Acts Amendment Act of 1936.

Mr. Mann: We brought that in.

Mr. PILBEAM: Yes. I am not taking that away from the hon. member's Government, even though he gave Rockhampton a left-handed compliment a while ago. The area over which the club had control was defined by Order in Council as extending to St. Lawrence in the north, Cracow in the south and Emerald in the west. The Rockhampton Jockey Club has the task of administering racing in that area and it also has a racing club of its own. The Committee of the Rockhampton Jockey Club have a double duty under the legislation. They assure me that accordingly they are just as keen as the Government are about the introduction of a successful measure which can be enforced and which will benefit racing. They will co-operate fully to that end. Racing is a real industry in Rockhampton, and over 400 people receive full-time or part-time wages from it. Hon. members will see that it is a fairly important industry, and it is very important that I should make representations on its behalf to the Parliament.

Last year the Rockhampton Jockey Club conducted 59 race meetings. Races are held every Saturday and on public holidays. As the hon. member for Brisbane will admit, the Rockhampton Jockey Club conducts more race meetings than any other racing club in Queensland. We have a very fine racecourse in Rockhampton, and it has always been the aim of the Rockhampton Jockey Club to remain a working man's club. There are 1,400 members in the club, and they probably enjoy Australia's cheapest racing. Each member pays two guineas a year and, in addition, a levy of 4s. when he attends a meeting. This works out at less than 5s. a meeting. In addition to the gentleman's ticket, each member receives two ladies' tickets. On many occasions the Rockhampton Jockey Club have been pressed to increase their membership fees, but they have never done so because they consider that Rockhampton is a working man's town and that the Rockhampton Jockey Club is a working man's club. The male members get their racing for 5s., and there is free racing for two ladies on each male member's ticket. One would not find cheaper racing than that anywhere.

The committee of the Rockhampton Jockey Club consists of 14 members, all of whom are honorary. For the purpose of fostering racing, during recent years the Rockhampton Jockey Club have installed all the modern amenities one expects to see on a first-class course. They have a photo. finish camera and a set of mobile starting stalls, and they have rebuilt a grandstand in the paddock and enclosure at a cost altogether of approximately £30,000. They are administering racing as it should be administered, and their chief concern is for the future of racing. They own their own premises in Quay Street and have freehold title to a building that would cost probably £15,000 to £20,000.

To fall into line with other principal clubs throughout the Commonwealth, the Rockhampton Jockey Club has for some years past introduced the swabbing of horses at Callaghan Park. It is estimated that this item alone is costing the club approximately £800 per annum. The inevitable result of providing these amenities has been that the club has incurred a substantial overdraft with its bankers.

To give hon. members some idea of the size of the industry in Rockhampton, at present there are 120 horses in training, and the average cost of training a horse is about £7 a week. I have heard criticism of the prize money offered by provincial racing clubs. The Rockhampton Jockey Club offers approximately £500 in prize money each Saturday, and for no race is the prize money less than £100. In addition—again this justifies their claim to be a working-man's club—the Rockhampton Jockey Club pay a rebate of £3 10s. for every horse that starts at a meeting. I shall make a special representation to the Treasurer later through you, Mr. Taylor, on that matter.

At present the undermentioned people are licensed by the club—

Bookmakers	76
Clerks	161
Trainers	75
Jockeys	48
Stable boys	21

The club have a staff of 22, made up as follows:—

Office staff	4
Course staff	4
Local stewards	4
Country stewards	3
Totalisator	7

In addition, they employ about 20 casuals who work as gatekeepers, ticket sellers, and barrier attendants, and about 20 people work part-time in the various booths round the course.

Approximately 28 bookmakers operate weekly at race meetings at Callaghan Park, and they, in turn, employ approximately 130 clerks. A bookmaker pays an annual licence fee to the club, and he also pays fees for ordinary race meetings, one if he wishes to operate on local events only, another if he wishes to operate on both local and southern events. The bookmaker pays an annual licence fee to the Rockhampton Jockey Club of £15 15s. and also daily fees for ordinary race meetings as follows:—

Local events only, £9.

Local and southern events, £23 10s.

For carnival meetings of three days the fees are increased slightly. The weekly overhead of the club is over £200 a week. At the present time, taking the weekly turnover into account, every week the club shows a slight loss. The gross profit over the last four meetings ranged from £130 to £200. It can be seen that every week the Rockhampton Jockey Club makes a loss from its weekly meetings. They get out of it by the extra profit they make from the carnival meetings and to a certain extent from the membership subscriptions. The Rockhampton Jockey Club is always in a state of suspense about its finances. The track can be flooded, and in the past has been flooded up to four or five weeks at a time. With an overhead of £200 a week and the possibility that the meetings might be discontinued for four or five weeks at a time they are always very apprehensive about the future of racing, never more so than when there is a change in the legislature.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. PILBEAM: I am putting their opinions before Parliament. Their balance sheet and profit and loss account show that they make a substantial contribution to the city's economy. Over all more than £100,000 a year is spent on account of the activities of the Rockhampton Jockey Club in Rockhampton. Figures were given this morning to show the bookmakers' contribution to Toowoomba meetings. I shall give the bookmakers' contribution to the four weekly

meetings already referred to. They vary from £498 to £567 a week. For the year ended 30 December, 1960, bookmakers in Rockhampton contributed £29,442. It is a solid club. Hon. members will see the justification for my defending registered bookmakers against unregistered bookmakers. I make no excuse for the efforts that are being made to bring some of the revenue from unlicensed betting into the revenue of the State.

The representation of the Rockhampton Jockey Club is that in view of the position they hold in the community and the excellent way they are conducting racing in Rockhampton, consideration should be given to the extension of the area. They consider that their interests would best be served by the extension of the area from a 15 to 30-mile radius, by reason of the fact that the townships of Yeppoon and Mt. Morgan would be included.

Mr. Bennett: Did you not vote for the 15-mile radius at the first Caucus meeting?

Mr. PILBEAM: I am giving their opinion and I am giving mine. I support the Government in their claim that it should be 15 miles. But the Rockhampton Jockey Club consider that their interests would be best served by a 30-mile radius. They consider their wishes could be met if they were to have sufficient control over the registration of bookmakers outside the area, to the extent that they require their attendance at the course. The figures I have just produced prove that if they were to lose even three or four bookmakers their weekly non-attendance would make a difference of £100, which would be the difference between the club's finishing the year ahead, or in the red. That is why they consider that if the area is not to be enlarged at least they might be given control over the registration of bookmakers to the extent that they could require them to attend race meetings held in Rockhampton as well as to operate S.P. shops at Mt. Morgan and Yeppoon. I submit that for the Treasurer's consideration.

The Rockhampton Jockey Club further consider that the £10 a year licensing fee for an S.P. bookmaker is too low. A course bookmaker pays £25 a week whereas the S.P. bookmaker, on being licensed, will pay only £10 a year. That is a great disparity. Of course, they realise that the man off the course will pay 2½ per cent. turnover tax whilst the man on the course will pay only 1½ per cent. They are not unreasonable. They submit these propositions and I would not be doing my duty if I did not put them up for them.

Another very important point they advanced is in regard to when the allocation of their share of the turnover tax is being computed. As the Treasurer has stated, 20 per cent. will go to the principal club, and, on top of that, 80 per cent. is to be distributed to the racing clubs in the

area on the basis of prize money granted and the number of meetings held. Their contention is that, when calculating that amount, the prize money should be augmented by the amount of rebates they pay out. I think that is a very just claim because, every week the Rockhampton Jockey Club pay £500 in prize money and, in some weeks, £200 in rebates as well. At present, 120 horses are racing in Rockhampton. Mr. Dawbarn has informed me that 68 have nominated for next Saturday's meeting. Even if 60 start the rebate paid out will be near enough to £200 at £3 10s. per horse started. Whether the payments made for horse racing are called prize money or rebates they should be allowed. They could make the whole of the money prize money and it would be allowed. I think it is reasonable to ask that the amount paid out in rebates be included. It is a case of calling a rose by some other name.

Those are the submissions put up by the Rockhampton Jockey Club. Their members are of the opinion that the radius should be increased from 15 to 30 miles but, as against that, they realise that their finances must be examined closely every week to ascertain the effect of the amendments. They admit it is a matter of trial and error and that they could be wrong. Conversely, they could be right. It might be better for them to retain the smaller radius and get a share of the revenue from the bookmakers that they register at Mt. Morgan and Yeppoon.

If they are right and we are wrong, and if there is a deterioration in their finances as a result of this legislation, they suggest to the Treasurer that the position should be re-examined and adjusted by a simple amendment of the Act, in order to give them a chance to survive.

There is not any real opposition from the people in my area to this Bill. I have stated the submissions the Rockhampton Jockey Club make and I consider them to be most reasonable ones. I leave them with the Treasurer for consideration. I have discussed the matter fully with the Rockhampton Jockey Club and, although we differed in some respects, they realise that I am supporting the Bill.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (2.49 p.m.): This is possibly the most remarkable piece of legislation ever introduced in view of the opinions expressed by members of the Government in times gone by in regard to gambling. I do not intend to cover the ground already covered by the Leader of the Opposition except to indicate very clearly and positively how the opinions of the Treasurer, the Premier, and other members of the Cabinet and many hon. members on the Government benches have altered considerably since 1954. To give an example of the opinions expressed in 1953 and 1954 I intend to read for the information of the Committee an

advertisement that appeared in a Toowoomba newspaper in March, 1953. It was quoted in the Chamber by the late Mr. Les Wood, the then hon. member for North Toowoomba. It shows up in true light the hypocritical attitude of the Government on this issue and the fact that they have embarked on a hasty and precipitous search for funds to enable them to carry on as the Government. At page 1575 of "Hansard" of 23 November, 1954, the advertisement is set out in the speech by Mr. Wood. It appeared during the election campaign and was issued by the Liberal Party. It reads—

"A message to every Christian-thinking Citizen. Tomorrow's vote is above any individual candidate. Legalised S.P. betting wrecked the home life of thousands of South Australians. You cannot afford to risk the future of your family by voting for Labour candidates—no matter how able or experienced they may be. They are pledged to Labour policy which is undoubtedly legislation of S.P. Vote Liberal-Country. These men are openly pledged to oppose this evil."

I invite hon. members to mark those words. It is a remarkable advertisement, having in mind the Bill now introduced by the Government.

I have an occasional bet of 10s. or £1 mainly on horses that lose but I can express an opinion on the general attitude of the public towards gambling. Whether it takes the form of telephone betting, illegal betting, a game of Swi, a game of poker, a game of bridge, the people exercise their privilege at certain times to do what they think is their democratic right. At the same time I hold the view, and I think it is held by most hon. members of the Australian Labour Party, that the vicious extension of the law to provide for the wholesale legalising of such things can have only one consequence, that is, to enrich the few at the expense of the many. We must recognise, however, the human weakness of most people in the community who bet, whether legally or illegally. That does not matter to a great extent. They will indulge in gambling, whether with cards or in some other form, and whether the bets are in pennies, threepences, or pounds. They will have their small gamble. They consider that they are entitled to gamble and while that human failing exists among the people not only of this State but of all countries of the world, we must give their opinion a great deal of consideration. Therefore, we need not take into consideration whether the principle of gambling is right or wrong. In considering the Bill we should decide whether the actual principles contained in it are right or wrong. That is the aspect that must be considered by members of the Opposition.

The Treasurer, when introducing the Bill, launched a rather soft attack on the 1954 legislation of the Labour Government, but at least at that time the Government gave the

people of Queensland an opportunity to decide for themselves whether they wanted legalised off-the-course betting or not. We gave them the privilege of deciding by means of a referendum. That was one of the principles contained in that Bill. In this case, although the Government had no mandate from the people at the last elections to introduce legalised S.P. betting, they have introduced the legislation. When we consider the whole effect of this legislation, we must remember the thousands of people employed in the industry who are dependent on it for a livelihood.

Because of human weakness, people will bet, particularly on horses, and they create an industry in the State. I want the Treasurer and the Deputy Premier, who unfortunately is not in the Chamber, to consider this very carefully for Queensland has the richest winter carnivals in horse-racing in Australia. During the winter months in Queensland I should imagine that at least £1,000,000 to £2,000,000 comes to this State because people bring horses here for the rich winter racing carnivals. They contribute to employment in the industry. There are many carnival meetings in the winter months that attract horses from the southern States, and many owners, jockeys and trainers. They may take away the rich prize money put up by the racing clubs, but they contribute much more to the solvency of the State because of its tourist attractions.

When we remember that the Treasurer is proposing that there shall be a 30-mile radius from Brisbane for legalised S.P. betting, and off-the-course betting, we must consider that he is proposing that the registered bookmakers with the four principal racing clubs in Queensland will be the people who, no doubt, will be able to make application for an off-the-course licence. They are the people who are considered by the principal racing clubs as the reputable members of their own profession. If they are in the southern portion of Queensland they will come under the control of the Queensland Turf Club and they will be entitled to make application for a special licence to operate as licensed off-the-course bookmakers outside the radius of 30 miles of Brisbane. I remind the Treasurer that there is nothing in the Bill—

Mr. Hiley: You will find there are real safeguards as to that.

