

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 3 OCTOBER 1923

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 3 OCTOBER, 1923.

The SPEAKER (Hon. W. Bertram, *Maree*),
took the chair at 3.30 p.m.

QUESTIONS.

COST OF EXECUTIVE AND STATE INSURANCE
BUILDINGS.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*) asked the
Secretary for Public Works—

“What was the cost to complete the
erection of—(a) Executive Building; (b)
State Fire Insurance Building?”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS
(Hon. W. Forgan Smith, *Mackay*) replied—

“(a) £142,132 3s. 7d.; (b) £140,966 9s.
4d.”

TRAVELLING EXPENSES OF SECRETARY FOR MINES
IN WARREGO BY-ELECTION CAMPAIGN.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*) asked the Secre-
tary for Mines—

“1. Is it his intention to draw Minis-
terial expenses and travelling allowances
for the period spent in his recent elec-
tioneering tour of the Warrego?”

“2. If so, state amount—(a) allow-
ance; (b) motor-car hire; (c) hotel
and other expenses?”

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon.
A. J. Jones, *Paddington*) replied—

“1 and 2. When travelling I charge
the expenses which pertain to the office
I hold, and which are the same as that
allowed to Ministers of previous Adminis-
trations.”

DAMAGE BY ENGINES TO FOREST HILL RAILWAY GATES.

Mr. LOGAN (*Lockyer*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

"1. How many times have the Forest Hill railway gates been broken or carried away by engines during the years 30th June, 1912, to 30th June, 1923?"

"2. What did it cost to repair these gates during that period?"

"3. What amount in wages per week does the gatekeeper receive?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. J. Huxham, *Buranda*), in the absence of the Secretary for Railways (Hon. J. Larcombe, *Kcppcl*), replied—

"1. Six.

"2. £53 1s. 4d.

"3. Gatekeeper, 20s. 6d. per week with free house, light, and fuel. Assistant gatekeeper, 23s. 6d. per week."

PRICE PAID FOR LOCKYER STATE QUARRY.

Mr. LOGAN asked the Secretary for Public Works—

"1. What was the price paid for the Lockyer quarry?"

"2. What was the date of purchase?"

"3. What number of men are employed at the present time?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS replied—

"1. £2,500.

"2. 29th January, 1923.

"3. Twenty-eight."

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER FOR TRADE.

Mr. MORGAN, without notice, asked the Secretary for Public Works—

"When are we likely to get the report of the Commissioner for Trade?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS replied—

"The reply to the hon. member is the same as I gave to the hon. member for Nundah yesterday. It will be laid on the table on or before the due date."

PAPERS.

The following papers were laid on the table, and ordered to be printed:—

Report of the Commissioner of Public Health to 30th June, 1923.

Report of the Commissioner for Railways for the year ended 30th June, 1923.

Twenty-eighth report of the Auditor-General under the Supreme Court Funds Act of 1895.

PRIMARY PRODUCERS' CO-OPERATIVE ASSOCIATIONS BILL.

INITIATION.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eacham*): I beg to 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 pro-

[*Hon. W. N. Gillies.*

vide for the formation, registration, and management of Primary Producers' Co-operative Associations, and for other purposes incidental thereto."

Question put and passed.

AGRICULTURAL BANK BILL.

INITIATION.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eacham*): I beg to 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 make provisions for State advances to co-operative companies and associations and to farmers and others, and for other consequential purposes."

Question put and passed.

JAPANESE EARTHQUAKE RELIEF FUNDS BILL.

THIRD READING.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eacham*): I beg to move—

"That the Bill be now read a third time."

Question put and passed.

RACECOURSES BILL.

SECOND READING.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinders*): This Bill being a taxation measure, very full information was submitted to hon. members on the consideration of the resolution in Committee of Ways and Means, and there is very little information to add. I might state, however, that one of the outstanding features of the measure is that it has already received the emphatic endorsement of members of this House and of the people outside, if we may judge from the criticism it has occasioned. In fact, the consensus of opinion is that the Bill is overdue. The only tax so far imposed on racing in Queensland—unlike the other States—has been that from the totalisator. During the last financial year, New South Wales imposed on racing taxation amounting to £509,000, New Zealand to the extent of £487,000, Victoria £152,800, South Australia £478,000, Western Australia £56,000, and Queensland £53,000, so that hon. members will see that the tax on racing is greater everywhere else in Australia than it is here. Hon. members may recollect that the British Government propose to take a hand in the taxation of betting and expect to raise, I think, £10,000,000 from bookmakers alone and about £100,000,000 from racing altogether, so that we in Queensland are very modest.

Mr. MORGAN: They will soon wipe out the national debt.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Yes, if they go on those lines, and perhaps it would not be a bad thing.

Mr. MORGAN: I give you the suggestion for nothing. (Laughter.)

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I am pleased to accept it. The leader of the Opposition at an earlier stage asked for an estimate of the tax which would probably

be collected under the measure. We expect that at the rates proposed to be imposed the amount will be about £43,000 per annum.

Hon. members will remember that the Treasurer in his Financial Statement stated that the amount he expected to derive by way of this tax would be £25,000; but, as the tax may not be imposed for some time yet owing to the necessity for preparing machinery, we shall probably not be able to collect more than seven-twelfths of the amount I have stated, which will approximate the amount indicated in the Financial Statement. Taking the amount of £43,000, which it is estimated will be obtained per annum, and the £53,000 collected by way of totalisator tax, it will be found that we shall collect altogether less than £100,000 from racing. As I indicated, when discussing the resolutions in the Committee of Ways and Means, the tax ranges from £50 down to £5, according to the course on which a bookmaker operates and the particular part of the course on which he operates. In Brisbane the registered bookmakers will pay £50 for the right to operate in the saddling paddock, £25 in the leger, and £5 elsewhere. On unregistered courses bookmakers will pay £25 for the right to operate in the saddling paddock and £10 elsewhere. The bookmakers operating within a radius of 10 miles from the post offices at Ipswich, Rockhampton, Toowoomba, and Townsville will pay £15 for the right to operate in the saddling paddock and £7 for the right to operate elsewhere. The bookmakers operating elsewhere throughout the State will be called upon to pay £5, which is not a very large sum. The bookmakers operating in Brisbane who have paid £50 for the right to operate in the saddling paddock and £25 in the leger will be able to operate on any racecourse throughout Queensland. The same thing will apply to bookmakers who have paid their fees in Toowoomba, Ipswich, Rockhampton, and Townsville. On paying those fees they will be able to operate on any other course outside those areas without paying any additional fee. In this respect this tax differs from the tax operating in New South Wales. In New South Wales the Government collect an additional tax for every association under which a man is operating, and in that way, although the bookmakers here will have to pay £50, the bookmakers paying fees under all the associations in New South Wales would have to pay £206 for the right to operate on all registered racecourses, and in regard to unregistered racing they would have to pay proportionately a larger sum than will have to be paid here. The same thing operates in Victoria. Various fees, ranging from £50 down, are charged for the right to operate at Flemington, and the Victorian Amateur Racing Club also charges fees from £50 down. In Victoria an additional fee is charged for the right to operate on courses within a 10-mile radius of the courses I have mentioned, and under those circumstances a bookmaker in Victoria would have to pay £110 to operate on the various courses, and he would have to pay an additional £5 for every small country course on which he operated.

Mr. MORGAN: There is no totalisator there.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The tax here will be very much lighter than the tax on bookmakers in New South Wales and Victoria.

Mr. VOWLES: What about the population?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I am discussing things proportionately now. There are a larger number of bookmakers operating in the other States. In connection with the right to tax bookmakers, it may be mentioned that, notwithstanding the criticism to the contrary, the Government tax on a bookmaker on a registered racecourse in Queensland under this Bill will be £5 per day less than the tax imposed by the Government in New South Wales on bookmakers operating on registered courses, and it will be £1 12s. 11d. per day less in connection with unregistered courses.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: What is the reason for the differentiation?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Because the scale of betting is very much smaller on unregistered courses than on registered courses. Hon. members would be surprised at the smallness of the wagers at Coorparoo.

Mr. FRY: How do you know—have you been there?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Yes. I have to go to all the racecourses if I want to familiarise myself with the conditions existing. I cannot be expected, as a Minister, to administer an Act unless I have first-hand information. (Laughter.)

Mr. FRY: If you have the right "oil," we will all come around to you.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Sometimes I have, and if I have I will give it to you. (Laughter.)

Another feature of the Bill which operates in favour of the bookmakers is that a bookmaker betting on the small country courses can, if he wishes, bet on the racecourses at Ipswich, Toowoomba, Townsville, and Rockhampton by paying the difference between the two taxes. In like manner a bookmaker registered for Ipswich, Toowoomba, Townsville, and Rockhampton can bet in Brisbane by paying the difference between the amount of the tax in those cities and the tax in operation here. That is only fair. Racing clubs are expected to furnish the Commissioner with the names and addresses of all bookmakers to whom they have granted permits, so that he will have some check in the collection of the tax. Under the Bill, betting is made illegal in places other than on racecourses. One of the main objects the Government have in view in introducing this provision is to make it easier than it has been in the past for them to deal with street and lane betting.

Mr. TAYLOR: What about betting in clubs?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Betting in clubs will be illegal.

Mr. VOWLES: Is it legal to bet on a racecourse now?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It is illegal now to bet on a racecourse, but the Bill makes it legal to bet on a racecourse.

Mr. MORGAN: The law has been allowed to be broken for a long time.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: In that respect, we are like any other States. I would like to see the Government that would close all the racecourses in Australia. No Government that did it would stand for twenty-four hours. You cannot go against the wishes of the people.

The Hon. J. G. APPEL: Why not nationalise racing?

Hon. J. Mullan.]

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Is the hon. member in favour of the nationalisation of racing?

Another feature of the Bill is that a tax of 3d. will be imposed on betting tickets issued in the saddling paddock at Brisbane, Ipswich, Toowoomba, Townsville, and Rockhampton, and a 1d. tax will be imposed on all betting tickets issued outside the saddling paddock, not only at the towns I have mentioned, but at every other centre throughout the State. The provision in this respect follows closely on the lines of the tax operating in New South Wales. In that State a tax of 3d. per ticket in the saddling paddock and 1d. outside that place is imposed in the same way. In Victoria the betting tax is 6d. in the grandstand at Flemington, 2d. on "The Hill," and 1d. elsewhere. Our tax, while following closely on the lines of the tax in New South Wales, will be much lighter than the one in Victoria. When hon. members consider the tax of 5 per cent. imposed now on the totalisator, they will realise that the betting tax is very much lighter. In fact, it is less than half the totalisator tax. The maximum deductions allowed on the totalisator will be 13½ per cent. at Brisbane and 15 per cent. elsewhere. This deduction has always been allowed but has never been legalised. The Government are legalising it now, so that clubs cannot collect in excess of that amount. There was really nothing in the past to prevent a club collecting any amount it liked so long as it paid the Government 5 per cent. Now the rate has been definitely fixed. We have also provided for the collection of fractions to the nearest 6d. instead of as at present to the nearest 3d.

Mr. MORGAN: That is confiscation.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: No. If it is confiscation, we are in the company of New South Wales and New Zealand. They also are collecting fractions of 6d. If the hon. member terms that confiscation, I wonder what he would term what they do in Western Australia, where they collect fractions of 1s.? That is also done in South Australia.

Mr. MORGAN: They have no bookmakers there at all.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: They have not in South Australia, but they have in Western Australia.

There are several unimportant consequential amendments in the Totalisator Tax Act, which are necessary to give effect to the Bill and the regulations. Racing in Queensland has heretofore been practically free from taxation, and the proposed tax is still light as compared with that of New South Wales, which amounted to over £500,000 last year. The indications are that the racing community will accept the tax like true sports, and recognise that they are particularly lucky that it was not in operation years ago.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: They will pass it on to the "punter."

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Yes, the "punter" will pay in the end. I have pleasure in moving—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. TAYLOR: Will agricultural societies come under the definition of racing clubs?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: No.

[Hon. J. Mullan.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): The first thing that strikes one in regard to this Bill is its designation, "Racecourses Bill." For some considerable time the people of Queensland have been looking for some control of horseracing. Although this is termed a "Racecourses Bill," apparently there is no intention to control horseracing in any way.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It is merely a taxation measure—not a controlling measure.

Mr. KERR: The designation of the Bill gives one an opportunity of discussing that phase of the question. Instead of utilising various Acts of Parliament, such as the Sugar Acquisition Act of 1915, to control racing, as was done or was threatened to be done in regard to the electric light racing proposal, the Government could very well introduce a racecourses measure giving complete control of horseracing in Queensland. No attempt has been made as yet to meet the requirements of the people in that connection. This Bill deals solely with the taxation of the bookmaker and of the totalisator. I wish again to express my regret that the Government have not seen fit as a question of public policy to deal with the control of horseracing now that they have the opportunity.

During the last session of Parliament when an Income Tax Bill was before the House, I moved an amendment to provide for a stamp duty on tickets issued by bookmakers. I still agree with that principle, and notice that it is contained in the Bill. Later on I shall qualify that desire, but I have somewhat modified the ideas I had when I moved my amendment last session. I agree with the Attorney-General that the revenue is likely to be £50,000. Possibly, it will reach larger figures. Turning to New South Wales, I find that in one year there were 15,133,140 betting tickets issued. The revenue from that source was £117,000, and the credit bets, of which a tally was taken, amounted to £96,000, making a grand total of £213,000.

If we take one-third of that amount, we can expect a revenue of something like £70,000 from the taxation of betting tickets. I said a moment ago that I wanted to qualify my opinion in regard to a tax on betting tickets, and I want to ask the Attorney-General and members of this House what is their opinion from an equitable point of view in regard to the amount of money that is collected by a tax on totalisator tickets, and the amount to be collected by a bookmaker's tax? The Government collect 5 per cent. on the gross takings of the enumerating machine, but where the bookmaker is concerned, although the money is coming from the same source, they only propose to collect ½ per cent.

Hon. F. T. BRENNAN: The "tote" takes 5 per cent.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: They take more than that.

Mr. KERR: The Totalisator Company take 13½ per cent. in the city and 15 per cent. in the country, but the Government get 5 per cent., while from this taxation which it is proposed to impose on bookmakers, they are getting something like ½ per cent. It is well known that a bookmaker at Eagle Farm may take in the course of a day as much as the whole of a totalisator on the same course.

Mr. KIBWAN: What!

Mr. KERR: One bookmaker at Eagle Farm puts through his book in a day in credit bets and cash bets as much as the whole of the totalisator. I am going on information which I know to be correct.

Mr. KIRWAN: One can hardly credit it.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: If you heard what was said by the deputation of bookmakers who waited on me after the introduction of the Bill, you would not say that.

Hon. F. T. BRENNAN: You are thinking of lane betting. (Laughter.)

Mr. KERR: I want to give the figures in connection with amounts passed through the totalisators in those countries where bookmakers have been abolished. These figures show that, generally speaking, the bookmakers took on the average ten times the amount put through the totalisators. The figures are authentic, and they are confirmed by the various "Year Books" of those countries. I want to confirm that by taking the figures for New Zealand. I forget which year the bookmaker in New Zealand was abolished.

Mr. CARTER: He has not been abolished altogether.

Mr. KERR: There may be a little leakage, but there is a substantial fine in connection with it. In 1914, £3,000,000 went through the totalisator in New Zealand. That was a very short period after the bookmaker had gone. In the year 1922-1923 the amount that was passed through the totalisator had increased to £10,000,000. That shows an increase of £7,000,000 in a few short years in the amount passing through the totalisator in New Zealand through the abolition of the bookmaker. The income received by the Government from that source has risen from £92,000 in 1914 to £262,000 in 1922-1923. That is a big increase.

Mr. KIRWAN: They get all that money out of gambling, yet they object to "Golden Casket" tickets. It shows what humbugs they are.

Mr. KERR: I want to quote the figures for another country where the bookmaker has been abolished.

Mr. KIRWAN: South Australia?

Mr. KERR: The returns from the totalisator there since the bookmaker was abolished have been exceptional. Let me take the Presidency of Bombay, [4 p.m.] in India. That is a place where before the bookmaker was abolished the totalisator took £30,000 in one afternoon. To-day in one afternoon it is taking £350,000, or ten times the amount which was taken when the bookmaker was operating. That all goes to prove my statement that the bookmakers at Eagle Farm are putting through ten times the amount of money that is going through the totalisator.

Mr. HYNES: Do you suggest that they should abolish the totalisator?

Mr. KERR: I am not suggesting anything to the hon. member. (Laughter.) I say that to tax the bookmaker only approximately $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the large amount of money he is handling in gross and to tax the enumerating machine, which gives an excellent service to the people, 5 per cent. is not equitable. There should be an equitable

taxation of all money that is laid in wagers on a racecourse. There is no difficulty in telling a bookmaker that he will have to pay the Government exactly the same amount on his gross takings as the totalisator pays.

Hon. F. T. BRENNAN: The totalisator runs no risk.

Mr. KERR: The hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about. We have lost tens of thousands of pounds in this country and in New Zealand on the totalisator—the machine is not infallible by any means. You must remember that the funds of the hospitals have benefited to a certain extent by mistakes in dividends. What is more, the Government by this Bill are nationalising the totalisator and not taking those risks. I ask hon. members if, when money is wagered on horses on a racecourse and a certain part goes through the machine and another part through the bookmakers, is it not a reasonable request that all the money which goes for one purpose should be taxed in the same way?

Hon. F. T. BRENNAN: Will you make a refund to the bookmaker for unfavourable meetings?

Mr. KERR: The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that the bookmakers always work their books to get a favourable return. The totalisator industry is now well established. It is providing a large number of men in Queensland with work. We are sending those machines to South America and India. There is a factory at Breakfast Creek turning them out and providing work. As gambling on the racecourse is recognised by the Government, I am out to give these machines a greater output and to provide a greater revenue to the Government. When you put £1 into the machine you have to give the Government 1s. in taxation; but, when you put on £1 with the bookmaker in the saddling paddock, he gives the Government 3d. There you have two totally different systems. There will be no difficulty in bringing the scheme I suggest into operation, and provision for it should have been included in the Bill. I had a look at a digest in regard to the operation of this matter in Bombay, and I ascertained that after each race the bookmakers' tickets are stamped. There are no additions or alterations possible after the race is over.

