

Legislative Council
Hansard
Tuesday 18 August 2026

[excerpt...]

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

MOTION

Gambling Advertising and Sponsorship at State-Owned or State-Funded Venues

[3.48 p.m.]

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

- (1) That Council notes on Tuesday 2 December 2025 the Council passed a resolution calling on the state government to introduce within one year a complete ban on gambling advertising and sponsorship at all state-owned or state-funded venues including the Macquarie Point Stadium, and on players' uniforms, and further to table an implementation progress report within six months of the passage of that resolution;
- (2) Further notes the six-month deadline was 2 June 2026; however, the state government has not yet tabled the requested implementation update as it was called on to do by this House;
- (3) Recognises the federal government's gambling advertising reforms announced on 2 April 2026, will partially implement recommendations of the 2023 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*, and do not preclude the state taking immediate action for state-owned or funded venues;
- (4) Reaffirms that publicly owned state venues should prohibit gambling advertising and sponsorship that normalise or glamorise wagering, consistent with the clear public health responsibility to avoid promoting activities known to cause harm;
- (5) Notes with grave concern the failure of the state government to acknowledge or address the December 2025 resolution passed by this House;
- (6) Formally requests by Thursday 10 September 2026 the state government provides to this House a comprehensive response to the 2 December 2025 resolution, and which is to address both:
 - (a) That resolution's call for gambling advertising and sponsorship at all state-owned or state-funded venues, and on players' uniforms, to be prohibited; and
 - (b) An implementation timeframe update.

I rise to speak to motion number 19 in my name on the notice paper. The summary title reads, Gambling Advertising and Sponsorship at State-Owned or State-Funded Venues. But, in fact, this Chamber has already had that debate and already passed that particular motion. That debate and vote occurred on Tuesday 2 December last year. It would be more accurate for the summary title of the current motion before us to be: government inaction on previous votes supporting a ban on gambling advertising and sponsorship at all state-owned or state-funded venues, because that sums up why I'm raising the matter here today via this motion.

I do not intend to re-prosecute the arguments put during the previous -December debate, nor should I have to. Instead, for the benefit of the members, I will provide a brief summary to assist in providing context for the current motion before us here today - a brief summary only. Last week, I circulated to members a background briefing paper, which was an updated version of the previous briefing paper provided for the December debate last year. That background paper also contained the text of the previous motion on page 6 passed by this Chamber on 2 December 2025, for members' reference.

Hopefully that document was sufficient to refresh the memories of members who were in the Chamber at the time, and/or to update those members who have joined us since in this place as to the intent and the content of the initial motion, which sought government action to transform all state-owned and -funded venues to be gambling-, advertising- and sponsorship-free zones, inclusive of players uniforms.

As stated, the intent of that initial motion was consistent with the 2023 Federal Parliament Standing Committee on Social Policy and Legal Affairs' multi-party report called, *You Win Some, You Lose More: Online Gambling and its Impacts on those Experiencing Gambling Harm*. That committee, that laudable committee, was chaired by Peter Murphy MP and despite the federal Labor government's stated support for all 31 of the recommendations in the report, little action had occurred at the time this Chamber considered and debated the 2025 motion. We are still waiting for the promised reforms to be delivered at a federal level, in fact. However, as stated, last year, this Chamber determined that, in some areas, Tasmanians did not have to be kept waiting. This Chamber recognised that Tasmania could progress in some small yet significant way the need to disrupt the social norm that betting and sport go together. It was recognised that banning gambling advertising and sponsorship within Tasmanian-owned or funded venues is consistent with current state government public health policy to treat gambling addiction as a public health issue, just as tobacco advertising and sponsorship was banned on public health grounds. Further, this Chamber recognised it was prudent to require that this policy commitment was implemented within a specified timeframe, as proposed in clause 5 of that resolution passed in December.

We should have seen by now an implementation progress report tabled in the parliament. In fact, by my calculations, that should have occurred by early June. Specifically, that progress report was to detail the removal of any gambling advertising from current state-owned or funded venues as an interim measure while the complete ban was developed and put in place by December this year. To be perfectly clear, should the current situation be that currently there isn't any gambling advertising or signage at venues or on players' uniforms, that's not an excuse for failing to table the requested update by the stipulated timeframe. In fact, such a situation should have made it very easy and concise report to prepare and table. However, any report would also have needed to be clear that if that is the happy situation for Tasmania currently, it is just purely by accident, not the outcome of good public policy design. Which is why a formal policy implemented by regulations or other appropriate mechanisms is necessary and should also provide the framing context for the requested parliamentary updates. I also note in passing

that in the eventuality there is no current gambling adverts, branding, or sponsorship evident in state-owned or funded venues or team uniforms, then formally prohibiting any such advertising and branding will not upset the status quo and should be relatively straightforward, I would have thought.

