



PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

REPORT OF DEBATES

Tuesday 17 March 2020

REVISED EDITION

Tuesday 17 March 2020

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

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT

COVID-19 - Precautions

Mr PRESIDENT- Honourable members, prior to going through the order of business, members have probably noted some changes to the seating in this Chamber.

We have moved the member for Hobart, Mr Valentine, to create some more space.

Members are obviously aware we are in challenging times with the spread of coronavirus so placed around the Chamber are tissues, bins and hand sanitisers that we encourage members to use.

It is a space and time consideration so we ask members to be mindful of this aspect and perhaps use the President's Reserve and other areas in the Chamber if you feel you need to have some space.

We also will work at times with just a quorum number of members in the Chambers. I ask members be conscious that we share that between all members so everyone can have a break if they feel they need to, but, of course, our quorum provisions will be adhered to.

Members may speak from their place if they desire or continue to use the lecterns. We are not admitting any visitors into the gallery area. This is both for our and visitors' safety, and only those assisting with the business of the Council will be permitted in the Chamber - for example, the Leader's advisors and the necessary staff we need. The Leader will also have one principal advisor at the Table when considering legislation in Committee. Advisors will also be permitted to use the area reserved for the press while waiting for the Leader's matters to be called on.

These might seem extreme measures, but we are in some fairly challenging times. I thank all members for their understanding and encourage their cooperation so we can minimise any effects of this dreadful disease which is spreading very quickly around the world.

PETITION

Medical Services in Strahan

Ms Forrest presented an e-petition signed by approximately 40 residents of Strahan and citizens of Tasmania and a paper petition from 355 resident of Strahan and citizens of Tasmania who are extremely concerned with the medical services in Strahan. It is particularly important at the moment. This petition was instigated well before the issue of COVID-19 arose.

Petition received.

TABLED PAPER

Government Response - Petition

[11.07 a.m.]

Mrs Hiscutt (by leave) tabled the Government's response to a petition from the member for Elwick regarding Tasmania's child safety system.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

Mrs Hiscutt (by leave) tabled and incorporated the answers to questions 5, 19, 20, 26, 29 and 30.

5. FAMILY VIOLENCE IN TASMANIA - ECONOMIC COST

Ms FORREST asked the Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council, Mrs Hiscutt -

With regard to the economic cost of family violence in Tasmania -

- (1) (a) What is the cost of health care related to treating women who are subject to family violence?

(b) What is the cost of health care related to treating men who are subject to family violence?
- (2) What is the cost of provision of, and access to, justice for women impacted by family violence?
- (3) (a) What is the cost of the provision of, and access to, justice for men as perpetrators of family violence?

(b) What is the cost of the provision of, and access to, justice for men impacted by family violence?
- (4) (a) What is the economic and social cost of time away from education for women, as a result of family violence?

(b) What is the economic and social cost of time away from education for men, as a result of family violence?
- (5) (a) What is the cost of the provision of shelter for women resulting from family violence?

(b) What is the cost of the provision of shelter for men resulting from family violence?
- (6) (a) What is the level of unmet demand for shelter for women resulting from family violence?

(b) What is the level of unmet demand for shelter for men resulting from family violence?

- (7) (a) What is the current cost, in dollar terms and per cent terms of Tasmanians GSP to treat or deal with the outcomes of family violence?
- (b) What is the current cost, in dollar terms and per cent terms of Tasmania's GSP to prevent family violence?

The incorporated answer read as follows -

In May 2016, the Australian Government released the report *The Cost of Violence against Women and their Children in Australia*.

The report updated KPMG's 2009 report and analysis titled *The Cost of Violence Against Women and their Children*. It is very difficult to estimate costs to government, community and individuals, which is why we use the figures developed by KPMG.

In 2015-16, based on the 2012 Personal Safety Survey, it was estimated the total cost of violence against women and their children was \$22 billion.

Victims and survivors bear \$11.3 billion, or 52 per cent, of the total costs. The Australian Government, state and territory governments bear \$4.1 billion, or 19 per cent, of the total costs. It was estimated the cost to Tasmania was \$500 million.

Of the \$22 billion, the report estimated the cost of physical and sexual violence as \$12 billion and the cost of emotional abuse and stalking as \$10 billion.

Safe Homes, Families, Communities: Tasmania's action plan for family and sexual violence 2019-2022 (Safe Homes, Families, Communities) invests \$26 million over three years to 40 direct and practical actions to prevent and respond to family and sexual violence.

This funding is in addition to Safe at Home services; specialist services funded by the government and delivered by the community sector; and government and community services that interact with victim-survivors and perpetrators, but are not specialist services.

An additional challenge is we know that family violence is under-reported. Therefore, any estimates are likely to be less than actual costs. For example, the 2016 report states -

... underrepresentation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women, pregnant women, women with disability, and women who are homeless within national prevalence estimates may add a further \$4 billion to the cost of violence against women and their children in Australia in 2015-16.

With regard to the economic cost of family violence in Tasmania -

- (1) (a) What is the cost of health care related to treating women who are subject to family violence?
- (b) What is the cost of health care related to treating men who are subject to family violence?

The 2016 report estimated the impact of violence on private and public health systems is estimated to cost victims, their communities and government \$1.4 billion.

In Australia, intimate partner violence is the greatest health risk factor for women aged 25 to 44 years.