Mr. LLOYD: I am afraid that the Treasurer did not cover this point very well in his introduction. Is it possible for agents to be appointed by the men who are to be legalised off-the-course bookmakers in the State?

Mr. Hiley: No registered bookmaker will be entitled to appoint an agent; only off-the-course ones in areas where there is not sufficient to warrant a licence.

Mr. LLOYD: I wish the Treasurer had been clearer when he introduced the Bill.

Mr. Hiley: I said so.

Mr. Houston: The on-course man could also be the off-course man.

Mr. Hiley: No. The on-course man cannot appoint an agent.

Mr. LLOYD: It is getting more complicated.

Mr. Hiley: You are trying to make your speech before you have seen the Bill.

Mr. Hanlon: You made enough speeches before you decided on the Bill.

Mr. LLOYD: I think the hon. member for Baroona is quite right. Before we knew that the Government intended to introduce the Bill the Treasurer had already given some of the details of the Bill to the newspapers in Brisbane. I think the Treasurer should consider his actions very seriously before he does that again. The Treasurer expects us to sit down and listen to his introduction of the Bill and then refrain from speaking on it. If he wants to have the Standing Orders amended to provide for that, let him put it to the Standing Orders Committee that we should be allowed to speak only after we have seen a Bill. At least he spent some time in introducing it and while we have the privilege of replying to his introduction we can speak only on what he has told us. There are many matters that we are allowed to raise on the introduction of a Bill and the Minister in charge of it has the right of reply. He can clear up many misunderstandings and we will appreciate it if he does.

In this case the Treasurer says the Bill seeks to introduce a system whereby in certain areas of Queensland there will be bookmakers registered as off-the-course bookmakers.

Mr. Walsh: They must field, too.

Mr. LLOYD: They must field when there is a race meeting in that town.

Mr. Hiley: In their town.

Mr. Hanlon: You said they could not.

Mr. LLOYD: The Treasurer said that there are two types of registrations for bookmakers—on-course and off-course.

Mr. Hiley: A man won't hold both.

Mr. LLOYD: A man cannot hold both?

Mr. Hiley: No.

Mr. LLOYD: In other words, what the Treasurer is saying—and I think I might clear the matter up—is that while there are race meetings held in any town or region that man cannot be an off-the-course bookmaker. Is that so? In other words he can be an off-the-course bookmaker, registered and licensed as such, while there are no race meetings in the area in which he is operating.

Mr. Hiley: Say there is an off-the-course bookmaker at Mitchell. The day there is a race meeting in Mitchell he must field in Mitchell.

Mr. LLOYD: Then he becomes an on-course bookmaker.

Mr. Hiley: He cannot do that in Brisbane. You are worried about Brisbane.

Mr. LLOYD: No, I am worried about the business of a bookmaker and his agent. In other words, the Treasurer has cleared up one matter to my satisfaction. Within a 30-mile radius of Brisbane a man registered as a bookmaker by the Queensland Turf Club cannot operate as an off-the-course bookmaker on a day on which there is a race meeting held in Brisbane.

Mr. Hiley: That is shut out. He cannot.

Mr. LLOYD: Is there anything in the legislation to prevent a man outside the radius of Brisbane becoming an off-the-course bookmaker?

Mr. Hiley: A man who is registered in Brisbane?

Mr. LLOYD: No. He is registered. The Treasurer has already said that there are four principal racing clubs in Queensland. Every bookmaker will be registered under the aegis of one of those four clubs. The Queensland Turf Club at present, as I understand it, controls racing from the Northern Territory border right through up to Bundaberg and down to the border of New South Wales. What then is to prevent an on-course bookmaker registered by the Q.T.C. becoming an off-course bookmaker outside the radius of 30 miles from the Brisbane G.P.O.

Mr. Hiley: All I can say is that if that is possible the way the Bill is worded, I will gladly accept correction of it because that is not the intention.

Mr. LLOYD: I just pose the question. I cannot see how the Bill will solve the main problem of legalising and fully controlling illegal off-the-course operations of any man in the State. The purpose for which two Royal Commissions were appointed by Labour Governments in the past, one in 1936 and one in 1952, was to try to find a panacea for the problems confronting us in respect of the illegal operations of bookmakers outside the limits of racecourses and I cannot see that the Bill will solve those problems. I can see nothing in the Minister's introductory speech that appears to solve this problem. There was no mention in it of increasing the severity of penalties for illegal operation. I think we all know that there are many methods by which illegal off-the-course bookmakers are operating, and I think it is generally recognised that some of these practices are condoned by the Postmaster-General's Department. The

department, even at this time, offers to anybody who wishes to take advantage of it for his own convenience the opportunity of monitoring his own telephone and transferring it to another number. There is nothing that the police or the licensing section can do to prevent this practice, and no provision in the Bill will curb the operations of illegal off-the-course bookmakers.

Mr. Hiley: Except that it will provide an opportunity for the average citizen to enforce his bets legally and have his disputes settled rather than go bush.

Mr. LLOYD: That might be completely correct. That was the point I was trying to make a short while ago, but I am still a little confused about it. There will be an opportunity for the Queensland Turf Club to make it legal for any man to operate just outside the 30-mile radius of Brisbane as an off-the-course bookmaker, or even to appoint an agent, although that must receive the approval of the racing club, too.

Mr. Hiley: Do you think that the Q.T.C. is likely to help people to cut its throat?

Mr. LLOYD: I do not know. The Treasurer is definitely giving them that opportunity.

Mr. Hiley: The race clubs would suffer most. They are not as silly as that.

Mr. LLOYD: They are not so silly as to introduce tote betting in Brisbane. The Treasurer need not think that he can pull the wool over our eyes on that matter. He suggested that plans were being put into operation by the race clubs to introduce automatic totalisators here.

Under the Bill there is an opportunity for a man to operate just outside the 30-mile radius. It would cost only 1s. 8d. for a telephone call to an area just outside the fringe of Brisbane. As the Treasurer has said, many people might take the opportunity of betting legally if they know that they are not liable to a penalty of £50 to £100 now provided by the Act for betting illegally. They will probably think that to spend 1s. 8d. in registering their bets outside the 30-mile radius is reasonable.

The bookmakers are not the main section of the industry. Thousands of people are employed in the industry throughout the State, particularly in the metropolitan area. After all, one-third of the State's population is in Brisbane. The industry is very important to Queensland, and we must consider the interests of those in it. I have already pointed out its value to the tourist trade, and we must also take into account the people employed on the stud farms where the horses are bred, the people who are engaged in training the horses, and the many people who are employed in getting them ready for racing. A great number of people depend upon the industry for a livelihood. Just because the Government are obstinate

about the 30-mile radius they are going to create a set of circumstances where the opportunity will be given to bookmakers to operate outside that limit, thus providing facilities for people to register their bets on race days by the payment of a small fee to the P.M.G.—a set of circumstances by which the industry will be damned. I think that the recommendation contained in the report of the Royal Commission in 1952 was the right one. In his speech in 1954 the Treasurer made numerous statements that were quite sound. But he was rather paradoxical when he then agreed with many of the statements made from this side today, that it is almost impossible to create some form of control to prevent people from having their 5s. and 10s. bets on racehorses. Briefly, what I think he said was, "We must appreciate human nature. We have to consider the fact that people in high authority recognise the principle that people will have a bet and therefore the police have to turn the other way." He said that what the Government were doing in 1954 was blasphemous. That is what he said after he referred to the working people of the State being crucified by the betting shops and members of the Cabinet, like Pontius Pilate, washing their hands. We have the paradox there.

In many parts of the State illegal betting has been going on for a very long time. In some of the northern and western parts of Queensland, irrespective of the restrictions placed upon them, they have had their bets on racehorses. Accepting that, at the same time we must consider the whole of the industry. When so many thousands of people are dependent on the industry for their livelihood, anything that is introduced as a means of securing additional revenue should not be against the best interests of the industry. It is in the same category as another industry that might be employing 2,000 people. Surely no Government would say that the interests of that industry should be sacrificed. We have heard hon. members opposite from time to time attack the Labour Party because of the taxation that was imposed on companies in the pre-war days.

(Time expired.)

Mr. DIPLOCK (Aubigny) (3.15 p.m.): I cannot accept the Treasurer's suggestion that because hundreds of people have been betting illegally off the course that is justification for bringing down this legislation. If we followed that argument to its logical conclusion we should have to scrap every law that did not suit a certain section of the public. We must adopt a realistic approach to this matter and recognise that off-the-course betting prevails in a very big way throughout Queensland today. It has prevailed down through the ages, and whether this legislation is introduced or not, whilst Australians have the characteristics that they have today, there will be off-the-course betting.

I see many advantages in the proposed legislation. The hon. member for Kedron said that he could not see how it could in any way help to stamp out illegal off-the-course betting. I think it can. I have spent most of my life in country areas. I am not referring to the big cities. In the smaller towns there are usually two or three recognised substantial S.P. bookmakers who are fairly regularly prosecuted for betting and they pay their fines. Almost immediately after such a bookmaker is fined there will be a crop of smaller men operating—one betting around the corner, another in a hotel, and another somewhere else. The substantial men are, at the present time, very angry with these fellows "horning in" on their preserves but they cannot do anything about it because they themselves are carrying on illegally. But, once they are licensed, those smaller operators, who very often are not substantial, will not be able to "horn in" on the licensed operator. He will be the man who will eventually control the small operators. The police cannot control them unless we are prepared to increase our police force tenfold, particularly in the outer areas. Once S.P. men are legalised they will curtail the activities of the smaller men.

Unfortunately, I have had quite a deal to do with racing, and, in my opinion, it is the small bookmaker who is the real menace in country towns because at present the unsuspecting ten bob punter will go along and lay his bet and be paid; another fellow will, perhaps, put on £5, but when he goes to collect, the small man cannot pay. So, I think there are some advantages in legalising the practice.

At present, whether people indulge in off-the-course betting or not—to any great extent, anyway—depends upon the police administration of that district. I am not for one moment suggesting that any police officer is lax in his duty, but I do say that some of them have different ideas from others as to just how far they should allow the practice to go. I suggest also, because of the prosecutions that have been made over the last two or three years, that at times different police inspectors might have a word whispered to them as to which district to leave alone and which not to leave alone. That is only an assumption, but, as I interjected to the Leader of the Opposition this morning, if they are not given some advice or direction, it is rather strange that certain men in certain areas go off quite regularly, whilst others in other areas seem to be immune. I think this legislation will put an end to that.

There have been reports over the past few weeks of many groups of people interesting themselves in this proposed legislation. It is obvious from the reading of those reports that all such people have spoken—and, I suppose, rightly so—in the interests of the body or society that they represent. There have been representatives of clubs, representatives of bookmakers, of trainers, of horse-owners, and so on. Although I recognise that those people are

big factors in the racing industry, John Public, too, is an important factor. As the Treasurer was seeking information, suggestions, ideas and thoughts of different people on the legislation, he would have been well advised to call in a cross section of the public to see why the general public prefer not to go to racecourses. In my opinion, very often the clubs are at fault. I was president of a club at Warwick for five years. Clubs generally do not set out to entertain the general public. They are quite prepared to charge the patron 10s. to go through the gate, but apart from that they do not seem to be very mindful of his requirements. He has to put up with insufficient seating accommodation, no shade, stone age amenities and bad drinking conditions. In saying those things I am referring to many country clubs. If those clubs set out to find what the public really wanted, they could get the public to patronise racecourses to a greater extent. Warwick did this and during my term progressed.

The attitude of many churches, as far as I can make out—and I have been to some of the meetings—is that gambling is morally wrong, first, because it stems mainly from a desire to profit from the misfortune of others; secondly, because gambling outrages the principle that material benefits should be distributed according to merit and not by chance; and, thirdly, that it leads to many evil consequences. All that might be right, but it has been so not over the years but over the ages and, despite the efforts of social workers, we do not seem to have progressed very far in educating the people on the menace of gambling.

Mr. Windsor interjected.

Mr. DIPLOCK: That may be so. We have to be realistic about it. Churches and social workers have been doing a very big job and they have gone a certain distance along the way, but I cannot see that the harnessing of off-the-course betting is going to do anything to pep up, as it were, the gambling instinct, provided the Treasurer insists that teenagers in particular be forbidden to frequent betting shops and, as he said in his introduction, that people are not allowed to loiter.

Much as I can see good in the Bill, I have had a job over the last two or three weeks to make up my mind how I should vote on it. I can see the good that can come from the legislation. I have read Volume 210 of "Hansard". I recognise the front bench Ministers as being able and honest men, but after reading what they said a few years ago I cannot really decide whether they were being honest then or are being honest now.