Which brings us to the here and now. Clearly the June deadline for the progress report has been and gone without a formal word of acknowledgement from the government. I believe this Chamber and the many Tasmanians who've been waiting for implementation progress on the December resolution have been patient. This current motion before us was tabled on 25 June this year. If the government had merely forgotten or the timeframes had slipped a little, surely the tabling of this current motion would have served as a reminder, as a gentle jog of the ministerial memory, perhaps. Tabling of this motion two months ago should have served as a reminder to the government, although really, it is not the responsibility of this place to have to provide reminders to government. It would also have been an indicator that there are clear expectations that the original resolution would be complied with.

The government has had six weeks, in fact, over the parliamentary winter recess to prepare such a progress report delivering upon clause 5B in accordance with December's resolution and then table that response during last week's sitting week when we returned from the break. That is what would have happened under a government that cares - cares both for the welfare of Tasmanians and particularly our young people. A government that cares about acting on evidence-based information, showing the destructive impact persistent and pervasive gambling ads have on communities, families, and our young people. A government that cares about breaking the unhealthy nexus between sport and betting. Further and fundamentally, that is what would have happened under a government that cares for and respects our democracy, our parliament and this Chamber.

Which gets us to the crux of the motion before us today. This is not just a matter of a deadline slipping someone's mind. A formal resolution was passed by this Chamber, one which was consistent with the government's current position of treating gambling harm as a public health policy matter and which requested a formal progress report be tabled in the parliament within six months of that resolution's date. As stated in the current motion before us today, by my calculations, that date is 2 June this year. I also point out that as we did not know the final 2026 parliamentary sitting schedule at the time the original motion was tabled, I did not seek to stipulate in which House that progress report was to be tabled.

Further, as we all know, we do have mechanisms available by which reports and documents can be tabled should neither House be sitting. We attempted to be as flexible and reasonable as possible regarding that six-month milestone built into to the original resolution, but apparently those goodwill efforts have been snubbed by the government. Which basically boils down to a fundamental disrespect shown to this Chamber, and therefore also to the Tasmanians we represent. This was a formal vote securing a formal resolution by a democratically constituted Chamber of the Tasmanian Parliament. On what grounds can it just be ignored?

Occasionally we'll hear about the apparent limited remit of the house of review, within a bicameral parliament. Let's address that briefly here. Members do not need me to tell them that we are working within a bicameral Westminster parliamentary model, but what does that mean when considering the respective powers and roles of our two Chambers? That is obviously an extensive question spanning constitutional law, as well as parliamentary institutional design, practice and conventions, so I'll restrict myself to detailing the elements specifically relevant to this debate. The relevant political science literature identifies a bicameral spectrum within

symmetric models at one end, and asymmetric models at the other. The asymmetric model is where one house, usually the upper house, is limited to varying degrees from a legislative advisory and delay review role through to being clearly subordinate to the house of government. Bicameral parliamentary Westminster models considered to be asymmetrical include the Canadian senate, for example. More pertinent to this Chamber is the fact that the Australian senate is characterised in the literature as an example of the symmetrical model, specifically one that is co-equal, with restrictions. This reflects an equal capacity to introduce, amend and vote for or against legislation, with the limitation of, or restrictions, referring to the fact lower houses and government, have a clear priority when initiating, or considering financial legislation, also referred to as money bills.

I think we can recognise this Chamber has a similar relationship with the other place, within the institutional design of this Tasmanian bicameral parliament. Other than money bills, the policy space of this Chamber is wide. We can roam across the spectrum of public policy, utilising a range of parliamentary mechanisms available to us. Such mechanisms available to this Chamber include the capacity to establish committees into matters of public policy, to put formal questions to ministers of the Crown with a corresponding requirement that a response is provided, to amend government and non-government bills, either originating in this, or the other place. To propose bills from this place, both government and non-government, to table petitions on public policy and other matters, and to have dedicated private members business time that is formally provided for in our Standing Orders.