Victim-survivors and perpetrators do not necessarily identify family violence as the cause of or reason for injuries when presenting to hospital or GPs. Therefore, it is hard to estimate.

- (2) What is the cost of provision of, and access to, justice for women impacted by family violence?

Refer above.

- (3) (a) What is the cost of the provision of, and access to, justice for men as perpetrators of family violence?

- (b) What is the cost of the provision of, and access to, justice for men impacted by family violence?

The 2016 KPMG report estimates the impact of violence against women and their children on the justice, services and funeral sectors to cost the Australian economy \$1.7 billion.

- (4) (a) What is the economic and social cost of time away from education for women as a result of family violence?

- (b) What is the economic and social cost of time away from education for men as a result of family violence?

This breakdown is not available in the KPMG report and would be almost impossible to determine.

- (5) (a) What is the cost of the provision of shelter for men resulting from family violence?

- (b) What is the cost of the provision of shelter for women resulting from family violence?

While there are no specific shelters only for people escaping family violence. However, we know that nationally 42 per cent of clients accessing homelessness services have experienced family violence.

Funding provided statewide for 2019-20 for crisis accommodation (shelters) specifically for women is \$5 878 015 (exclusive of GST). This comprises -

- Young women aged 13 to 20 years - \$2 282 436
- Women with or without children - \$3 595 579

Funding for shelters in Tasmania provides safe and secure accommodation for people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. Funding for Rapid Rehousing provides transitional accommodation and support for people escaping family violence. Total funding for 2019-20 is \$750 000 (excluding GST). While there are no specific shelters only for people escaping family violence, we know that nationally 42 per cent of clients accessing homelessness services have

experienced family violence. Funding provided statewide for crisis accommodation (shelters) specifically for men is \$3 913 867 (excluding GST). This comprises -

- Young men aged 13 to 20 - \$2 096 508
- Men aged over 20 - \$1 817 359

Some crisis accommodation shelters provide for both males and females, the funding for those is a total of \$3 174 813. This comprises -

- Young men and women aged 13 to 20 - \$1 936 066
- Men and women with or without children - \$1 238 747

There is a further \$5 million to deliver additional crisis accommodation to reduce homelessness and housing stress. Bethlehem House will provide an additional 18 new units for men and the Hobart Women's Shelter will provide an additional 17 units for women, children and family groups. This is being delivered under the Tasmanian Affordable Housing Strategy and Action Plans.

Funding for Rapid Rehousing provides transitional accommodation and support for people escaping family violence. Total funding for 2019-20 is \$750 000 (excluding GST).

- 6) (a) What is the level of unmet demand for shelter for women resulting from family violence?
- (b) What is the level of unmet demand for shelter for men resulting from family violence?

Data for unassisted requests for Specialist Homelessness Services does not outline if clients present with family violence issues.

The data collection records the type of services that are required and identifies that most daily unassisted requests are for accommodation or housing assistance. The unmet need data does not record why people are presenting for assistance. In Tasmania in 2017-18, 100 per cent of daily average unassisted requests were for short-term or emergency accommodation. For around 94 per cent of instances, the reason no service was provided was that accommodation was not available.

For people who presented to Specialist Homelessness Services and did receive assistance in 2017-18, 24.4 per cent (or 1590 clients) presented as needing assistance associated with domestic and family violence. Of these, 23 per cent were male and 67 per cent were female.

- (7) (a) What is the current cost, in dollar terms and percent terms of Tasmania's GSP to treat or deal with the outcomes of family violence?
- (b) What is the current cost, in dollar terms and per cent terms of Tasmania's GSP to prevent family violence?

The KPMG 2016 report estimated in 2015-16 the cost of violence against women and their children to Tasmania was \$500 million.

Safe Homes, Families, Communities invests \$3.3 million in primary prevention and early intervention initiatives.

This does not represent all primary prevention activities being undertaken in the state.

19. PUBLIC HOSPITAL STAFFING

Ms FORREST asked the Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council, Mrs Hiscutt -

For each one of the state's 23 public hospitals, listed separately, please provide the following data for the financial years 2017-18 and 2018-19 -

- (1) The average numbers of FTEs for –
 - (a) salaried medical practitioners
 - (b) nurses
 - (c) diagnostic and allied health professionals
 - (d) administrative and clerical staff
 - (e) domestic staff
- (2) The average bed occupancy rates for each hospital for each of these periods.
- (3) The number of patient days for each hospital, for each of these periods.

The incorporated answer read as follows -

- (1) Please see Appendix 1 at page 76 for the table dealing with Tasmanian Health Service Average Paid FTE 2017-18 to 2018-19.
- (2) and (3) Please refer to the following table -

	2017-18		2018-19	
	Occupancy rate - %	Bed days	Occupancy rate - %	Bed days
Beaconsfield	67.75	937	93.17	1323
Campbell Town	76.92	1608	93.42	1909
Deloraine	61.17	4487	60.83	4229
Flinders Island	31.33	545	31.17	615
George Town	66.42	3338	64.25	3792
Health West (Queenstown)	49.50	1924	36.83	1304
King Island	31.75	743	25.42	565
Launceston General Hospital	79.79	110 206	83.01	110 644
Mersey Community Hospital	76.92	14 213	75.49	14 250
Midlands MPC	50.25	759	42.83	603
Millbrook Rise	99.75	9821	99.7	9823
Mistral Place	96.3	3515	96.8	3534
New Norfolk	83.42	4238	85.17	4295

