

Legislative Council

Hansard

Tuesday 2 December 2025

The President, Mr Farrell, took the Chair at 11 a.m., acknowledged the Traditional People and read Prayers.

[excerpt...]

MOTION

Gambling Advertising at State-Owned and State-Funded Venues

[3.29 p.m.]

Ms WEBB (Nelson) - Mr President, I move -

That the Legislative Council:

- (1) notes that gambling harm in Tasmania remains significant, with annual poker machine losses alone exceeding \$190 million, and growing evidence linking exposure to gambling advertising with risky gambling behaviour and the grooming of children into gambling;
- (2) further notes the findings and recommendations of the Commonwealth House of Representatives Standing Committee on Social Policy and Legal Affairs in its 2023 report *You Win Some, You Lose More – Inquiry into Online Gambling and Its Impacts on Those Experiencing Gambling Harm*, particularly Recommendation 26, which calls for the Australian Government, with the cooperation of the states and territories, to implement a comprehensive ban on all forms of gambling advertising, including a 'prohibition on all in-stadia advertising and logos on players' uniforms';
- (3) recognises that governments have a clear public health responsibility to avoid promoting activities known to cause harm — just as occurred when tobacco advertising and sponsorship were banned to protect community wellbeing;
- (4) affirms that publicly owned venues should model this standard by prohibiting gambling advertising and sponsorship that normalise or glamorise wagering;
- (5) calls on the Government to:
 - (a) introduce, within one year of this resolution, a complete ban on gambling advertising and sponsorship at all state-owned or state-funded venues, including the proposed Macquarie Point Stadium, and on players' uniforms; and
 - (b) table a progress report within six months of this resolution on the implementation of the removal of gambling advertising from existing venues.

I rise to speak on motion 8 standing in my name relating to gambling advertising at state-owned and state-funded venues. We are a nation of sport lovers here in Australia. In fact, it can appear a bit like an obsession sometimes to those from other countries just how rabidly we are into sport. Barely any of us would blink when we hear observations that sport is part of the national psyche or that it informs our sense of identity.

We are proud that we punch above our weight on the international stage, such as at the Olympics and the Commonwealth Games, and particular codes such as cricket or rugby, and even as a state, Tasmania shares in this cultural tradition just as much as the rest of the nation and proudly we love our sport. At a community level, it's recognised that participating in or supporting local sports can foster a sense of belonging, improve fitness connectivity and provide mental health benefits.

We have a high sports participation rate as well as a strong supporter ethos and dedicated fan culture around sport. However, just as our nation is recognised globally as 'sports mad', Australia also records another, more dubious global reputation. Australians lose \$32 billion on legal forms of gambling each year, the highest per-capita gambling losses in the world.

According to the Grattan Institute's 2024 report, *A Better Bet - How Australia Should Prevent Gambling Harm*, the nation's average losses per adult equate to a whopping \$1635, which far exceeds the average in similar countries such as the US, which comes in at an average annual loss of \$809, and New Zealand at \$584 - significantly lower amounts.

An Equity Economics research report of earlier this year notes that since around one third of Australian adults do not gamble, the average gambling loss per gambler increases to \$2942 per year. Further, Equity Economics estimates that frequent gamblers lose, on average, approximately \$35,000 a year. This equates to almost two-thirds of an annual minimum wage and it's worth noting that evidence is of frequent gamblers in that example.

That's not even those who would be recognised under certain metrics as problem gamblers necessarily. Sadly, Tasmania also shares that trend with our interstate counterparts. We know that annually, here, just in the last financial year, Tasmanians, for example, lost a shocking total of over \$190 million on poker machines alone.

We love our sports. Research tells us that policymakers know that, as do a range of community and physical and mental health advocates organisations, we all know that, but who else has noticed those national trends and state trends? Gambling and betting companies have. They've noticed how much we love our sport, that's for sure, because we see a barrage of gambling advertising spurring these trends, normalising gambling, inducing more spending and triggering betting urges for people who are at risk.

According to the Grattan Institute, in 2022-23 there were more than 1 million gambling ads aired on free-to-air TV and metropolitan radio, for example. Additionally, online gambling companies are responsible for 64 per cent of total gambling advertising spending. Companies do not sink that degree of capital into advertising if they did not think it would reap them a substantial financial reward. The gambling and betting companies, along with the advertising and promotional consultancies, utilise targeted strategies to ensure lucrative returns.