I am not going to embarrass the Premier or the Treasurer by mentioning the statements made by both of them a few years ago. The Leader of the Opposition did that effectively, but I should like to read something that was said by the Deputy Premier

as reported in Volume 210 of "Hansard" at page 1499. This is what he said, referring to the then Treasurer, Mr. Walsh—

"The hon. member is a typical Vicar of Bray and so are all his colleagues. Whichever one you care to select, each of them is a Vicar of Bray."

Then, he told us what the Vicar of Bray did. He said—

"You will recall that the Vicar of Bray used to change his view according to the political party in power at the time and yet he did not change and twist nearly as much as the Treasurer has twisted here. When the Treasurer introduced this measure he said that parents have a responsibility for the morals of their children."

Then he said—

"I agree with this. I look upon the Parliament as a parent of the State and I believe it is our duty to try and give a lead on a very important moral issue and that is what the Government are failing to do."

I do not know just how the Deputy Premier will vote, but from that I should say he will be voting in opposition to the Treasurer. Then, he said—

"The first question that I asked myself in relation to the introduction of the off-the-course betting is this: is it or is it not desirable from the point of view of the community itself? I have done what the Treasurer has done. I have tried to secure information from many centres outside Queensland.

In South Australia, after the introduction of S.P. shops, or off-the-course betting shops, the amount spent in gambling increased from approximately £1,500,000 to £7,000,000 in four years. Are the Government going to make that temptation available to the people of Queensland? Surely the Premier realises that the people who will frequent these shops will be, in the main, the youth of the community? I am not worried so much about the older people, the people of his age or my age or, for that matter, the age of any hon. member; I am more interested in the youth of the community."

So, I could go on. From what the Deputy Premier said in 1956, I just cannot make up my mind what he will do now.

Mr. Munro, who did a very good job on the Liquor Bill, because representatives of the strong temperance unions—

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gaven): Order! We are not debating that Bill.

Mr. DIPLOCK: When in Opposition, Mr. Munro said—

"A Gallup poll was held on this matter and it was strongly in favour of legalising off-the-course betting, but let me say clearly and emphatically that on the basis

of that Australia-wide Gallup poll I am in the minority because I am against legalising off-the-course betting."

He then said—

"I find myself agreeing with the hon. member for Mundingburra that controlling measures are not enough and that we have to educate the people that off-the-course betting is something that is morally wrong and bad for the nation and the economy."

As I know the type of man the Minister is, I expect him to be against the Treasurer now. We will pass over what the Treasurer had to say. Mr. Chalk has a portfolio now, and he said—

"Firstly, I believe that if we pass the legislation we will set up facilities for the rapid spread of what has rightly been described as a social and moral evil."

Then he continued—

"As a parent I am concerned about this legislation. If our young boys and girls are to be reared in a community in which betting shops are legalised, they may mix with people who will tell them of the facilities that are available and they may come to look on betting as part of the normal way of life. Those shops could be frequented by teenagers. If the shops were not licensed, the temptation would not be present."

Naturally, I expect to find him voting against the measure.

Mr. Chalk: You are a bad tipster.

Mr. DIPLOCK: Let us hear what the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation had to say when he was in Opposition. He said—

"I took it from the Treasurer's remarks that he considered it was a necessity, and that northern and western people were entitled as a right to have a few shillings on an S.P. bet. I have every sympathy with those who because of distance are unable to attend racecourses, but I think we should bear in mind that in this Chamber we are legalising for the greatest good for the greatest number in Queensland.

"The self-righteous insistence that the provision of S.P. facilities is a necessity for country people leaves me a little cold. As a man of the land who owns sheep, I liken that to letting my sheep drift around in a paddock infested with some disease. As a parent, I liken it to letting my children come in contact with people suffering from some communicable and bad disease. I think that is quite a good analogy. After a time S.P. betting facilities would be regarded as part of our normal life and people would be subject to possible contagion as a result of this dangerous social disease. If the protection of my children and other children from this communicable disease is weighed against the doubtful benefit to people in remote areas,

that is, western and far northern areas, of having access to betting shops, most responsible men would consider that protection from it was far more important. I am sure almost 100 per cent. of the parents would be inclined to take that point of view."

Mr. Chalk: What did you say about it?

Mr. DIPLOCK: I did not make any contribution to the debate. It is going to be hard to decide how to vote if we are to take a lead from those earlier speeches of hon. members who occupy the Government benches today. However, being realistic and considering whether the Bill might do some real good one would have to consider voting for it.

Mr. Chalk: Have you got off the fence now?

Mr. DIPLOCK: What do you mean by "off the fence"?

Mr. Chalk: You have been sitting on the fence.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gaven): Order! I ask the hon. member to address the Chair.

Mr. DIPLOCK: One thing about it, Mr. Gaven, no matter what fence I sit on, the Minister for Transport will never be able to knock me off it. If he feels so inclined, he can try any time at all.

I will conclude by suggesting to the Treasurer, as I have done previously, that he should insist that the real purpose of the Bill is not defeated by allowing the clubs to register the mushrooming bookmakers who have been registered in the last few months and who are not men of financial stability. That judgment is based only on what I know of their past. I suggest that he give consideration to those who have been honest, who have been able to accept bets and pay out over the years.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (3.33 p.m.): When the Treasurer introduced his Budget some weeks ago I said that if the chairman of the stewards were in charge of that meeting as he is at Eagle Farm and other race meetings, the Treasurer would be fined for excessive use of the spurs. Today, as we are directing our attention exclusively to racing and betting, under a Bill to which racing parlance might be of more relevance than to the Budget generally, let me say that the Treasurer, having been dealt with on that charge, would find himself recalled to the stewards' room to face a series of charges against his conduct. Indeed, I suggest that he would be more exclusively the property of the stewards even than Mel Schumacher, whom he saw fit to mention. From his self-confessed pinnacle of ignorance on racing matters, he even saw fit to criticise the Brisbane "Telegraph" for publishing Schumacher's version of his career and giving

people the opportunity to read it. Judged on the evidence presented by the Leader of the Opposition today of the Treasurer's past form on legalised off-the-course betting and his performance today, he presents one of the most glaring examples of a reversal of form that I have ever seen or heard of either on or off the course. It would be merely a matter of the stewards deciding which run should be the subject of the inquiry—the 1954 run or the 1961 run. Was he really running fair dinkum in his fervent opposition to legalise off-course betting in 1954, or was he running dead today? I suggest that if Mr. Frawley, the chief steward, were investigating the Treasurer from a racing point of view, he would hang him either way. In his remarks in 1954, which were quoted by the Leader of the Opposition this morning, against legalised off-course betting of any type, he was, as he is today, a political opportunist. I think that his indignation then was as hollow as his platitudes in support of this measure are today. When I say that the Treasurer is a political opportunist, I do not mean to be personally offensive. But in 1954 he was taking a political opportunity in Opposition of scoring off the Government, who were then interested in providing a method by which people in various areas of the State could decide by referendum whether they wanted facilities for off-course betting. Today, in Government, he is looking for revenue, and he has a gleam in his eye that I suggest one would not find in the eye of even the most desperate punter on a racecourse. Like Schumacher, for whom he expressed such contempt, he is out to win at any cost. No matter whom it affects, whether it affects people off the course or on the course, he is interested in winning more funds for the Treasury. We must sympathise with him to some extent, because the finances of the State certainly put him in the position of a desperate punter who has little left to bet with and very little in his bank.

If I may continue to use racing parlance, his handling of his mount could be described as dangerous riding because of the headlong attitude he has adopted in rushing into this legislation without giving it the consideration that it merits. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, when the former Labour Government considered whether there was any need for off-course betting facilities they went to a great deal of trouble to examine all aspects of it. They appointed a Royal Commission that heard evidence from owners, trainers, bookmakers, and the various clubs, and also from people opposed to legalised betting in any form—church people, and others. All those people were invited to give evidence before the Commission, and in due course their suggestions were incorporated in the report read by the hon. member for Brisbane this morning. The Treasurer made a snap decision in his Budget to introduce legalised off-course betting and said that it would come into effect by 1 January, by hook or by crook. As far as he was concerned,

it was only a matter of passing legislation to bring that about. Since then he has had some of the practical difficulties brought home to him. After conferring with the clubs and the owners and trainers, he realises that it is not just a matter of waving a magic wand to bring off-course betting facilities into operation.

As he acknowledges his ignorance of racing, perhaps he might expect some leniency. Perhaps he has lost his irons. I do not know what has happened. At least he will not lack excuses for the inconsistency of this measure; I am sure that he will have all the excuses in the world when he replies. However, he has steered far from a straight course in his handling of the legislation for off-course betting.

Getting away from the somewhat ancient sayings of the Premier and others in 1954, let us have a look at the Treasurer's more recent form in relation to the administration of the Racing and Betting Act. Hon. members will recall the efforts of the Brisbane Amateur Turf Club to introduce place betting by bookmakers on the course. At that time there was quite a battle within the Cabinet. I understand that the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity was one of those who were in favour of place-betting and that the Treasurer was against it.

Mr. Evans: I am always for the little people.

Mr. HANLON: That may be so, but there was a great deal of brawling and intrigue within the ranks of the Government when the B.A.T.C. were warring with the Q.T.C. about whether there should be place-betting by bookmakers on the course. The Treasurer was prevailed upon to bring pressure to bear on the Q.T.C. to allow place-betting facilities on the course. For a short time a half-hearted trial was made. After three months the practice was discontinued. The Treasurer made no further effort to give punters on the course, who had been patronising the course for years, the opportunity to bet for a place with bookmakers. I have never heard him suggest here or elsewhere that the clubs should prevail upon bookmakers on the course to allow punters to accept S.P. odds if they wanted to. Now he is making all of these avenues of betting freely available to off-the-course punters, avenues that have been consistently denied to course patrons, particularly in the four years of his administration. I think it is a fair question to ask the Treasurer, and I should like him to give an answer. Is he of the opinion that after the legislation comes into force, punters on the course should be given the same avenues of betting—S.P. odds, place betting with bookmakers, a quarter of straight-out odds for a place, each-way odds—that up till now have been denied them, but which are to be available to off-the-course punters? Is the position going to arise that the punters who continue

to go to the racecourses, particularly in the metropolitan area, are to be the bunnies to keep the tote going and will not be allowed to bet with bookmakers in the various ways allowed to off-course punters? Are they to be required to bet for a place on certain southern events through the Trans-tote? That facility is available only in the paddock enclosure. Are they going to be allowed to bet for a place on local events only on the totalisator? There is no doubt in my mind that a great anomaly will arise if that position develops.

I have no doubt that despite the Treasurer's endeavour to pass the buck on to the racing clubs to arrange the machinery and put into effect the scheme for introducing the off-course totalisator to replace the off-course bookmakers envisaged under the Bill, that this is going to be effected in a number of ways by the operation of the Bill before the clubs are in a position to bring an off-the-course tote into being. The punters off-course having tasted legal betting of the type I have mentioned, S.P. odds, quarter straight-out odds for a place, and so on, are not going to take as kindly to the off-course tote as if the Treasurer had waited, as he should have waited, until he could more carefully examine the clubs' submissions about the tote. He should have waited until the information from the P.M.G. was more complete about when they expected they would be able to handle the off-course tote hook-up. He should have waited until such time as all the information was available, but the Treasurer preferred to rush in with legislation to insist that the clubs should license off-course bookmakers first and give punters the opportunity to bet in those various ways. But then he expects them meekly to accept the off-course tote when his or some other Government tell the punters that they are going to cut all that out and that they will have to bet through the tote exclusively. It will have much the same effect as telling punters on the course that you are going to cut the bookmakers out. We know the great outcry that would arise if that happened. Perhaps they intend to wipe out bookmakers on the course too. One cannot differentiate. This is an industry no matter how we view it, morally or ethically. If after a few years the Treasurer tells off-course bookmakers that they are not wanted any longer, he will not be successful. The same will apply to people who become used to betting off the course with bookmakers for a number of years. They would not like to be confined to tote betting.

Once this group of off-course licensed bookmakers is established, they will constitute a pressure group. We have to be realistic enough to acknowledge that once 200 or 300 registered off-course bookmakers operate in Queensland they will represent a very strong pressure group on any Government that attempts to replace them by an automatic tote. They would have established

a vested interest and having set themselves up legally, as others before them did illegally over the years, they will not permit any Government to tell them to pack their duds and go because a tote is ready to take over from them.

That is another aspect of the Treasurer's handling of the matter that is not in the best interests of the racing industry or of the community as a whole. Furthermore, if attendances at courses are reduced, very few of the smaller country clubs will be able to run a meeting successfully. There is no doubt that there will be a falling off in course attendances when the 30-mile limit comes into operation in relation to the metropolitan area and the 15-mile limit in the country. If S.P. is allowed 15 miles from some of the smaller country courses, they will not be able to continue with their meetings. The only way in which to build up the attendances at these smaller centres is to bring people in from many miles around and the only way in which to get bookmakers to field there is to bring them in from neighbouring towns. Many of the racing clubs that race only four or five times a year will certainly go out of business completely. Even in the metropolitan area, with a 30-mile radius, there must be some falling off in the attendance at metropolitan courses.