	2017-18		2018-19	
	Occupancy rate - %	Bed days	Occupancy rate - %	Bed days
North West Regional Hospital	90.43	38 697	95.63	42 381
Roy Fagan Centre	90.9	13 599	96.5	14 441
Royal Hobart Hospital	91.91	141 761	91.03	15 4628
Scottsdale (NESM)	47.92	3222	48.42	3020
Smithton	36.50	1603	41.33	1864
St Helens	37.50	1252	32.25	1100
St Marys	34.33	1028	38.08	1109
Tolosa Street	87.2	3819	88.8	3889
Wilfred Lopes Centre	67.8	5696	60.9	5114

20. SMOKING PRODUCT LICENCE HOLDERS - SALES VOLUMES

Mr DEAN asked the Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council, Mrs Hiscutt -

- (1) What is the progress of the Government's collection of the sales volumes provided by smoking product licence holders?
- (2) What is the sales volume by type of business, for example newsagent, hotel, bottle shop, supermarket, tobacconist et cetera?
- (3) What is the provision of information to smokers at point of sale?
- (4) How many licensed smoking product retailers are there in Tasmania currently?
- (5) (a) Is there a map or list by suburb/town/location of where those retailers are located?
(b) If so, can a copy be made available?
(c) If not, why not?
- (6) What is the numbers of smoking product retailers by type of business, for example newsagent, hotel, bottle shop, supermarket, tobacconist et cetera?
- (7) How many licensed tobacco vending machines remain in Tasmania and where are they located ?
- (8) What action has been taken to move forward to ban smoking around schools and hospitals?
- (9) (a) Since the abolishment of the infringement notices has any action/prosecution been taken against retailers?
(b) If so, what action has been taken and how many cases?

The incorporated answer read as follows -

- (1) The Government is developing an online licensing system to cut red tape and facilitate tobacco retailers submitting volume sales information as part of their annual licensing

renewal. Funding for the system was made available following the fee increases in 2017 and 2018. The Department of Health has procured a system and is working to ensure the system is safe and efficient for retailers and government to use in 2020.

- (2) As per the response to (1), tobacco sales volume information is not currently available.
- (3) Proposals for quit smoking information at the point of sale were explored but both smokers and retailers were not overly interested. Further progression represented a risk in terms of adverse reactions and prohibitive costs.
- (4) On 4 November 2019, 661 smoking product retailers were licensed on the register.
- (5) A register of licences maintained is by Public Health Services in the Department of Health. This is not publicly available. In 2012, the provision in the Public Health Act 1997 that made the register of tobacco retailers available for public inspection was repealed. This was done in response to concerns that tobacco companies could use the information in the register for commercial purposes. The Public Health Act 1997 now only permits the disclosure of identifiable information from registers in accordance with specified circumstances or authorisations consistent with the purpose of the act.
- (6) There are 16 hotels; 91 bottle shops; 100 small supermarkets; 47 large supermarkets; 67 newsagents; 5 specialist tobacconists; 92 mixed businesses; 152 service stations; 57 takeaway outlets, restaurants or cafes; 2 vending machines; and 30 bars, pubs or clubs that sell tobacco in Tasmania. There are also two specialist vaping retailers.
- (7) There are two vending machines operating in Tasmania; they are both in the south of the state.
- (8) The Government is in the process of finalising policy options for smoke-free environments in and around hospitals and schools and implementing smoke free environments in its main hospital sites, including training nominated officers and support for all staff and patients to quit.
- (9) Only one type of offence relating to tobacco and smoking had its infringement notice provisions removed from the legislation. This offence related to selling tobacco to a minor.

In total 12 infringement notices and six written warnings have been issued for other offences relating to the retail sale of smoking products since the single infringement notice provision was removed.

In relation to sales to minors: some offences were observed during 'controlled purchase operations' conducted by the Department of Health where 140 purchases were attempted by volunteer minors contracted to the department. Written warnings were issued to six offenders and the licence holders. More recently three additional alleged offenders are pending prosecution. However, the Department of Public Prosecutions and Tasmania Police are limited in their capacity to represent the Director of Public Health in these matters. Following the detection of the first six offences, a campaign has been targeted at retailers to prompt retail assistants to check for photo identification if they are selling tobacco. The Department of Health developed a web-based automated graphic, sent letters to all licence holders, and redesigned the Smoking Product Retailers guide in Tasmania. The Department of Health is currently piloting a Responsible Service of Tobacco online

course to further improve compliance with sales to children requirements. This work has received positive feedback from a number of retailers.

26. BOB BROWN FOUNDATION

Mr DEAN asked the Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council, Mrs Hiscutt -

Since the Big Canopy Campout event, the BBF has conducted several tree-sit protests, resulting in two trespass arrests. The BBF has published several video clips, showing protesters have remained for days at a time in the tree-sits during dangerous weather conditions, and still remain.