The Australian Gambling Research Centre (the AGRC), based within the Australian government's Australian Institute of Family Studies, has found that the growth in sports and race betting has happened alongside rapid increases in expenditure on wagering advertising in

Australia. Recent estimates suggest that the gambling industry spent \$287.2 million on advertising nationally in 2021, an increase of \$15.9 million from 2020.

As the Grattan Institute researchers state:

Gambling advertising is particularly prominent around sport. As well as direct broadcast advertising, betting companies sponsor stadiums and teams, meaning their logos are visible throughout the game. Most major sporting codes have partnerships with online betting companies and receive a cut of the money bet on their games, so they have financial incentives to promote gambling among fans. Official apps display the odds for every game alongside the score. Betting companies also use online advertising, direct marketing and inducements to entice gamblers, including those who are vulnerable to gambling harm or, from the company's perspective, lucrative VIPs.

Our sports grounds have become gambling, hunting grounds. There was nothing accidental about that and people are beginning to become very concerned.

In 2023, an AGRC study revealed that the community is finding that betting advertising is making sport less enjoyable and less family-friendly. Specifically, the report states,

Australia's renowned love of sport is being negatively impacted by the proliferation of betting advertising. Betting advertising is eroding Australia's love of sport, which has been part of our national identity for many years. We're now seeing a significant level of concern about the relationship between gambling companies, Australian sporting teams and sports coverage.'

It is worth looking at that report statistics in detail. It tells us 69 per cent of Australian adults believe that sport and race betting advertising is too common and with 60 per cent thinking that it makes sport less family-friendly.

Almost half, 46 per cent, of respondents reporting that wagering advertising is decreasing their enjoyment of sport. More than half of Australians, 52 per cent in fact, believe that betting advertising and I quote:

Normalises gambling among children.

With 69 per cent concerned that it makes betting seem like a normal part of sport. The report also found a link between exposure to wagering advertising and riskier betting behaviour.

Young people aged 18 to 34 years are significantly impacted as one-in-five young women, 19 per cent and one in seven young men, 15 per cent, started betting for the first time after seeing or hearing an ad on TV.

Among individuals who were at risk of gambling harm, 41 per cent reported trying a new form of betting and 40 per cent bet on impulse as a result of seeing or hearing wagering advertising.

These are very alarming statistics. It is no wonder then that the AGRC study also found respondents demonstrated strong support for government-led action to address the issue, with two-in-five participants backing outright bans on sponsorship of sporting teams and clubs and sponsorship of sports coverage by betting companies.

These concerning statistics are also borne out by other research and studies, however I will not go into them in detail now because of time, but it is well established that people

have had enough of these invasive and predatory gambling advertising practices. Many members here will be well aware of the Federal Parliament's House of Representatives Standing Committee on Social Policy and Legal Affairs Report, *You Win Some, You Lose More - Online Gambling and its Impacts on Those Experiencing Gambling Harm*. This important report is also referred to as the Murphy report after its chair, the late Peta Murphy MP.

This federally led thorough examination of online gambling is broader than the motion here before us today. However, it is worth noting that it did examine as part of its brief, the impact of gambling advertising, including its impact upon sports and our sporting culture.

Significantly, the Murphy Report warns,

Gambling advertising is grooming children and young people to gamble and encourages riskier behaviour.

I wonder then that the Murphy report recommended ending the barrage of gambling advertising with a total ban. The report's recommendation number 26 states,

Prohibition of all online gambling advertising and commentary on odds during and an hour either side of a sports broadcast. Prohibition on all in-stadia advertising, including logos on players uniforms.

Unfortunately, despite the federal Albanese government accepting all 31 of the Murphy report's recommendations, implementation has yet to occur. We may not have to be here now debating this motion if implementation of those important recommendations were underway, but there is just no sign of it.

Which brings us to the crux of the matter before us. This is not just a mere story of statistics, nor is it just that people are noticing the growing escalation in and barrage of gambling advertising hitting our airwaves and a range of devices, or that researchers are busy researching what we think or feel about that. The specific and key concern here that this motion calls on us now to face is the growing recognition and the deep concern about the normalisation of gambling in sport, our national pastime, our obsession that is intrinsically linked with positive aspects of our national psyche - sport, the social activity that hones athletic powers, provides inter- and intra-community connection, and which can be a unifying force across generations, creeds, genders and cultures. As I touched on briefly, the 2023 AGRC report found that more than half of the surveyed respondents believe that betting advertising normalises gambling among children and 69 per cent were concerned it makes betting seem like a normal part of sport.