There is another subject to which I desire to draw the attention of the House. While the bookmakers are increasing their takings with the increase of population, the tax to the Government has decreased. There must be some reason for that decrease.

Hon. F. T. BRENNAN: The bookmakers are giving better odds.

Mr. KERR: I will tell the hon. gentleman the reason in my opinion. In 1919-1920 the totalisator tax was £56,791, and in 1922-1923 there was a drop of somewhere in the vicinity of £3,000. In two years the totalisator returns have dropped by that large amount. It shows that the policy which has been adopted in regard to the totalisator has not increased the takings in the percentage which is due to the Government in accordance with the increase in population. We find that in New Zealand, as quoted by the Minister, the totalisator tax was $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., which was subsequently increased in 1910 to $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., as against 5 per cent. in Queensland. The hon. member for Toowoomba interjected that the odds are

Mr. Kerr.]

greater. If he looks at the totalisator returns he will find that for every £1 that goes in there 13½ per cent. is taken off. Eight and three-quarter per cent. for the racing club, which in turn hands a certain amount to the proprietary racing company—2 per cent. up to £5,000, and 1½ per cent. above that. They retain for themselves 6½ per cent., and there is approximately 15 per cent., taking the fractions into consideration, taken off that £1 before the balance is divided among the people who invest. That is one reason why the bookmaker is able to give a better return. He has no tax of 15 per cent. before he starts to pay out. When you look at the returns, 15 per cent. is a pretty large amount on the money that goes through. In New Zealand, as I have stated, the tax is much lower.

Mr. KIRWAN: You overlook the fact that the bookmaker has to pay a stiff fee.

Mr. KERR: I am not overlooking that at all. I think the working expenses of the totalisator are pretty heavy. There is the printing of tickets and such like.

Mr. KIRWAN: The bookmaker is taxed, too.

Mr. KERR: I notice that under the Bill the Government may make regulations as to what horses dividends shall be paid on, and the percentages to be paid on each. I understand that to-day, when there are a certain number of starters, they pay the first, second, and third horses 60 per cent., 20 per cent., and 20 per cent. I would suggest to the Minister that he should include a clause in the Bill, and not merely leave it to be laid down by the Government by regulation, that the totalisator shall not pay on more than the first and second horses. I ask that because the investments on the totalisator are going down and the Government are losing revenue. The totalisator is not able to compete with the bookmaker in that direction. When you have ten horses and pay 60 per cent. on the first, 20 per cent. on the second, and 20 per cent. on the third, it is not possible to give the same odds as the bookmaker will give. I hope that the Attorney-General will insert a clause in the Bill to provide that the totalisator will only pay on the first and second horses.

Mr. CONROY: What about the bookmakers in regard to place betting?

Mr. KERR: They should be restricted, too. In New Zealand they tax racing a good deal more than in Queensland. Up to 1921 the Government took 1 per cent. of the total value of all stakes on racecourses, and 2½ per cent. of all dividends, but in that year the percentages were increased to 10 per cent. and 5 per cent., respectively. In New Zealand, with a population of 1,250,000, the Government receive somewhere in the vicinity of £504,000 a year from racing taxation. That result has only been brought about by the encouragement of totalisator betting as against any other method. I think the clubs receive about £610,000 a year, or about the same amount as the Government; but if you went into the question here, I think you would find that the clubs are receiving a great deal more than the Government.

As I said at the outset, this Bill gives the Government no control over racing, which is very regrettable indeed. In New Zealand the Government control the racecourses by means of the totalisator legislation, owing to the fact that they can limit the number

of days on which the totalisator may be used. Not long ago a commission went into the question, and as a result the number of days was increased. If Queensland had legislation on those lines, it would be much better for the State, and any such legislation should be of such a nature that the Government could increase or decrease the use of the totalisator as the situation demanded.

On looking closely at the definition of "bookmaker" in the Bill, and at other parts of the measure, it is difficult to conceive how betting is going to be prevented in such places as factories and sports grounds, and I would like to see a clause included to control the matter thoroughly.

Mr. KIRWAN: You cannot control betting. Did you not read the evidence before the Betting Commission in Great Britain?

Mr. KERR: I know you cannot control people who will not put their betting returns in for income tax purposes, but you can control betting to a fairly large extent. You can have legislation anyhow. (Government laughter.) Whether the legislation is properly administered depends on the honesty and ability of the Government. In New Zealand there is a law prohibiting street betting, and there are provisions dealing with betting in clubs. Under similar legislation here there would be no more betting at Tattersall's Club. Street betting is supposed to be abolished in Queensland, but it would be better to have it definitely stated in this Bill that street betting will be dealt with by the imposition of a heavy fine for the first offence and imprisonment on the second occasion, exactly as is the case in New Zealand, rather than that the law should be obscure. We could very well copy the New Zealand legislation in that respect.

It appears to me that the Government may under this Bill practically nationalise the totalisator, because they may make regulations for—

"the regulation and management of totalisators."

What is the meaning of the word "management?" That power is, in my opinion, a means of nationalising the totalisator without taking the attendant risks. The Government also propose to take power to make regulations for—

"the price of totalisator tickets; the information to be shown on totalisator tickets; the posting of dividends; the time within which dividends shall be paid";

and prescribing various other conditions affecting the totalisator. I think the Attorney-General might explain in Committee how far the Government propose to go. It would be a very fine thing if a Government official attended meetings of the stipendiary stewards. That would be for the benefit of racing generally in Queensland.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The totalisator inspector does that.

Mr. KERR: I think he goes to some of the meetings as a matter of courtesy.

Mr. KIRWAN: It would be much better if you put a representative of the punters among the stipendiary stewards.

Mr. KERR: That would be very unwise, because their books are very often examined by the stewards.

Mr. KIRWAN: I said punters.

[Mr. Kerr.

Mr. KERR: They are the same thing—they lay off—you cannot discriminate. Although I agree with this taxation—and I have given a good deal of consideration to it—I think a more equitable method, and one which would benefit the revenue more and give us a greater control of racecourses generally, would be to deal by means of taxation with all money spent on racecourses for betting purposes. On the totalisator the people see everything out in the open. They see exactly how much money is going on each horse, and the Government receive 5 per cent. On the other hand, people who bet their money with the "books" have only $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. taken off. I thought of asking at a later stage that it be a direction to the Committee to make such an amendment as would bring about more equitable taxation. If the Minister would study the question from every possible aspect, he would see that my reasoning is sound. Instead of losing revenue because of reduced totalisator receipts, the Government would obtain more revenue, and what in my opinion is legitimate revenue, from racing. I regret that the Bill has not gone a great deal further and been true to its name. It is not a Racecourses Bill. It is merely a Bill to tax a certain section of the community, and I regret that, on the resolution which was the foundation of the measure, I did not speak on this phase of the question. I do not know that it would have made much difference, but I believe that the policy which I am propounding in regard to taxation generally on racecourses is a very good one for the State, particularly from the point of view of revenue.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): This Bill is founded on certain resolutions which were agreed to in Committee of Ways and Means by this House a few days ago. The Government having exploited every other avenue of taxation have apparently decided that the time is ripe to fall back on the bookmakers. It must have been very noticeable to you, Sir, and to hon. members, that the Minister in delivering his speech did so with apologies to the bookmakers and excused himself by saying, "In taxing our friends the bookmakers at last, we are not going to be as harsh on them as is the case in other places."

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: We must proceed step by step. They are more harshly dealt with in New South Wales.

Mr. VOWLES: I propose to deal with that a little later. This is a taxation measure and we have to deal with it from a fiscal point of view. I am in agreement with the hon. member for Enoggera when he says that he regrets that the Government are not tackling the big principle of dealing with racecourses, and are only falling back on one section of the people who frequent the racecourses. You will remember, Sir, during the recent Parliament, when you occupied the same position as Speaker, a resolution was agreed to by this House approving of the principle of the abolition of proprietary racecourses. At that time we were told by the Government that it was their intention to bring in a comprehensive measure dealing with gambling generally. Are we to understand that this is the comprehensive measure?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: This is a taxation measure.

Mr. VOWLES: It does not deal with racecourses, but only with betting on those racecourses. It certainly goes further than what was suggested by the hon. member for Enoggera. It confirms a new principle, and it entrenches the proprietary racecourse owner, because he is recognised in the Bill just the same as the bookmaker is. After this Chamber has agreed to the principle of abolishing proprietary racecourses, it is a scandal to have to deal with a measure which in a way embodies the principle of the recognition of individuals as racecourse owners. You will find that the definition of "racing club" includes "any individual person." We know that much of the abuse in racing in Queensland to-day is due to one man, who is not a resident of Queensland, controlling racecourses and reaping huge benefits from them, and not applying the money which he receives from those courses towards the purpose for which racecourses were established—the encouragement of racing and the breed of horses. There is no need to mention that gentleman's name, because I think it is well known to everybody in this Chamber. We have got to the stage that we are going to legalise betting in certain places. I have carried out a great deal of research, and I have gone back to 14 Vic. No. 9 on gaming; I have traced the Vagrancy Act, and I have looked through subsequent Acts dealing with gaming, and through the Criminal Code, and I am not yet satisfied that there is any legislation—other than that there is a custom—which would permit a bookmaker carrying on his calling on any registered or unregistered racecourse. We are going to remedy that position, and I think it is a very good thing that we are doing it. It puts the bookmaker in the position that we are going to take a fee of from £50 down to £5 from him according to the places on which he operates, and that justifies him carrying on his business. But I cannot for the life of me see, when we have gone that far, why we do not go further and put him in this position: that, being recognised in law, he shall have the right to sue for betting debts and also to be sued. I cannot see why we do not go further. Quite recently we have been dealing with new principles in connection with auctioneers and commission agents and trustees of public funds, who are required under legislation recently imposed upon us to enter into certain fidelity bonds, yet the man who carries on the business of bookmaker, who we are told handles huge sums of money, is not asked to find a fidelity bond. We know that in the old country certain cases have recently been decided under the existing legislation. The law has been amended in Victoria. Quite recently it was held that where a person died or went insolvent, his trustee or representative could claim back from the bookmaker moneys which had been paid to him. The Government here are now going to legalise the bookmaker, and take money from him as a fee for the right to carry on his business, and he should be entitled to some need of protection. On the other hand, the public also have a right to be protected, and the bookmaker should be compelled to produce a fidelity bond showing his bona fides. It seems that the tendency of the Government has been to encourage gambling. All our laws in respect of gambling, more particularly in respect of lotteries, have been honoured in the breach, and we have

Mr. Vowles.]

established a form of lottery which, according to the Suppression of Gambling Act of 1895, is absolutely irregular. It is permitted to be carried on. We have advertisements appearing in newspapers which are irregular and illegal. All sorts of competitions are permitted to be carried on which were never intended to be carried on, and no prosecutions take place, simply because of the fact that the Government themselves are operating in gambling and reaping benefits from it, and therefore are not in a position to object to other people. I remember the Minister saying, on the resolution in a Committee of Ways and Means, that it is not possible to cope with street betting. What a commentary on the Department of Justice!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I said it was easier to deal with it now than previously. It is hard to suppress it.

Mr. VOWLES: If the Minister will look at the law at present in operation, he will find that he has sufficient remedies and powers. He has used those powers quite recently and has prosecuted certain individuals. I have here a copy of "Lloyd's Weekly News," containing a report by the Chairman of Customs and Excise in connection with a Royal Commission on Betting in England. We find that there the Government suffered the same as the Government here have suffered in respect of street betting. They have used every endeavour to check it, but, instead of there being a decrease in street betting, there has been an increase. It is most alarming, when we come to look at the number of fines imposed and the amount of penalties, to find that it is still on the increase. In London, in 1920 there were 2,513 convictions for street betting, with fines amounting to £22,541. It was thought that the imposition of those fines might deter it, but in 1921 there were 2,652 convictions, with fines amounting to £23,193. In 1922 there were 3,262 convictions, with fines amounting to £28,711. My reason in referring to that is, that the Commission recommended certain remedial measures, and, as we are going in for some remedial measures, if we follow what is suggested in England, we may gain what is desired by the Government in that direction. In England they not only sanction the carrying on of betting on racecourses, but they license betting-houses as well. I do not know whether it is desirable, but they are right up against street betting. I do know, and I think everyone of us knows, that betting-houses are conducted in most towns. It is hard to suppress them. In attempting to do so we are tackling old customs, and there is no desire to interfere so long as they are carried on decently. It would be a great deal better for all concerned, if we are after revenue, to legalize bookmakers and put a big fee on them, and demand a fidelity bond. That would be a remedial measure.

The first matter that strikes me as strange in connection with the Bill is the recognition of the principle that individual persons are to be regarded as racing clubs. I am strongly opposed to that. I do not care [4.30 p.m.] who the individual is; he has no right to conduct public racing. Horseracing should be conducted by a racing club, and its books should be open to the inspection and audit of the Government to see that the proceeds are utilised for the

[Mr. Vowles.

promotion and encouragement of a better breed of horses. The definition of "bookmaker" is a most startling one. The term includes—

"any person who carries on the business of or acts as a bookmaker or turf commission agent"—

This is the part which strikes me as strange—

"or who gains or endeavours to gain his livelihood wholly or partly by betting or making wagers."

Every man who visits a racecourse, unless he does so with the avowed intention of losing his money, does so for the purpose of betting, and therefore is a bookmaker. Possibly this definition is intended to embrace urgers, tip slingers, and that class of gentry who frequent racecourses for certain nefarious purposes. It seems that racing clubs, before granting a permit to a bookmaker, has first to see whether he is a registered bookmaker, and if he is, he is allowed to bet by paying the fee prescribed. An auctioneer or a commission agent, in addition to paying an annual fee of £15 and finding a fidelity bond, has to pay for the upkeep of an office for the purpose of carrying on his business. The bookmaker has possibly no office at all, and carries all he requires in the way of betting cards and money required for betting purposes in his bag, and he is simply asked to pay a fee of £50 for the larger racecourses, or £5 for the smaller courses. The Minister, in making a comparison of what it cost a bookmaker to bet in New South Wales and Victoria as compared with Queensland, overlooked several important points. In some of the other States bookmakers have no competition from the totalisator, while in other States he has a greater number of people and more wealthy people to do business with. He has not got, as in Queensland, the number of days on which he can ply his trade. I am told by some of the men who are in this business that one and a-half racing days a week is about the average number of racing days that the bookmaker will be able to bet in the future if he pays a fee of £50. That is seventy or eighty meetings for £50. No one is likely to cavil at that. I quite agree with the Minister that there should be some imposition in the shape of a tax on betting tickets. I am glad to see that the Minister has taken up the suggestion I advocated earlier in the session that this should be done through the Treasurer, and that all betting tickets should bear the imprint of the Treasurer. An account is to be returned of booked betting, and the tax is to be imposed accordingly. The great bulk of the betting is not done on the racecourse but in other places, and for that reason a large number of bets will escape taxation. The Minister might well consider the advisability of devising a means to collect revenue on this form of betting. The Bill also provides that every bookmaker evading stamp duty shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty of not less than £2 and not more than £10. That is for defrauding the revenue and not sending in his returns. If a citizen does not furnish a land or income tax return he is liable to a penalty of £100. The penalty provided in the Bill should be increased to make the punishment fit the crime. If the penalty was made larger, the Government would have less trouble in this respect.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: A penalty follows that.

Mr. VOWLES: The penalty for not paying the taxation is £5 a day, but if a bookmaker never forwards a return at all, he is only liable to pay a fine of £10 when he is caught.

There are other matters in the Bill which are worthy of consideration. We know that it is very hard to get over established customs. It has been the custom in the past to permit betting at places other than racecourses and shops, such as at pigeon matches, coursing, and pedestrian sports meetings. There will be betting at those gatherings in the future as in the past. Most of the pigeon matches take place on registered racecourses: so that, under the Bill, betting at these sports will be cut out.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: They are cut out now.

Mr. VOWLES: Yes; and so is betting on horseracing prohibited now. If the matter is looked at strictly, it will be seen that betting is prohibited even now. The Government should bring in legislation to let the people know exactly where they stand. We do not want to breed a race of criminals and law-breakers.

There is another matter I also wish to mention. Any man who is a member of a sporting club knows what is meant by the "calling of the card." At certain times in these clubs the card may be called and bets made on the horses. Under the Bill that will be illegal, as the betting is not done on a racecourse. Every man who wants to make a bet on a horse and is unable to go to the racecourse goes to a club to make his investment.

There is nothing new in the section dealing with the totalisator, excepting that the Government are going to take some of the money belonging to the general public and apply it to the public revenue. The hon. member for Enoggera referred to the effect that the payment of dividends on first and second horses has upon the totalisator. It does not assist the machine but plays into the hands of the bookmakers. I can quite understand that, because the system has been in vogue for a considerable time, and racegoers will make place bets with bookmakers so that they will know when they make the bet what odds they are getting. They do not know what return they are getting on their investment on the totalisator until the numbers go up. I say that there should be no hard-and-fast rule so far as first, second, and third place betting is concerned. The totalisator people should be consulted on the matter as much as the public.