- (1) (a) Was a permit issued by STT to the BBF to conduct the Big Canopy Campout Event this year?
 - (b) If not, what steps, if any, did STT take to consult with the BBF about the requirement of a permit for the event?
- (2) What steps if any, did STT take to ensure this event complied with all safety regulations?
- (3) Does STT have a duty of care under the Forest Management Act 2013, the Work Health and Safety Act 2012 or any other legislation or regulation, to protect users of Permanent Timber Production Zone - PTPZ - land of known safety risks?
- (4) (a) Has STT made any assessments on the safety of the trees where the BBF are conducting their protests?
 - (b) Has STT advised the BBF of these facts?
5. Does STT have the authority to -
 - (a) prohibit a person from entering, an area in the interest of their safety?
 - (b) request a person to leave an area in the interest of their safety?

The incorporated answer read as follows -

- (1) (a) I have been advised that Sustainable Timber Tasmania did not issue a permit for the Big Canopy Campout to occur on Permanent Timber Production Zone land in 2019.
 - (b) Sustainable Timber Tasmania has informed me that it has previously advised the Bob Brown Foundation of the need to request permission to conduct an event of this nature on Permanent Timber Production Zone land. Specific advice was provided on 6 September 2018 prior to the 2018 Big Canopy Campout. The Bob Brown Foundation has also been made aware of the requirement for a forest activity assessment to be undertaken to allow events of this nature to occur.

The purpose of the assessment process is to assess environmental values and the potential impacts of activities. Sustainable Timber Tasmania provides information on its website and in its publicly available Forest Management Plan as to the process to conduct an event on Permanent Timber Production Zone land.

- (2) Sustainable Timber Tasmania has advised me that the event was not authorised by Sustainable Timber Tasmania, nor was Sustainable Timber Tasmania aware of the location of the event prior to it occurring.
- (3) Sustainable Timber Tasmania has advised me that there is no statutory duty of care prescribed in the Forest Management Act 2013. The act includes a specific exemption in relation to roads -

20. Forest Manager not liable for failure to maintain forest road

The Forest Manager does not incur any liability by virtue of its failure to keep a forest road in repair in respect of pedestrian or vehicular traffic using that road.

The Work Health and Safety Act 2012 prescribes a duty of care effectively in circumstances where PTPZ land is a workplace within the meaning of the WHS act. This includes a duty of care to 'other persons' not just 'workers'. It is also important to note that 'other persons' have a duty of care as well, namely to take reasonable care of his or her own health and safety.

There is a common law duty of care where it can be established that STT is in actual control of a relevant area - for example, doing works or where a specific hazard or risk was brought to its attention and then it would be required to respond, armed with that knowledge in a way that was reasonable taking into account the nature of the risk et cetera. The Civil Liability Act 2002 limits exposure to a breach of duty of care.

- (4) (a) Sustainable Timber Tasmania has advised me that they have not assessed the trees in the area of the forest protests. STT were not aware of the location of the protests as BBF did not apply for the required permits.
(b) No.
- (5) (a) Yes. STT, as forest manager under section 22 of the Forest Management Act 2013 has the authority to prohibit a person from entering an area of Permanent Timber Production Zone land in the interests of a person's safety. The act also provides for an authorised officer of the forest manager to similarly prohibit persons from undertaking those activities.
(b) Yes. STT, as forest manager under section 22 of the Forest Management Act 2013 has the authority to prohibit a person from remaining in an area of Permanent Timber Production Zone land in the interests of a person's safety. The act also provides for an authorised officer of the forest manager to similarly prohibit persons from undertaking those activities.

29. EAR, NOSE AND THROAT SURGEONS - SPECIALIST SERVICES

Ms ARMITAGE asked the Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council, Mrs Hiscutt -

- (1) How many ENT surgeons are currently providing specialist services in -

- (a) The north-west?
 - (b) Launceston?
 - (c) Hobart?
- (2) Of the total number of ENT specialists, how many are -
- (a) expected to retire across the three regions in the near future; and
 - (b) is it expected that two overseas-trained surgeons at the Launceston General Hospital will be leaving?
- (3) What specific plans are in place and what action is the Government taking to address issues surrounding recruitment and retention of ENT specialists in Tasmania considering there has not been any ENT specialist trainees in Tasmania for 15 years?

The incorporated answer read as follows -

- (1) The Government is advised that most hours of ENT specialists are presently worked within the private sector.
- In the public system, ENT surgeons work as follows -
- (a) In the north-west, one ENT surgeon is employed as an ENT visiting medical specialist - VMS - working 0.47 full-time equivalent.
 - (b) While recruitment for a permanent specialist continues, the Launceston General Hospital has on-call coverage provided by two local ENT visiting medical specialists for one week each per month. Urgent cases are referred to the Royal Hobart Hospital if required.
 - (c) In Hobart two ENT surgeons are employed as ENT VMS, each working 0.26 FTE, and two others are employed as ENT visiting medical officers, each working 0.09 FTE. A career medical officer and an ENT registrar also each work full-time.
- (2) Any practitioner's retirement is a personal decision based on a range of factors. The two overseas-trained ENT specialists at the LGH have unfortunately departed due to a range of factors, although one has expressed an interest to the THS in returning to the LGH as a specialist surgeon if he is able to obtain his Australian qualification, which could occur next year.
- (3) There is a desire to support accredited training in Tasmania, and this will be considered by the Royal Hobart Hospital. Future specialist medical recruitment strategies for the THS will be informed by the Health Recruitment, Retention and Workforce Planning Unit.