As highlighted by research including by the Grattan Institute, gambling and betting company spend a considerable amount of time marketing to sports fans. Their presence is highly visible throughout broadcast and online ads; a format outside the scope of the current motion before us, because it's outside the scope of the state government. However, other delivery mechanisms include team and stadium sponsorships and deals with sporting codes. It is this promotional delivery mechanism which is also so insidious. It's so insidiously normalising.

Betting logos and stadium promotions around the game, and on favourite teams' uniforms, not only become a visual constant; they also implicitly imply an endorsement of the promoted activity. As it is designed to do, this blurs the line between a group, communal and even family-friendly activities such as sport, and a recognised, potentially problematic activity

such as gambling. The lines between sport and gambling become blurred when a slogan or logo is recognised both on and off the pitch.

As many have observed, this blurring of the lines extrapolating from a social sport environment makes gambling and betting appear as a natural and intrinsic aspect of the fan and team supporter experience. Significantly, it is not only the research telling us that exposure to such gambling advertising, particularly during sports coverage or sports games, is leading to riskier betting behaviour and escalating the likelihood of experiencing gambling harm, as summarised by that 2023 AGRC report; it's also community members, parents, young people and athletes who are calling for time out.

It is interesting to note the AGRC research highlights community concerns regarding the impact of gambling advertising and promotions online and at live games. An example of that negative impact - which I hear a lot about - is the risk of triggering harmful behaviour; particularly amongst those battling either a gambling problem, or who are concerned they are on their way to developing a serious gambling problem. For those people, including many Tasmanians, sitting through a match to watch their favourite team becomes an endurance test; a battle of wills between themselves and the triggering of the gambling advertising pummeling them during every ad break, commentator spiel or watching their favourite player run past in their logo-adorned uniform.

Some cannot withstand that onslaught and succumb to those harmful messages. Others may resist by choosing to turn off the match or decide not to go to support their team live to avoid being exposed to it. Ironically, gambling self-exclusion can prevent team supporters paying their ticket at the gate and supporting their team at live matches. It's a shame for them as a fan. It's a shame and a commercial shame also for that local venue and team. More importantly, it can damage family ties, if that act of self-exclusion also prevents children and young people being able to attend the live match due to the adult's responsible decision. We may recognise that hard choice as being responsible but try explaining that to your enthusiastic 10- or 14-year-old whose mates will also be at the game, but they can't be.

It's also important to mention here last year's federal government's rapid review of prevention approaches to gender-based violence. This report, released in August last year, calls for the prioritisation of further work to review and strengthen alcohol and gambling regulatory environments to prioritise the prevention of gender-based violence. It also recommends, as recommendation 17, stronger restrictions leading to a total ban on advertising of gambling.

These calls for action, whether from community research, such as that undertaken by the AGRC, or parliamentary and government inquiries, including the Murphy report of 2023 and more recently the federal rapid review of preventative approaches to gender-based violence, reflect the actual reported harm occurring; not just that perceived, but actual harm.

Another particular driving factor is the recognised harm that blurring the lines and the normalisation of gambling with sporting activity is having on our young people and children. It is important to invest a little more time in examining what the evidence is telling us regarding the ramifications that the normalisation of gambling is having on our children and young people. I mentioned earlier the warning contained in the Murphy report that, I quote,

Gambling advertising is grooming children and young people to gamble and encourages riskier behaviour.

It's a strong statement, nothing equivocal in it, but how is that grooming occurring? As I touched on earlier, it is the targeted and predatory combination of placement evoking

subliminal and implied endorsement. It's in the information I circulated prior to this debate to members. I drew attention to a 2024 Deakin University paper published in the *Research in the Sociology of Sport Journal*, volume 18. The paper is called *The impact of marketing on the normalisation of gambling in sport for children and young people*.

I wish to highlight some of its key points as it's pertinent to the intent of this motion. In discussing the influence of marketing on the normalisation of gambling for young people, it examines a range of socio-cultural influences and observational learning trends amongst children and young people. These trends can be informed by seeing what family and parents are doing as well as influenced by peer group activities. Observational learning in this context is highly predicated upon awareness. Researchers have identified that young people have significant unprompted recall of sports betting brands, with multiple studies finding that over 75 per cent of young people can name at least one betting brand.

