

From: [Matt G](#)
To: [LIA review](#)
Subject: LIA Review discussion submission
Date: Wednesday, 14 June 2017 4:16:22 PM

Hello,

I am writing to submit my thoughts to the discussion on the LIA review and whether it is an appropriate measure for harm minimisation with regards the NSW Gaming Industry. Let me start by stating that I am a problem gambler and completely reject the statistics that the government love to publish on the number of problem gamblers in NSW. In fact in the discussion paper itself you continue to push this lie - "While it is recognised that in NSW only 0.8 per cent of adults are classified as problem gamblers, approximately 3 per cent are moderate risk gamblers and 8 per cent low risk gamblers. Problem and moderate risk groups have been observed to gamble for longer sessions, participate in 5 or more gambling activities a year, and gamble for at least an hour at a time."

In the 2015/2016 financial year NSW pubs & clubs turned over more than \$74 billion in a population of 7757800 people. This amounts to every man, woman and child in NSW gambling \$9538.00 in that year. As children are not allowed to access gaming machines in NSW but are still counted in population data, the individual amount per man and woman spent on gaming machines skyrockets! According to your own methodology on what constitutes a problem gambler "participate in 5 or more gambling activities a year, and gamble for at least an hour at a time" the maths on those figures do not stand up to scrutiny. I can also say that in every venue I have been in on multiple occasions the VAST majority of people using the gaming machines are there for over an hour at a time, and participate in 5 or more sessions a fortnight - let alone a year. This is across all socio-economic demographics and different areas. Just because a doctor or lawyer has the financial capacity to gamble \$1000's in a session does not mean they don't have a problem - it only means the short term impacts are not as severe as someone on social security or low wages.

Question 1.

Absolutely not. Measuring impact by LGA areas totally disregards the fact that boundaries of subsequent LGA's can be literally a street next door. Impact should be measured by geographical area alone, such as a 3km radius around the venue to be truly accurate.

Question 2

Banding should be completely dismantled, as the points I made in my opening statement point to. Whether a person is on social welfare or a high level job, does not negate the chance that they are/could be problem gamblers.

Question 3

No, the methods used to determine levels of risk have always been flawed. Problem gamblers do not in general put their hands up and shout to the world "We have a problem". The amount of problem gamblers is vastly under-reported and cannot be adequately explained by flawed statistics, no matter how much the government enjoys getting the tax benefits from gaming machines. If you want to get at least halfway to the real story, forget pollsters and actually ask entities such as the Salvation Army and St Vincent De Paul in local areas. Let them inform you of the amount of food vouchers and other support they need to hand out each week.

Question 4.

Community consultation should only be amended due to the fact that there should be more of it. For those wishing to partake in the riches that gaming machines provide to complain that the system is too onerous is a complete joke.

Question 5

Sorry....had to read this question a couple of times to make sure you were actually serious. At 49 years of age I am yet to see any "positive contribution" gaming machine operators make to the general community that they didn't before. Perhaps except for the bottom line of the government's general revenue they have no positive contribution to society. The other factors commonly mentioned include jobs (not many needed to take care of automatic machines), tourism (don't make me laugh). A dubious one off payment that does not even come close to equaling the profit made by

a gaming venue in 1 year does not even come close to a "positive contribution". If there were payments stretched over 3 or 5 years then maybe you could begin arguing the point.

Question 6

There should be no exemptions whatsoever for an industry whose sole purpose is to make money off gamblers. If the government was truly serious about limiting the damage caused by problem gambling then perhaps they should introduce a taxation model for those businesses involved in gaming that equals the gamblers chance of winning the jackpot on a machine. As it stands the regime is basically a license for both the operator and the government to print money!

Due to the wholesale selloff of publicly owned businesses and assets by the governments of both persuasions, I hold no hope whatsoever of the government of the day to get serious about problem gamblers. They are far too addicted to the taxes gained by gaming machines to ever do anything about the problems, and perhaps they shouldn't even be involved in the decision making process due to the huge conflict of interest present. It's like asking the Obeid family to set rental rates for Circular Quay cafes and food businesses.

Regards,

Matt Gibson