It is suggested that we should build up the tote to replace bookmakers when the attendances at local courses fall off but, when the pool becomes smaller the dividends will not reflect the same value as when there was a bigger attendance on the course. That will be a disadvantage to the tote. If someone is betting at Bullamakanka and getting 6 to 1 Beetle Bomb and he sees that the tote in Brisbane paid only 3 to 1 that will not be a very good advertisement for the tote. It will react unfairly against the tote in the transitional period envisaged by the Treasurer.

Let me return to the Treasurer's consistency or inconsistency in these matters. We know that the Liberal Party led the racing people in Brisbane up the garden path in 1957 by suggesting that if the Country-Liberal Government were returned to office they would re-introduce mid-week racing. Over the past four years there have been successive deputations of racing people seeking the re-introduction of mid-week racing, not in the sense of mid-week racing at Eagle Farm or Albion Park but a limited number of meetings at Bundamba, 21 miles from the city. The Treasurer has absolutely refused to have anything to do with it. He has consistently rejected the overtures of owners and trainers for the re-introduction of mid-week metropolitan racing in any form.

From reports in the Press his original scheme would have allowed bookmakers to take bets on Wednesdays at Tattersalls Club or at their homes. He proposed to allow them to bet mid-week on Sydney or Yarraglen or Wollongong—wherever races were

being held in Australia. He has apparently changed his tune. Even on Saturday mornings he was going to allow bookmakers in Brisbane to bet on events on Brisbane courses. He has changed his tune substantially in recent weeks since light has been thrown on the subject, but where is his consistency of attitude on mid-week racing? He rejected any suggestion of mid-week racing time and time again, and then he was going to allow betting not only on local races but on any race in Australia on a Wednesday or any other day of the week when a meeting was being held. That practice, of course, will be legal for registered off-course bookmakers in country towns. They will be able to lay bets on any mid-week races held in Australia. Registered bookmakers in a country town will be able to lay bets on races held in Sydney during the week, but bookmakers in Brisbane will not be allowed to do so. I find difficulty in following the Treasurer's consistency or the operation of his usually precise accounting mind on these matters.

Then we come to the taxation element. Everybody realises, and it has been clearly pointed out, that that is the real basis of the move. We know the Treasurer is not interested in giving people the legal opportunity to bet, nor is he interested in the issues that he paraded as the main grounds for the introduction of the Bill. We know he is out to get revenue. That is the basis of the legislation. Whatever paper he uses to wrap up the parcel, inside the parcel is £1,000,000 in cash that he hopes to get from the legislation.

I am not going to try to deal with the disposal of the revenue as between one club and another. The matter is too complicated to discuss before studying the Bill in detail. That is one reason why the Opposition is prepared to allow the Bill to pass this stage so that we can gauge the extent of the Government's intention more fully. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, however, it is not to be taken that we give our blessing to the legislation. We propose to examine it to see what it contains and then give a clear-cut decision at the second reading stage.

It was clear from the Treasurer's Budget that the additional sum of £1,000,000 was to be milked from the racing industry by way of a turnover tax. Although to my knowledge bookmakers in Brisbane are competitive in that they extend their prices when money does not come in, in a manner that can be considered reasonable, at the same time there is a limit to how much the bookmakers can and will absorb the additional tax. The additional money taken out of the ring by this tax must be reflected in lower odds for punters.

I draw attention to one unfair feature of the turnover tax as outlined by the Treasurer, having regard to the positions of

paddock and leger bookmakers. The Treasurer said that the ticket tax in the paddock which to date has been 6d. will be 2d., that all tickets henceforth will be subject to a tax of 2d. The paddock bookmaker who previously paid 6d. a ticket and no turnover tax is now to pay 2d. a ticket and a turnover tax of 1½ per cent. Bookmakers in the cheaper enclosures will be paying exactly the same ticket tax as before, that is, 2d., and also a turnover tax. In that respect I submit the Treasurer is not dealing fairly with bookmakers in the different enclosures. I carry no brief for them and I have had no submissions from them, but from what the Treasurer said it would appear that a leger bookmaker who previously paid a ticket tax of 2d. will now pay on a £1 bet, 5¾th pence, that is, ticket tax of 2d. and 3¾ pence turnover tax. On the other hand the paddock bookmaker who previously paid 6d. ticket tax will now pay ticket tax of 2d. and the same turnover tax on a £1 bet of 3¾ths pence. In other words, in the case of the £1 bet the leger bookmaker and the paddock bookmaker will be exactly the same. It is true that the paddock bookmaker handles a much greater volume of money and in total he will pay more in turnover tax to the Government. It seems quite illogical to me that a bookmaker operating with a comparatively small bank in the leger will pay exactly the same amount in betting tax as the paddock bookmaker—in respect to a £1 bet. I suggest to the Treasurer that as he increased the ticket tax by 100 per cent. a year or two ago, and as he increased the leger and flat betting tax from 1d. to 2d., he should either wipe out the ticket tax in the leger and flat, or drop it back to the 1d. as it was before. That would eliminate the anomaly that exists between leger and paddock bookmakers.

Mr. Coburn: Do away with the ticket tax and let them pay 2½% as with off-course.

Mr. HANLON: I would not suggest that at all. I suggest it is not fair that the leger bookmaker should pay the same ticket tax as the paddock bookmaker. They are dropping the paddock ticket tax from 6d. to 2d., and retaining 2d. on the ticket tax in the leger. They should either drop the leger from 2d. to 1d., or scrub it altogether because the leger bookmaker pays 3¾d. turnover tax on a £1 bet. In any case, these are matters that may be looked at better in the Committee stage.

In conclusion, I must say that this will result only in shorter odds being available for the punter.

The Treasurer waxed lyrical about the plight of the punter when he said that it was folly for anyone to think he could win at the races, but all he will do with the additional tax will be to lower the odds over all so that the average punter will have less chance of winning than before. That is his contribution to the welfare of

the punter, but from the bookmakers and the industry generally he will derive £1,000,000 under this legislation.

Mr. ADAIR (Cook) (3.57 p.m.): I welcome this legislation. I believe it should have been introduced many years ago. It is only legalising what has been carried on illegally with S.P. betting. Not so many years ago we read that police raided betting shops in different areas throughout the Far North, that bookmakers were arrested and taken to the police stations and charged, that they paid their £50 fines, and they then went back to their betting shops. This legislation will legalise the bookmakers who will be able to carry on their operations properly. Quite recently, police were sent from Cairns to Mareeba, over the head of the police officer in charge at Mareeba, and the betting shops at Mareeba were raided and closed. Every person betting in the shops was fingerprinted. It took at least two hours to fingerprint them and they were detained until the whole procedure was finished. They were treated like criminals and then fined for the offence.

Mr. Walsh: With open betting in the adjoining electorate.

Mr. ADAIR: Yes, open betting everywhere in Queensland. As I have said before, in the West and in the North, anywhere you care to go you will find these betting shops operating with the boards up. This legislation only legalises what has been carried on illegally.

I have no brief for Brisbane. It does not concern me one iota. Anybody who goes to a racecourse in Brisbane has to pay £1 before he has a bet on the race track, and the facilities there are not as good as they ought to be. Go out to Doomben or to Eagle Farm on any wet day, especially a very wet day, and see if you can come away from the track without being wet through. There is no accommodation to protect people from the weather. The drinking facilities, too, could be greatly improved.

Mr. Walsh: How do you get on at Coen?

Mr. ADAIR: We can get out of the rain at Coen, and at Cairns too. The racing clubs must pull their socks up and provide more facilities for the public.

The only provision in the Bill to which I am opposed is the one that allows country clubs to operate on the morning of a race meeting up to an hour and a half before the commencement of the races. If bookmakers are allowed to remain open till an hour and a half before a race meeting, it will tend to reduce the attendance at the track and that will be detrimental to the racing clubs in the area.

I said during the Address-in-Reply debate that the 20-mile radius was too great because it meant that, with the Atherton race track 5 miles nearer to Mareeba than Atherton is, on race day the people of Mareeba would

have to go to Tolga to bet at a race meeting. The provision for a 15-mile radius will suit the people of Mareeba.

Bookmakers are operating today throughout the State and it is not only phone betting. You can go into a shop and place a bet. The boards are up on the three meetings—Brisbane, Sydney and Melbourne.

Mr. Walsh: Do you mean to tell me this goes on under the eyes of the police?

Mr. ADAIR: It goes on everywhere and the hon. member knows it, too.

Mr. Walsh: There are no S.P. shops in Bundaberg.

Mr. ADAIR: The Bill will only legalise what is already the practice. It is just like drinking on a Sunday. It is going on and there is no way in the world that it can be stopped. The best course is to legalise it.

Under the legislation, as the Minister pointed out, a betting saloon has to be a certain distance from a hotel. I cannot see any reason for that. I know it should not be on licensed premises but I cannot see any harm in having a betting shop next door to a hotel. In many places throughout the State it would be nearly impossible for a bookmaker to rent or purchase premises the required distance from a hotel. I will not name those places but I know several of them in the North where betting shops operate close to a hotel. I cannot see any harm in it as long as the shop is not on the licensed premises. I suggest that when bookmakers' requests are put before the Minister they should be given sympathetic consideration.

I intend to speak in the debate on the second reading of the Bill on Tuesday. I think I have dealt with all the matters that I wish to raise at this stage. I commend the Government for bringing down the legislation. It should have been brought down years ago. I believe that it will be an advantage to the people of the Far North.

Dr. DELAMOTHE (Bowen) (4.6 p.m.): Members of the Opposition should hang their heads in shame over their opposition to the Bill, because in 1936 they considered amending the Act, had a look at it, almost reached the barrier, and were recalled by the Premier to the saddling paddock. In 1954 they had another go at it and produced a ridiculous compromise so impossible of implementation that ever since it has been the laughing stock of the country and nobody has taken advantage of its provisions.

Mr. Davies interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Maryborough will be dealt with if he speaks across the Chamber in that way.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: The speeches of Opposition members this morning were nothing more than a recapitulation of remarks

that appeared in "Hansard" many years ago. The Premier said, very wisely, I thought, that it would have been a shame under any circumstances to do away with "Hansard" because there would then have been no Opposition speeches. To speak of what people said in a particular Parliament in the remote year of 1954 has nothing whatever to do with the proceedings of Parliament in 1961.

Mr. Walsh interjected.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: The hon. member for Bundaberg will have a chance to speak. I do not know how many members of the 1954 Parliament are members of this Parliament, but they would certainly be in the minority. So let us stick to what members of this Parliament think about the Bill.

Speaking of my particular area, which is the largest and most important area of Queensland as far as the Bill and most other matters are concerned, the district covered by the North Queensland Racing Association takes in the whole of Queensland from Mackay north. In that area, which is a very old racing area, there are 79 race clubs. The officials of the N.Q.R.A. are generally satisfied with the provisions of the Bill, and I shall deal with some of the provisions that may be slightly controversial but which will be beneficial. I want to make it clear that the people who control racing in this large and important racing area in Queensland are in the main satisfied with the principles of the Bill as far as they have been made public.

Let us now have a look at some of the principles. Some people, including hon. members opposite, many of whom know nothing about racing, have complained about the 30-mile limit. I should like to tell the people who make such a fetish of the radius that off-course betting, or the greater proportion of it, comprises betting on Melbourne and Sydney events. It does not matter how long or how short you make the radius, it is not going to put one extra person through the turnstiles of the Brisbane racecourses. The big majority of the people who use the betting shops in the metropolitan area are interested only in southern events. In my opinion the introduction of the Bill will not add or subtract one from the attendance at metropolitan racecourses. The facilities for betting in the country are already there. I agree with what was said by the hon. member for Cook. He knows North Queensland well. There is not a town in North Queensland where those who want to make a bet on a Saturday cannot make a bet. The starting-price bookmakers operating throughout the country areas handle large sums of money. They pay no betting tax, and in many instances, give only a limited service to their clients. I have no apology to make for the Government's introducing a Bill to do something towards rectifying this organised law-breaking, a form of law-breaking that has been condoned by custom because it has

been in accordance with public opinion, but which has fattened on organised racing without paying anything towards it. The Government have acted very courageously and very wisely. Of course, to be courageous is to be wise.

In dealing with the matter on the ethical side hon. members have read extensively from the Royal Commission report of 1952. I can do no better than quote from the same official document because it has the imprimatur of authority. The report states—

"No good purpose would, we think, be served if we were to attempt to determine the religious and philosophical question as to whether gambling is ethical or unethical, or whether, being ethical in some degree, it becomes unethical in a higher degree.