30. TRAFFIC MONITORING CAMERAS

Ms ARMITAGE asked the Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council, Mrs Hiscutt -

With regard to cameras installed at traffic intersections, given the obvious benefits for recording and retaining footage from traffic monitoring cameras, including for the purposes of assisting police investigations, as well as planning for traffic infrastructure and road user safety, what are the reasons for the Department of State Growth not recording and retaining footage from traffic monitoring cameras?

The incorporated answer read as follows -

The Department of State Growth has advised that it operates and maintains traffic monitoring cameras at various locations for the purpose of managing the State Road Network. These cameras feed back to the State Roads traffic management centre, from where operators monitor traffic conditions which allows them to adjust traffic signal timing, variable speed limits and other devices installed around the network as appropriate.

Operators can pan, tilt and zoom, to suit the operational needs at the time. It is not possible to predict at any particular time the view that will be available from any of the traffic monitoring cameras, meaning capturing footage of a particular incident is not guaranteed.

Footage from traffic monitoring cameras is also provided in real time to Tasmania Police, enabling them to monitor conditions directly.

The department has also advised that the image resolution that is available from the traffic monitoring cameras is such that it is possible to detect significant details, including information that could potentially be used to identify individuals. Due to concerns around the management of this potentially sensitive data, the department's policy is to not record or retain traffic monitoring camera footage.

FACIAL RECOGNITION DATA COLLECTION

Member for Nelson - Questions

[11.15 a.m.]

Mrs HISCUTT (Montgomery - Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council) - Mr President, I seek leave to provide answers to the member for Nelson's question following a government briefing regarding facial recognition.

Leave granted.

Mrs HISCUTT - Mr President, I want to read out the answers to the member for Nelson's questions. I will read the questions to give clarity. In hindsight these questions should have been placed on the Notice Paper because they were fairly intricate and detailed.

The questions were -

- (1) What legislative authority does the registrar rely upon for secondary collection of facial data for the purposes of the 2017 Intergovernmental Agreement on Identity Matching Services not relating to the functions of the registrar under section 6 of the Vehicle and Traffic Act?

- (2) In the notice of the Vehicle and Traffic (Driver Licensing and Vehicle Registration) Amendment (Identity Matching Services) Regulations 2017 it was stated that the regulations would -

... amend the Vehicle and Traffic (Driver Licensing and Vehicle Registration) Regulations 2010 to allow the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to divulge information in accordance with the Intergovernmental Agreement on Identity Matching Services.

- (a) Noting the regulations may only be issued within the jurisdiction of the act (common law, section 45 of the Vehicle and Traffic Act – VTA), what legislative authority does the registrar rely upon for the issuing of regulations for each and every purpose set out in clause 1.2 of the Intergovernmental Agreement on Identity Matching Services?
- (b) If the above-stated regulations related only to the divulging of information, under what authority has the registrar been collecting facial records for purposes of the Intergovernmental Agreement on Identity Matching Services?

- (3) Under clause 2 of the intergovernmental agreement, Tasmania agreed that -

... the design and operation of the Identity Matching Services adopt robust privacy safeguards, informed by independently conducted privacy impact assessments, developed in consultation with federal and state privacy commissioners (or equivalents), to balance privacy impacts against the broader benefits to the community from sharing and matching identity information.

- (a) What specific privacy assessment was undertaken in respect of this undertaking prior to the collection of data of the Face Verification Service?
- (b) When was this privacy assessment undertaken?
- (c) On what basis was the exemption for the collection of a regulatory impact statement granted that means no RIS was conducted on the amendments to the Vehicle and Traffic (Driver Licensing and Vehicle Registration) Regulations 2010?
- (d) How does the secondary collection of data to the Face Verification Service database comply with privacy information principle 1 under Schedule 1 of the Personal Information Protection Act?

- (4) The Legislative Council was informed at the briefing on 28 November 2019 that a regulatory impact statement was not prepared for the Subordinate Legislation Committee under section 5 of the Subordinate Legislation Act.

- (a) Were the burdens on the community and individual privacy considered in determining not to issue a regulatory impact statement?
- (b) Did the registrar or department explicitly advise the minister no part of the regulations would impose any significant burden, cost or disadvantage on any sector of the public?

- (c) Did the registrar or department make an assessment as to whether or not the regulation was within the regulation-making power conferred by, or in accord with the general objects of, the act pursuant to which it is made?

I am sure members can appreciate that was some fairly intricate questioning, so I do apologise for the time it took but the minister wanted to get it right. We have the answer today, which is that -

Driver licences are the most common form of identification used in Australia and are therefore a target used by criminals, including organised crime, to assume somebody's identity or create a false one. New identities are also created to obtain a new driver licence to avoid licence suspension. The new service will be a tool to assist the Registrar of Motor Vehicles and Tasmania Police to detect duplicate and false identities, thereby maintaining the integrity of driver licences and limiting opportunities for identity fraud and other identity-based crime.

The collection of facial images for drivers licences has been in place for nearly 30 years. The Vehicle and Traffic (Driver Licensing and Vehicle Registration) Regulations 2010, in particular regulations 20, 25, 29 and 138, are the current legislated authority for the collection of these images. The requirement to divulge images for the purposes of identity matching services has not resulted in the collection of any additional information or images. The registrar already held this information for the purposes of driver licensing.

