Joint Select Committee on Gambling Reform

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Treasury Portfolio

15 February 2011

Question: I have a question for Treasury. A week or so ago this bubbled up in the media, I think in an article in the Australian Financial Review. Someone must have put in a freedom of information request, of which you may be aware; it led to an article, in the Australian Financial Review, I think. Much of it was black box. But, from the little bit that was not blacked out, it was quite clear that Treasury has come to the view that the implementation of a mandatory pre-commitment system will not – I cannot recall the exact words. In fact, I will correct myself. Treasury offered the opinion that the industry's claims were exaggerated. Does that ring a bell?

Topic: Problem Gambling

Hansard Page: GR 75 and 76

Answer:

In the recent freedom of information request from Mr Josh Gordon, the Treasury released a number of briefings and other advice on the Government's proposed gambling reforms.

In these documents Treasury discussed some of the claims put forward by industry bodies and the Productivity Commission on the possible impacts of the proposed reforms, including on employment and on contributions made by gambling venues to community groups. The evidence provided by Treasury to assess the industry's claims was based on the report from the Productivity Commission's Inquiry on Gambling (2010).

In terms of net employment effects, we note that the Productivity Commission's view is that the gambling industries do not create net employment benefits, because they divert employment from one part of the economy to another. Conversely, this argument suggests that the proposed reforms should not result in net job losses in the economy over the long-run.