Further, researchers have demonstrated that young people can retell the plotline of sports betting advertisements, with some children being able to recite verbatim the taglines and slogans used. Children could name and or describe the celebrity who was used in a specific betting company campaign. The study states this, I quote,

Importantly, young people also recall seeing marketing for sports betting embedded in community settings, including on billboards and public transport. However, it is young people's awareness of the different types of marketing that appear during sporting matches that demonstrate the omnipresent nature of marketing for these products aligned with sport. This includes gambling marketing at the stadium, around the grounds, on player jerseys, on the scoreboard and during announcements by commentators.

This journal article makes for compulsive, if not disturbing reading. However, I'd limit myself to highlighting a further two very pertinent points it makes within the context of this debate. The first is what the research tells on the influence gambling marketing on young people's perceptions. For example, the study reports that marketing makes gambling appear fun and exciting. It also influences the way young people perceive how they would engage with gambling with reports that they believe that gambling appears easy and is highly accessible.

Disturbingly, the report reinforces how the alignment of gambling with sport also influences how children and young people conceptualise engaging with gambling. For example, young people believe that gambling on sport would make people more invested in the game and more committed or loyal sports fans.

It highlights the negative impact of celebrity endorsements that we see in advertising and on grounds. For example, young people have reported that when they see sports stars endorsing gambling, it increases perceptions of trust associated with the gambling brand.

The journal article states, and I quote,

Young people have reported, that when current athletes have the brand of a gambling company on their jersey, they are legitimising the company. They also perceive that if the athlete is happy to wear the brand, then they must support the company.

Worryingly the study also found,

Young people have been curious to try gambling, particularly if they are sports fans. In our most recent study, we found that a fifth of young people said they would bet on a sport when they were older.

The problem is pretty clear. We have evidence based and peer reviewed report after report. We have parliamentary and government inquiries corroborating that evidence and making very similar recommendations. However, it's important to note that when making those recommendations, empirical research and parliamentary inquiries are doing so by applying a public health policy lens and this is a very important factor to this debate.

Addressing potential and actual gambling harm must be approached as a public health issue. Taking a public health policy approach is consistent with the Tasmanian Government's Gambling Support Program Strategic Framework 2019 to 2023. Despite being a little out of date now, this framework includes the following statement by the former Minister for Human Services at the time, Roger Jaensch MP said this.

The Tasmanian Government takes a public health approach to reducing gambling harm that not only considers harms for individual gamblers, but also their families and communities.

That is as it should be, and the motion before us is consistent with that established state government public health imperative policy. A fundamental tenet of modern public health policy is that prevention is better than cure. We need to apply that tenet if we're going to successfully disrupt the social norm that betting and sport go together.

As public health policy-makers, parliaments have precedent in taking a prevention-overcure regulatory approach on a wide range of matters. The most obvious and comparable example being that of banning tobacco product advertising and sponsorship. At the risk of offending any members, and I am sure there are many of us who can recall the dim dark smoke obscure days when we sat down to enjoy a Benson & Hedges cricket test match, for example, when the ground fences would be clad in tobacco product advertising.

Ms Forrest - Some members are too young for that.

Mr Hiscutt - Yes, sorry.

Ms WEBB - There you go, lucky you. The turf - where the ground fences would be clad in tobacco product advertising - the turf and uniforms would bear tobacco company logos and commentators would roll company names into score updates without drawing ventilator-assisted breath. In correlation, millions of taxpayers' dollars were being were being spent in trying to save lives from lung cancer and other tobacco-linked illnesses, preventing young people from taking up smoking and anti-smoking awareness campaigns.

People could no longer smoke in their workplace and other public venues, but they were constantly under siege of advertising telling them that they wanted to-they needed to-light up.

Government's first banned tobacco broadcast advertising in 1976, but it took until 1996 to ban tobacco product sponsorships altogether. The parallels and the harmful tells are all there, between the tobacco advertising and sponsorship of yesteryear and the current gambling onslaught. We have replaced one highly addictive, harmful and predatory product with another.