With regard to the questions raised, the following information is provided -

- (1) and (2)

Data provided in accordance with the 2017 Intergovernmental Agreement on Identity Matching Services is already held in the registers maintained by the registrar. No additional data is collected for the purposes of the agreement. These registers and the registrar's powers to release information from them have been created under the authority of section 41 of the Vehicle and Traffic Act 1999.

The data transferred into the segregated National Driver Licence Facial Recognition Solution - NDLFRS - database is a subset of the register of driver licences. The driver licence register is required to be kept under regulation 124 of the licensing regulations. The registrar maintains and owns the NDLFRS database and no other jurisdiction or agency is able to amend or delete or add extra data into this segregated database. The National Exchange of Vehicle and Driver Information System - NEVDIS - also contains a subset of the driver licence register except for images and has done so for a number of years.

- (3) The registrar is empowered to divulge protected information from the driver licence register in accordance with regulation 125 of the licensing regulations. Additionally, divulging information for the purposes of identity matching services under the agreement is also consistent with personal information protection principles set out in the Personal Information Protection Act 2004. These principles allow for the disclosure of personal information for a purpose other than the purpose for which it was collected if the disclosure is reasonably necessary for law enforcement purposes. A comprehensive set of safeguards

were developed in consultation with federal and state privacy commissioners, including the Tasmanian Ombudsman.

- (4) In accordance with the Subordinate Legislation Act 1992, an assessment of this amendment was undertaken by and received endorsement from the Department of Treasury and Finance in November 2017, and final determination was given in December 2017 that a regulatory impact statement was not required because the regulation did not impose a significant burden, cost or disadvantage on any sector of the public. The then minister for Infrastructure provided a certificate of compliance that the guidelines were followed in accordance with section 4 of the Subordinate Legislation Act. This was provided to the Subordinate Legislation Committee in January 2018.

TABLED PAPER

Select Committee into Short Stay Accommodation in Tasmania Government Response to Report

[11.23 a.m.]

Mrs Hiscutt tabled the Government's response the report of the Legislative Council Select Committee inquiry into short stay accommodation in Tasmania.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Member for Pembroke

Mrs HISCUTT (Montgomery - Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council)(by leave) - Mr President, I move -

That the honourable member for Pembroke, Ms Siejka, be granted absence of leave from the service of the Council following the birth of her first child on Wednesday 26 February 2020.

MOTIONS

Member for Prosser - Discharge from Committees

[11.24 a.m.]

Mrs HISCUTT (Montgomery - Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council) (by leave) - Mr President, I move -

That the honourable member for Prosser, the Minister for Racing, Minister for Sport and Recreation, Ms Howlett, be discharged from the Legislative Council Select Committee on AFL in Tasmania, Select Committee on Production of Documents and the Select Committee on Greater Hobart Traffic Congestion.

Establishment of Committees

[11.25 a.m.]

Ms FORREST (Murchison)(by leave) - Mr President, I move -

That the following revised ministerial portfolios be allocated to the Legislative Council Government Administration Committees A and B as a result of the 28 January 2020 ministerial portfolio changes.

Committee A: the Premier, the Treasurer, the Minister for Climate Change, the Minister for the Prevention of Family Violence, the Minister for Tourism, the Minister for Health, the Minister for Strategic Growth, the Minister for Women, the Minister for Small Business, Hospitality and Events, the Minister for Housing, the Minister for the Environment and Parks, the Minister for Human Services, the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, the Minister for Planning, the Minister for Finance, the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, the Minister for State Growth and the Minister for Science and Technology; and,

Committee B: the Deputy Premier, the Minister for Education and Training, the Minister for Mental Health and Wellbeing, the Minister for Disability Services and Community Development, the Minister for Trade, the Minister for Advanced Manufacturing and Defence Industries, the Attorney-General, the Minister for Justice, the Minister for Corrections, the Minister for Building and Construction, the Minister for the Arts, the Minister for Heritage, the Minister for Primary Industries and Water, the Minister for Energy, the Minister for Resources, the Minister for Veterans' Affairs, the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Management, the Minister for Local Government, the Minister for Sport and Recreation and the Minister for Racing.

[11.26 a.m.]

Mr DEAN (Windermere) - Thank you, Mr President, I support the motion. These changes were necessary because of the situation with the Government and the resignation of the Premier. A number of portfolio areas were changed and I think they are a good fit. I sent it to all members of Sessional Committee B. I had one response to say they were satisfied with it; others did not respond and I take it that they are happy as well.

Motion agreed to.

SPECIAL INTEREST MATTERS

Uluru Statement

[11.27 a.m.]

Mr FINCH (Rosevears) - Mr President, it was interesting to hear your welcome today to Aboriginal land - the first time we have heard that. It is a snap for me because I want to talk about a tragically squandered opportunity. The Uluru Statement from the Heart of 2017 presented an opportunity for the federal government and opportunities for state governments to make dramatic progress in reconciliation between our First Nation people and all Australians. It sometimes seems

that any step toward reckoning with this nation's colonial foundations and genuinely acknowledging the voice of its traditional owners falters. This is not a new phenomenon.

Almost 200 years after Governor Arthur reflected on the 'fatal error' of not having a treaty with this island's Indigenous peoples, Australia remains the only Commonwealth country never to have reached a treaty with its Aboriginal peoples - the only one. This is a matter of great shame and continuing harm. Why haven't we adequately acknowledged the devastating implications of this truth for generations of Aboriginal people? Why haven't we created space in our parliaments for Aboriginal people to be heard?