"History is redolent with examples of the unwisdom of the State attempting to adopt repressive or coercive measures in respect of matters of private conduct in opposition to the personal convictions of numerous sections of the community.

"What appear, in any event, to be involved are questions of individual conscience, and such matter are, we think, outside our province. Nor are they, in our view, within the province of the State."

I think that completely disposes of the argument from the Government's point of view in introducing such a Bill that it is unethical, immoral and not to be condoned.

Some reference has been made to its economic effect. The editor of "The Economist," a well recognised and accepted paper, states that the proportion of the national resources absorbed by gambling is nearer $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. than 1 per cent.

There has been some criticism of the provision in the Bill that lays down the 30-mile and 15-mile radii, but those of us who know our State know that Queensland is made up of many small towns which are, to a very great extent, complete in themselves in that there is no surrounding populated area. Whether the limit was 15, 25, or 30 miles it would make no difference because the radius would not include any greater area of habitation.

So that the 15 miles would, in most cases, include all the inhabited parts and those in which starting price betting facilities would be necessary. The larger towns, where regular racing is conducted, are suitably catered for by racing on the racecourses and starting price bookmakers have been completely excluded from those. In the smaller towns where occasional meetings are held, on the off Saturdays, as we call them, the starting price bookmakers will be able to provide the service which country people richly deserve, in spite of the hon. member for Brisbane's remarks that some people should be debarred for their own good from having betting facilities. In the smaller towns, on the day that races are run—and they are social gatherings rather than

race meetings—shops will be allowed to function until one and a-half hours before the race meeting commences.

Mr. Sullivan: The S.P. man has to attend the races himself.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: The S.P. man on off Saturdays is the registered bookmaker on the racing Saturdays. I think it is agreed by all that where it is possible—and this is proved by the New Zealand experience and more recently by the Victorian experience—a very acceptable form of off-the-course betting is the off-course totalisator. I think all members of the Government, all members of racing clubs and the general public would agree that that is the best form of off-course betting. If this Bill has any weakness—and I do not agree that it has—so far as Brisbane is concerned the 30-mile limit will have the effect of hastening and bringing in very quickly off-course totalisators to Brisbane and, in due course, to the larger provincial cities. If the Bill does that, if it brings in the ultimate good off-course betting, quickly, then it is a good Bill whether it has any obvious weaknesses or not, and I do not agree that it has.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (4.19 p.m.): In joining in this debate, I support the statements by my leader and other members on this side with regard to the proposed legislation. I do not think there is any doubt in the mind of any member of this Assembly or of the community in general, that the Government brought it in for one reason only that is, to obtain more revenue for the State.

Mr. Sullivan: To stop people from breaking the law every Saturday afternoon.

Mr. HOUSTON: The breaking of the law is not the main consideration at all. If the hon. member for Condamine wants to enter the debate I suggest he stand up and make a full speech; he has plenty to answer for in some of the interjections he has already made. The Government required more revenue to carry on the affairs of the State. They could blame the Federal Government, if they wanted to, for their attitude towards Queensland. Anyway, it became evident that they wanted more money and they decided that they would get it. After investigation, I believe that they considered that the many people betting away from racecourses constituted a very lucrative source to attack. The Treasurer then sought ways and means of legislating to tap this source of income. Strangely enough, although the Country Party at its conference, I think in Rockhampton, in 1959, decided to press the Government to legalise off-the-course betting, the Government and the Country Party section in particular made no reference to the matter in their policy speeches at the 1960 election. They thought so little of

public opinion that they did not put themselves to the test by saying to the public in 1960, "If we are returned as the Government, we will legalise off-the-course betting." They did not do so because they knew public opinion at that time would be against the proposal or they were not game to run the risk that it might be. They waited until 12 months after the election to bring in the legislation. They have followed the old Liberal and Country Party line of hoodwinking the people, despite the fact that they had the opportunity 12 months earlier to test public opinion at the ballot box.

The Australian Labour Party Governments had different ideas. When, owing to the demand of certain sections of the community, we were required to investigate off-the-course betting, we did not legislate for it off the cuff or make statements hoping they would be approved. Two commissions were set up, the Racing and Gaming Commission in 1936 and the Off-The-Course Betting Commission in 1952. Both commissions submitted recommendations.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: I have plenty of support. I did not require four Ministers of the Crown including the Premier to back up my argument.

The Labour Government, before introducing legislation, set up expert committees so that they could get the views and opinions of the people of the State, and having received those views introduced the legislation. On this occasion the Government have decided to legislate in order to get additional revenue. The Treasurer said he sought expert opinion. He certainly sought the opinions of race clubs, bookmakers and others associated with gambling but to what extent did he seek the opinion of the ordinary, little people.

Mr. Sullivan: He got a lot of excellent advice in the Caucus.

Mr. HOUSTON: What about the thousands of A.L.P. voters throughout Queensland and the representatives of those voters? Were their opinions sought? Of course not. In that respect the procedure on this occasion is similar to that adopted by the Government on other occasions. If the Minister or Caucus decides on the introduction of legislation, complete contempt is shown for Parliament and the opinions of hon. members. On many occasions we have pointed out to the Government the weakness of their legislation. They have rejected our advice, but within a short time they have had to amend their legislation.

We have heard a great deal about the fact that the Bill will do away with illegal gambling and illegal off-the-course operators but I point out that the majority of S.P. bookmakers operate in Brisbane and the other main centres.

Mr. Ramsden: The hon. member for Brisbane did not say that.

Mr. HOUSTON: The hon. member can make his own speech. The great majority of illegal bookmakers operate in Brisbane and provincial cities where race meetings are conducted. Newspapers in those areas play up the racing game because it suits many of their readers and because they get money from the racing fraternity. Their efforts are a contributing factor to the present state of affairs. It pays them to give publicity to race meetings. I think comparatively speaking, a greater number of people would bet in areas where newspapers give publicity to racing than would bet in areas where newspapers do not publish advertisements and articles on horse racing. This Bill will not stop S.P. betting in those areas. If S.P. betting could be wiped out by legislation the Minister would have told us. As he said, until the totalisator method is considered, there will be no legalised betting in Brisbane or within the 15- or 30-mile radius.

The Minister hopes that the reduced ticket tax will fool the public. Again, it is a case of the Government's finding opposition from race clubs and people directly associated with racing and they have decided to give them a pay-off. They have told the bookmakers, "All right, you will stop losing because of the S.P. operators, and we will reduce the ticket charge to 2d. But at the same time, to get more revenue we will put on 1½ per cent. or about 4d. in the £1 so that the Government will get their 6d.—the 2d. ticket tax plus the 4d. for every bet over £1." There again, this so-called concession will result in more income for the Government. The bookmakers in the leger and in the flat paying 2d. will have to pay an extra amount. Let us not kid ourselves that this legislation has been brought down to do away with illegal betting. The Minister is introducing a turnover tax. Whether that is right or wrong, I am not sufficiently expert to know, because I do not know exactly how it will apply. I will wait to look at the legislation. The Minister did not refer to the opinion of the Royal Commission of 1952, when he drafted the Bill, because this is what the commission said about the turnover tax on betting—

"We have examined the possibility of imposing a turnover tax on betting tickets but after a thorough investigation came to the conclusion that as there are so many difficulties in its practical administration we would be unable to make any recommendation. We had evidence before us which disclosed that where a turnover tax has been imposed it has been evaded to a considerable degree, particularly in respect to telephone and credit betting. In the circumstances we are of opinion that a tax on the betting ticket is the more practicable."

The Minister saw fit to change that completely and reduce the ticket tax and bring in

a turnover tax. I do not think he gave any worth-while explanation during his introduction for the reason for using a method different from the one recommended by the commission.

The hon. member for Kedron and the Minister debated at some length across the Chamber the principle of the four principal racing clubs issuing off-the-course bookmakers' licences. I want to know who is to guarantee that the bookmakers' premises are kept in a satisfactory condition? Who will draw up the regulations for the administration, control and management of off-the-course betting? Who will determine the conditions under which licences should be granted? Who will determine the number of licences to be granted in any area or approve of the location and nature of premises in which such betting is to be conducted? Who will administer and give effect to all the laws relating to off-the-course betting? Surely the Minister is not going to leave all those matters in the hands of the principal race clubs! They are not public bodies. It is public money that is being invested in S.P. and other betting, yet apparently the race clubs will be given that power. The Bill lays down that the shops shall be in a certain locality but who will guarantee what they are like inside? Who will make sure that people entering them will not be abused by the proprietors? The Minister should have given us a clearer picture on all these matters.

He began by saying that the Bill was necessary to legalise S.P. betting in this way because it was impossible to carry out the 1954 legislation. That is so much nonsense. The Minister knows as well as everybody else that all the Government had to do was amend the legislation so that it could be put into effect. If he thought that, with the redistribution, the zones could not be operated effectively, or that the previous zones could not work effectively, he could easily have introduced an amending Bill to change the zones. Other legislation lays down zones for local option polls. Surely the Minister does not contend that they have not worked effectively! Recently the people of Redcliffe decided on Sunday sport. The poll was conducted with decorum, and, close as the voting was, the result was accepted. If the Minister had wanted to give the public the right to decide on S.P. betting, and if that had been the only factor that worried him, he could have changed the zones. In industrial legislation of much more importance, affecting the decision of workers whether to strike, areas were set out. If the Government had wanted to, they could have redefined the zones or areas to ensure that those who wanted to vote on this matter had the opportunity.

Much has been said by the Minister and other Government members about the morals of betting. I do not think morals enter into it. Some of the statements made by Government members make a complete mockery of the talk about morals. The

Leader of the Opposition read many extracts from a previous "Hansard" to show how the attitude of hon. members opposite has changed. If off-the-course betting was morally wrong in 1954, there has been no change to make it morally right now.

Let us look at the Bill to see how it applies differently. It appears that the Government believe it is morally right to have a bet on a racecourse, morally wrong to bet off the course within 30 miles of a racecourse, and then morally right again to bet beyond that area. Once the totalisator is brought in, it is morally right to bet within 30 miles of a racecourse. I cannot see any logic in that, unless it is that it is morally right to bet on the tote but morally wrong to bet off the course. I hope the Minister in his reply will be able to satisfy the Opposition on the subject of the morals of betting.

He also said quite a lot about the advantages of the totalisator system. If he firmly believed that that was correct and his idea was, as he stated, to do away with illegal off-the-course betting, he should have waited till the system had been investigated completely and allowed the 1954 Act, even if amended, to stand. I believe that the 1954 Commission did not give an answer to totalisator betting because the evidence then available did not show conclusively enough whether it could or could not be put into operation. I believe that much more evidence is available now, and if the Government had wanted to, they could have investigated thoroughly the use of totalisators. I read recently that a totalisator system is operating in Malaya. That could have been investigated. The result of investigations into the operation of totalisators should have been put before the Committee when the desirability of introducing a measure such as this was being considered.

The Minister said that the setting up of totalisators is a matter for the clubs. I do not know exactly where the Government are going in this matter. They are saying to the clubs, "If you think the totalisator is better, you introduce it." Who is running the State? Who decides what is best for the public? Who are the representatives elected by the people to make decisions one way or the other? Surely the decision should not be left to the racing fraternity controlled by the Q.T.C. or any of the provincial clubs! I believe that it is the Government's responsibility and that they should accept it. They should not say to the principal clubs, "If you think you can set up a totalisator system successfully, go ahead and do it."

Off-the-course betting has been introduced in Victoria and a board has been set up to control it. The fact that influenced the Government was that the Treasurer knew from the 1959 decision of the Country Party that he had the backing of Government members for the introduction of off-the-course betting. If my memory serves me

correctly, the Country Party said at that time that it wanted it only in country areas, but the Treasurer knew that he had the backing of the Country Party and decided to go ahead with the legislation. He was strengthened in his decision, of course, when he saw the effects of the Victorian scheme on Government revenue. Mr. Bolte, the Premier of Victoria, made a statement that S.P. betting had made a tremendous difference to the income of that State. In fact, on 18 March last year, which was in the very early stages of the operation of the system, punters invested £47,348 10s. in off-the-course bets at Flemington in one day. There was a limited clientele of 8,000 people because of the limited number of telephones available at the time. The Victorian Government believe that they will receive over £400,000 in net income from off-the-course betting, and they expect that the tote take in Victoria will exceed £10,000,000 a year.

I believe that the Committee should consider these important factors. We should not be told, "Here is the Bill. You have to take it." After all, it makes a great difference if one knows its purpose.