There is another matter, and I think it is one of the things which will be appreciated by most racing men—jockeys and bookmakers particularly. The Bill states that the Governor in Council may make regulations to deal with the issue of permits to persons who carry on the business of or act as bookmakers in respect of racecourses, and the terms and conditions on which the same may be issued, suspended, or cancelled. I have heard from bookmakers that on certain occasions the fees which have been taken out of them for the right to bet and the amount of money which has been taken in other directions in connection with race meetings have been more than sufficient to pay the whole of the expenses of the day, and that at big meetings such as we have at Exhibition time at Kedron Park the entrance fee paid by every person who goes through the gate is the property of the proprietary owner of the

course. No one dares to open his mouth, because there is no power to interfere with that proprietary, and consequently all those persons who are carrying on their business are fleeced. That should not be. There should be justice in all things. If you had not any proprietary concerns, but had legitimate concerns instead and race meetings run by committees, you would find, as is found in the country districts, that there would be no room for complaint. I trust that the Minister will be guided, as far as that power for making regulations is concerned, by the representations which will be made to him from time to time by the persons immediately interested. Racecourses are not established for the benefit of one or two individuals, and any person carrying on racing as a livelihood should be referred to in this matter.

It is to be regretted that we did not get the comprehensive Bill which we had anticipated, dealing with racing matters generally. No one was looking forward to it more than I was—a Bill for dealing with proprietary interests. Notwithstanding the move by proprietary owners recently in converting the titles of their concerns, we know that the proprietary right is there all the time controlling and receiving the revenue. That revenue should not be received by one or two individuals: it should be brought back into racing to give higher prizes, better conditions, and to improve the horses.

Mr. KIRWAN: It should be used to establish an old-age pension for punters.

Mr. VOWLES: I do not know about that, but it might go to establish a fund for disabled jockeys, instead of making millionaires of a few men and giving them more money to buy racehorses to compete in States outside of Queensland. If that money was put to the purpose for which it was originally intended, we would to-day be carrying on races satisfactorily and carrying out the original intention of racing—that is, improving the standard of our racehorses.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): For some years now people throughout Queensland, and more especially in the metropolitan area, have been crying out for racecourse reform, and the Attorney-General himself has on several occasions admitted the necessity for bringing in a Bill which would do away with the evils at present existing in connection with racing. The only way in which we can satisfactorily deal with those evils is by bringing in measures that are likely to control them. No doubt betting has been carried on ever since we can remember in some form or another. It is a gamble to be connected with the Stock Exchange and many other forms of business, just as it is a gamble to be connected with betting on races. Notwithstanding that fact, we all recognise that there should be some reform in connection with horseracing. Instead of that, the Government have introduced a measure only for the purpose of taxing the people who attend racecourses. The Attorney-General has admitted that this Bill is for the purpose of raising revenue, and that the bookmaker will pass the taxation on to the public. I agree with him. The public are going to get no benefit from this extra taxation, which is going to be placed in the Consolidated Revenue. The people are entitled to some reform. It is urgently necessary that racing should be so controlled that it will not be possible to carry it on practically every day

Mr. Morgan.]

of the week. It appears to me that in every page of this Bill you can see the name of John Wren. No doubt Mr. Wren has been responsible for the Government bringing in the Bill. It is going to mean an enormous amount of revenue to Mr. Wren. It will force the people who now go to the "Outer Outer" to pay fees, and the bookmakers now operating in the "Outer Outer" will be compelled to cease business. Mr. Wren is going to benefit to the extent of many thousands of pounds through the Government introducing this Bill, yet he will not contribute any of this increased revenue to the State of Queensland.

I want to see justice done. I do not want to see a man like Mr. Wren taking £50,000 or £60,000 out of Queensland which should be used for the development of the State—not for the purpose of making a millionaire of one individual who is putting that money into other investments in other parts of Australia.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: If he is making all the money you say he is, then he must be paying the maximum income tax.

Mr. MORGAN: He may be, but that is not the point. The point is: Should Mr. Wren be allowed to take any of that money out of the State? Why should not the Government carry out their platform, which says that the people shall have control and not the individual? In this Bill the Government are giving greater power to proprietary racecourse owners than they previously had. Instead of endeavouring to do away with proprietary racecourses, it is going to mean the further establishment of those institutions.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Do you know that it was not this Government that created proprietary racecourses? It was the previous Government.

Mr. MORGAN: I admit that proprietary racing had its foundations many years ago through another Government, but we now have the opportunity of doing away with proprietary racing. I would remind the Attorney-General that he has voted several times in favour of a motion that was carried in this House for the purpose of introducing legislation to do away with proprietary racing. Instead of continuing that attitude, he is now encouraging proprietary racing to spring up all over Queensland. I hope that he will accept an amendment when the Bill is in Committee that will prevent any bookmaker being allowed to bet on any racecourse when the races are conducted by a proprietary firm or by any club that is not a legitimate licensed club which must have its books audited once a year and must disclose the disposal of its funds.

Mr. CARTER: I thought you were out for private enterprise.

Mr. MORGAN: Racing is not a business. It is more or less a recreation. We are told by some that racing is carried on for the purpose of improving the breed of thoroughbred horses. I do not think racing to-day is carried on for the improvement of horses at all. It is carried on so that people who desire to gamble can attend a racecourse and gamble. When we decide to legalise betting, as we are doing under this Bill, we should go still further. The Minister has already admitted that betting up to the present time has been illegally carried on in Queensland. I am one of those who think the public should be protected; likewise the person

[Mr. Morgan.

who carries on the legal calling of a bookmaker should also be protected. At present a stockbroker can sue or be used for a debt, and the moment we legalise the profession of bookmaking we should also allow the bookmaker to sue for monies owing to him, and the man who bets with a bookmaker should also be allowed to sue for money due to him. A bookmaker may be a bird of passage. He may be able to secure sufficient money to obtain his license, but that does not say he will be able to meet his liabilities. We are placing the bookmaker on the same footing as a hotelkeeper. For a certain amount of money we give a hotelkeeper a license to sell intoxicating liquor, and we can prevent it from being sold in any other place. We allow a publican to recover up to a certain amount, and we should give the same opportunity to the bookmaker. A bookmaker may hold £5,000 on a big day's racing, yet he can abscond with that money, or he may close his book up and say to the punters, "I do not intend to pay you one shilling." If he does that, all that would happen to him would be that he would be removed from the register of the club which licensed him to follow the calling of a bookmaker.

Mr. WEIR: Don't you think that, when he is legalised, the punter will have access to the ordinary courts to obtain payment of bets due to him?

Mr. MORGAN: We say that not only should the bookmaker have full access to the courts to recover debts due to him, but the punter also should be protected. The bettor should be further protected by the bookmaker being compelled to take out a fidelity bond for an amount equal to £500. The man who carries on the calling of an auctioneer is compelled to take out a fidelity bond, and we compel commission agents and others also to take out a fidelity bond. The same thing should apply to bookmakers now that we are legalising his calling.

I want to draw attention to the fact that there is no comparison in the amount of taxation taken from the public who invest their money through a bookmaker and those who place their money on the totalisator. At the present time 15 per cent. is taken from the investor on the totalisator. That is taken on every race. If £100 went through the totalisator on the first race and that £100 continued to be put through the totalisator on every race, at the end of six races £90 would be left in the machine and only £10 carried away by the people who made the bets. That is not fair. We have legalised the totalisator and we are legalising the bookmaker.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: You will make yourself very popular if you can suggest a way of overcoming the difficulty.

Mr. MORGAN: The amount of taxation on the money invested through the totalisator is too great. We are told that the amount of revenue that will be received from this tax on bookmakers will be £50,000. We should pass a law preventing the people who have the right to run totalisators taking from the betting public through the totalisator a greater amount than 10 per cent. Then, if the Government find they want more revenue, they can increase the taxation on the bookmakers. At the present time if I bet £1 with a bookmaker in one part of

the course it only costs 1d., and in another part of the course it will cost 3d.; but, if I put £1 on the totalisator, an amount of 3s. is deducted.

Mr. CONROY: You get the £1 back from the bookmaker.

Mr. MORGAN: I may get the £1 back from the bookmaker or I may leave it in the bookmaker's pocket. There is no guarantee that I will get my £1 back from the bookmaker or from the totalisator, but from the £1 invested on the totalisator 3s. is deducted, while from the £1 invested with the bookmaker only 3d. is deducted. Is that not likely to encourage people to bet more with the bookmaker than on the totalisator? I have stated in this House before, and I state now, that I am in favour of the abolition of the bookmaker entirely, only allowing betting through the totalisator, as is done in New Zealand. The cleanliness of racing has improved enormously in New Zealand and also in the Southern States where they have done away with the bookmaker. You will never prevent betting. You will never prevent gambling, but, when we are legalising it, we should endeavour to protect the public. That should be the duty of the Government, and now is the time for the Minister to include in this Bill a clause which will prevent more than 10 per cent. being deducted from investments on the totalisator. If that is going to mean the loss of any revenue, then it could be made up by increasing the tax on bookmakers, and if that were done the Government would have my support and the support of those members of the public who attend race meetings. It would not affect the rest of the community. It is an extraordinary thing that one set of people who gamble in one way are free from taxation while another set of people who gamble in another way are asked to contribute a large amount of revenue to the State.

I am not here to oppose this Bill. I approve of the Bill generally, but I condemn it in that it does not go far enough. It does not contain what the people desire that a Bill of this sort should contain. It is purely and simply a measure for the purpose of obtaining revenue.

[5 p.m.] That seems to be the principle generally adopted by the Government; they are out to grasp anything they can in the way of revenue to keep the ship of State afloat. They want revenue, and do not know where to find money to meet their liabilities, and here is a new discovery. This is one of the first forms of taxation that should have been introduced by the Government. If people can afford to go to races daily, as some of them do, then they cannot complain if they are asked to contribute a certain amount of money to the racing machine; but, in my opinion, the taxation should be fair. It should not discriminate and allow one set of people to do well at the game at the expense of another section. If the Government allow "Key Mo" to escape with only 3d. on his ticket, and make another bookmaker pay 6d., it is discriminatory and unfair. The Government are doing that now in connection with those who frequent racecourses. From one they deduct 3d. in the £1 and from the other 3s. in the £1. I hope that the Minister will recognise that my argument is fair and do something in the matter; it will help to balance things up. If not, there may be a

general agitation throughout Queensland for the abolition of the bookmaker altogether and asking that the totalisator only be allowed to run. In Victoria—the State which the Minister has spoken so much about—they have a very fine Act known as the Lotteries Gambling and Betting Act, which provides that racecourses must be licensed. The Government have the power to license the racecourses.

Mr. CONROY: They have no totalisator there.

Mr. MORGAN: They have no totalisator there, and that is one of the blots on the racing game in Victoria. They had no totalisator in New South Wales until a short time ago. It is practically only two years ago since they introduced it.

Mr. CONROY: More.

Mr. MORGAN: It may be two and a-half years. Perhaps Victoria will eventually obtain the right to run the totalisator. The reason why the people there have not had the totalisator is because church people and the bookmaker go hand in hand.

Mr. KIRWAN: What an unholy alliance!

Mr. MORGAN: It is just like the position we see here to-day in connection with prohibition. We see in some instances the parson and "Mr. Bung" arm in arm against prohibition. We see the parson in Victoria walking arm in arm with the bookmaker in order to keep out the totalisator—there is no doubt about that—I do not mince matters in anything I have to say. In Victoria the racecourses are licensed and under the control of the Government, and they limit the number of race meetings.

Mr. ROBERTS: Do you know what the license fee is in Victoria?

Mr. MORGAN: It is on a sliding scale, according to the amount of money they get in revenue. The Victorian Act provides that no club can hold a race meeting unless it gives away a certain amount of prize money. It also provides that races are to be for a certain distance. Here we allow the control to be exercised by one individual, who can say whether a race shall be for a distance of 1 furlong, 5 furlongs, or 10 furlongs. We allow him to say what the weights shall be—whether the jockey shall ride 10 stone or 5 stone. In Victoria they limit the number of pony race meetings and also the number of trotting race meetings. They place a definition in the Act as to what are pony races, and also provide what shall be the length of the racecourse and the accommodation. We have none of that here. We do not trouble our heads about distance, weights, or other things. As soon as an accident occurs and a boy is killed we have an inquiry to find out whether the course is right—we always wait until some unfortunate boy is injured.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have allowed a good deal of latitude in the discussion, but I would point out to the hon. member that this is not a Bill to deal with racing. It is purely a taxation measure. I do not want to interrupt the hon. member, but I hope he will discuss the Bill as a taxation measure, and not generally as a measure to deal with racing.

Mr. MORGAN: The Bill provides that regulations may be made, and the Government may be able to stretch the regulations to a certain extent to do what I am advocating in connection with racecourses. The Bill

Mr. Morgan.]

also contains a definition with regard to what is a racing club. We propose to widen that definition so that we may do away with proprietary racing. It must be admitted that we have every right as an Opposition to move amendments in Committee in connection with the definition clause.

I also want to ask the Minister if he intends to prohibit betting in streets and clubs. I understand that even in Tattersall's Club, which is the recognised home of the bookmakers who are licensed by that club, they will not legally be able to bet on the races. If that is so, why does the Minister not include a provision in the Bill to prohibit the publication of the odds that are offered by bookmakers before the event? In Victoria and some of the other States newspapers are prohibited from publishing the odds. If this Bill passes, we know it will be unlawful to bet in that direction; yet in the daily papers we see all the odds published before the races. Does not that go to show that the thing is being carried on under the noses of the administrators of our laws, and that we are purely and simply winking at the thing?

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: It is not illegal here, but it is in New South Wales.

Mr. MORGAN: It is illegal now. The Minister has admitted that there is no law now making it legal to bet on a racecourse. I believe that Mr. Macrossan was one of the first to find that out. He mentioned in a police court case that if the Government would give him the power to do so he could successfully prosecute any bookmaker for making a bet on a racecourse. Up to the present we have not stopped betting at Tattersall's Club or any other recognised club, and properly so; but when this Bill is passed we shall have legalised the bookmaker. It will then be legal for him to bet on a racecourse but not at Tattersall's Club. Perhaps, when the Brisbane Cup is coming on, we shall see published in the paper that the "card" has been read at Tattersall's Club and certain odds offered by the bookmakers. Does the Minister want that to happen?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Do you object to its happening?

Mr. MORGAN: I certainly object to its happening if the Government are going to prohibit betting at Tattersall's Club. It would be better and more honest for them to say to Tattersall's Club, "We will charge you £500 a year for a license, and allow you to bet as the home of the bookmaker." But the Government are going to tell the public that betting is legal only on racecourses, and are going to wink their eye and tell the authorities, "Do not touch Tattersall's Club." That is wrong.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Is betting legal at the Victorian Racing Club?

Mr. MORGAN: Bookmakers have nothing to do with the Victorian Racing Club. They do not assemble in that building. They go to the Victorian Racing Club racecourse.

Mr. CONROY: Do they not call the card at the Victorian Racing Club?

Mr. MORGAN: The Victorian Racing Club has no more to do with betting than the Queensland Turf Club. They call the card at Tattersall's Club in Melbourne, just as they call the card at Tattersall's Club in Sydney and Tattersall's Club in Brisbane.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Is it legal to call the card in Victoria at Tattersall's Club?

[Mr. Morgan.]

Mr. MORGAN: If the card is called in Victoria and it is not legal, has that anything to do with Brisbane? Because they are breaking the law in some other State, do the Government say that it is a justification for breaking the law in Queensland? The Government should take the responsibility of giving a license to Tattersall's Club and charging a fee of £500 or £1,000, or of saying to the club, "You cannot bet at all." We ought to carry out the law of the land independent of the fact that the Minister says we cannot. What do you find when sly grog-selling goes on? The Government license the hotelkeepers, and their revenue police get busy; the moment there is any notification from the licensed victuallers that somebody is selling sly grog. They can have every policeman in Brisbane at work if the law is being broken. Why should not the same thing apply to betting? The Government say they have cleaned up street betting. They have stopped lane betting to some extent, but street betting is still going on.

Mr. KIRWAN: And in every other part of the world to a worse extent.

Mr. MORGAN: I agree with the hon. member, but what is the good of the Government saying that they have cleaned it up? And if the Minister says he cannot prevent betting at Tattersall's, why not set apart a place for the purpose—which will legalise and register it? Either they should do that or compel the people to abide by the law. One or two things might be done. I am not going to move an amendment to that effect, but if the Minister thinks he cannot prevent betting away from racecourses or the reading of the card at Tattersall's Club, I say to him, "Don't wink your eye at it, but register the place."

I recognise that this measure needs very careful consideration in Committee. I do not know whether the Government are going to make it a party measure or not, but I hope that any amendment which may be moved will receive every consideration.

There is a rumour that the Government have been subsidised by individuals connected with racing. That may be true or it may not, but it is perfectly certain that an individual who controls racing, or partly controls racing, in Brisbane has had too much weight, and his opinions have been respected too much by the Government in power. Whether they have been respected because he has contributed to the party fighting funds or not, I do not know.

Mr. WEIR: You should not say it if you do not know whether it is true or not.

Mr. MORGAN: The hon. member knows that everybody in the street is saying it. In fact the bookmakers and racing people are saying that the measure we are now discussing is the project of John Wren. There is no doubt about that, and when I have proved, as I have proved conclusively, that this measure is going to put thousands of pounds into the pockets of John Wren, by reason of the fact that betting will not be allowed on the "Outer Outer," and 3,000 people will not be able to go there to bet—

The SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order in repeating his argument.

Mr. MORGAN: I have heard it said that if you have something good, you ought to repeat it over and over and over again, and I have something good so far as this "Outer

Outer" is concerned, because I do know that it is going to cause considerable satisfaction in that locality if people who want to see the horses gallop have to pay for admission, and I know that an hon. member is going to announce the profits of a certain individual. We know that although some of these courses are now controlled by racing clubs, it is really just the same as it was before; although, instead of one individual carrying on racing as a proprietary concern, several individuals are doing so. It is not doing away with proprietary racing. The change is only nominal.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MORGAN: The whole of the profits will go into the same pocket. There is no doubt about that, and the Bill fails miserably in not carrying out the expressed intention of this House.

The SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the Bill. He will not be in order in discussing the control of proprietary racecourses.

Mr. MORGAN: I would like to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that this is a Racecourses Bill.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member knows that the Bill is not one to control racecourses, but to raise revenue from the taxation of bookmakers.