Further, it's worth restating quite clearly that under our bicameral Westminster parliamentary model, the executive is subordinate and accountable to the parliament. That also applies to this Chamber. Which is why questions asked by this place are taken as seriously by ministers of the Crown, as the questions asked by the other place are, for example. I thought it pertinent to articulate some of those mechanisms and tools, which were utilise to go about our work in this Chamber, on the off-chance there may have been an attempt to try and justify the government's failure to act upon the previous resolution of this place, on the dubious grounds this place is only a house of review and therefore resolutions on matters initiated by non-government members are somehow less serious or real than any other democratic vote undertaken in this place.

Traditionally, yes, we have inherited the role and responsibilities of a house of review, but constitutionally we are not limited to only those responsibilities and that role. I note this reality has caused frustration to a range of former premiers, who have at times wished to corral the Chamber back into that particular box. I recognise how a co-equal, with restrictions, bicameral model can show up a listless and spent government of the day, can annoy a government when its legislative agenda is amended, and frustrate the executive by probing government activities it would prefer remain unexamined. Quite simply, that's just too bad.

As our current model demonstrably holds the government to account, serves as a check on executive power, and furthers the interests of our electorates in the broader community, I'm not going to apologise for working to deliver on those responsibilities. So, please, let's not have our time wasted here today by any such week try on that the Chamber exceeded its review remit, to attempt to deflect from the government's failure to respect this Chamber's December resolution.

Having established this Chamber is not subordinate to the other place, I wish to briefly touch upon the principles of comity. I did provide a simple summary in the information circulated to members on Friday, but in the interests of providing as comprehensive of a debate as possible here today, it's also necessary to outline some of those concerns.

Sitting suspended from 4 p.m. to 4.30 p.m.

MOTION

Gambling Advertising and Sponsorship at State-Owned or State-Funded Venues

Resumed from above (page xx).

Ms WEBB (Nelson) - I will provide an outline of some concerns relating to the core principles of comity between the Chambers. The core principles of comity can be summarised as underpinning the following things. Firstly, equal status, mutual respect between the two Houses, providing independence and institutional balance. Secondly, working relationship: that's to ensure communication between the Houses is open, such as refraining from insulting language or reflecting upon the other House or its members. The third one is non-interference, neither House interfering in the internal proceedings, privilege arrangements or daily operations of the other. Clearly, the failure of the government to respect and respond to a resolution passed by the Chamber is an affront to that paramount comity principle of mutual respect between the two Houses, independence and institutional balance. By balance, I mean the fact that one Chamber is not subordinate to, or has lesser scope and powers than the other. Excluding the previously acknowledged financial bills limitation.

Crucially, as previously stated, the executive is subordinate to the parliament. Before I move on, I wish to address potential furphy relating to that distinction between the executive and the parliament. Which may be raised by the government in an attempt to justify its failure to comply with last year's resolution. There may be an attempt to put the spurious argument that somehow this House exceeded its authority, or was not in compliance with these comity principles, calling for the actions contained in the 2025 resolution. To be clear, that 2025 motion did not seek to call on the other place to do anything. If this place had passed such a request, then it would be up to the other place to formally consider, accept, or reject, such a request. Instead the December resolution, as does the current motion before us, clearly directs the respective requests to the government, which is to say the executive.

In Westminster parliaments, the comity principle of mutual respect, independence and institutional balance, is between the two Houses, not between the parliament and the executive. Yes, we would want a respectful and open communication channel to exist between the parliament and the executive, but that is not a matter of comity, as it is between the two Houses.

As per Associate Professor Richard Herr's testimony on the 6 September 2019, before this Council Select Committee inquiry on production of documents, of which I was a member:

The supremacy of the parliament requires that the government accept its position of being responsible to you, not telling you what it's going to allow you to do to be able to do your job.

Further, he said:

Parliament is the enabler of government. The government doesn't exist if you don't pass laws. The government does not exist if you don't pass money bills. You are the enablers, they are the supplicants to you, you are not supplicants to them.

The failure by the government, the executive, to formally respond within six months, as per the resolution of this place, is a disappointing and unacceptable example of this Chamber yet again being treated with contempt. It is arrogant, dismissive and, to put it bluntly, undemocratic. It's an attempt to snub the principle of comity between the Chambers. We have examples of the executive acting on non-government motions moved in the other place, but not those passed by this Chamber. The cynic in me thinks the prioritisation of equivalent non-government and crossbench private members' business of the other place, over private members' initiated resolutions of this place, is due to the ramifications of successful censure or non-confidence motions passed by the Assembly. However, a truly accountable government of the day, respectful of the parliamentary foundations and conventions in which we operate, would act respectfully on resolutions passed by either Chamber, without requiring potential standoffs over censure motions.