Some would also include the prevalence of alcohol advertising in these venues, too, which I acknowledge, however, it's outside the scope of this particular debate and the intent of this particular motion before us. There are many comparisons and detailed analyses between tobacco product and gambling advertising and sponsorship that we could go into, but the key

point, for the purposes of this debate now, is that we have the evidence that tobacco advertising bans - that model worked.

As stated by the Deakin University study into gambling advertising impacts on children and young people,

As has been shown in tobacco control, the only robust way to significantly reduce young people's exposure to gambling advertising is through comprehensive government regulation, including comprehensive curbs on advertising, promotions and sponsorship across a range of media platforms and community environments.

I brace myself for the inevitable buck passing of, 'Oh, this is a federal government problem. The states cannot do it on their own.' While I agree that states cannot implement the Murphy report recommendation of a blanket ban on gambling advertising in isolation on their own, I will push back on the excuse that we do not have any responsibility to act to implement good public preventative health policy where we can. We do have the power to declare our state-owned and -funded venues gambling ad free zones. The state can do that. We have a responsibility to do that. Let's be clear, failure to implement such a public preventative health policy is a deliberate choice to not do so.

This motion before us, specifically clauses 3 and 4, emphasise both the state government's responsibility to act and the national leadership such action would demonstrate on this important public health policy issue. Other states, including some sports codes, are also exploring ways to create gambling-ad-free zones for their communities. For example, Victoria had banned gambling advertising from its public transport assets, partially in recognition that many young people and children are reliant on public transport just going about their daily school and recreational lives.

In February this year, New South Wales announced it will also remove gambling advertising from its public transport network. Additionally, New South Wales, South Australia and Victoria also have state government-supported, code-based voluntary programs to go gambling-advertising-and-sponsorship free, a club-based self-exclusion strategy you could say. A commentary theme across these three state-based programs is the calling cry in their respective names to put the game, to put sport, first.

'Love the game' calls Victoria. 'Here for the game,' reminds South Australia, and 'Reclaim the game,' exhorts New South Wales. These programs work by local and state-based clubs declaring to go gambling-advertising-and-sponsorship free. The largest scheme in New South Wales includes clubs from six codes, the AFL, the A League, Cricket, NBL, Netball and NRL. These include the AFL Sydney Swans, Cricket Sydney Thunder and Sydney's Sydney Sixers, Giants Net Ballers and South Sydney Rabbitohs.

Tom Harley, CEO of the Sydney Swans, states on the website that the club is working in partnership with the New South Wales Government's Reclaim the Game initiative to raise awareness of the risks associated with gambling. He says:

This partnership supports our ambition to provide a more family-friendly sporting experience at our home matches for both our men's and women's teams.

There are many other insightful contributions from players across the codes on the New South Wales Reclaim the Game website, and if members have not yet had the opportunity to do so, I encourage you to check it out. A telling insight provided on New South Wales Reclaim the Game web page is the following:

Sports betting advertising and sponsorship is everywhere. You see it in most sports. It has gotten to the point where we don't know sport without it and young people are exposed to too much betting advertising. As a result, many young people think betting is a normal part of watching sport. Almost 50 per cent of 12- to 17-year-olds see gambling advertising on TV during sports and racing on a weekly basis.

There's nothing sporting or impressive about those stats, but some in New South Wales are trying to do something about them and to turn the stats around. However, the other commonality shared by these states, those three states is that unfortunately programs are voluntary only. It's up to individual clubs to take on all of the responsibility which should I think be shared by the state governments and the public health policy-makers and regulators.

Therefore, despite that fundamental limitation, suffice to say these few interstate examples I have highlighted demonstrate that not only are the concerns identified in the motion before us real, they are recognised elsewhere and they are being acted upon elsewhere by others who take responsibility to act where they can. So why not here too?

One last consideration that warrants being addressed briefly, is the concern of loss of revenue for venues or clubs which forego gambling, advertising or sponsorship. The evidence tells us, that not only can venues and clubs survive, they can thrive without this source of income. Again, the previous tobacco product ban model provides relevant examples here.

As highlighted by the Grattan Institute on page 42 of its A Better Bet report, when the tobacco product advertising and sponsorship bans were finally implemented, other sponsors, including state government public health agencies quickly jumped into the openings.