Mr. MORGAN: I always respect your ruling. I have already called your attention to the fact that regulations may be made by the Minister giving him power to deal with proprietary racing. In fact, before the Bill leaves the House it may be definitely provided that bookmakers shall not bet elsewhere than on a racecourse carried on by a recognised and registered club, and not by individuals. We have the power, if we so desire, to compel them to conform to those conditions, and I hope we use it.

I am sure that there is not a member on the other side of the House who will not bear me out when I say that this Bill is not all it should be. One of its weaknesses is that the definition of "racing club" includes the words, "any individual person and any club." We have the power to delete the words, "any individual person," and if we do that, it will mean that a racecourse controlled by an individual will not be recognised. We also have power to include in the definition a provision that any racing club must be a recognised and registered club, and that its membership shall be open to the general public.

Instead of prohibitive annual subscriptions keeping people out of the club, the Government should have the power to say that the annual membership fee shall not exceed a certain amount. We know the club formed to carry on racing in Brisbane on the courses taken over from Mr. Wren has fixed an exorbitant annual subscription fee. Why? They do not want us to have anything to do with it. We would be inquisitive. I would. I would want to know if a legitimate amount was being spent on the improvement of racecourses. That is one of the weaknesses in connection with this Bill. It does not provide definitely—it may be done by regulation—that race clubs must spend a certain amount on the upkeep of their land, and beautify it for the people of Queensland. I also want it definitely stated in the Bill that

a club shall set apart a certain amount for the improvement of the breed of horses.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. gentleman is not in order in proceeding on those lines.

Mr. MORGAN: I shall be in order in discussing the taxation on bookmakers?

The SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman will be in order in discussing taxation.

Mr. MORGAN: Why not increase the taxation so that the Government can earmark some of the money to be utilised in establishing a fund for injured jockeys and their dependants, and set aside a certain sum so that they will be able to import the best thoroughbreds from other parts of the world and thus improve the breed of racehorses? That should be the duty of a club. A club should not only hold race meetings for the purpose of enticing people there to gamble. The clubs should have higher ideals. Their object should be to establish beautiful grounds and make up-to-date improvements and cater for the public. The money is obtained from the public and should go back to the public in some way or another. It is not going back to the public at all. It is going into the pockets of individuals. The taxation should be increased, so that improvements can be made in this State. I admit that a mistake was made when we allowed proprietary interests to come into Queensland forty or fifty years ago. It is never too late to mend, and if we have something that is objectionable, it is never too late to introduce something new if that new idea is going to benefit the people of the State. Now is the time to do that. I ask the Minister to recognise that there is something more than taxation to be considered. There is something more than squeezing from a certain class of people a little more revenue. If we are going to squeeze revenue from a certain class, we ought to be able to say, "This is how we have spent your money. You have got value for it." We are not doing that. I have no objection to racing. I think it is the finest sport that a man can attend, provided it is clean. There is nothing more exhilarating and more exciting than to see a number of horses competing honestly and fairly with one another.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. gentleman has exhausted the time allowed him under the Standing Orders.

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mipini*): Hon. members on this side have spoken in support of the Bill, but I am inclined to oppose it, because I consider that we have never yet had before us a more disappointing measure. We know that for years the question of dealing with horseracing has been before Parliament, and when the introduction of a Racecourses Bill was promised we naturally thought it would deal with some of the needs and some of the evils in connection with racecourses. I do not suppose that under this Bill I would be in order in moving that a special subsidy be granted for the purpose of improving the breed of horses; it would require another message from the Governor to do that; but at the same time I think I am in order in urging on the Minister in charge of the measure the suggestion that he should make the Bill a much better one. It would do away with some of the opposition that it naturally excites if he would devote some of the proceeds of this tax to improving the breed of horses. Regarding the evils appertaining to racing, no one has been more

Mr. Swayne.]

emphatic during the past three or four years about this excrement—using their own words—of proprietary racing in Brisbane than hon. members opposite. We have had motions dealing with that matter in this House. We have had utterance after utterance from hon. members opposite urging that this great incubus or evil should be dealt with. Is it any wonder that, when we heard that we were going to have a Racecourses Bill, we thought it would deal with those needs and those evils? It may be yet possible to do so—I do not know. On looking at the Bill I find that it is one—

“To impose certain taxes in connection with bookmakers and betting and certain restrictions on bookmakers and betting; to amend the Totalisator Restriction Act of 1889 and the Totalisator Tax Act of 1892 in certain particulars; and for other purposes.”

It might possibly be in order to move in Committee that this privilege or license, or whatever is proposed to be conferred upon bookmakers or totalisators, shall only be extended to proper racing clubs—that is, clubs where horseracing is carried on under trustees and not conducted by a private individual for his own profit. It might be possible to move an amendment in that regard. It will be worth trying when we get into Committee. Unless something of that kind is done, we must certainly oppose the measure as it stands, because it seems to be so useless. I know that the Government want revenue, and they say that they hope to raise an additional £25,000 by the imposition of this tax. I can quite understand that, as a result of the various demands that have been made upon them, and their anxiety to spend money in certain quarters, they are glad of every £25,000 they can get hold of. Still, it seems like taking a steam hammer to crack a nut to introduce this Bill under such a pretentious title, merely for the purpose of raising £25,000 from bookmakers. At any rate, that is the Government's responsibility. I would like to urge that part of the proceeds of this measure—if only 10 per cent., which would be £2,500 out of the £25,000—be devoted to the improvement of the breed of horses. I think everyone in this House acquainted with horses—I know that you will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, in this respect—knows that something should be done. We are getting too many short distance races, with horses carrying a minimum weight. We are gradually losing the class of horse that Australia has been noted for in the past—the class of horse that buyers came across to buy for army remounts for India—the class of horse which did splendid work in Palestine and on the Continent of Europe during the great war.

If this was recognised, it might prevent the deterioration of the horse. The horse is a national asset, and the time may unfortunately come—probably it will—when we shall have to defend our land on our own soil and within our own boundaries. It will then be found in a country such as Australia, with its vast distances, that a good saddle horse is a valuable asset. For many years to come there will be room for mounted

[5.30 p.m.] men if war ever comes about.

For those reasons it is only reasonable that I should urge that a slight proportion of the tax be devoted to that purpose. If only 10 per cent., or £2,500, of the total revenue proposed to be raised under

this Bill is devoted to that purpose, the Government could give a subsidy of £500 to the senior racing club in Brisbane for a 2-mile race, provided it devoted a similar amount. The Government could also subsidise the racing clubs at Rockhampton and Townsville to institute a 2-mile race.

Hon. F. T. BRENNAN: What about Toowoomba?

Mr. SWAYNE: The Government can give more money if it likes. The hon. gentleman is one of those who hold the purse strings, and he can be as liberal as he likes.

Hon. F. T. BRENNAN: I thought you had £2,500 to give away.

Mr. SWAYNE: I am talking about a subsidy of £1,500 to the three clubs. If those clubs were granted a subsidy for a 2-mile race, the minimum weight would be 7 stone 10 lb. with a maximum probably exceeding 10 stone. A horse that could win that race under those conditions would in all probability be the type of horse to get good saddle horses. The object is to improve the breed of saddle horses. There would still be £1,000 left, and with that amount the Government could subsidise ten of the minor racing clubs to the extent of £100 each for a race under similar conditions, provided the clubs put up a similar amount. I happened to pick up promiscuously last Saturday three race programmes and a report of a meeting just run. The racing took place on courses under the control of the proprietary incubus that races in Queensland. I found that the races were over distances of 4, 5, and 7 furlongs, and that there was not one mile event on any of the programmes. That is the reason why we are getting the herring-gutted type of horse we see to-day, which if you keep in a yard all night looks like a hunted devil in the morning. If we turn to the programmes of the Queensland Turf Club, the Australian Jockey Club and the Victorian Racing Club, we find some 2-mile events and fair weights. I cannot understand why hon. members opposite have a decided objection to devoting portion of the tax to attain the purpose I advocate. If the proposal is adopted, Queensland will be well repaid by getting a better type of horse and by attracting foreign horsebuyers, who would come here to buy the horses which would be bred if races of that kind were encouraged. The amount may seem very small, but there is nothing to prevent the Government devoting a greater proportion of the tax to the purpose. My objection to the Bill is that it contains nothing likely to lead to an improvement in the breed of horses, and that it does not prevent betting on proprietary courses. The Bill does not intend to deal with proprietary racing at all. To show what a reputation Brisbane is acquiring in the other States owing to the proprietary racing which exists here—it seems to be peculiar to Brisbane—I wish to quote an article which appeared in the Melbourne “Leader” of 22nd September last—

“THE ART OF STOPPING HORSES.

“A new trouble has arisen in connection with racing in Queensland. Perhaps the South has not yet experienced it. It is the art of being ‘left at the barrier.’ To be sure, racing, apart from the Queensland Turf Club meetings, is purely a business, and it is doubtful whether the Queensland Turf Club would not be the better of a ‘clean up’ by strong hands in the way of stipendiary stewards backed

[Mr. Swayne.

up by a committee sans peur et sans reproche. It is complained in the daily papers that at Albion Park (the Breakfast Creek course) the starting of late has been anything but good, though the starter is 'not always to blame for the straggling starts.' On Saturday last, it is alleged that, 'after watching the antics at the barrier of a rider on a very solidly backed horse,' a Press writer offered to bet the horse would not get away. Then, we are ingeniously told: 'Whether as the result of sleepiness on the part of the rider or design on his part, the horse was left—as also were its backers.' The old-fashioned ways of simple 'pulling,' or pulling in on the rails behind a field or getting accidentally 'pocketed,' or running wide at the turns are now regarded as the ways of the troglodyte jockeys. The modern riders lose their races at the barrier or perhaps indulge in the gentle art of the dope. Despite the caustic comments in the papers, 'balking at the barrier' does not yet appear to have caught the eyes of stipendiary stewards."

By quoting this article I want to show the repute in which some of our principal courses are held in the South. It entirely bears out my utterances and reasons why the Bill should be opposed. I also wish to quote what the hon. member for Gregory said in this House on 7th September, 1916, to support my contention that the Bill is not worthy of the attention of the House—

"The only place in Brisbane where races are run which would possibly improve the stamina of horses in any way is at Ascot or Eagle Farm, where the Queensland Turf Club holds its meetings, and there we find races of 2 miles, 1 mile, and ½ mile, and they should go a long way towards improving the breed of racehorses. But at the same time, the proprietary courses are only the dumping grounds for rejected horses, horses which are not able to race either at Ascot or, in many cases, even at Albion Park."

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. SWAYNE: Surely I am in order in inquiring why this Bill does not deal with such a monopoly? The hon. member for Gregory stated that this class of racing is a monopoly about Brisbane. The Labour platform expresses its abhorrence of anything in the shape of monopolies, and hon. members would expect them to deal with a monopoly in such legislation as this. When it is found that this Bill makes no provision for dealing with the monopoly referred to by the hon. member for Gregory, I begin to wonder if there is any hidden reason for its introduction.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): I have listened with a considerable amount of interest to the discussion this afternoon. The Attorney-General has told us that it is a taxation measure pure and simple. That may be so, but taxation measures are of two kinds. There are certain Bills in regard to taxation which are introduced and the taxation is imposed in the public interests. There are other measures of a taxation character which are not looked upon as being in the public interests—I refer to such taxes as the income tax. The measure that we are discussing this afternoon is intended to a certain degree. I take it, to protect the

public interests from men following the vocation of bookmakers on the various racecourses of Queensland. I am not going to give an address this afternoon on the evils of gambling because you will pull me up, Mr. Speaker, but I should like to refer the Attorney-General to a cartoon in to-day's "Standard," which refers to racing. It is a very good cartoon in its way, and represents the racegoers as a lot of donkeys and shows the "Ikey Moes" going along to collect their dividends from the bookmakers who are carrying on their business.

Mr. KIRWAN: "Ikey Mo" does not collect the dividend—he runs the book.

Mr. TAYLOR: In the Sydney "Bulletin" of last week there is an excellent cartoon, which I commend to the notice of the Attorney-General, and underneath the cartoon it reads—"The sport of Kings—God save the kings!" If he only saw the kings represented in the picture he would certainly abolish proprietary and other racing to-morrow. I think it is right and proper that men following the sport of racing should pay their full proportion of taxation to the country. In such sports as cricket and football, etc., there are no proprietary interests. We have in this measure a differentiation made with regard to what are called clubs, such as the Queensland Turf Club. This club has even sent me a free pass and an invitation to go down to their meeting. I have written thanking them. I have not been at one of their meetings yet, but now I might go. The revenue of clubs of that nature is devoted to increasing prize money, to the beautification of their grounds, and other beneficial purposes. I think that I am getting on to dangerous ground, but I think that one of the curses of racing to-day is proprietary racing, and I am very sorry that the measure which is now being introduced does not in some way deal with the evil. I think that all racecourses should pay a mighty stiff tax.

I recollect an article that appeared in the Sydney "Bulletin" a little while ago in connection with certain proposals regarding the taxation of amusements. The Federal Government, as we know, withdrew certain taxes that were imposed on amusements, and the "Bulletin," commenting on that action indicated that, when a Government took off taxation on amusements and placed it on industry it was time for that Government to get out of the way. I think so, too. If there is one legitimate use for taxation, it is to apply it to racing and amusements of a similar type. It is quite evident from what has taken place in this Chamber this afternoon that, while an effort to eliminate betting in our lanes and backyards has been mentioned by the Attorney-General, Tattersall's and other such clubs will be permitted to continue. I do not think that is right. If it is right and proper to permit betting in Tattersall's Club, then we should not clear the man out of the lane. It is not right to cater for the man who is able to pay his entrance fee to the club to enable him to carry on his betting transactions. It is evident that there is going to be no restriction whatever on betting in these large clubs.

I know that we cannot absolutely eliminate a lot of evils for which we legislate in Parliament. If we could do so, there would be no necessity for our police force and

Mr. Taylor.]

gaols. If we cannot eliminate them, the next best thing is to control them as far as possible. Any effort which we may make by this Bill to control and purify gambling on raccourses will be justified. I take it that this is not purely a taxation measure but a measure in the interests of the general public and for the betterment of racing generally. If that is not so, why does the Attorney-General specifically state that he wants to cleanse the streets of Brisbane of a very objectionable element that exists at the present time?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: You know that it is connected with street betting in this way, that, if they bet in the street, they will not bet on the raccourse.

Mr. TAYLOR: My reason for giving support to the Bill in certain directions is that racing in Queensland to-day is not paying its fair proportion to the taxes of the State. I consider that it is able to pay its fair proportion. It is not very often that I go to races, but I was in Melbourne last year in the month of October and went to see the Caulfield Cup run. I have stood on railway stations in Melbourne and Sydney and have seen trains pouring out their loads of iniquity. That is the only appropriate term. We ought to tax those trainloads of iniquity and try to make them better citizens than they are now.

Hon. F. T. BRENNAN: Do you say that every man who goes to a raccourse is an iniquitous individual?

Mr. TAYLOR: No, I did not say that, but I think the hon. gentleman will agree that the majority are.

Hon. F. T. BRENNAN: When he comes back in a motor-car he is all right?

Mr. TAYLOR: I did not say that. I understand the measure which we are considering is one that is going to add approximately £50,000 to the revenue of the State. No doubt the Government want the revenue, and no one can complain about the taxes that are to be levied. They are fairly reasonable and fairly just, and the method of issuing the betting tickets which the bookmakers are to use certainly provides a check which is absolutely necessary so that the revenue may not be defrauded. It is rather a remarkable thing that racing should have had a free leg for such a long time so far as taxation is concerned. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Dalby, bookmakers attending a raccourse receive probably anything from £500 to £1,000 on one big race, and there is no guarantee or security whatever that these men are going to pay over the money which they have received on trust from the people who made bets with them. As has already been pointed out, commission agents and auctioneers have to pay license fees, and we are now considering a Bill which is going to compel insurance companies to deposit up to £50,000 with the Government as a guarantee that they will carry out the contracts which they enter into. I do not think for one moment that the State Insurance Office would take on many of the guarantees with regard to fidelity bonds for these people, but at the same time the bookmakers should be compelled to take out fidelity bond or something of that nature to ensure payment of their obligations.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): I am very sorry that the Bill does not go further than it does. It is merely a taxation measure. I think

[*Mr. Taylor.*

we can get some good out of it even if it is a taxation measure because possibly, when we get into Committee, we shall be able, with the assistance of some members on the Government side, to get amendments inserted in the Bill that will considerably improve the situation. I have a strong objection to the way racing is carried on in many places, not only in Brisbane, but outside Brisbane at the present time; and any restriction that we can put on racing, and any method by which we can secure more revenue from the large amount of money that is disbursed at these race meetings, is going to be a good thing. It is a source of entertainment that has been tax free far too long, and, if we have an opportunity of securing a certain amount of revenue from it which the State is justly entitled to, we should seize that opportunity and get what we can out of it while endeavouring to improve the whole position. Gambling, after all, is doing no good to the public. If one man wins, it means that another man must lose. The totalisator must win all the time, as 13½ per cent. or 15 per cent. is deducted from the amount invested. That must mean that the individual has no chance whatever of coming out on top. Certain individuals through nefarious practices, such as "cronk" running and "nobbling" jockeys, are able to make a success for a time, but we know perfectly well that no bookmaker could make a living and only the totalisator could keep going if the public, as a rule, were to win. We know perfectly well that the bettors do not win. A man has only to keep on long enough and he must lose. He has not only to take fair legitimate chances, but he has also to take the chance—which is no chance at all—of not getting a "square go" for his money.