Earlier I stated that the lack of government action on the December resolution is an example of a vote of this Chamber being treated with contempt by this government yet again. As some members will recall, and for the benefit of new members, it took three votes in this Chamber to secure government action on ministerial diary disclosure reforms. In March 2023, this Chamber passed my motion calling for public consultation on developing a best-practise legislative ministerial diary disclosure scheme, including more timely release of diaries and more detailed content to be provided. Instead, the Rockliff government announced it would move to quarterly disclosures, but left it unlegislated, hence voluntary, and without any public input or form of consultation.

Subsequently, on the 10 September 2024, this Chamber again voted for my second motion of the ministerial diary disclosure system to be put out for public consultation regarding its adequacy, and requesting the government report back on progress by 28 November 2024. I know we all here will be surprised and shocked by the fact that the date passed, without the government acting upon that formal resolution of this place. Again, a year later, on 23 September, this place passed another resolution calling on the Rockliff government to establish a public consultation process on best-practise ministerial diary disclosure models and require the government to provide a progress report by 5 December 2025. Finally, then, in response to that, on 10 November that year, the government released its discussion paper on that topic.

Now is not the time to go into the strengths and weaknesses of the eventual reforms progressed by the government. The point I'm making in recounting this example is that, shamefully, it does not appear the Rockliff government has changed its stripes when it comes to failing to respect resolutions of this place and dragging its feet inappropriately responding to those resolutions. There is no good excuse or justification for the disrespect shown to this Chamber by this government.

The Council's resolution on gambling advertising in December last year did not demand sensitive or commercial-in-confidence documents. It did not demand privileged Solicitor-General or other legal advice provided to the government. What this Chamber did ask for was for the government to stand up for Tasmanians, particularly our young people and those vulnerable to being preyed upon by predatory and destructive gambling entities, when the community should just be able to enjoy watching, attending a sports game, and cheering on their local teams.

It is also pertinent in this context to remind members of the statement presented in this place by the Leader on Wednesday 24 June this year to address concerns raised in this place regarding the attitude of the government to the Legislative Council. We were assured on that

day that:

The Premier and his government look forward to continuing to work constructively with all members of this Chamber.

That commitment was in relation to both adjournment matters, conventions, and also, and:

The range of other pathways available to raise matters with the executive.

In the context of the Council's December resolution, here was the Premier's opportunity to demonstrate that reiterated intent of constructive good faith. How are we meant to interpret that reassurance of barely two months ago now? It will be treated with good faith when it's convenient, it would appear, and ignored when it's inconvenient, perhaps. That is not how it should work, and shame on any leader, let alone a premier, to think that it would be. This Chamber is not being treated consistently with the respect it should be afforded in accordance with the principles of comity between the Houses and in respect of the Tasmanians we in this place were elected to represent.

There's another faux argument I wish to pre-empt, and hopefully by doing so I will prevent too much of this Chamber's time being wasted on a red herring. As members would be aware, nationally there has been mounting pressure on the federal Albanese government to implement in full its stated acceptance of the 31 recommendations from the Murphy report. I could well imagine there'll be some within government trying to excuse its inaction along the lines of, 'Well, the Albanese government is going to implement the gambling in stadia ban anyway, so there's no need for Tasmania to do so, and there's no need for us to table an update in the state parliament.' Well, wrong, wrong, wrong.

Recommendation 26 of the Murphy report acknowledges the roles of states and territories in the implementation of this particular recommendation and the need for the federal government to consult with those other jurisdictions. Further, I reject the notion that Tasmania cannot be a national leader in this space. In fact, this Chamber's December resolution itself thrust Tasmania upon the national leader's stage in the matter of disrupting the social norm that betting and sport go together. The full compliance with clause 5 of that December resolution requires a statewide ban to be implemented, both on gambling advertising in stadia and venues and on team uniforms. As acknowledged by clause 3 of the current motion before us, we know that, should the federal government reforms pass the Australian parliament, the best-case scenario will not see those reforms commence until 2027.