I should like to reply to a statement made by interjection when the hon. member for Brisbane was speaking. The hon. member for Condamine said that it was completely right for the people of Gatton to have an S.P. bet because Gatton is so far away from Brisbane. I do not intend to debate whether it is right or wrong at this stage. But I pose the question to the hon. member: is it also right that when the races are held at Gatton the people of Brisbane cannot have a bet on those local events? I ask the hon. member to consider that point when he gets up to speak.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah) (4.40 p.m.): Some hon. members have spoken and others are prepared to speak in favour of legalising off-the-course betting. They seek to give reasons to justify the Bill. Largely there are three groups of people. One section of the community is interested in racing and betting. To a lesser or greater degree those people should be content with the Bill. There is a second section of the community comprised of people who are not interested in the Bill in any shape or form or in the facilities that it will provide for off-the-course betting. Perhaps the largest group is the third group comprised of people who are opposed entirely to such a measure. I speak on their behalf. They are concerned with the moral issue. Their reasons are the same as those that have been held by some hon. members over the years. They hold the same views today. In that connection I mention the hon. member for Wavell who has asked me to state that his views remain the same as those expressed by him in 1954. As a consequence, he is not supporting the Bill.

Mr. Walsh: Will he vote against it?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: Yes. He is not supporting the Bill. I have never been able to see any justification for increasing off-the-course betting facilities. I cannot see how it can help people, how it will give them greater security or improve their every-day well-being. Never have I been able to to reconcile the practice as an amenity necessary for those who are not able to attend race meetings in various parts of the State. Strange as it may seem, I am heartily in agreement with the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Brisbane when he spoke in rather scathing terms of the so-called amenity. On the other hand I am not in agreement with the views expressed by the hon. member when he said he was not concerned in any way with the morals of the whole issue, that he was interested only in so far as it affected the people interested in betting. Of course I disagree with him on that aspect.

When it is estimated that £1,000,000 is going to be taken from the people who engage in off-the-course betting, by no stretch of the imagination can I see how it can be referred to as an amenity, unless, of course, the so-called kick of using your money to bet on horses that in most cases lose can come within the category of an amenity.

Mr. Hiley: It comes under the heading of having joy through pain.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: It must be something of that nature. I have never been able to understand where the joy is. Over the years it has become the practice amongst a certain section of the community to engage in S.P. betting. I know just as well as other hon. members the arguments that are advanced for the introduction of the legislation. They say that Australians by nature are gamblers. Therefore, they say that we may as well legalise it; we may as well participate in some of the spoils from this source. I always believe that the true purpose of law is to legalise in the interests of the people and to guide the people as far as possible. This legislation, legalising off-the-course betting, cannot, under any circumstances come within those categories.

I think it is generally recognised that the majority of people who engage in this practice are average wage-earning people. When we consider that and realise the points outlined in "The Courier-Mail" some weeks ago by one of the world's leading jockeys who referred to the punter as a fool, because sooner or later he is sure to be parted from his money, I do not think that the legalising of this practice could be a true function of law. I have the feeling that it will result in the practice of S.P. betting becoming much more widespread than it is today. I know that the Treasurer does not agree with me in those views. He feels that it will be kept to the even level it is at today and only people interested in betting will bet under the new system. But, I cannot help thinking

of New Zealand and other States where a tremendous increase in off-the-course betting has taken place since its legalisation. I am afraid the same result must occur in this State particularly when we consider the time at the disposal of people today and the way of life they enjoy as a result of the 40-hour week.

Young people are already finding it difficult to utilise their leisure time to the best advantage, as is evidenced by the juvenile crime in the community. I cannot believe, with the legalising of this practice, that many of these young people who are, in many cases unstable, will not drift into the habit of squandering much of their earnings in this way.

Mr. Davies: The Treasurer wholeheartedly agreed with you in the past.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: Many of these young people, as I say, are not able to utilise their time to the best advantage now. The fact that they might squander their money in other directions is not, to my mind, a good argument for providing another avenue whereby this may be possible. As the years go by, new generations arise who will not realise that S.P. betting has ever been illegal. It will be something that they will accept and participate in, in their every-day life, because they have never known anything better. It will certainly not be in the interests of our people or of the community generally.

Some six months ago I was in Perth attending a Parliamentary Association conference with many members of Parliament from other States and I visited various towns in Western Australia. Whilst there I called at some of the betting shops in that State, I can assure you, Mr. Taylor, not to lay any bets, but to get first-hand information on how they operate and the general atmosphere in the shops there. I was most forcefully impressed by the fact that in many cases the men and women in these places were exclusively average wage-earners. In most instances they were lined up to pay their money and lay their bets. I could not help thinking they were doing so in the forlorn hope of winning something, although it was almost a certainty that they would lose the money they had. They were suffering from the illusion that lures many people to their financial doom. That is why I think the Bill is not really in the interests of the people.

I repeat that I know all the arguments and the various reasons advanced for the legislation. Many can be advanced from different viewpoints. I personally think the legislation is not in the interests of the people in spite of all the arguments that may be advanced in favour of it. That is why I wanted to place on record my views on what I regard as a very important issue. At the same time I think I am expressing the views of the large section of people I have referred to who also think for the reasons I outlined that the legislation is not in the interests of the people.

Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg) (4.52 p.m.): Having regard to the views expressed by the Treasurer in 1954 when the Racing and Betting Bill was introduced, I have no doubt he is in a very unhappy state of mind today, with the responsibility thrust upon him of bringing down a measure which must cut completely across his conscience and his personal views.

The hon. member for South Coast states that the Treasurer is happy. He does not appear to be happy, that is, judging him purely in the person of Tom Hiley. In his capacity as Treasurer, no doubt he will be very happy.

Having regard to some of the quotations used today, I thought while sitting back here that the Treasurer would be quite happy if each hon. member made a speech as short as the speech made by the hon. member for Clayfield in 1954. The hon. member for Clayfield in the discussion on the Bill in 1954 rose to speak at 11.56 p.m. and made what I think was the shortest speech ever made in the chamber—2½ lines and exactly 20 words. I recall that the name of the hon. member for Clayfield appeared in the division list on that occasion, voting against the introduction of the Racing and Betting Bill. The circumstances today no doubt are such that we will not find his name in the division list voting for or against the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I am sure there are times when the hon. member for Clayfield would appreciate similar brevity and decision.

Mr. WALSH: Out of respect for the Chair I did not want to identify you, Mr. Taylor, as the hon. member for Clayfield.

However, there is much in the Bill that has been outlined by the Treasurer and it would be foolish at this stage to attempt to debate it intelligently. There are so many complex phases of this type of legislation that we have to know the actual wording before we can intelligently criticise or support the measure in its entirety.

Dealing with the change of front of the Government, I am glad to see the Minister for Labour and Industry in the Chamber, because his 1954 remarks are pertinent to the things that are happening now and the Government's attitude on this issue. In the 1954-1955 volume of "Hansard" No. 210, at page 1596, the present Minister for Labour and Industry, and the then Deputy Leader of the Opposition, said—

"I can see a certain amount of justification in a party's asking for a loyal vote on matters of policy, but when it comes to a question of principle and conscience, where some people feel strongly one way and others feel strongly another, only a dictator will force his fellows to support him against their conscience and principles."

Mr. Nicklin: Did you say that?

Mr. WALSH: No, the present Minister for Labour and Industry, Mr. Morris, said it. I am glad the Premier has given me the opportunity of emphasising who said it.

Having regard to the views expressed by the Minister for Health and Home Affairs, the hon. member for South Coast and the hon. member for Cooroora and various other hon. members, I am wondering what they will do on this occasion, whether the Premier or the Minister for Labour and Industry, his deputy, will line these fellows up and act as the dictators and force the members to support them, against their conscience and principles.

Mr. Nicklin: We are not going to line anybody up.

Mr. Morris: We are not going to line anybody up.

Mr. WALSH: There is a clear indication that there are at least two members who are not going to vote for it. There is the hon. member for Barambah. We can compliment him for being consistent in this matter. He expressed his views on this occasion as he did in 1954, as did the hon. member for Wavell. Apparently the hon. member for Barambah will not support it. He will walk out. The hon. member for Bowen said that these people had the courage of their convictions. I wonder what will happen to those members of the Government who had the courage to declare themselves against the Bill in 1954. I wonder if they have the courage of their convictions now to vote against the measure, or walk out.

The present Minister for Labour and Industry said—

"I know and all other hon. members know that in this Chamber we have a goodly number of members of the Labour Party who hate this measure as much as I do, and hate it on principle."

Look at him sitting there! His name will appear in the division list alongside those of other hon. members when it comes to saving the Government when they are going out after an additional £1,000,000 from the community.

I well remember the Premier, and the Minister for Labour and Industry taunting the then Government about Turf Skill and Find-the-Ball and various other doubtful "Courier-Mail" competitions that were under way at the time. We were queried about their legality. Questions were being asked in the House as to whether it was legal for "The Courier-Mail" or the other newspapers to run these competitions. The Minister for Labour and Industry knows only too well what I am referring to. He was trying very hard to get legal interpretations in respect of these matters.

The other day I had someone put up a proposition to me that I should ask the Minister for Justice had his attention been

drawn to the dispute over Wealthwords. It was suggested that I should put up to the Government that the solution should be left to the Department of Justice so that there would be no hanky panky business.

Mr. Morris: Do you remember how you voted on this subject on that occasion?

Mr. WALSH: I always remember how I vote. I am unlike the Minister. He will not engage me in any cross-fire because I have a few things I wish to draw attention to concerning the Premier. He is speaking on behalf of the party.

Mr. Nicklin: This has been read two or three times.

Mr. WALSH: No. The hon. gentleman has not heard this before. This is from "The Courier-Mail" of 5 September, 1952 under the heading of—

"State Opposition View.

Evils and abuses with S.P. Shops

It goes on—

"The State Opposition at a special meeting yesterday unanimously opposed the licensing of betting shops. The Opposition Leader (Mr. Nicklin) said that the evils and abuses associated with 'bingo' would be a mere flea-bite compared with those which would soon result from licensed betting shops.

"Mr. Nicklin was speaking on behalf of the State Country and Liberal Parties."

These are not necessarily his own views. He spoke on behalf of the parties. The report goes on—

"Mr. Nicklin said the Opposition Parties considered that to facilitate and expand and give legal sanction to a social evil was entirely undesirable.

"The Opposition was opposed to licensed off-the-course betting as proposed in the report or any other of its addendums or any other system that could be devised."

The Premier followed that up, as reported in "The Courier-Mail" of 10 February, 1953. Outlining his policy speech he had this to say about the parties' policy on S.P. betting—

"We are definitely of opinion that it would be altogether wrong for Parliament to extend facilities of what is undoubtedly a social evil. Queensland Royal Commission's report was tabled in Parliament on September 3rd last and considered at a joint meeting of the opposition parties on the following day. After considering the report from their angle we were unanimously opposed to the licensing of betting shops. We stated at the time, and we have no reason to alter that view, that to facilitate and expand and to give

legal sanction to a social evil was entirely undesirable. We stated that we are opposed to licensed off-the-course betting as proposed in the report or any other system that could be devised. On that decision we stand."

Where do they stand today? How emphatic they were then! Almost to the stage of fanaticism did they insist that that was their policy. True to his words the Premier, when the Bill was introduced in 1954, had this to say at page 1497 of "Hansard"—

"In the time available to me and to bring this question down to a proper perspective, I propose to move the following amendment:—

'Add the words—

"but not to include any provision which would give legal sanction to the licensing of betting shops whether contingent upon the carrying of a referendum or otherwise."'"

It did not matter even if the people approved of it; they were still going to oppose it. He went on to say—

"The effect of that amendment would be to eliminate from this Bill all reference to the legal sanctioning of betting shops."

One is entitled to ask, and the community is entitled to ask, although we feel we can provide the answer, of course, why the Premier and his Cabinet, who are now with him and who were with him then in Opposition, have changed their attitude. Let us see if I can give the Premier the answer to what he asked in 1954 at page 1563. He said—

"And now let us examine the matter from another angle. Who wants this legislation?"

So I can rightly ask the Treasurer, "Who wants this Bill?" That is a question many people would like answered. In 1954 I interjected—

"Are you speaking about the Bill generally now?"

And Mr. Nicklin replied—

"No, particularly the section dealing with legalised off-the-course betting."

Evidence in galore to show that there was such great unanimity within the party itself at the time! They were entirely opposed even to letting the people themselves decide whether they were in favour of S.P. betting.

Mr. Nicklin: Do you know that the Country Party conference in 1959, I think it was, favoured S.P. betting?

Mr. WALSH: I have an idea. As a matter of fact, that is one of the observations I wish to make. The Treasurer gave various reasons and various excuses for the introduction of the measure. But he left out

two very important reasons. One was the pressure within his own political group; the other was his desire to get more and more revenue.

Hon. members on this side of the House are entitled to ask the Premier and the Government, who wants this Bill? The Racing and Betting Act, which the Treasurer now seeks to amend, made provision for the holding of a referendum where 10 per cent. of the electors within a zone demanded a poll. Apparently not even 10 per cent. of the electors in any one of the zones wanted the legislation amended, because they did not ask for a referendum. How can the Government justify their attitude at this stage when it has been shown that not even 10 per cent. of the people in a particular zone were prepared to make that request? Those are very important matters.