It is a good thing to legalise bookmakers, but the Bill does not go far enough. If you are going to legalise betting and say that a man has to pay a tax for making a bet, you should also protect the public and see that the bookmaker has a certain amount of money behind him to make sure that he will pay up if he loses. The bookmaker also should be protected by being enabled to sue. More betting goes on outside the raccourses than takes place on the raccourses, and it is far better, as the Minister says, if you cannot stop this betting, to legalise it and confine it to certain definite limits, get revenue from it, and see that it is carried on in a fair manner. At present it is not carried on in a fair manner. Every man knows the amount of betting that takes place in betting-shops and in other places. There is power to stop this sort of thing. It only wants the will to stop it; but, if the Minister does not feel inclined to stop it—he says it is not possible—then legalise it and see that the public get some revenue from it and some protection for the amount of money they are spending on it. I take exception to the flat rate of tax imposed by this Bill. As in all other forms of taxation, there should be a graduated scale. It could be worked quite simply. At the present time the bookmaker has to send in a return within seven days, and it is easy to see the amount of money that was put through his books. If he had to make a return of the number of bets that were made for £5, the number for £25, the number for £50, and so on, it would be quite simple to impose a graduated tax. To make a flat rate of 3d. and 1d is not a fair thing in any sense of the word. To impose a graduated tax should not be as difficult as it is in connection with

other forms of taxation. There has been no difficulty under the Stamp Act, and there has been no difficulty under the income tax, and there should be no difficulty in connection with this tax. It certainly would be far fairer. It is only a reasonable thing when the industry is carried on—I suppose you call it an industry although it is of no benefit to the country—it is rather to its detriment than otherwise—that the revenue secured from it should be according to the amount of money put through, and everyone should not pay the same amount. I noticed in the Sydney "Bulletin" last week an article on the turf, and in that article they go into the question of the protection of the public. After all, it is not only a question of taxation. There is also the question of the protection of the public who put their money on racehorses. When betting transactions are legalised, as they are under this Bill, it is only fair that the public should receive the same protection that they receive in every other industry that is carried on legally. The article is headed, "A Tainted Turf," and there is a rather instructive paragraph in it which reads—

"Apart from these more or less public swindles there are the private bargains—struck days before the race, maybe—between stables and sweep winners, owners and professional punters, jockeys, and bookmakers, and any number of similar combinations of conspirators. The net result is that hundreds of thousands of citizens are being robbed yearly for the benefit of certain malefactors whose cynical unscrupulous methods would not be tolerated in any other calling. If our Legislatures primarily considered the public interest they would abolish proprietary racing, and insist on the Australian Jockey Club disciplining wealthy owners and bookmakers who overstep the mark, equally with obscure trainers and jockeys. Unfortunately both political parties are under financial obligations to the betting nabobs. With the departure of the party Government system the 'Zany' who imagines he can beat books, owners, trainers, jockeys, and their attendant parasites might be protected from himself. At present those who live by fleecing him are safe as though, in another place, they had the backing of a 'squared' jury."

With the evidence that is before our eyes during the whole year round, it must be perfectly obvious that the persons who go to these race meetings do not in nine cases out of ten get a fair deal. There are certain persons who are not interested in racing and not interested in making a better ground, but interested solely in making a profit.

[7 p.m.]

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time—put and passed.

PROPOSAL TO GO INTO COMMITTEE.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinlers*): I beg to move, Mr. Speaker—

"That you do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill in detail."

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): I do not object to going into Committee, but at the same

time I do not like to see a taxation measure rushed through, and I hope that this will not be taken as a precedent.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: We will not regard it as a precedent.

Question put and passed.

COMMITTEE.

(Mr. Kirwan, *Brisbane*, in the chair.)

Clause 1—"Short title"—

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinlers*): I move the addition to the clause of the following new paragraph—

"This Act shall come into operation on a date to be fixed by the Governor in Council by proclamation published in the 'Gazette.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 2—"Interpretation"—

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinlers*): I move the omission, on lines 5 to 7, page 2, of the definition of "Minister," reading—

"'Minister'—The Minister of the Crown for the time being administering the Stamp Acts, 1894 to 1918,"

with a view to inserting the following definition in lieu thereof:—

"'Minister'—The Attorney-General or other Minister of the Crown for the time being administering this Act."

The reason for the amendment is that the Minister administering the Stamp Act now is the Treasurer. I want to have it so that I, or any other Minister who may be in office for the time being, may administer the Act.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN (*Marilla*): I move the omission, on lines 21 and 22, of the words—

"any individual person and any club, association, or body of persons,"

with a view to inserting the words—

"any non-proprietary club or association."

My object in moving the amendment is to endeavour to prevent the bookmakers from being allowed to bet at any race meeting which is not conducted by a genuine club. It is generally recognised that the resolution carried in Committee of Ways and Means—

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I rise to a point of order. I have no desire to prevent the hon. member moving his amendment, but I raise the point now purely to settle the matter before we proceed. If the amendment were carried, it would prevent the Government from collecting a tax from bookmakers plying their vocations on proprietary courses, and therefore it conflicts with the resolution which has already been agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN: Before you give a ruling, Mr. Kirwan, I should like to point out that the amendment will not prevent the tax being collected from any bookmaker. We are dealing now with the definition, and I claim that the provision which prevents a bookmaker from operating elsewhere than on a racecourse or any part of a racecourse not specially set apart by a racing club for the time being holding race meetings means that

Mr. Morgan.]

a club which is not genuine will never be able to hold a race meeting.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: They could hold them, but we could not collect the tax.

Mr. MORGAN: In the first place, permission would only be given to genuine clubs to hold race meetings. All my amendment would do is to amend the definition, which says that a "racing club" shall include—

"any individual person and any club."

The amendment is not interfering with the taxation principle of the measure.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Of course it is. It interferes with the primary condition.

Mr. MORGAN: I am asking for an alteration in the definition of "racing club." I am not asking for an increase or a reduction in the taxation, and it would be dangerous if you held that we are not in order in altering the definition.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The point is not the alteration in the definition, but what it involves.

Mr. MORGAN: An individual or individuals who combine to establish a racing club would not be able to hold race meetings at all unless they were a genuine club in accordance with my amendment; and, if they did, the bookmakers would not be able to bet, because they would not be race meetings within the meaning of the Act. If a bookmaker were to bet at such a meeting, he would be liable to prosecution for betting on a place which was not a racecourse. He would be committing an offence, and I want to make betting on any course which is not run by a licensed non-proprietary recognised club an offence. That is all I am asking for.

Mr. CARTER: Your amendment would prevent betting at a coursing meeting.

Mr. MORGAN: This Bill unfortunately prevents it. It says that any person who carries on business or acts as a bookmaker elsewhere than on a racecourse is guilty of an offence. The coursing meetings at Rocklea are not held on a racecourse. But I am not dealing with that point. I say that we are perfectly in order in amending the definition of "racing club."

I hope, Mr. Kirwan, that you will not rule the amendment out of order. If you do, you are going to establish a very dangerous precedent. I think we are quite in order in seeking to exercise our rights by amending the Bill. The amendment is not going to reduce or increase taxation.

The CHAIRMAN: The point of order taken by the Attorney-General on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Murilla is certainly a very important one, and from what I am able to find in "May" I am afraid that I cannot rule the amendment out of order. It is a question of whether the amendment is relevant or not. In dealing with this question it is stated in "May," at page 497—

"Debate and amendment on the stages of the Finance Bill or other Bills imposing taxes are governed by the ordinary rules of relevancy. . . ."

I am inclined to think that the amendment is relevant.

Mr. MORGAN (Murilla): I thank you very much for your ruling, Mr. Kirwan. I think you have given a fair, just, and sound ruling. My reason for moving the amend-

[Mr. Morgan.

ment is to bring about the expressed wish of the legislators of this State, and once and for all put a stop to proprietary racing, which, unfortunately, has grown to considerable dimensions in Queensland. I feel sure that this is not a matter that should be dealt with from a party point of view. We must all recognise that it is a matter of very serious importance, and one that deserves the serious consideration of all members in this Chamber. I would like to remind the Minister in charge of the Bill that the policy of the Government is to prevent an individual from exercising a monopoly or from carrying on a business of this description—if you like to call it a business—and obtaining a profit thereby. Racing undoubtedly is, or should be, a sport, unless the Minister wishes to convey to the people of this State that racing is carried on for the purpose of legalising gambling.

Mr. CARTER: So it is.

Mr. MORGAN: I have to agree with that interjection, because, unfortunately, racing has been to those controlling it, more especially the proprietors, a money-making game. It is a money-making game, because it provides profits for those controlling it. Let me take a club like the Queensland Turf Club. Everybody is eligible to become a member of that club, and every member has the right to attend a meeting of the club once a year. The committee elected by the club may be elected again at the expiration of their period of office. That is a club belonging to the public.

Mr. CARTER: It is a close corporation.

Mr. MORGAN: It is not a close corporation, although the initiation fee and the subscription are too high for the average person to become a member.

Mr. BRUCE: It has a limited membership.

Mr. MORGAN: It has not.

Mr. BRUCE: At the last annual meeting the Queensland Turf Club decided to limit the membership.

Mr. MORGAN: I remember now that there was a motion moved at the last annual meeting having that effect. That strengthens my case, because up to the last annual meeting the Queensland Turf Club was not a close corporation. Up to that time any person who so desired, on paying the initiation fee and the membership fee, could become a member and take part in the election of the committee to control the club. If my amendment was carried, the Government could prevent the Queensland Turf Club from limiting its membership. The Government could also prevent the club from charging an exorbitant membership fee.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is not dealing with the amendment.

Mr. MORGAN: I am giving reasons why the definition should be altered by the deletion of the words "individual person and any club, association, or body of persons." I am referring to the Queensland Turf Club, the Queensland Amateur Turf Club, or any other club that is so organised as to prevent the public becoming members. If my amendment is carried, I will then move the insertion of the words "any non-proprietary club or association." That will enable the Minister to prevent any club becoming a close corporation. Hon. members must recognise that this is a most important point. If the Queensland

Turf Club carried a resolution limiting its membership, it is no better than a proprietary club, excepting that it does not divide its profits among its members. We have so-called clubs which, after providing for prize money and improvements, divide the profits among the individuals who form the club.

Mr. CONROY: What about hospital benefit meetings?

Mr. MORGAN: They would be quite legitimate.

Mr. CONROY: This amendment would prevent those meetings from being held.

Mr. MORGAN: The licensed club in the district could run such meetings.

Mr. RYAN: The amendment will interfere with shearers' race meetings.

Mr. MORGAN: The amendment will not stop those meetings. The club in the Roma district, whether registered with the Queensland Turf Club or with the Western Downs Racing Club, could run meetings with their officers and hand over the proceeds to the hospitals.

Mr. BRUCE: What about when the shearers run a meeting?

Mr. MORGAN: This amendment will not interfere with those meetings. They will ask for registration, and so long as the proceeds do not go to individuals it will be competent for them to race.

Mr. RYAN: How can they hold a meeting if they are not registered.

Mr. MORGAN: They cannot run a race meeting unless they are registered. They get a permit to run a shearers' race meeting for the benefit of a hospital.

Mr. CONROY: By your argument they could run them at Kedron Park.

Mr. MORGAN: That is a bogey. The hon. member has raised that point for the purpose of having an excuse to vote against my amendment. I have as many shearers' race meetings in my electorate as any hon. member. I take as much interest in such meetings as hon. members opposite. My amendment will not in any way interfere with racing. The shearers may form an association or club and run a meeting, provided they ask for a permit and give the profits from that meeting to the hospital or other body. They would come under the definition of "non-proprietary club or association." They could not be termed a proprietary club. Bookmakers would be permitted to bet at those meetings, and there would be no interference. The amendment will make it illegal for a bookmaker to bet if the races were run for the benefit of an individual, or if the profits went into the pockets of the promoter. It will not interfere in any way with legitimate clubs that use their profits for the purpose of giving better prizes and improving their grounds.

Mr. CONROY: It will interfere with taxation.

Mr. MORGAN: It will not. It will prevent illegal clubs springing into existence, but will not interfere with legitimate clubs in any shape or form. Hon. members might just as well say that if we had race meetings every day in Brisbane, more taxation would be derived from racing. That would not be so, because only a certain number of men go to races, and they could not be in two places at the same time. Probably a

greater amount of taxation would result if we only ran one race meeting a week, for then the betting would be on a larger scale. I have much pleasure in moving the amendment, and hope it will be accepted by the Attorney-General. It will put the responsibility on the shoulders of hon. members opposite of voting in favour or otherwise of individuals being allowed to exploit the racing public and of putting the profits in their own pockets. I know the Labour party's policy is against such a procedure. The Labour platform seeks to socialise such matters, and my amendment is going to socialise racing. It will mean that only genuine clubs can run races—clubs which use the profits to improve the sport and to improve their grounds. I am moving an amendment which is in accordance with the Labour party's platform. If they turn it down, they will show they are not genuine, and that their policy is only make-believe, or, on the other hand, it will demonstrate to the people outside that John Wren dominates them—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MORGAN: And that they are afraid to do anything that is going to harm that individual. The whole responsibility is going to be placed on the Government, and they must shoulder the responsibility.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinders*): In the first place, I would remind the hon. member that he is not the custodian of the platform of the Labour party. We are the best judges of what the Labour platform is and of what it represents, and we require no information or advice from the hon. member as to whether we are going to violate that platform or not. The amendment, if carried, would mean that "any individual person and any club, association, or body of persons" could not come within the definition of a "racing club," and, as was rightly interjected from this side of the House, the amendment would prevent the holding of race meetings for the benefit of hospitals or for any other charitable purpose. It is refreshing to find members of the Opposition standing for State control. Why are they so keen about State control in the matter of racing? Why are they so keen to abolish proprietary racing while they are so keen to prevent the abolition of any other kind of private enterprise? I would like to point out to hon. members opposite that the responsibility for having proprietary racing in Queensland rests upon them and not upon members on this side, because we found proprietary racing in existence when we came into power. We found vested interests established, and we are not so keen on brushing away rights which we found existing when we came into office. If there is proprietary racing here at present—and there is—previous Governments and not the Labour Government are responsible for that.

Mr. MORGAN: You are continuing it.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: These proprietary bodies have gone to enormous expense in connection with their racecourses, and would the hon. gentleman suggest that we should repudiate their rights? Hon. members opposite are the party who talk so much about repudiation, and now they want us to repudiate our obligations to interests which they established by permitting proprietary racing in this State. If this amendment were carried, it means that we would

Hon. J. Mullan.]

repudiate our obligations to men whom we have permitted for years to establish racecourses in this State. One would imagine that these proprietary individuals pay nothing towards the revenue. If these men are making the profits alleged here to-day, then they are paying maximum tax under the Income Tax Act, which is a little over 17½ per cent. That is not a bad tax for the State to be gathering from proprietary racing. Let us carry the thing to its logical conclusion. Why pick out racing? Take the Stadium, which my friends opposite occasionally visit. The Stadium is run by a proprietary body. Are we to say that the profits from the Stadium are to be solely employed for the purpose of developing pugilists?

Mr. MORGAN: No. You won't allow betting there now.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It does not matter about betting; the principle is the same. It is a public amusement, the same as racing is a public amusement; and if you say the profits from racing are to be devoted to the specific purpose of improving the breed of horses, then the profits from the Stadium should go towards developing a particular type of pugilist. Then take our theatres. All the profits from the theatres should go towards developing a particular type of actor.

Mr. MORGAN: I am glad you are making yourself ridiculous.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I could go right through the whole ambit of public amusements, and say that the profits derived from these amusements should be devoted exclusively to the development of a particular amusement.

[7.30 p.m.]

Mr. MORGAN: Why did you vote against proprietary racing? You voted for Mr. Donald Gunn's motion.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I do not know what I voted against then, but I am going to vote against the hon. member's amendment now. I think the thing would be absurd. In any case this is a purely taxation measure, and the present is neither the time nor the place to insert the amendment of the hon. member.

Mr. PETERSON (*Normanby*): The Attorney-General was labouring under heavy seas in arguing against the amendment. The amendment does not suggest the closing of proprietary racecourses, but it seeks to preclude bookmakers from betting on proprietary racecourses.

Mr. MORGAN: Hear, hear!

Mr. PETERSON: The Minister spoke of theatres and other places of amusement, but you do not find gambling at theatres.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The hon. member for Murilla does not object on that ground.

Mr. PETERSON: I have listened to the hon. member for Fitzroy, the hon. member for Gregory, and other hon. members opposite speaking against proprietary racing. The amendment does not prevent the running of races on proprietary racecourses, but deals specifically with bookmakers, so where does the Minister's argument come in that we are trying to repudiate or take away the right? The hon. gentleman knows that, if we take away gambling from a racecourse, that ends the racecourse.

[Hon. J. Mullan.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: You are destroying your own argument.

Mr. PETERSON: I want to be fair. I rose to point out that the hon. gentleman was not sound in his argument that the amendment would mean the closing of proprietary racecourses by taking away certain rights held by vested interests. It is quite clear that the amendment does not aim at that. I would suggest that, in consonance with the majority vote given in this Chamber against proprietary racing, we should support the amendment in order to give effect to the wishes Parliament expressed previously.

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*): The amendment seems to me to be a step in the right direction. While not directly making proprietary racing illegal, it will prevent betting on proprietary racecourses, and we know that they will not last very long under that condition of things. Therefore the amendment will carry out the object that many of us have had in view for a number of years. It would surprise hon. members opposite if they were to look up some of their own utterances on the subject. I could quote from a Melbourne newspaper with reference to the abuses in connection with proprietary racing in Brisbane. Let us see what hon. members opposite themselves have said on this matter. For instance we find the hon. member for Gregory, when speaking in 1916 (vide "Hansard" for that year, page 393), said—

"For once in a while I am in accord with the hon. member for Carnarvon in some of the views he has expressed and also with the hon. member for Murilla, because I realise that those gentlemen have hit the mark in many places."

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I fail to see how the hon. member is going to connect that with the amendment, which specifically provides that bookmakers shall not be allowed to follow their occupation on proprietary racecourses. I hope the hon. member will keep to that point. I am certainly not going to allow a discussion on proprietary racing.

