




Speech by

Jarrold Bleijie

MEMBER FOR KAWANA

Hansard Tuesday, 14 February 2012

CHARITABLE AND NON-PROFIT GAMING (TWO-UP) AMENDMENT BILL AND CRIMINAL CODE (ANZAC DAY BETTING) AMENDMENT BILL

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (9.22 pm), in reply: I thank all honourable members for their contributions to the cognate debate on these two bills. In relation to my private member's bill, which amends the Criminal Code, I note that members opposite have talked about minors playing two-up. The private member's bill that I introduced was quite prescriptive in terms of playing on 25 April—one day a year—at a celebration to commemorate Anzac Day and I also kept the normal provisions as currently prescribed under the Liquor Act 1992 in relation to what is a licensed club or a licensed hotel. I did that for a reason. For instance, my uncle was the original owner of the Ettamogah Pub. It has Australia Day celebrations and it has Anzac Day celebrations. I thought that the simplest way was that, if people had been getting away with it anyway—and the Attorney is right; there have been no prosecutions—and for regional and rural hotels and pubs that may not have subbranches of RSLs, if the community gets together on the one day a year to commemorate Anzac Day I thought that they ought to have the right to play a game of two-up.

That is why we did it through the Criminal Code. That is why it is prescriptive to say it is for a celebration. It was not open slather for minors to go out every day of the year and have games of two-up and bet money on them. It was not that at all. It was prescribed as one day at a celebration to commemorate Anzac Day at a licensed pub or a licensed hotel. We did that because licensed hotels, pubs and clubs under the Liquor Act obviously have all of the provisions in relation to security so it would be in a contained environment. That is why we did it under the Criminal Code. I just wanted to explain that to members opposite in terms of this idea that minors were going to go rank at two-up games, because it was pretty prescriptive. As I said, both bills achieve an intent at the end that I accept. I do have issues with the regulation. The government's bill is certainly more burdensome in terms of RSLs, but at the end of the day they get an entrance fee so they make some money out of it and we envisage that diggers and men and women will receive more support from this. I thank all honourable members who contributed to the debate.