Further, nothing prevents the state taking immediate action within their own jurisdictions. There's nothing to prevent that. Nothing standing in our way. In fact, there's no good reason for the Rockliff government to stall the proposed state ban now the federal government has acknowledged the public harm currently being caused and the need to remove gambling advertising from sporting venues and gambling branding from players' uniforms. It will send a strong message regarding the government prioritising the community's welfare over corporate interest. It will be preventative, consistent with the government's stated public health policy, and it would also reduce the opportunity for gambling corporates to attempt a pre-federal ban rush, which we have seen in other areas of public policy reform where affected vested interests attempt to buy in. That is, in this instance, they may seek to install gambling advertising or lock in sponsorship prior to a change in government policy coming into force, either in a strategic attempt to slow down those reforms and/or set up spurious compensation claims, for example.

The current motion before us is very moderate, in my opinion. I've already addressed the ramifications of clause 5 of the motion before us, noting the seriousness of the failure of the state government to acknowledge or address this Chamber's December resolution. It's also worth noting that while this motion may serve a rebuke to the government, not without justification, it does not seek to censure. Instead, it provides the government with a second chance. Clause 6 of the motion today provides a revised timeframe by which the intent of the original resolution passed by the Chamber last year can still be honoured and implemented. This motion provides an extension until Thursday 10 September for the government to prepare and return to this Chamber the currently outstanding response to 2 December resolution and which is to also address both the call for the gambling ad ban in state-owned venues and on players uniforms, while also providing an implementation timeframe update. By doing so, this motion presents a second chance for this government to demonstrate that it is prepared to put the welfare of Tasmanians before gambling and betting interests, at least in some small but significant way. It also provides a second chance for the Premier to demonstrate he is committed to the statement delivered by the Leader on the premier's behalf to this Chamber on Wednesday the 24 June. Further, that his government does and will continue to respect this Chamber, its role within our bicameral Westminster parliament and the principles of comity between the Houses in action as well as in words.

I hope to hear an apology when the government's response is delivered today, not to me personally, of course, but to this Chamber for such unacceptable disrespect and breach of the principles of comity between the Houses and to those Tasmanians who welcomed this Chamber's resolution of 2 December 2025 and expected in good faith for this request requested action to occur. In closing, we should not need to have had this debate here today. It is very disappointing that, due to either the inaction or disrespect shown by this government towards a resolution passed by this Chamber, we have had to take our time up again to seek an explanation as well as prompt compliance.

As I stated at the outset, the intent of this motion today is not to re prosecute the substantive matter detailed in the initial motion debate of 2 December last year. Instead, the purpose of today's debate is to, first, place the failure of the government to comply with an agreed resolution of this democratically elected Chamber on the public record. Second, to provide a formal opportunity for the government to address the outstanding deadline for the six-month progress report on the 12-month deadline to establish a formal policy ban as per the resolution passed on 2 December 2025. And third, to reiterate the democratic expectation that resolutions passed by this Chamber will be respected by the government of the day and acted on accordingly. Further to that, to respectfully require that the government places a formal response before this Chamber by the revised date of 10 September detailing the implementation.

Legislative Council resolved last year Tasmania should do its bit on the public policy matter of addressing the negative impact of gambling ads and sponsorship in local sport. That resolution should have been respected, acknowledged and acted upon in some way by the government, irrespective of its policy position on that matter. Hypothetically, the six-month report could have simply stated that correspondence from the relevant minister or department had been sent to all state-owned or funded venues advising them of the Council's resolution that the state has requested an update from its federal counterparts regarding the implementation of the Murphy report, relevant recommendations, but there is nothing further to report yet, for example. I wouldn't have considered that satisfactory to be honest, but at least it would have demonstrate an acknowledgement of Council's resolution which required a formal and appropriate response by the six-month deadline.

There have been opportunities between when I tabled this motion in June and now for the government to provide the requested update which would have saved us time here in the Chamber as well as avoided the unnecessary and concerning compounding of this government's reputation for arrogant disrespect towards this Chamber and for the broader parliament. It's now incumbent upon the government that in its response to this debate here today, it must either include the required six-month implementation plan update as per last year's resolution or at the very least, commit to table that update by 10 September as per clause 6 of this motion. So on that, I commend the motion to the House question.

[5.30 p.m.]

Ms WEBB - Thank you, Mr President. Thank you to members for engaging with the motion. I really appreciate the contributions made by members, and some of them thoughtful and quite comprehensive, others more simply stated, but also supportive and recognising the core elements of the motions. I very much appreciate it.