Mr. SWAYNE: I think it is recognised that the amendment has that purpose in view—that it will prevent what is called proprietary racing. It seems to me that I shall be in order in supporting the arguments in favour of the amendment by quoting opinions which have been expressed on previous occasions when a similar question came before the House.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! It is not a similar question. The question on that occasion was a resolution to get an expression of opinion from the House as to the abolition of proprietary racing. On this occasion the amendment is to prevent bookmakers from following their calling on a proprietary course. The hon. member will have to show the Committee why a bookmaker should be allowed to bet on a course that is not a proprietary course as against betting on a proprietary course. That is the limit of the discussion.

Mr. SWAYNE: I am supporting the amendment because I think it will be a very good thing if betting on a proprietary racecourse is made illegal. I am supporting it because I recognise that it will be the

death blow to proprietary racing, and I am surely entitled to give my reasons for supporting the amendment. I would point out that there have been no stronger denunciations of proprietary racing made than by hon. members opposite.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member heard my ruling, and I hope that he understood it. If he persists in that line of argument, I shall have to call on him to resume his seat. I will read the amendment to the hon. member in case he did not hear the hon. member for Murilla move it. The amendment is to omit the words—

“any individual person and any club, association, or body of persons.”

with a view to inserting the words—

“any non-proprietary club or association.”

Under the amendment bookmakers are not to be allowed to bet on any course which is considered to be a proprietary course.

Mr. SWAYNE: I am supporting the amendment because I think it is a good one, and it will be the deathblow to proprietary racing.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must ask the hon. member to resume his seat.

Mr. SWAYNE: Under the circumstances I have to obey your ruling.

Mr. CONROY (*Maranoa*): I do not think the hon. member who has resumed his seat has any idea of what the amendment is. The definition reads—

“‘Racing club’ includes any individual person and any club, association, or body of persons, whether incorporated or not, promoting or controlling or formed for promoting or controlling horse racing, pony racing, or trotting contests, or holding or formed for holding race meetings.”

The hon. member for Murilla has moved the omission of words—

“any individual person and any club, association, or body of persons”

with a view to inserting the words—

“any non-proprietary club or association.”

It has nothing to do with bookmakers at all—it is a question of the definition of “racing club.” The objection I have to the amendment is that in many country centres at different times, in shearing sheds and such like places, the men who are working there arrange to hold a race meeting for the benefit of the hospital. They are not a racing body.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: They are non-proprietary.

Mr. CONROY: They are not registered and have no connection with any racecourse, but to enable them to carry out that race programme they have either to register as a racing club or else ask for permission from a registered club to enable them to carry it out.

Mr. TAYLOR: They are the same as an agricultural society.

Mr. CONROY: That is so. The amendment will prevent that, because that body would not have the power. I do not think that any hon. member on the opposite side

wishes to prevent that being done, but to my mind that is what the amendment will mean.

Mr. MORGAN: The words to be inserted read “any non-proprietary club or association.” It does not mention registration at all.

Mr. CONROY: If a shearing shed decided to have a race meeting—

Mr. MORGAN: Would they not be a “non-proprietary club or association of persons”?

Mr. CONROY: The Bill as it stands, enabling any individual person to conduct a race meeting, is all right, but under the amendment an individual person who conducted a race meeting for a shearing shed would be doing something illegal. That is done time after time by shearing sheds.

Mr. MORGAN: This amendment will not make any difference.

Mr. CONROY: It will make all the difference, and I am very pleased that the Minister has refused to accept it.

Mr. BRUCE (*Kennedy*): Hon. members opposite do not seem to understand what the hon. member for Maranoa has referred to. A body of shearers often hold a race meeting, and the horses are usually lent by the station owner for the day, and for their use for the day are sold at auction to whomsoever likes to bid for them. They are owned for that particular day's racing by the successful bidders. The definition, including “any body of persons” as a racing club, will certainly include a number of shearers, and they are the persons who organise these race meetings for the benefit of the hospitals in the locality. The practice is followed right throughout the Western country where I have lived for many years, from Cloncurry to Urandangie and to Torrens Creek and Winton and Barcardine, and a considerable amount of money is raised. If the amendment were carried, it would be fatal to meetings of that kind.

I want to say, also, that up in the far North for the last two or three years, owing to the unsatisfactory manner in which registered racing has been carried on, a majority of the racegoing public are in favour of unregistered and proprietary racing. Anybody who has studied the history of racing in North Queensland will have found that many of the largest towns, including Cairns, have decided to break away from the North Queensland Racing Association.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the hon. member will not discuss proprietary racing.

Mr. BRUCE: Proprietary racing has been independent, and we are handicapped unless we can debate the statements made by hon. members opposite. The amendment is brought forward in order to destroy the Bill, which is designed to give the Government revenue from racing. Racing has been an established fact ever since British communities existed, and the question which has been debated here to-night has been as to the form of racing—whether it should be under registered clubs or proprietary owners.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BRUCE: The follower of racing has an afternoon out in the open, and personally I am in favour of it so long as the courses are well regulated and of imposing the taxation which the Minister proposes.

Mr. Bruce.]

The name of John Wren has been mentioned in this debate. I want to say that, whenever he touched racing, he improved it and raised its standard.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BRUCE: Hon. members opposite have used the other argument, but I understand that I am not in order in replying.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member should have spoken on the second reading. I am not going to allow proprietary racing to be discussed on this amendment.

Mr. BRUCE: The hon. member for Mirani referred to it in his speech on the amendment.

Mr. FRY: And he was made to sit down.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope the hon. member will confine his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. BRUCE: The hon. member for Murilla said that the abolition of proprietary racing was contained in the platform of the Labour party, and he had no doubt he would get support from hon. members on this side. I am satisfied that the hon. member for Murilla is not sufficiently intelligent to interpret the Labour party's platform—owing to class bias he is certainly unqualified to do so. I had prepared some notes on this question, but apparently they are out of order at this stage. The amendment is brought along solely to destroy the Bill; it would prevent the shearers' meetings for hospitals which I have described, and I hope it will be defeated.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): I think we have been on the wrong track so far. We ought to have been discussing the definition of a "racing club," and not the question of registered or unregistered racecourses. The Bill includes as a racing club any individual or body of persons—which would embrace proprietary clubs—and the amendment has been moved to get round that. In order to save the face of hon. members opposite, who are going to vote against a previous decision of this House, a very ingenious argument has been brought forward. This House has already arrived at a certain decision, which, if carried out, would prevent Mr. John Wren or anybody else from carrying on proprietary racing.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope the hon. member is not going to raise that question.

Mr. VOWLES: I would just like you to hear what I have to say, Mr. Kirwan.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member may not realise—if he was not in the Chamber I will tell him—that I have already ruled two hon. members out of order for discussing that question, one on either side. I hope the hon. member is not going to discuss that matter.

Mr. VOWLES: I do not intend to do so. I do not see why any man's name should be sacrosanct in this Chamber. No individual person should be able to constitute himself a racing club, and that is what we are dealing with. If any man can be a racing club, then John Wren or anybody else can be that person. I say that your ruling is quite wrong.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman can adopt another course if that is the case.

Mr. VOWLES: Yes. If one person can constitute himself a club, then John Wren

[*Mr. Bruce.*]

or anyone else will come within the definition of "racing club." This ingenious argument about hospital meetings is only brought forward to save the faces of hon. members opposite. It is only sentiment—hospitals, widows, orphans—anything at all! It is a different matter in the country where race meetings are held for hospitals under the auspices of a registered club or the auspices of an unregistered club. If the amendment is carried, then a racing club will not be a proprietary club. If a function is held for the benefit of a hospital, the proceeds will not then be for an individual person. The argument is all at sea. If a man likes to race his horses at an unregistered race meeting, he can do so, but they will be disqualified from competing at a registered race meeting. If he does not get a permit, then the horses are banned for six months before they can race on a registered course again, but that will not affect the object of the meeting or the distribution of the profits. No doubt one individual is responsible for a function of that kind. He is the secretary and the head and shoulders of the movement, but he has a committee to assist him in minor matters. The proceeds do not go into his pocket. It is a non-proprietary club conducting a meeting for the benefit of a charitable institution, and that is a great deal more than you can say about certain institutions which are being conducted in Brisbane to-day. The amendment will not prevent the charitable institutions from receiving proceeds from race meetings.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): I would like to reply to the remarks by the hon. member for Maranoa in connection with shearers' race meetings. I have had a lot to do with many of the shearers' race meetings that are held in my electorate and in the western parts of Queensland at different times. When the shearers want to hold a meeting they form themselves into a club and ask for a permit from the Queensland Turf Club, or the Downs and South-western District Racing Association. Before they can get that permit they have to submit the names of their president, secretary, and other officials. The permit enables them to conduct a registered race meeting, but, if they are going to conduct an unregistered race meeting, then they can go along as they like without any interference from anybody. Even if my amendment is carried, they can still apply for a permit to conduct a registered race meeting, but they will still have to form a club and submit the names of their officers to the associations I have mentioned or to the association in that locality. They cannot get a permit until they do that.

Mr. GILDAY: What is wrong with that?

Mr. MORGAN: Nothing. My amendment will not interfere with it. If a number of shearers decide to run a race meeting, they will come under the definition of a proprietary club or association. The hon. member for Maranoa has only raised a bogey to try and excuse his vote on this matter.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): I intend to support the amendment. I do not think it is a good or wise policy to allow any one person to form a racing club. In looking at the dictionary I find that the word "association" means the association of persons. Association must mean the association of something. The argument with regard to shearers' races for hospitals is very thin.

The amendment will allow shearers to conduct race meetings for the benefit of hospitals. The amendment says that a racing club shall include non-proprietary clubs or associations. If shearers or any other body of people in the country desire to come together for the purpose of running picnic races in order to help a hospital, they can still do so. The dictionary meaning of "association" is—

"Union of persons for some particular purpose. Association of ideas."

This Committee either desires that one person may form himself into a proprietary club and conduct racing in Queensland, or that an association of persons shall carry on the racing business. Racing is being carried on in our midst, and the amendment is only intended to exclude something that is going to be to the detriment of racing generally and everything connected with it. The amendment should be accepted by the Minister. The question of repudiation does not enter into the matter at all. The amendment simply seeks to give a better definition of "racing club," and a racing club can very well be defined as an association of persons. A "racing club" could not very well be defined as an association when it is constituted by one person. You are stretching the matter too far when you call an individual a racing club. Nothing is going to be gained by rejecting the amendment. It must be distinctly understood that, when we vote on the amendment, it is to prevent one person declaring himself a racing club and conducting racing in Queensland, and not against racing generally. That is not the intention of the amendment. It is a menace to Australian racing to have one man drawing the profits from race meetings. Now is the time to take action against the one-man proprietary clubs. The amendment could very well be accepted by nearly every hon. member representing the Labour party who believes in his own platform; but it is one thing to have a programme for the people and another thing to come to this Chamber and not support that programme.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): I intend to support the amendment. I think it is a very wise one, and the bogey that has been raised by hon. members opposite saying that shearers will not be able to hold race meetings and get funds for hospitals is entirely without foundation. The amendment is perfectly clear. It means that a racing club shall include non-proprietary clubs or associations. It is to limit betting to non-proprietary courses. A racing association may be comprised of "dummies" with really only one individual, and we want as far as possible to have a racing club constituted by an association of persons appointed to go in for the improvement of racing and the improvement of racccourses. We do not want to have large profits going to individuals. Racing for charitable purposes at country meetings at which purses are given will continue in the future, exactly the same as in the past, and the amendment will not make the slightest difference. Hon. members opposite know that perfectly well, and they know that under certain conditions a body of shearers can be registered as a club and conduct a race meeting. They register as a body and get a permit from

[8 p.m.] the Queensland Turf Club or some other racing association to race for a particular purpose on a certain

day. There is no suggestion that they should be a racing club. Clause 3 gives authority to grant permits to a club. The whole thing is a farce. The restriction that this amendment is going to impose is not going to affect the revenue to be raised under the Bill. It will only limit racing to registered racing clubs. No reasonable man can object to the amendment. We know the abuses which have arisen in Queensland as a result of proprietary racing. We have expected a Bill to be brought in for the purpose of eliminating proprietary racing, and the opportunity presents itself now to insert in this Bill a definition of a racing club which will conform to the views we hold. Hon. members opposite know that the object is a desirable one, but, unfortunately, this Bill is being made a party measure, and they will not be allowed to vote according to their own conscience. We only seek to adopt a principle which will be for the benefit of racing, and there is no underhand intention to prevent people from holding meetings for the benefit of charity. The amendment will not interfere with the conditions governing such meetings to-day. To hold those meetings now a permit must be first obtained, and exactly the same procedure will have to be followed under the amendment.

Mr. FRY (*Kurilpa*): I recognise that racing is the sport of the bush. The men outback hold their meeting and secure as much enjoyment from it as the men in the city do from their meetings. If I thought the amendment was going to deprive bodies of shearers or men anywhere from holding meetings for hospitals or charity, I would vote against it. I fail to see that it will do that, or how any individual can be classed as a club. If one man can constitute himself as a club, where is the principle going to end? What is going to follow? If the seal of Parliament is given to one-man clubs, very many undesirable features are going to be introduced into racing. It will be opening the door to corruption and practices which are undesirable.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It was your party that created the one-man club.

Mr. FRY: I am here to express my opinion on this matter. I am not going to be guided by any party, but by what I think is fair and just in the interests of the State. The only question that influences my vote is what is going to benefit the State. The argument of the hon. member for Maranoa was all piffle, and simply aimed at sidetracking the measure in order to confuse the issue. I cannot see that the hon. member for Murilla is wrong in his argument, but I do think that the Government are wrong, and until the question is shown to me in a different light to what I understand it now, I am going to support the amendment.

Mr. EDWARDS (*Vanango*): I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment moved by the hon. member for Murilla. It is a pity that the Minister has made this a party question. The amendment is not only in the interests of racing, but of Queensland. Everyone must admit the amount of corruption that has crept into racing circles, particularly in the cities, and that this racing, controlled as it is by one person, is not in the interests of the State. If the Government were doing their duty in the

Mr. Edwards.]

interests of the people, they would vote solidly for the amendment.

Mr. DASH: What would the amendment do?

Mr. EDWARDS: The amendment would curtail the amount of money that is taken out of the State at the present time by one person, and possibly divert it into channels for the development of industries. That is what hon. members opposite stand for. I hope that the Minister will reconsider his decision, and accept the amendment in the interest of the people of Queensland, so that the money which is now taken out of the State will be used for other purposes within the State.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted (*Mr. Morgan's amendment*) stand part of the clause—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 31.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Gledson
„ Bertram	„ Huxham
„ Brennan	„ Hynes
„ Bruce	„ Jones
„ Bulcock	„ Land
„ Carter	„ McCormack
„ Collins	„ McLachlan
„ Conroy	„ Mullan
„ Cooper, F. A.	„ Payne
„ Cooper, W.	„ Pease
„ Dash	„ Ryan
„ Dunstan	„ Smith
„ Ferricks	„ Weir
„ Foley	„ Wilson
„ Gilday	„ Winstanley
„ Gillies	

Tellers: Mr. F. A. Cooper and Mr. Pease.

NOES, 22.

Mr. Appel	Mr. King
„ Barnes, G. P.	„ Logan
„ Bell	„ Maxwell
„ Brand	„ Moore
„ Corser	„ Morgan
„ Deacon	„ Nott
„ Edwards	„ Peterson
„ Elphinstone	„ Roberts
„ Fry	„ Swayne
„ Kelso	„ Taylor
„ Kerr	„ Vowles

Tellers: Mr. Kerr and Mr. King.

PAIRS:

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Theodore	Mr. Clayton
„ Hartley	„ Warren
„ Stopford	„ Costello
„ Launce	„ Petrie
„ Wright	„ Barnes, W. H.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*): I beg to move the insertion, after the words "pony racing," on line 25, page 2, of the word "coursing."

Coursing is as much a legitimate sport as is horseracing, and it is far cleaner than horseracing. I do not see why race clubs and horseracing meetings should have a monopoly. If you are going to prohibit betting at a coursing meeting, you should prohibit betting at horseraces.

Mr. HYNES: What about pak-a-pu?

Mr. DEACON: That is altogether a different thing.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: What about pigeon shooting?

Mr. DEACON: Coursing and pigeon shooting are entirely different things, and I am surprised at the Attorney-General com-

[*Mr. Edwards.*

paring them. Hon. members opposite apparently do not know anything about coursing. The few who know coursing are aware that it is a cleaner sport than horseracing. You cannot dope the hare or the dog.

Mr. GLEDSON: They can dope the dog.

Mr. DEACON: It is practically impossible to do so. Hon. members opposite do not take the matter seriously. At present the Bill is confined to horseracing. Clause 4 provides that any person who bets in any other place than a racecourse shall be guilty of an offence and be liable to a penalty not exceeding £50.

Mr. HYNES: They are liable at the present time for betting.

Mr. DEACON: Nothing of the kind. It is absolute nonsense to say that. The law does not prohibit a man betting at the present time; or, if it does, the law is not enforced.

There is no reason at all why betting at coursing meetings should not be allowed by the Bill, and I hope that hon. members opposite will look at the question from a sensible point of view. I appeal to them all. I am quite sure that those members on the Government side who have participated in the sport of coursing—and some have participated in it as long as I have, and that is a good many years—know that everything I am saying is correct, and that coursing is the finest and cleanest sport in the world, and just as much entitled to recognition as horseracing. It is absolutely outrageous that we should debar any person betting at a coursing meeting while we allow people to bet on proprietary racecourses.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I am afraid that the amendment of the hon. member for Cunningham comes too late. The hon. member should have moved that when the definition of "race meeting" in the previous paragraph was being considered.

Mr. DEACON: I could not call a coursing meeting a race meeting. Later on I intend to move the following definition of "coursing meeting"—

"Coursing meeting"—Meeting in an enclosure whereon only coursing is held."

There will be several consequential amendments.

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid the amendment is not relevant, and on that account I must rule it out of order.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): Coursing is racing. Two dogs can race, two men can race, or two anything can race, and the definition of "racing club" might include the racing of dogs or anything else.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Is the hon. member going to move that my ruling be disagreed to?