As I learnt in a very public way three years ago, the process of reconciliation is not always straightforward. In 2017, I proposed that my electorate of Rosevears be renamed kanamaluka, the palawa kani name for the Tamar estuary. This was proposed as an act of reconciliation with our past through the symbolic renaming of my upper House seat. However, I was to learn that my perspective and the perspective of the traditional custodians are very different, as the Tasmanian Aboriginal Council Chief Executive, Heather Sculthorpe, explained. I learnt that Aboriginal people, who feel disenfranchised from the political system that now governs their homelands, consider it incongruous to consent to cultural renaming of a political electorate when the system has not changed to become more inclusive of First Nation people. Despite internal divisions, the Uluru Statement continues to offer the best hope of a solution.

The three key elements to the reform set out in the Uluru Statement involved enshrining a First Nation voice in the Australian Constitution that would empower Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. They involved a commission to supervise a process of agreement making with Australian governments and to oversee a process of truth-telling about Australia's history and colonisation. That is a brief summary of what to my mind is a brilliant, almost poetic statement. I urge everyone to read it and then read it again.

The key phrase, and I will quote, is 'we seek to be heard'. As far as the federal government was concerned that fell on deaf ears, but the call of the Uluru Statement will not be silenced. The federal government may refuse to act, but there is evidence the Uluru Statement continues to resonate among ordinary people, the First Australians and those who came later.

The Tasmanian Premier may not be a great dancer - as we saw on television - but his awareness of Tasmanian Indigenous issues was demonstrated at an Indigenous celebration in Launceston last month. He alluded to the ongoing journey to mend relationships and recognise the past. He may well prove to be better at reconciliation than he is at dancing, but he had a go.

The Chair of the Aboriginal Land Council of Tasmania, Michael Mansell, believes a treaty with the state Government would help right the wrongs carried out on Aboriginal people. It could result in more land being returned under the *Aboriginal Lands Act 1995* and increasing the lower House to 35 seats could open up the opportunity for a permanent Aboriginal seat. As Aboriginal historian and author Dr Patsy Cameron says, Tasmania already has a treaty made on three separate occasions in 1831 between the colonial government and three Aboriginal leaders which was never honoured by the government, but was never rescinded.

Aunty Patsy says the Tasmanian Parliament should acknowledge the existence of that 1831 treaty to open the way for Aboriginal people and political leaders to consider what a modern-day treaty might look like. A revised treaty could provide for Aboriginal voices in parliament and it

should ensure returns of land to Aboriginal people and honour those promises made in the 1831 treaty.

Veteran journalist Kerry O'Brien told an audience at last year's Logies that the failure to reconcile Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australia remained one big glaring gap in this nation's history. While lamenting, and I quote, 'the awful racism this country is capable of', he said the Uluru Statement endorsing a constitutionally enshrined Indigenous representative body offered hope for the future. Kerry O'Brien concluded, and I will quote again -

We all have an opportunity to make a genuine effort to understand and support what is embodied in the Uluru Statement from the Heart. We like to be seen as one nation made up of many parts. Now is the time to prove it.

The Uluru Statement from the Heart is 12 paragraphs long, 439 words. Three years on, it is an historical Australian document which I am confident will eventually help shape a dynamic new relationship between First Australians and those who came later.

[11.34 a.m.]

Sailing Vessel *Rhona H*

Ms ARMITAGE (Launceston) - Mr President, today I am speaking about one of Hobart's oldest and smallest working tall ships, the sailing vessel *Rhona H* or *SV Rhona H*, to which it is commonly abbreviated. In the interests of full disclosure, the *Rhona H* was for over 20 years in the possession of my husband, meaning I know it very well, and I understand its authenticity and just how much it means to people. Since the sale of the vessel, I have become its patron.

The 52-foot gaff-rigged fishing vessel was originally built for Frere Youl of Symmons Plains in 1942, and was sold around 1946 to Max Hardy, a Stanley fisherman, who helped promote the crayfish industry in north-west Tasmania around that time. The *Rhona H* was built by Tasmanian shipwright Ned Jack, from Huon pine over celery top frames with Tasmanian Oregon masts. Those with knowledge of these materials will be aware of their high quality and thus begin to understand the quality of the vessel itself.

The *Rhona H* is equipped with traditional rigging, six handmade sails and authentic wooden blocks. Whilst there are modern sailing tools on board for emergency use, typically the rigging and furling the mast is done all the traditional way, making it extremely environmentally friendly. Stepping onto the *SV Rhona H* therefore is like stepping back in time. It forms a special part of Tasmania's rich sailing history and heritage.

The *Rhona H* continued to be used as a commercial fishing vessel until around the early 1990s, at which time she was converted for use in sail training and charter work. Throughout her tenure the *Rhona H* has made many trips across Bass Strait to Queenscliff on Victoria's coast and has sailed to King and Flinders islands. These days the *Rhona H* is a Hobart icon, setting sail from Sullivans Cove all year round, crewed by volunteers, usually on the weekend, with twilight harbour sails offered during the summer months.