As the member for Huon said in her contribution, this is about accountability. I'd like to address a couple of things in my summing up here that have come up during contributions. One being, in the first instance what I believe to be the core of this motion today, which I largely focused on in my contribution for the motion, was about the government failing to respect this place and respond appropriately to a motion duly passed here in December last year. This is about accountability and the government's failure to be accountable to this Chamber. Quite frankly, the Leader got up on behalf of the government and spoke about a range of matters, some of which were relevant to the motion last year, and some of which weren't. Regardless, certainly the elements that were relevant to the motion passed last year could easily have been put into a short document and tabled in this place by the 2 June, in accordance with the call in the December motion to provide an update to this place. It didn't say, 'Provide an update that Meg Webb will be happy with'. It didn't even say, 'Provide an update that the majority of the Chamber would be happy with'. It just said provide an update.

Quite frankly, if the government, via the Leader here today, is able to run through a range of matters, some of which were vaguely relevant, here now, when dragged kicking and screaming by yet another motion to do so, it could have been done respectfully and in appropriate accordance with the motion from last year. They could have tabled that and got on with it, we could all have got on with it. We may have wanted to discuss it further via other motions subsequent to it; so be it. There could have been other ways that members here, including me, might have expressed views about the response provided, but it would have been a response. It would have been tabled as per the motion, and it would have been what this Chamber should be able to expect from a respectful government of the day to this Chamber.

Absolutely ridiculous, for the Leader then to say at the end of the government's contribution, that they'll take note of how this motion goes today and respond to it. Well, why on Earth would we believe that to be true? Why on Earth would any of us here bringing any motion at any future date, as the member for Pembroke rightly said in his contribution: we all bring motions at times, and if they're supported in this place, all of us, I think here, or many of us here, would have each other's backs in the fact that a motion passed by this Chamber should at least be responded to appropriately and respectfully by the government. Maybe not to the extent that we would all like; we may not have been in agreement with the original motion when it was debated, but once passed it's actually this Chamber's responsibility to hold the government to account to the motion. Which is what this motion was about today.

Thank you to the members who expressed support for that function of today's motion. What an embarrassment for the government. I'm sorry that the Leader had to be embarrassed

in that way by the government, because what they had her get up and say here could have just been done two months ago in accordance with last December's motion. We wouldn't have needed this one. It could have quietly gone away.

That's that part of it. The other part - although I didn't go there in my initial contribution because other members brought up some elements relating to the substance of the original December motion last year. I will respond to a couple of those. We know that I could potentially respond to those in some detail, but I will keep it very brief for the purposes of summing up, knowing we have other business today. I absolutely agree with the member for Murchison. It's a complete nonsense that we could not act on this in a leadership fashion, as a state, particularly as a state, as the member for Murchison said, that has established its own team under a state banner, essentially. That we could show leadership and do so on behalf of our community, knowing that that would be well supported by this community in Tasmania.

It's an excuse, and nothing more, for the government to say: things have to happen at the federal level before they can do anything. That's rubbish. We are able to take action on matters that relate to the specific things under the purview of the state government. State-owned venues and arrangements relating to those absolutely fit squarely in that. Yes, there is a national framework that's playing out. Yes, there was legislation that the federal government did finally bring, and I think has actually just been passed through the federal parliament. Let's be clear though, the most contentious parts of that legislation that the federal government were bringing, and that have recently been negotiated there and passed, by the sound of it, in the federal parliament in negotiation with the federal opposition: the contentious parts of that related to the phased-out banning of online gambling advertising. Those were the bits that became contentious, and the inducements associated with that. The actual recommendation from the Murphy report that related to the banning of gambling advertising in stadia and on players' uniforms was uncontentious. That was supported; that is still supported by the federal government. I haven't heard anyone in the federal parliament getting up and speaking against that. That is part of the plan. The Murphy report said the federal government would need to work with state and territory jurisdiction governments to implement that recommendation because the federal government could not do it by themselves because it sits here at a state level for this state government to be acting in that place. It's absolutely available to this state government to do it, even if it doesn't want to rush into that. If that's what it feels like, if you're requested to do it in a 12-month period - that seems like a fairly reasonable amount of time to give it some thought and begin progress towards it - you could do it in a longer timeframe, but you could start taking tangible steps now.