Mr. MORGAN: I do not propose to do that, but I am supporting the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have ruled that the amendment is out of order.

Mr. MORGAN: There is a good deal in the contention of the hon. member that the Minister has not provided for betting in connection with coursing.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member cannot discuss the question of coursing, as I have ruled the amendment out of order.

Mr. MORGAN: I am not discussing the amendment. I am discussing the definition of "racing club," and I express regret that the Minister has not included coursing within the scope of that definition.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MORGAN: Very well; I can get it in on page 4.

Mr. ROBERTS (*East Toowoomba*): There appears to be some doubt as to what this Bill is intended to control. I take it that the Minister will say that it only has to do with horseracing and has nothing to do with coursing or pedestrian racing.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: That is so.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*): When the Bill becomes law it will be impossible for a bookmaker to carry on his calling at any other race meetings than those stipulated. There is no provision for him to operate in connection with coursing.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: There is no provision now.

Mr. CORSER: There is nothing to stop him to-day from betting at a pigeon match, at footracing, or at coursing, but when this Bill becomes law I understand he will be prevented from carrying on his calling anywhere except on a racecourse. The interjection by the Minister to a certain extent misleads the Committee, because we are restricting the operations of the bookmaker. As the Minister seems to be somewhat doubtful in the matter, he should also make provision in connection with coursing, pigeon matches, and footracing, as well as registered horseracing. This may be an inopportune time to bring it forward.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Why not include ping-pong?

Mr. CORSER: The hon. gentleman can speak for himself and his own sport. I am very serious about the matter, and when we have an hon. member who certainly has a knowledge of coursing—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will not allow any discussion on coursing, as I have ruled the amendment out of order.

Mr. CORSER: I do not intend to do more than refer to—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member will be out of order in referring to it.

Mr. CORSER: I do not intend to refer to coursing at all. (Laughter.) The Minister might broaden the Bill to include some of these sports that have been suggested and which I do not intend to mention again. It appears that the Bill is a kind of kill-joy business, and is going to place in the hands of the Minister the power to prevent bookmakers from attending sporting meetings. A man cannot go outside and enjoy a pigeon match or anything else without being bound by regulations, and bookmakers cannot go there at all.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: They cannot go there now.

Mr. CORSER: They do go now.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It is illegal.

Mr. CORSER: Why not make it legal and not try to make criminals of people who are out for a bit of sport? There is no harm in any betting that goes on at pigeon matches, and there is no harm in the other sports that I do not propose to mention. (Laughter.) We might make provision now to legalise this business that is going on as a sport that is quite genuine and is enjoyed by quite a number of the best members of our sporting community, giving them an opportunity of betting legally and not giving the Minister power to come down on them with a sledge hammer.

Hon. F. T. BRENNAN: Did you hear what the leader of the Opposition said about sports?

Hon. J. G. APPEL: He referred to ferrets.

Mr. CORSER: I do not know what the hon. gentleman is talking about. I am making a reasonable request, and I hope the Minister will not have an opportunity of coming down on these sporting clubs who carry on betting in a decent way.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): I beg to move the insertion, after the word "meetings," on line 27, page 2, of the words—

"and whose accounts are submitted as prescribed by the regulations to the Auditor-General for examination and report."

If the amendment is made, it will mean that all racing clubs, whether they consist of an individual or individuals, will each year be compelled to submit their accounts to the Auditor-General so that they may be audited by a Government official. We must look upon racing as a business that can be run at a profit, and, if money is being made out of racing, the Government are justified in ascertaining how that money is being spent. We should know just what profits are being made and how those profits are being disposed of. The information would be of interest to Queensland and to those who support racing, and therefore the Minister cannot justly refuse to accept the amendment. At the present time local authorities and other bodies have to submit their accounts to the Auditor-General for examination, and there is no reason why racing clubs should not do the same. In some instances the funds of racing clubs have been misappropriated, and this amendment will be a check on the misappropriation of the funds of racing clubs. Even in the country districts the books of the racing club can be audited by the audit inspector when he is in the district, and there need be no expense attaching to it except to clubs carrying on business in a very large way, which can well afford to pay the expense incurred.

Mr. DASH: What is wrong with the clubs appointing auditors themselves.

Mr. MORGAN: All the genuine clubs present a balance-sheet at the annual meeting and a member can ask what questions he likes, but that is not so with the individual. He runs the club for gain, and the public know nothing whatever about the profits. We should know what profits are made and how they are disposed of.

Mr. CONROY: What individual do you refer to?

Mr. MORGAN: I refer to any individual who is running a club for profit. I refer to

Mr. Morgan.]

any number of individuals running a club for profit and putting the money into their own pockets and not using it for the improvement of thoroughbred horses or for improving the grounds and conveniences for the public. There is any amount of profit made in the racing game that is used only to enrich certain individuals.

Mr. CONROY: Where are they?

Mr. MORGAN: I mention your friend, Mr. John Wren.

Mr. CONROY: I do not know him. Do not call him my friend.

Mr. MORGAN: He is evidently backing the hon. member and his party. It is he whom I am referring to. I want to say straight out that at the present time there are several of these clubs in Brisbane, and we are told by people who know—it has been made public in the Press time after time—that at least £50,000 profit a year is made by one proprietary club and that money is going out of the State. We have a right to know whether that is correct or not. We have a right to be able to audit the books of that [8.30 p.m.] club and to know whether the money is going out of the State and not being expended for the development of the resources of the country. If it is being taken out of the State, it is doing an injury to the State and to the crowds who go to the races at the week-ends and lose money which is not being used for the benefit of the State but going away to other parts of Australia.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You are a subscriber.

Mr. MORGAN: I am a subscriber like yourself. I would subscribe more money if I knew that it was going to be used for beneficial purposes. I hope that the Minister will accept the amendment; I do not think he can conscientiously refuse it. In connection with all the measures which the Government have brought in for some considerable time they have been out to try and get knowledge. We have the same thing in connection with the trust accounts of auctioneers and numerous other businesses carried on by private enterprise. We provide that accounts must be kept and audited each year. This is not a new thing, as it has already been introduced in connection with other businesses in the State. The Minister cannot say that it is establishing a precedent that has not already been established by the present Government. A club represented by one man who reaps all the profit is a bogus club.

Mr. FOLEY: Are there any around Brisbane?

Mr. MORGAN: Of course there are some around Brisbane.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It is a proprietary business.

Mr. MORGAN: Exactly: it is a proprietary business. The hon. member for Leichhardt appears to be somewhat innocent, but he understands the matter as well as I do. He probably would like to have some of the profits of the proprietary racing that goes on in and around Brisbane.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Has this been done in any other State of the Commonwealth?

[Mr. Morgan.]

Mr. MORGAN: This State has established precedents which no other State in the Commonwealth has established, and the Labour Government pride themselves on it, but because no other State has done it that is no argument why it should not be done here. Hon. members opposite say that, if a thing is right, it should be done whether it is or is not done anywhere else in the world. I am with the Government in establishing precedents which are good, but not those which I do not believe in. Although it cannot be discovered that a certain reform has been brought about in any other part of the world, if it is a good reform the Government will deserve every credit for being the first to bring it about. This amendment has not come from the Government benches—if it had it would no doubt have been carried unanimously—but, as it has not come from the Government benches, the Government will probably say that they do not intend to accept it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Why did your party allow these interests to be established here?

Mr. MORGAN: I am not responsible for what my grandfather or great-grandfather did. Proprietary racing was here before I came to Queensland, and Mr. Wren was here also. I consistently objected to it, even when I was on the Government side of the House.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I read the paper you used to have in Victoria. Why did you not object to Wren then? (Laughter.)

Mr. MORGAN: I heard too much about John Wren when I was in Victoria.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the hon. member will discuss the amendment.

Mr. MORGAN: In those days there was no proprietary racing in Victoria. I hope that the amendment will be accepted by the Minister.

Mr. GLEDSON (*Ipswich*): I ask your ruling, Mr. Kirwan, as to whether the amendment is in order. The clause we are considering deals with the definition of a "racing club," while the amendment proposes to lay down the duties of a racing club.

The CHAIRMAN: The clause contains the definition of a "racing club," and the hon. member for Murilla proposes to add to that definition the words—

"and whose accounts are submitted as prescribed by the regulations to the Auditor-General for examination and report."

I therefore think that the point of order cannot be sustained.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinders*): I am not going to accept the amendment, because it is really absurd. If I accepted it, it would really have no effect. The amendment reads—

"and whose accounts are submitted as prescribed by the regulations to the Auditor-General."

If I allowed that to go in, and we do not provide for it by regulations, it would have no effect. (Opposition dissent.) The hon. member is going the wrong way to get what he wants. The amendment, as he proposed it, means nothing. We would have to consent to some regulations being made in order to

carry out the proposal. I think that the club represented by the hon. member would be the first to object to this interference by the Government.

Mr. MORGAN: I do not represent any club.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The country clubs particularly would be harassed at being asked to submit accounts to the Auditor-General. As I have said repeatedly, this is not a Bill to control racing but a taxation measure. All we propose to do is to secure from racing a certain amount of taxation, and racing will continue to exist as it did before the imposition of the taxation. I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): I really must take exception to the excuses offered by the Minister.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Not excuses; they are arguments.

Mr. VOWLES: The hon. gentleman has kept away from the main point and given us a side issue to deal with. The Auditor-General's officers inspect the books of racing clubs in the country to-day. There is no reason why we should not be able to see how the profits made during the year have been disposed of. If we are going to allow a monopoly on the part of one or two individuals in Queensland with respect to private racing, it is only a fair thing that the public should know what profits are being made, and whether they are being expended in the direction for which racing is sanctioned by the public—that is, for the giving of comforts to the general public and the giving of prizes to encourage the breeding of horses with stamina. When a man carries on a public undertaking and takes large sums of money out of Queensland, then I say the Minister's excuse is a poor one to offer. We do not know what income tax he pays, but we do know that some time ago somebody was prosecuted for a leakage of information in connection with his returns.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): I want to support the amendment. It is only a reasonable one. The Government have insisted that all sorts of organisations—charitable institutions, and so on—should have their books audited by the Auditor-General simply because the public interests are concerned, and I think it only reasonable that racing clubs which conduct amusements for the people on which large sums of money are expended should have to submit their accounts also to the Auditor-General for report. I believe that even the Eight Hour Art Union has to submit its accounts to the Auditor-General. We have had hon. members opposite declaiming against all sorts of practices that go on in connection with racing, and there is nothing unreasonable in the amendment, and to say that the Queensland Turf Club would be one of the first to object to it has no bearing on the matter at all. It does not matter whether a club or an individual objects. We want to see whether the money is expended for the benefit of racing or whether it goes into the pockets of individuals. We know that the way in which some clubs are conducted leaves a great deal to the imagination of the people, and all sorts of rumours go about by which suspicion is engendered in the minds of people who attend the meetings. The Government insist upon the submission of accounts for audit in cases where the urgency is not

nearly so great as in the case of large clubs such as the amendment affects. We know perfectly well the numbers of people who attend and that great sums of money are spent. The public are told how it is spent by some clubs, and there is no reason why they should not know how it is spent by other clubs. Why should we not have the information, unless the reason is that it is going to touch the susceptibilities of a few friends of the Government? Why should we have to submit to such a position because there are certain individuals or companies about whose distribution of funds the Government want us to remain in ignorance? Why should we have these facts hidden from the people of the State? I think it is only right they should be disclosed, and the Minister has submitted no reason—he has submitted a very lame excuse—as to why the people should be kept in the dark. We know perfectly well that, so far as many of these meetings are concerned, not one-tenth of the money that passes through the hands of the people controlling them goes towards the improvement of racing. We know, for instance, that the whole of the prize money comes from book-makers because of the exorbitant fees they are charged, and it is only reasonable that, when there is a suspicion that abuses are going on, we should have a public record each year as to the amount of money collected and where it goes to, and that we should know exactly the position of these clubs.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): I desire to support the amendment. The Attorney-General must recognise that already the Auditor-General examines the accounts of racing clubs to confirm the totalisator returns, so that there should be no objection to the amendment. The only difference between the existing law and the amendment is the addition of the word "report"; and if the Auditor-General, as a public officer, finds it necessary to examine the books of a club, it is only right that he should report to the people. Racing is different from an ordinary business. It is in the nature of a public function, and none of the considerations mentioned by the Attorney-General should override the public interest. The Minister will be well advised to see that everything connected with racing is aboveboard and that the Auditor-General or his officers make periodical inspections and reports. I hope the Attorney-General will not take up the attitude that this is a party question. It is above any consideration of party, and the amendment does not depart in any way from any principle in the Bill. It merely adds to the Bill, and makes it a better one and helps to provide that racing shall be carried out as it ought to be carried out. The Attorney-General would be well advised to insist on reports as to the larger racing clubs, at any rate. Members of genuine clubs are entitled to see annual reports, and individuals who patronise other racing bodies should be entitled to the same information.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*): I desire to support the amendment also. I do not see why one racing club should object to having its books audited by the Auditor-General when other racing clubs publish their accounts and annual reports. You can see them in the daily papers, and why should not such clubs know just what the others are making? I never dreamed for one moment that the Minister would object to the amendment, which

Mr. Deacon.]

is merely designed to give us all the information we can get. Why should the racing public, who attend proprietary race meetings in particular, not be able to see how the funds are used? Are not the horseowners affected? I have seen letters in the papers time after time asking how much the proprietary racing clubs make by their racing. We hear over and over again of proprietary clubs giving very small prizes and making huge profits. Why should not the facts be known? We should have the information as to just how much they make.

Mr. EDWARDS (*Nanango*): I intend to support the amendment. It is a very fair and reasonable one, and one which the Minister would be well advised to accept for more reasons than one. If the books of the racing clubs are inspected by the Auditor-General, that will at least create confidence. If the Minister wishes to make this a successful measure, he cannot do other than accept the amendment. I agree with what has been said by other hon. members on this side, and I trust that the Minister will give the question serious consideration. He has not yet accepted one amendment, and he might very reasonably accept this one.

Mr. FRY (*Kurilpa*): I still believe that, if the Minister gives the matter due consideration, he will accept the amendment. There is nothing in it that is likely to embarrass the Government or impose any extra duty on the Government or do any damage to the State. In view of the circumstances connected with racing, where public funds are expended, I think that the officials would welcome an amendment of this kind. If the reasons given by the Minister as to why he cannot accept the amendment are the only objections, then there is no reason why he should not accept it. One of his reasons was that he would have to consent to a regulation. Of course he would have to consent to a regulation if this Chamber ordered it. We know that if the amendment is accepted the Minister must make the necessary regulations. That is not a valid reason against the acceptance of the amendment. The other excuse advanced by the Minister was that this is a taxation measure. Of course it is. Seeing that it is a taxation measure, what objection can there be to the Auditor-General examining the books of these clubs? If it is true that £50,000 per annum is leaving this State and going into other States, then we should know it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the hon. gentleman will not be guilty of tedious repetition. That is about the fifth time that I have heard that statement.

Mr. FRY: I have not said it before.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman is repeating what other hon. members have said, and he cannot do that.

Mr. FRY: I do not intend to—I have enough original stuff of my own. (Laughter.) I appeal to the Minister to accept this reasonable amendment. If he does not do so, then we must come to the conclusion that he has something to hide. I ask the Minister to put country before party and before individuals, and consider the finances of the State and accept the amendment.

[*Mr. Deacon.*]

Question—That the words proposed to be inserted (*Mr. Morgan's amendment*) be so inserted—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 21.

Mr. Appel	Mr. King
„ Barnes, G. P.	„ Logan
„ Bell	„ Maxwell
„ Brand	„ Moore
„ Corser	„ Morgan
„ Deacon	„ Nott
„ Edwards	„ Roberts
„ Elphinstone	„ Swayne
„ Fry	„ Taylor
„ Kelso	„ Wowles
„ Kerr	

Tellers: Mr. Brand and Mr. Nott.

NOES, 23.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Hynes
„ Bertram	„ Jones
„ Brennan	„ Land
„ Bulcock	„ Lloyd
„ Collins	„ McCormack
„ Conroy	„ McLachlan
„ Cooper, W.	„ Mullan
„ Dash	„ Payne
„ Dunstan	„ Pease
„ Ferricks	„ Ryan
„ Foley	„ Smith
„ Gilday	„ Weir
„ Gillies	„ Wilson
„ Gledson	„ Winstanley
„ Huxham	

Tellers: Mr. Foley and Mr. Gledson.

PAIRS:

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Clayton	Mr. Theodore
„ Warren	„ Bartley
„ Costello	„ Stoford
„ Petrie	„ Larcombe
„ Barnes, W. H.	„ Wright

Resolved in the negative.

[9 p.m.]

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*): I would like to ask your ruling, Mr. Chairman, on a further amendment I am going to move, on line 47, page 2, to insert the words—

“ ‘ Coursing Enclosure ’—An enclosure whereon only coursing contests are held.”

I am not proposing to include coursing contests under this Bill, but I propose to move a consequential amendment so that betting at coursing meetings will not be prohibited.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: That amendment is outside the scope of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I shall have to rule the amendment out of order, as it is not relevant.

Mr. MORGAN: It is a Betting Bill.

Mr. DEACON: The preamble of the Bill, which is certainly a Betting Bill, reads—

“ To impose certain taxes in connection with bookmakers and for other purposes.”

The Bill prohibits betting at all places excepting racecourses.

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid that the same reasons I gave in connection with the amendment moved by the hon. gentleman previously stand good on this occasion. This is a Bill dealing with betting on horse-races on racecourses, and for that reason the amendment suggested by the hon. member is not relevant.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): I would like to point out in connection with the question raised by the hon. member for Cunningham that the preamble of the Bill reads—

“ To impose certain taxes in connection

with bookmakers and betting and certain restrictions on bookmakers and betting."

Bookmakers and betting may take place at a coursing match on a racecourse. The Bill imposes a tax on bookmakers betting on racecourses.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is not in order unless he intends to move that my ruling be disagreed with.