So much has been said about the Treasurer that I hate to blister his back any more. However, I must refer to one matter.

At page 1579 of Volume 210 of "Hansard", the Treasurer said—

"Primarily it is one for the regulation of horse and dog racing. I said that I would declare my attitude on the Bill. I should say that I do not love either form of racing, but I would not stop them, neither would I stop on-the-course betting."

That does not get very far away from the Treasurer's attitude today. Although he is supporting the legalisation of off-course betting, he still says that he does not like racing—either dog racing or galloping. To that extent he is consistent, and it makes it more difficult for the racing industry if they have to deal with a man who is not sympathetic to their problems. If he does not like racing in any form, it is very difficult for him to interest himself in it.

At page 1580 of the same volume of "Hansard", the Treasurer said—

"I object to giving a betting monopoly to a man with a licence over a particular shop. As I see it, under the Bill, racing will become the maid servant of betting."

What has the hon. member for Bowen to say to that? That was the Treasurer's view in 1954. Has he changed his view on that particular matter? He went on to say—

"I now want to explain why on reasoning and prejudice I am opposed to extending betting facilities to off-the-course betting shops. In the years I have been practising my profession as an accountant I have come across a limited number of cases of financial crashes. In some instances the man has made a complete and utter mess of his own financial affairs and in other cases there has been a breach of trust by an employee, in the

course of which he has embezzled money, and has had to be dealt with. It is my experience that, of all the factors that can unsettle a man's life and can lead to those things, horse-racing and betting on horse-racing is by far the major one.

"Having in mind the cases of men who have made a complete and utter mess of their lives, I must confess that I approach this matter with a bias against any further extension of facilities for betting. That state of mind is based on my experience of broken lives and ruined fortunes. It is true that those cases are not many, but it does not take many instances of that nature to make an indelible imprint on the mind, and to affect subsequent judgment. If that is prejudice, I confess to it. That is one of the most potent factors influencing my assessment of any proposal to extend betting facilities."

Our former colleague Mr. Arthur Jones interjected that such cases would not necessarily be brought about by off-the-course betting. The hon. gentleman replied—

"No, but those cases influence me against any further extension of facilities for betting."

Where is the consistency? I can understand the satisfaction that the hon. member for Barambah gets out of this, because he at least can say that he is consistent in his attitude, but we cannot say that the Government are consistent. I know the Treasurer is in a very difficult position with finance. To that extent we should have some sympathy for him. Through the financial institution he controls he has to look after the welfare of many thousands of people in the State. Any Treasurer who goes short of money becomes unpopular with his colleagues, his Government, and the community generally. It is a terrible reflection on society and the financial system that a Government should be forced into the position where they have to seek more and more of their revenue from grog and gambling in order to finance educational and hospital systems. That is the position the Treasurer has been forced into because of the attitude of the Menzies Government. I hope somebody will deal with them on 9 December. The Treasurer and the Government can be likened to the person who, because of his economic circumstances, being out of a job and with a family to feed and clothe—as there are 16,000 in the State now—is forced to thief. Here we find that the Government have to go to the brewers, gamblers, bettors, and others to maintain their system of education.

Without my drawing attention to it the Treasurer knows that last year he collected £127,000 more revenue from that source than in the last year of the Labour Government. The financial tables show that he collected £427,000 as against £300,000 in the

last year of the Labour Government. He is going to collect another £1,000,000 in a full year, which means that he will be taking approximately £1,500,000 out of the pockets of the punters of the State. I know that it is their money and that they do not have to bet, but surely we should be able to get the money in some other way. The Treasurer has admitted that the problem is basically the same as it was prior to 1954. If it is the same I do not know why he is bringing in the measure because we got along and, as the Leader of the Opposition showed this morning, at least the law was enforced more effectively then.

I have only very limited time and no doubt, Mr. Taylor, you will say that I should have discussed some of the principles of the Bill. I will do that for sure when I see it. But there are a few matters I should like the Treasurer to elaborate on. The principal club will determine who shall have licences. The Treasurer made that clear and I agree with it. The principal club can do that better than the Government. I am querying what will happen in areas like Maryborough where there is no race track, but trotting is conducted. Who will issue the licence? The trotting club will not be registered with the Q.T.C. or any other principal club.

Mr. Hiley: Provision is made for the registration of the principal trotting club.

Mr. WALSH: I realise that, but the position is not so now. Frankly, my own attitude would be that the principal racing club in any area should license all bookmakers, whether they be for trotting or galloping.

I notice that provision is made to reduce the fee from £50 to £10. No doubt that will be acceptable to the bookmakers. The matter of the formula is one that will require the very closest examination by the clubs and hon. members. If the formula is fair to the provincial clubs as well as the principal clubs we should have no complaint there. Many of the other provisions are similar to the old Act where it deals with minors and matters of that nature. In reply to hon. members on this side who said, "How are we going to police this?" I would say that we will have more unofficial policemen if legalised S.P. betting is introduced, because all the legalised off-the-course bookmakers will themselves become policemen. If that is so and it tends to stamp out what has been regarded as an illegal form of S.P. betting over the years, it will have done some good. If it cuts out the repeated suggestions that there has been extensive graft amongst members of the Police Force in this matter, again it will be doing something good in the community.

I repeat, until we have seen the measure we cannot intelligently discuss its principles as we should like to do. I will reserve further comment until I see the Bill.

Mr. BROMLEY (Norman) (5.16 p.m.): The Treasurer's conscience must have been at variance with his pretended sincerity this morning when he presented the Bill. Government members in the past have spoken against S.P. betting. They did so in 1953 and 1954 when they were in Opposition. What they said then has been revived, taken from "Hansard" and thrown back at them this afternoon and I think it will be interesting to see how they vote on the measure, whether they will vote consistently with their statements of the past.

I think they will take a different view now because of the revenue that will be derived from the measure. Money talks and it is strange that very few hon. members on the Government side have said anything in opposition to the Bill. They are not at all vociferous in their antagonism to it as they were when a similar measure was introduced by a Labour Government some years ago.

It is apparent from what can be heard around town that the Treasurer led the clubs, the bookmakers and others in the racing industry up the garden path in his early discussions. He certainly did not tell them about the turnover tax, nor did he concern himself to find out what the people of Queensland wanted in relation to S.P. betting. I do not think he consulted the people at all, certainly not the average citizen either in Brisbane or in the country areas.

This legislation is another attempt to fleece the people and is typical of the Government's attitude since they attained office. So far as I am concerned the Government will go down in history as "The hungry coalition Government"—hungry for money. I think that adequately describes them. Virtually every Minister has indulged in a hungry grab for money. I do not think one Minister has failed to get his claws into some section of the community. The Minister for Labour and Industry slugged the motoring public with increased fines for minor traffic offences. He slugged them again with the parkatareas.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member will not refer to the parkatareas on this Bill.

Mr. BROMLEY: I am tying this up with the Treasurer's wanting to get on the band wagon with other Government departments in his search for money and I think I am justified in making the analogy. The motorist, who is also amongst the betting public, was hit by the Treasurer with increased third party insurance premiums, and again by the Treasurer with increased stamp duties in various forms. The tax on betting tickets recently was raised from 2d. to 6d. The Treasurer has now announced his intention of reducing it to 2d. in the paddock and leger, but against that he is imposing a turnover tax of 1½ per cent., which will hit them again. In that way the public is hit again.

The Minister for Labour and Industry has increased the fee for driving licences. The public was slugged by the Minister for Transport in the matter of rail fares and freights. The Minister for Justice has slugged the people indirectly by recent legislation which has had the effect of increasing liquor prices. The Minister for Education has also got on the band wagon.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the hon. member has made his point, and I ask him not to refer again to those irrelevant subjects.

Mr. BROMLEY: I just wanted to mention that the Minister for Education has increased the University fees.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member might just want to mention a dozen more, but I think he has made his point.

Mr. BROMLEY: I cannot mention a dozen more, because I have gone through nearly all the Ministers, and have made my point.

Mr. Nicklin: Tell us something about the Bill.

Mr. BROMLEY: I am entitled to answer interjections if I am interrupted during my contribution. Every department is getting more money for the Government and the Treasurer apparently thinks that he must insist on getting more money. To a certain extent he may be jealous of the other Ministers. The Minister for Health and Home Affairs has increased dental and hospital charges.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the hon. member does not obey my request he will be asked to resume his seat.

Mr. BROMLEY: I shall now get onto a subject that is perhaps more relevant to the debate. I think the Bill will force sections of the community onto the breadline. I do not begrudge people living in the city or the country the right to have a bet, but I think the radius of 30 miles from the Brisbane G.P.O. should be at least 50 to 100 miles. I think such a decision would be in the best interests of all concerned.

A couple of years ago I visited the capital cities of Hobart, Adelaide and Perth where S.P. betting is in operation. I inquired into S.P. betting because it did not operate in Queensland. I had no doubt that the Treasurer would decide to attack the public purse at some time by introducing S.P. betting and so I inquired into it. I saw the damage that had been done by S.P. betting. I am concerned about the effect on the population as a whole, hence my great interest in the subject. I realise we must adopt a fairly broad outlook on such matters, and A.L.P. members do so. We must support

legislation that will be of benefit to all sections of the community, but I fail to see how the Bill can be of benefit to all sections.

I am going to deal with the effect on the people and the economy of the other States where S.P. betting operates. The people were adversely affected and I do not think anyone can deny my statement. The Treasurer said that betting would not increase as a result of the legislation. I cannot agree with him. In Adelaide betting increased by over 400 per cent. after the commencement of S.P. betting shops.

Mr. Hiley: How would they measure it when they would not know what was going on beforehand?

Mr. Duggan: How was it measured by the Royal Commissions set up in England, New Zealand, and other places? They deal with it in their reports.

Mr. BROMLEY: Through you, Mr. Taylor, I inform the Treasurer that it is well known down there, and I was told by a Liberal Member that the amount of betting increased approximately from £1,750,000 to just over £7,000,000. The Treasurer is up here in Brisbane, but I spoke to a man on the job down there, and members of the Liberal Party in Adelaide. As I said before, I was particularly interested because I thought the Treasurer would introduce this measure. I was also told that people of all ages frequented the betting shops. It is well known. We have seen letters to the paper about it. Child delinquency will increase also, but I would not blame S.P. betting for that altogether I believe that the parents are to blame for some of it, but I think S.P. betting will have a tendency to increase it.

When I was there I met many sporting people and they told me they found it was practically impossible to carry on organised sport of any description while S.P. betting was in operation. A secretary of an Australian National Rules Football club told me that they had to close down because of the S.P. shops. Protests came from various officials of sporting organisations and the general public.

We have heard hon. members refer to S.P. shops being in the vicinity of hotels. I have been in Western Australia, and I have found that because of this, drunkenness has increased. Some people say that we cannot alienate hotels from betting shops. I think that can be done. With the passage of this Bill S.P. shops will be established. I believe that the Treasurer should insist that the shops must be situated well away from any hotel, even in smaller towns where there are not many streets. The Treasurer should take cognisance of the fact that where betting

and drinking are together, a person who drinks more than he should is inclined to gamble more than he should. We are all aware that liquor excites people, and that an irresponsible attitude can be created by its consumption and, as a result, they bet beyond their means.

I point out that in South Australia I found that the Government waxed fat on the rake-off in tax tickets from the S.P. betting shops and the bookmakers, and so did those connected with the liquor industry. The racing clubs suffered. I know the Treasurer is not in favour of racing clubs, but we should think of all sections of the community. The racing clubs suffered, of course the bookmakers suffered, and the public did too. The only ones to benefit were the Government and certain minorities in the States. I was told by the racing fraternity in Adelaide that owners were taking more and more horses out of the State to race them elsewhere, mainly in Melbourne, where S.P. betting did not operate at that time. The S.P. tote certainly did not operate, as we know it today. The whole racing industry in those States suffered. I may be wrong, but I do not think the betting public want the eventual elimination of bookmakers. It is well known, I think, that the tote operates strictly in New Zealand. We find that owners and trainers in New Zealand and the betting people send their horses over to Australia for the sole purpose of getting a good betting price on them. They are probably interested in the prize money, sometimes amounting to thousands of pounds, but most hon. members will agree—and certainly the Minister for Mines will agree—that the owner wants a price for his horse.

Mr. Evans: I am just wondering whether you want to have racing at all. You have been all round the world. Do you want racing?

Mr. BROMLEY: I took the Minister for a tour round the world because I thought he was interested in racing.

Mr. Evans: I am, too.

Mr. BROMLEY: That is good. I think he will agree that the average racing owner wants a price about his horse. He does not want to go to the tote because there he does not know what dividend he will get. The betting public do not want the elimination of bookmakers but I honestly think that the Treasurer and his Government have that as their eventual objective. This is probably one of the first steps.