Rugby league's Winfield Cup became the Optus Cup, Ansett and Carlton and United Breweries took over the Benson & Hedges Cup series. Significantly, the total value of sports sponsorships grew by an average of 11 per cent per year in the three years after the ban was implemented in 1996. Just to repeat that, sponsorships grew by an average of 11 per cent per year in the three years after the ban.

The evidence also indicates that the removal of an aggressive large corporate advertising sector, such as tobacco or gambling, actually assists in opening up and providing a more level sporting sponsorship field. Former AFL CEO boss, Gillan McLaughlin, has acknowledged that at least part of lost gambling sponsorship revenue would be replaced by making it more accessible for other participants.

The Grattan report also cites as Sports Bet's chief commercial officer, now CEO, Barney Evans, who said that when the company started sponsoring the AFL in 2017:

It's absolutely a premium media asset; it gets right to the heart of footy in the southern states and therefore it's absolutely appropriate asset to go for and as a consequence is heavily sought after.

Just like big tobacco, big gambling can outprice other players, but like that historic example, once the gap is created in the market, others can then fill it in a more sustainable manner. It may allow a broader range of potential advertisers who are not out-competed in a blanket manner.

Yes, it may be at a lower funding rate, but there is a greater scope. There can be more advertisers and sponsors, potentially ensuring the funding numbers balance. For example, the South Sydney Rabbitohs were previously sponsored by Luxbet and Sports Bet, but since the

club joined the New South Wales Reclaim the Game program in 2022, the club's sponsorship revenue grew from \$8.9 million in 2021 to \$11 million in 2023. Levelling the sponsorship playing field may well be an important investment for the state to take.

The final point I wish to make is in relation to clause 5 of the motion before us. While it should be self-explanatory, I do wish to place on the record that nobody is suggesting turning off the tap overnight. The affected Tasmanian venues and any teams with current gambling sponsorship would have at least 12 months to make adjustments under this motion's proposed time frame.

Sitting suspended from 4.00 p.m. to 4.30 p.m.

Resumed from above.

Ms WEBB (Nelson) - Mr President, I was saying the affected Tasmanian venues and any teams with current gambling sponsorships would have at least 12 months to make adjustments under this motion's proposed time frame. The motion also provides for a six-month update report to be provided by which we can evaluate implementation progress.

For many state-owned venues and teams, it may not be an issue, in which case this motion will ensure there are clear and consistent public health policy guidelines which need to be applied when any future advertising and sponsorship arrangements are being considered.

To conclude, I reiterate my earlier statement that prevention is better than cure. Again, we need to apply that principle rigorously if we're going to successfully disrupt the social norm that betting and sport go together. Ongoing and contemporary research reveals the degree to which gambling and betting companies are exploiting our love of sports to their lucrative benefit. There's a growing recognition and concern that our young people and children are also being actively targeted by these companies, with potentially dire future impacts on gambling rates and addiction.

We have heard a lot in recent times of the community sporting aspirations and that of our young people in particular. As part of those aspirations, I know there are parents or older siblings wishing and hoping they can attend a local game or event with their children or younger siblings without feeling they're risking potential gambling harm from being triggered. Many will just aspire to being able to drop their self-mandated self-exclusion from attending Tasmanian Government-owned or funded venues and events because they cannot afford to take that risk.

I share the aspiration and wishes of many that they could watch their favourite player and cheer on from the sidelines, their child, siblings, friends on the field without having to turn a blind eye to the gambling advertising stitched across the team uniform or around the grounds. Imagine fulfilling the aspirations of parents wanting to turn off the online devices at home to have a break from all the betting updates pervasively punctuating a games broadcast by taking the family to watch it live instead. Securing the knowledge they will be sharing that experience in a gambling ad and sponsorship free zone.

Imagine delivering on the public health policy mandate, an aspiration to prevent future gambling harm, either for current gamblers and their families tackling the disease now or for future generations. Tasmania could become a national leader in this regard. We could throw down the gauntlet to the federal government and say, come on, catch up with us. Implement the Murphy report recommendations as you said you would, and we'll be happy to share our evidence-based expertise derived from our state venue gambling ad free zone policy to give you a hand. Wouldn't that be something to aspire to?

Public spaces funded by the public dollar, which seek to protect the public interest by deliberately disrupting the norm that betting and sport go together. Let's give gambling and betting ads the boot and declare state owned and funded venues gambling, advertising and sponsorship free zones. I commend the motion to the House.