Mr. MORGAN: I am not going that far.

Clause 2, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 3—"Tax on bookmakers"—

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): I beg to move the insertion after the word "lit," on line 22, page 4, of the following new sub-clause:—

"(3) Every person who desires to obtain from a racing club a permit to act as a bookmaker shall lodge with his application a fidelity bond in a prescribed amount, not exceeding five hundred pounds, from the State Insurance Commissioner or other prescribed security."

There is no need to labour the matter, as the amendment speaks for itself. The Government, having legalised racing, should give the bookmaker the right to sue for his debts and also the right to be sued. The Government have not thought fit to make that provision in the Bill. If every commission agent, auctioneer, and every trustee handling public moneys has to provide a fidelity bond of £500, or such sum as may be deemed necessary, security should also be required of a man holding a permit as a bookmaker to satisfy the public as to his bona fides.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinders*): I cannot accept the amendment. In the first place—although I am not using this as the principal argument—it increases the burden of taxation on the bookmaker. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. MAXWELL: What about the burden on the auctioneers?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I am only pointing out that fact to those hon. members opposite who seem concerned about the tax being too high. I am not concerned. The real reason why I object to the amendment, as I have stated again and again to-night, is because this is not a Control of Racing Bill.

Mr. KERR: Unfortunately.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: If any security of this kind is advisable, it is the duty of the clubs to obtain it. One of the functions of the clubs is to issue permits, and they can then obtain a bond as to the bona fides of the bookmaker if they think it necessary. It is not necessary for the Government to interfere with this function of the clubs any more than it is for them to interfere with the hundred and one other things connected with racing. If this was a Control of Racing Bill the amendment might be considered.

Mr. VOWLES: Doesn't the same argument apply to auctioneers and commission agents?

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): The Government pride themselves on protecting the people from those who are out to defraud. If they

were sincere, they would accept this amendment, because the bond could be used to pay those who legally enter into a bet with a bookmaker in case he defaults. The Government are now legalising betting on racecourses, but they are taking no measures to protect the public. They should allow the bookmaker to sue if the punter does not pay his debts, and the punter to sue the bookmaker if he fails in his obligations. The Government are now legalising the business of betting, but while obtaining revenue from it they will not protect the bookmaker from the unscrupulous punter or the punter from the unscrupulous bookmaker. I say the Government are not sincere in their protestations, and that their statement that they are out to protect the public is wrong. An auctioneer who may not handle a shilling and who is employed by a firm is compelled to take out a fidelity bond to the extent of £500. No money may pass through his hands; he merely sells the commodities and the money passes through his firm's books, yet he has to take out this fidelity bond. The same applies to shire clerks, solicitors, and numerous other people. We know that a bookmaker may have thousands of pounds belonging to other people in his bag. He may close that bag and go off the course and not pay anyone anything. The police cannot interfere, and the Government cannot interfere. The same thing applies to the punter, who can go to the racecourse, book a bet for £1,000 and walk off the course if he loses that bet. That is not British fairplay. You must protect both the bookmaker and his client. You protect them in connection with other matters; why not do so now? The Government are now making betting lawful and are getting a revenue from it. I consider therefore that the Attorney-General should accept this amendment. Further, I think he should move for the insertion of a new clause giving the bookmaker or his client the right to sue if money is not paid. They would then both get fair treatment.

Mr. KERR (*Enaggera*): I trust that the Attorney-General will accept this amendment. It has been pointed out time and again to-night that this Bill is now legalising the occupation of bookmakers on racecourses.

At 9.13 p.m.,

Mr. DUNSTAN (*Gympie*), one of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, relieved the Chairman in the chair.

Mr. KERR: It has been mentioned that betting was previously illegal. It was not. It was merely a case of there not being a law that had to be carried out. In this Bill we are dealing with the occupation of bookmaker and making it a legal occupation. It is necessary to protect people who are investing their money with bookmakers. They desire a legalised occupation, and if the bookmaker is protected in this way it is only fair to protect the sporting public. The public pay for all the horses, the prize money, and the expenses of the jockey and trainer—in fact, they pay for everything in connection with racing. When we are asking the Committee to give reasonable security to the public the Attorney-General does not feel inclined to accept the amendment, but is inclined to reject it without giving a reasonable argument for its rejection. It is a small matter to ask for a guarantee to the extent of only £500, but it will give the bookmaker the sense of security which is

Mr. Kerr.]

necessary, and he will be pleased to pay for it. I trust that the Attorney-General will not continue his attitude of having divisions on these small amendments. This particular one is to safeguard the public, and I hope that he will accept it.

Mr. CONROY (*Maranoa*): It is all very well so far as insisting on a bond for Brisbane bookmakers is concerned, but what about country bookmakers?

Mr. MORGAN: Why should they not pay? Country auctioneers have to take out a bond.

Mr. CONROY: You are asking a country bookmaker to take out the same bond as the city bookmaker. What about the small man?

Mr. MAXWELL: What about the small auctioneers? They have to pay.

Mr. CONROY: I have had a considerable experience in racing, and I think that the bookmaker should be protected against some of the punters.

Mr. MORGAN: Why not give them power to sue?

Mr. CONROY: You may look back as far as you like, and I guarantee that in nine cases out of ten the unfortunate bookmaker has been mulcted by absconding punters. A man goes on the racecourse, goes up to the bookmaker, and books his bet. If he wins he is paid. If he loses he may abscond without paying.

Mr. MORGAN: Why not protect the bookmaker? You are not doing much to-night. You have not yet moved an amendment.

Mr. CONROY: You are asking the bookmaker to put up a fidelity guarantee bond. If you want a fidelity guarantee bond, you should make the punter put it up.

Mr. KERR interjected.

Mr. CONROY: I do not wish to be personal, but, if the hon. member for Enoggera went to the racecourse to-morrow and had no money, he could go to a bookmaker and book his bet. The bookmaker would pay him if he won, but I do not say that the hon. member would not pay if he lost.

Mr. KERR: Would he book the bet?

Mr. CONROY: Of course he would. I am very pleased that the Attorney-General will not accept this amendment.

Mr. KING (*Logan*): I hope that the Attorney-General will accept the amendment, and in a few words I shall try to show why. If the Government are going to be consistent, they should accept the amendment. They have demanded a fidelity bond from auctioneers. They demand a fidelity guarantee bond from solicitors, from trustees, and from anybody holding trust money, and everyone must admit that a bookmaker is holding trust money. I think a bookmaker ought to come under the Trust Funds Act. He is holding trust property for the most part for himself and a little for the man who is betting, but it is all trust money. The Government, to be consistent, ought to accept the amendment, more particularly as neither the bookmaker nor the punter has recourse one against the other. A defaulting trustee, a defaulting auctioneer, or a defaulting solicitor can be sued, but you cannot sue an absconding bookmaker or an absconding punter.

The position is ever so much stronger in the case of persons who come under this Bill

[*Mr. Kerr.*

than it is in the cases that have already been provided for by Act of Parliament, and I ask the Minister in all fairness to be consistent with the actions of the Government in the past and accept the amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windoor*): I certainly think the Minister should accept the amendment. The latter portion of it is going to help the State Insurance Office, but apart altogether from that there should be some protection for the people who invest money with a bookmaker.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: In 90 per cent. of the cases the bookmaker trusts the public.

Mr. TAYLOR: I do not think so.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR: I think the bookmaker is amply protected, because he has the money in hand.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: In the case of big bets they are not paid until two days after the race.

Mr. TAYLOR: The big bets do not represent the whole of the betting carried on on racecourses.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Ninety per cent. of it.

Mr. TAYLOR: I am quite satisfied that this is only a taxation measure. It is not brought forward to purify racing or to make it better or safer for the public. It is absolutely and purely for taxation purposes, and not to raise the status of racing in any shape or form. The amendment is one that should be accepted.

Amendment (*Mr. Fowles*) negatived.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): Subclause (4) reads—

“Any person who carries on business or acts as a bookmaker—

(i.) Elsewhere than on a racecourse: . . . shall be guilty of an offence against this Act, and be liable to a penalty not exceeding £50.”

Is the Minister going to wink at all bets made at other places, such as pigeon matches, coursing, bicycle races, footraces, and so on, or is he going to take steps to stop it? When the hon. member for Cunningham brought up the question of betting on coursing, the Minister said things would be no different from what they are at present. If the Government are going to pass an Act to legalise betting on racecourses, they are going to make it illegal in all other places, and, if they are then going to wink their eye and not see that the law is carried out, it is a disgraceful state of affairs. Is the law going to be enforced, or is it not? Apparently, if a bookmaker makes a bet on a footrace or a bicycle race, nothing is going to be done. If we pass an Act and are not going to enforce it, it is only going to encourage law-breaking in the community. In certain cases laws have been passed which have been almost impossible to carry out, and the Government have winked their eye at it. I want to know whether the Minister is going to see that the law is carried out. If we are going to pass a law and allow the people to break it with impunity, we are going to breed a race who will think the law is of no value. That is a bad state of affairs, and I am sorry the Minister will not accept an amendment

which would legalise this class of betting. Is the Minister prepared to say whether the Government are prepared to stop this illegal betting, or whether they are going to allow it to continue?

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): I think the point raised by the hon. member for Aubigny is a very important one. Does the Minister intend, when this Bill becomes law, to prosecute if a bet is made elsewhere than on a racecourse? The clause distinctly states that any person who carries on business or acts as a bookmaker elsewhere than on a racecourse shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable to a fine of £50. Does the Minister intend to carry out that provision, or is he going to wink the other eye and allow bookmaking to be carried on in the streets, in lanes, in shops, or anywhere else? If he is going to do that, the quicker he makes it known the better, and then this Bill will cease to be of any use, because he will not be able to get any taxation from these individuals. In connection with coursing, there is a most important meeting

[9.30 p.m.] known as the Waterloo Cup, which is held in the different States in rotation. The dogs and their owners come from all parts of Australia to the different localities. When this Bill becomes law and the Waterloo Cup is set down to be held in Brisbane, as this is the only State which prohibits betting at coursing meetings, people will not come here.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: That is not right. Where is it legal to bet in the other States?

Mr. MORGAN: It is legal to bet in every other State in Australia.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: You are wrong.

Hon. F. T. BRENNAN: To-day it is not legal to bet anywhere in Queensland.

Mr. MORGAN: The point I want to make is that this Bill is going to make it legal to bet on racecourses and illegal to bet anywhere else.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It always has been so.

Mr. MORGAN: There has never been a prosecution of a bookmaker for betting on a racecourse. This Bill is going to make it legal to bet on a racecourse, but nowhere else. Is the Minister going to allow betting to take place in other places? If so, what is the good of passing a Bill such as this? I move the insertion, after the word "racecourse" on line 33, of the words—

"or coursing enclosure."

It will then read—

"Any person who carries on business or acts as a bookmaker—

(i.) Elsewhere than on a racecourse or coursing enclosure: or"

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: That has been ruled out of order.

Mr. MORGAN: This Bill imposes taxation in connection with bookmakers and betting. I want bookmakers to be able to bet on a coursing enclosure. That has not been ruled out of order. If it is not legalised and the Minister allows betting to take place on a coursing enclosure, it will escape scot free. There will be no taxation of a bookmaker who bets on a coursing enclosure. If the Minister does not intend bookmaking to be carried on except on a racecourse, why does he not make it illegal to bet on a Plumpton?

It is ever so much fairer than horseracing. Owners will not bring their dogs into Queensland from Victoria and other States for the Waterloo Cup if betting is not allowed.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: You do not understand the clause.

Mr. MORGAN: The clause reads—

"Any person who carries on business or acts as a bookmaker—

(i.) Elsewhere than on a racecourse."

A bookmaker cannot carry on his calling in any other place than a racecourse, otherwise he is subject to a penalty of £50.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is the law now.

Mr. MORGAN: Has it ever been enforced? A bookmaker has never yet been prosecuted for betting on a racecourse, at a sports meeting, or on a coursing enclosure which is not a racecourse.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: He could have been.

Mr. MORGAN: Then the Government have been condoning an offence against the law.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: What would you have done?

Mr. MORGAN: I am prepared to say that we should either legalise betting or stop it. If we stop betting, I would prosecute every person who broke the law, no matter who he was. On the other hand, if I thought it was right to legalise betting, I would legalise it. I never want to become a Minister if I have to administer one law for one man and another law for another man. We want a law for all sections of the community. I do not want to be in a position where I have to say that because a man has a certain amount of influence or backing I must wink my eye at what he does, but if he is a poor, unfortunate devil without friends, the law is to be enforced. Coursing is a good sport, and I want it to be included in the clause.

Hon. F. T. BRENNAN: It is a cruel sport.

Mr. MORGAN: The hon. member who says that knows nothing about it. Only about one hare in every fifteen or twenty is ever caught.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You do not consider everybody. You consider only your own sport.

Mr. MORGAN: I try to be fair to all classes of the community.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: What about pigeon shooting?

Mr. MORGAN: If pigeon shooters want to bet, and they approach the Government and the Government decide in their favour, well and good. I am merely asking that coursing men be included. If anybody else wants to include pigeon shooting, he can include it; I do not see any harm in it. This afternoon I asked the Minister to legalise betting in Tattersall's Club, and to make a charge of, say, £500 for a license.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Why not somebody else's club?

Mr. MORGAN: We all recognise that there has to be some particular place for that kind of betting—the home of the bookmaker, as it were. According to the Minister's argument, why should we not let everybody sell strong drink?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Why not, according to your argument?

Mr. Morgan.]

Mr. MORGAN: We have to set apart particular places for selling liquor—places where you can control the sale. I am not one of those who think that we are going to become Simon Pures and do away with betting altogether. The hon. member never heard me say that we could do away with betting or a number of other things which are often attacked. I say that we should control them. We should control liquor, and we should control betting. At any rate, I move the amendment I have already outlined.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: In view of the fact that amendments on the definition clause dealing with coursing have been ruled out of order, I must rule the hon. member's amendment out of order also.

Mr. TAYLOR: (*Windsor*): I think we are entitled to hear from the Minister something as to the intentions of the Government in carrying out the provisions of this measure. I am quite satisfied that it does not restrict "two-up," as it is played in the lanes and by-ways of the city, in any shape or form. That will go on uninterruptedly in the future as in the past. The Bill is designed specially to meet the case of bookmakers and betting on racescourses. We are asked to pass a Bill to prohibit betting anywhere else than on racescourses, and we know perfectly well that a tremendous amount is carried on outside racescourses at present—in clubs, in the street, and in other places. It seems to me that we are asked to pass a Bill which the Government have no intention of enforcing, except that part of it which is going to bring in revenue. I think we are entitled to know that. If the Government are sincere, we have a right to know, and if they are not sincere, we have a right to know that. We want to know whether the Minister is going to make any attempt to administer the Act and stop the betting that takes place in the various betting clubs that have meetings of their members where the card is called for the various races. If he is not, he might as well tear the Bill up and say that we are a lot of fools for coming here and considering the matter at all.

Clause 3 put and passed.

Clauses 4, 5, and 6, put and passed.

Clause 7—"Fractions."

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): I beg to move the omission of the word "sixpence" on line 52, with a view to inserting the word "threepence." At the present time the Totalisator Company pays as low as 3d. to the investors, and I think it is reasonable to continue that practice. At one time fractions of 1s. were retained by the company, but the Government saw fit to take those fractions, and then the company paid as low as 3d. to the investors. The Government now propose to wipe out the present practice, and collect every fraction less than 6d. I want to draw the Minister's attention to the fact that the Totalisator Company is already paying 13½ per cent. in the cities and 15 per cent. in the country. In 1920 I asked a question as to how much the fractions of 1s. amounted to, and I was told that they amounted to £7,994 5s. 5d. in twelve months. That means taking from the people an additional £8,000, and if the Government are going to collect all fractions less than 6d., it means they will collect £16,000, which is a fairly large sum to be collected as fractions. I think the Minister should allow the investors to receive the fractions of 1s. above 3d.

[*Mr. Morgan.*]

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinders*): I am sorry that I cannot accept the amendment. On the second reading of the Bill I explained that the Government had been collecting fractions less than 3d. for some time, but there was a time in Queensland before we took charge of affairs when no fraction of 1s. was paid by the totalisator, and the Government decided to collect all fractions of 1s. less than 3d.

At 9.45 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Kirwan, *Brisbane*) resumed the chair.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: We find that Tasmania, New Zealand, and New South Wales take all the fractions up to 6d. It is fair that we should impose our tax on the same lines. In Western Australia and South Australia no fractions of 1s. are paid. This means that those States collect exactly double what we propose to do. This may not seem an important matter to the hon. member, but it will inflict a loss of taxation on the Government of over £8,000. The racing community can well afford to pay it. I am striking the average at 6d.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): I do not think that the Minister was quite right in stating that the Government were responsible for reducing the fractions from 1s. to 3d. The Government came in and took the fractions of 1s., which were previously held by the Totalisator Company, who then announced that they were going to pay to the nearest 3d. The company then only handed the Government over the fractions of 3d. The Government therefore cannot claim that they were responsible for the dividends being paid down to 3d.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: We did bring it about.

Mr. KERR: The Totalisator Company thought that, rather than pay it to the Government, it was fairer to pay it to the investors. I am proceeding on the practice that obtains in the other States.

Amendment (*Mr. Kerr*) negatived.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*): I beg to move the omission, after the word "paid," on line 17, page 7, of the word "on," with a view to inserting the words—

"within one week of."

It is quite possible that a person holding a totalisator ticket might be able to produce it the next day.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: That is the practice obtaining at the present time. Nobody is ever refused the dividend if the ticket is produced. There is no necessity whatever for the amendment.

Mr. DEACON: With the permission of the Committee, I will withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 7 put and passed.

Clauses 8, 9, and 10 put and passed.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported the Bill with amendments.

The third reading of the Bill was made an Order of the Day for Friday next.

The House adjourned at 9.51 p.m.