Let me turn to the principle in the Bill, as outlined by the Treasurer, dealing with betting prices. In my view, for the protection of the public, betting prices should not

be allowed to be made off the course as this without any shadow of doubt could lead to roguery, and to use racing parlance, cold decks. If a horse was at 6 to 1 in the S.P. shops on Friday afternoon or Saturday morning the people in the know, the owners, and their connections, would perhaps snap up all the 6 to 1 wherever they could get 100 to 16, or 200 to 32, as the case may be. I do not say that all owners are unscrupulous. Most of them are as honest as they can be and perhaps with their horses they are trying. But an unscrupulous owner and his connections could take up all those pickings at a good price on the Friday afternoon or the Saturday morning and then perhaps arrange for the scratching of half the field, that is, the ones anyway with form good enough to win. That could happen. It is easy to see how a cold deck could eventuate with the possibility then of the public on the course getting perhaps only 6 to 4 or even money for a horse that had a 6 to 1 chance in the market. I do not think that can be avoided because in the early 1930's when prices were available and published, as is intended under the Bill, that sort of thing went on. It was through the publication of the pre-race prices in the Press on the Friday and Saturday that racing suffered and the goose that laid the golden egg almost had its head chopped off. A horse may be at 6 to 1 on the overnight market and be a shortener in the market on race day but with the introduction of the S.P. totalisator outside, off the racecourse, anomalies would creep into the betting and we should find cases where the poor old punter with his 5s. or 10s. bet would only be getting his money back. That has happened often down South.

Mr. Evans: It happens there now.

Mr. BROMLEY: That is what I said—because of the amount of money on one particular horse, one goes in the race. We know that punters are fairly sharp. If they see a horse backing in from 6 to 1 to 2 to 1 they will all follow the lead and back up on the totalisator off the course so that eventually, instead of paying a reasonable dividend for 5s., it will be paying less than the 5s. As the Minister for Mines pointed out, we have seen it happen down South following the installation of the off-course tote.

Mr. Evans: I saw it happen in Brisbane.

Mr. BROMLEY: It has happened in Brisbane, but it will happen a hundred times more with the introduction of the S.P. totalisator system. That is one aspect of the legislation that I think should be considered carefully.

I intended to ask the Treasurer this morning where he got all these ideas from in regard to the introduction of this money-grabbing legislation, particularly the turnover tax, but I have a fair idea where he got it from. He admitted that he did not have the slightest knowledge of bookmaking or S.P. betting. Although he may studied it in the South, I wondered where he got his information from in Brisbane.

I know as a fact that bookmakers are scraping the bottom of the barrel for finance, and 70 per cent. of them are in a fairly bad way. Expenses associated with fielding cost a paddock bookmaker approximately £100 a day. That is big money in any man's language, and it is the only calling, industry, trade, or whatever one might call it, in which a person has to pay for himself and his employees to go in the door to start work.

The hon. member for Rockhampton South spoke about provincial racing and the Rockhampton Jockey Club. I should like to add something to his remarks for the consideration of the Treasurer. The passing of the Bill could mean the end of provincial racing, because there is no doubt that the bookmakers supply the prize money in the country. I have worked out exactly how much they pay and how many bookmakers field, and they supply all the prize money, plus some extra money. The entrance money that they pay for themselves and their clerks also enables the clubs to operate. If S.P. betting is introduced there will be fewer bookmakers on the course and, consequently, the clubs in provincial areas close to Brisbane will suffer. The legislation will be passed, of course, because we cannot beat numbers.

I wish to go on record as saying that members of the Australian Labour Party believe that legislation should be passed for the benefit of all sections of the community in Queensland, not for the benefit of sectional minorities.

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth—Treasurer and Minister for Housing) (5.39 p.m.), in reply: Although today's debate has been long, I must say that I have found it interesting. It has been particularly interesting because, apart from one speaker who expressed basic disagreement on moral grounds, not one speaker has gone on record against the basic purpose to be served by the Bill. I have listened carefully to the speeches and there has been no disagreement by any speaker with the fact that S.P. has been and is rife. Not one hon. member has attempted to suggest that the existing law is a satisfactory answer. Indeed, amongst those hon. members who committed themselves at all, there was general agreement

that the public in remote areas was entitled to some off-course facilities, and that, Mr. Taylor, is just what the Bill provides.

There was a measure of general agreement that the off-course tote is better. Its introduction is permitted by the Bill, and I am positive that it will come, and come quickly. Inevitably those of us who have been in the Chamber for years very often find ourselves being twitted about inconsistency. The longer I am in Parliament the more I am convinced that two classes of speaker are beginning to emerge. There is the scissors-and-paste type of speaker who is devoid of original thought. He can make a speech only when he cuts out and pastes what somebody else has said 10, 20, 30 or 40 years ago. Of course, there is the other type of speaker who has some capacity for original thought and an ability to express it. I leave it to hon. members to judge who were the scissors-and-paste merchants and who were those who had capacity for original thought.

Mr. Duggan: And who was the political acrobat?

Mr. HILEY: I frankly acknowledge some inconsistency. I shall explain it in two ways. First of all, the Bill to which we violently objected some years ago did not provide for off-the-course facilities in the remoter areas not within the reach of racecourses. It allowed off-the-course facilities right in the shadow of the racecourse fence.

Mr. Hanlon: You were going to permit it on Saturday morning.

Mr. HILEY: That is not in the Bill.

Mr. Hanlon: You have changed your mind again in a fortnight.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. HILEY: Just listen to the sansculottes on the job again.

Secondly, if some of us still think that gambling is bad we think that consistent lawbreaking is worse. I repeat that that is justification for whatever inconsistency hon. members opposite twit me for.

Various speakers have destroyed many of their arguments by the contradictions amongst themselves. Some of them have said that the Bill has been introduced because of money; some have said it was due to pressure from country people; some accused me of being too hard on the clubs; some accused me of being too kind to the clubs by giving them too much power; some contended that it was a tax on the racing clubs; others contended it was a tax on the general public.

Mr. Duggan interjected.

Mr. HILEY: All I can say is that it is very hard to detect any clear line from all this bewildering variety of self-contradictory argument.

Dealing quickly with some of the observations made, I think the Leader of the Opposition adopted a proper course by reserving his main attitude to the Bill. He chose to make much out of the fact that a committee had been appointed. I want him to know that there is a party committee on every Bill. Every Minister has a committee attached to him. My Treasury committee goes through every Bill I bring down, and the same applies to all Ministers. That was put up as though it was something novel, unusual, and even sinister.

Mr. Duggan: I did not say that at all. I said it was unusual for such a committee to be present when you were receiving a deputation.

Mr. HILEY: I agree that is unusual. Because I was somewhat of a stranger in that field I fortified myself by giving men who knew more about the practical details than I, a chance to bring in what several hon. members opposite have urged, the view of the average man in the street and the average punter.

Mr. Duggan: And their recommendations were rejected.

Mr. HILEY: That shows again that he is listening to latrine gossip—

Mr. DUGGAN: I rise to a point of order. Is it in conformity with the dignity of the Treasurer to refer to some of the leading officials of the turf clubs as engaging in latrine gossip?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I am unable to rule on the dignity of the Treasurer, but I suggest the expression is hardly in keeping with the dignity of Parliament.

Mr. HILEY: All I can say is that after conferences with the race clubs, seven recommendations from my Committee went to the party meeting and five out of the seven were carried. On the two that were not carried the race clubs themselves were not unanimous.

As I took the trouble to tell hon. members this morning, on the question of whether it should be S.P. bets or the four-way option, the clubs in Southern Queensland wanted only S.P., while the clubs in Central and Northern Queensland wanted the four-way option. It was a case where, as far as the advice tendered by the racing clubs was concerned, one got some headed south and some headed north.

Mr. Hanlon: Are you going to give the course punter the four-way option you are giving to the off-course punter?

Mr. HILEY: That is for the clubs. I was taxed with the fact that I did not tell the Committee on this occasion that this Bill would produce some revenue. Heavens above! I told the Assembly quite plainly two months ago that the Government proposed to bring in an off-course betting Bill and that we intended to institute a turnover tax. I listened week after week, while speaker after speaker made that the theme song for his Budget speech. If I had attempted to cover all that ground again, Mr. Taylor, you would have properly sat me down for tedious repetition.

Mr. Graham: Rubbish!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Was the Leader of the Opposition referring to the authority of the chair when he used the word "Rubbish"?

Mr. Duggan: I did not use the word at all.

Mr. Graham: I did. I was referring to the statement made by the Treasurer.

Mr. HILEY: The hon. member for Carnarvon put up some arguments concerning whether the Bill should have attempted to lay down a scale for determining the number of licences. Thought was given to that, and our conclusion was that the number of licences is not reducible to a population scale. Some towns indulge in betting much more freely than other comparably sized towns, and often comparably placed towns. For example, those who know will tell one that there would be an infinite distinction in the betting practices between the residents of Boonah and the residents of Gatton. They are both agricultural towns; they both have a close farming surround, but Gatton is recognised as a town where people are accustomed to bet far more freely than is the case in Boonah.

Mr. Houston: Because of the racecourse.

Mr. HILEY: Maybe; but it cannot be reduced to a population scale.

Mr. Houston: You are giving the racecourses the right to license.

Mr. HILEY: Because they understand the position much better than we do.

Mr. Hanlon interjected.

Mr. HILEY: Hon. members have broken the arrangement on time now; let me finish please.

The second thing that I think should be said is that as one goes further West, as one gets into a purely pastoral surround, in my experience, there is a greater percentage of betting amongst the people than there is in an agricultural surround. I think the agriculturist is tied to his property; he has periods of the year when he is either preparing the land for cropping, or taking the crop off, when he just cannot afford to get away from the task that confronts him, whereas pastoralists are much more likely to settle down to a steady routine and develop a regular week-end betting habit. Consequently, I do not think that the hon. member for Carnarvon's suggestion is feasible.

He also suggested that we should have instituted a time within which the clubs should be expected to install an off-the-course tote. If he followed the practice very recently adopted in Victoria, a practice that I think it is probably desirable to follow here, then first of all it is their money, and, secondly, it is their organisation and planning. It would be quite wrong for anyone to shut his eyes, grab at a time and say, "You must have facilities in so many weeks or months from now." Too little is known about it. The clubs have only very recently shown a disposition to do something about the off-the-course totalisator, and I think it will be some weeks before they are in a position to evaluate the scheme, work out its final details, work out the money requirement, and at the same time discover how they can command the money required. Then and only then could they give an estimate on time.

The hon. member for Brisbane expressed the view that the 30-mile limit will harm Brisbane racing. He plumped solidly for the recommendation of the Royal Commission on 100 miles. I point out that at the last discussion I had with the race clubs it was indicated to me that they would be well contented with 50 miles. I regard 100 miles as oppressive. Look at the map of Queensland and consider the position of a resident of Gympie. If he wanted a bet he would be forced to travel all this distance to Brisbane. Is it reasonable to ask people to incur such a time factor or such a cost factor? It would be an oppressive burden.

Mr. Hanlon: But you are going to make the position such that on Wednesdays a person in Brisbane who wants a bet on Sydney races has to go to Gympie where he can get a bet that he cannot get in Brisbane.

Mr. HILEY: He has not to go to Gympie. There are race meetings in the provincial surround.

Mr. Hanlon: He may have to go to Gatton.

Mr. HILEY: He may have to go to Gatton, and would anybody suggest that Wednesday is a better opportunity than Saturdays or holidays?

The hon. member for Brisbane complained about the uniform approach. He said there should be varying tests. I observe that that is just what we have done. We have laid down two tests. We have a closed territory because racing there is accessible and we have an open opportunity where racing is not accessible.

Other hon. members raised other points, one being the special problem of Rockhampton. On the point raised by the hon. member for Rockhampton South I point out that the Royal Commission in its report took cognisance of the fact that Mt. Morgan presented a special problem and it recommended that Mt. Morgan should be excluded from the zone it was prepared to throw round the city of Rockhampton.

The hon. member proposed that in determining the split-up of the racing clubs' pool that rebates to owners should be treated as if they were prize money. I am prepared to consider the suggestion. My travelling reaction is that it could have some merit. Some clubs pay no rebates at all, and all the money is paid as prize money; other clubs, particularly provincial clubs, pay rebates plus prize money, and the total pay-out by such clubs to the owning public is a combination of the two. I am prepared to consider that matter and advise at a later stage what conclusion I reach.

I think I have covered the main points. I repeat that I am heartened indeed to find, even if there is some disagreement on some of the details, that nobody denies there is a problem confronting the Government, that nobody denies that the present law is inadequate; and I did not find any deep, basic objection generally to the principles of the Bill.

Motion (Mr. Hiley) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

FIRST READING

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr. Hiley, read a first time.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN (Landsborough—Premier): I move—

"That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until Tuesday next."

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.56 p.m.