The fact that the government wasn't able to say, having noted complexities about contract sign, impact on sports clubs, and a whole bunch of other things. Having noted that, it didn't describe taking any action in the time that's transpired since December last year. It didn't describe any action it's taken to try to quantify some of those complexities to try to model out what an impact will be, to gather information about what the scope of this might look like at a state level, even though this is coming down the tunnel because it is part of the Murphy report recommendations that have been accepted by the federal government. It will be progressed in conjunction with the federal government down to the state and territory jurisdictions. There's plenty of work to be done then to work through the complexities. If the government can describe the complexities, then - even if it's slower than we might like - it could be taking steps towards better understanding, documenting, quantifying and analysing those complexities on its way to arriving at the destination of the required ban.

It wasn't able to describe any of that, therefore, it's simply busy work that they're talking about things that can assist them to give excuses and delays, assist them in explaining why

they're doing absolutely nothing - 'Oh, it's all too hard.' No, it's not. If you want to do it, if you wanted to do it on behalf of Tasmanian families, Tasmanian children who want to be able to go to a state venue and watch sport without it inextricably being linked to gambling via advertising there at the venue on players' jerseys when you're trying to watch your local team. Of course, it's possible. If the government wanted to do it, it could and it should. I think the Tasmanian community would have an expectation that this government would do so and will applaud if and when it finally does.

It's unquestionable now that we do not advertise alcohol products in our stadiums or on players' jerseys and uniforms. We don't advertise smoking products. We got to that point on those products. They're both legal products, there's nothing illegal about them. We can all purchase those products legally, but we don't advertise them in any way to do with our sporting codes anymore. We haven't for a long time. This is the same direction we're moving in for gambling; slowly, far too slowly in my view, because we all know that gambling is a harmful product. We all know it's designed to be addictive, to entice people into a state of utilising that product to the point of self-destruction. That's what it's designed for, so of course it's a public health issue for us to minimise the impact of in our community. And that will inevitably arrive at us banning the advertising of that product; certainly in situations where we know vulnerable, and particularly vulnerable young, people will be exposed to it.

There should literally be no-one in any leadership position in this state who has any doubt about that inevitability, the path that we're on to get to that destination. The only reason we would have any delay in getting there is to be self-serving to the vested interests in that space and the hold they may have over us in some form. It's a shame to have any government provide excuses that aren't about not being able to get something done, it's about not wanting to get something done, quite frankly.

As the member for Murchison quite rightly said, this is a government that makes very questionable claims to supporting evidence-based reforms when it comes to gambling. Wrong. They don't. They turn their back on evidence-based reforms and put forward fake reforms instead. That's an absolutely true fact, indisputable. Our Liquor and Gaming Commission says as much.

This is a government that still uses completely inappropriate terminology when it speaks about this topic. The government's response here today talked about the fact that the government has a role in promoting responsible gambling. There couldn't be a worse way to characterise that. There is no such thing as responsible gambling when it's an addictive product. The people who end up with a gambling addiction, who are victimised by predatory gambling habits through advertising, inducements and the like, are not finding themselves in that horrific situation because they lack responsibility. 'Gamble Responsibly' is outdated, incorrect and victim-blaming word usage. It's the 'responsible service of gambling' that should be the focus of any sort of examination and promotion here. The responsible service of gambling is about how we present it to our communities via advertising, how we present it in terms of where it's available and restrictions we might put on that, and how we put protections and consumer protection in place around it. That's the responsible service of gambling.

This government should never speak about responsible gambling because when it comes to addictive gambling, it's nothing to do with a moral failing of the person who's the victim of that. It's a moral failing of the government that fails to responsibly regulate it and put the right consumer protection. There's plenty of evidence-based consumer protection available, but this government rejects all of it. So, let's just be really clear, a government that was genuine, that really did support evidence-based reforms will be doing pretty much the opposite of anything

this government is doing in the gambling space right now.

Anyway, more could be said on that, but, as I said, I'll keep it brief for today and I'll again thank members for engaging with the motion. May I suggest to the government, can you pay attention to what happened here today with this motion? Can we not do this again? If we pass a motion in this place and it does something as moderate and simple as asking for a report back in a six-month time period on what may be taking place in response to the motion, could you please just provide a report back to this place within six months, even if it's a report back that we're not going to like or that says, guess what, we haven't done much? Even if it's just that; that respects at least that very moderate, modest request of a motion passed by this Chamber. Can you please pay attention to that and have the respect for us not to have to do this again?

Motion agreed to