Trips on the *Rhona H* range from short trips along the River Derwent, or longer day sails along the D'Entrecasteaux Channel down to Kettering and Bruny Island. Annually, the vessel makes a trip to Port Arthur or Recherche Bay, providing a truly authentic and immersive experience for those who make these trips. The *Rhona H* is operated by Heritage Sailing Tasmania, a not-for-

profit enterprise, whose vision is to integrate traditional sailing, conservation and health promotion in Tasmania. Heritage Sailing Tasmania does this by providing these unique experiences for their crews and guests, and providing team building, education, health and enjoyment.

As an organisation which is so entrenched in the maritime community in Tasmania, and which works with the organisations such as the Cruising Yacht Club of Tasmania and the Wooden Boat Guild, Heritage Sailing Tasmania and the SV *Rhona H* promote health and wellbeing, social cohesion, and secure passage of heritage maritime knowledge for their youth development programs. The sense of connection and community which is fostered through these activities places an emphasis on mindfulness and brings a team spirit to the crew and guests on the trips the SV *Rhona H* makes. The *Rhona H* therefore brings vibrancy and a rich culture to the Tasmanian maritime community.

To this end, the SV *Rhona H* has also deservedly received a number of awards and recognitions, including a bronze award from the Tasmanian Tourism Awards in 2018, winning the innovative service award from the Innovative Tasmania Awards in 2017, and a certificate of excellence from Trip Advisor in 2019, amongst many others. We are very lucky to have access to such a vessel, which is so true to history in both the way it looks and the way it operates. Under Heritage Sailing Tasmania stewardship, the SV *Rhona H* provides people with a truly unique and authentic opportunity to experience traditional sailing on a traditional vessel, which brings a great deal of character to our waters. I encourage everyone here to visit the vessel at Elizabeth Street Pier, and to perhaps even try their hand at some of the tasks on a weekend trip. I know the current owners, Julie and Charles, would make everyone very welcome. The SV *Rhona H* is a truly magnificent vessel and adds richness and depth to Tasmania's maritime community.

End of Life Choices Bill

[11.39 a.m.]

Mr GAFFNEY (Mersey) - Mr President, my special interest speech is about the process I have undertaken in the last couple of months regarding the forums held across the state. It is good for parliamentarians and those listening to hear about what is and is going to happen. It is about the process regarding one of the bills to come up later in the year.

I have had the opportunity to speak to present the forums across all 29 council areas, from speaking to two people at Nubeena to 55 people at Port Sorell, about 650 people in all. I would like to thank some councils that are very proactive in getting the flyers out into the community. That was really good. I have had 10 members of parliament attend those, some more than once. I appreciate that - six MLCs and four MHAs.

I also realise how busy people are in their working lives. Some members of parliament sent staff. One member even sent their partner along because she could not attend. That is why I am offering three forums here in parliament for parliamentarians and their advisers and staff: Monday from 3.00 to 4.00 p.m.; Wednesday from 1.15 to 2.15 p.m.; and Friday from 9.00 to 10.00 a.m. next week. If they did not have a chance to attend forums in their communities, they might be able to attend these. It is important for them to hear the message I have been sharing with the community.

The first part of that message is that I am not here to convince people, I am here to explain a process.

In doing that, I was initially focused on the background of the voluntary assisted dying bill at international, national and state levels. Then I spoke about the bill and the parliamentary process and I found that very interesting. One teacher, who is a very good teacher and has been teaching at a primary school level for over 30 years, said, 'Michael, I did not realise that you could have private members' bills originating in the upper House'. She said, 'I have been teaching this for 30 years'. Presenting that material was interesting.

I also had to talk about the political environment. People wanted to know what happened in Tasmania in 2009, 2013 and 2016, and the strategy of when the bill would be presented and people found that interesting. Throughout the PowerPoint presentation I tried to focus on the bill and what is going to happen and what happens in parliament. I had a lot of people come up to me to say that they were very pleased to be exposed to that.

I was asked to carry the bill some 18 months to two years ago by Dying with Dignity, if the bill were tabled in the lower House and passed. I was then asked to consider to move the bill as a private member's bill in the upper House. I decided, if that were the case that I would need to make certain that the bill to be presented was not one that had gone through and had been developed in 2009, 2013 to 2016. I then asked the Premier if I could have access to the Office of Parliamentary Counsel, which he agreed with.

In October, November and December last year, I worked with the Office of Parliamentary Counsel. Instead of the bill being presented in November last year, as was first thought, I thought it was important to put out a consultation version of the bill to the people of Tasmania. That was presented by the end of January and accessed. I thought it was important to visit all council areas to present the forums, so that people were aware. This enabled me to get feedback from all those different groups. Individually, I am meeting with different groups, nurses, doctors, COTA, the children's commissioner, and individual parliamentarians who have asked me for individual briefings, which has been really good.

That is the process. It was also important to understand that the Victorian six-month operation report - because they passed their bill on 19 June 2019 - was to come into play on 19 February. It was important to have that information. That information highlighted that 52 events, as the Canadians called them, of people taking the voluntary assisted dying pathway, have occurred in Victoria in the last six months; 43 of those were self-administered and nine of those were physician-assisted.

If you look at that purely on a numerical basis, there are about 6.5 million people in Victoria, say, 500 000 people here in Tasmania - that is one-thirteenth. To equate it, that would be about four people in Tasmania. However, there are different demographics, but it is simply to give people an idea of the number of people who might have gone down that road.

What will happen now? With a new premier and a new Cabinet, I felt that all focus would be on that situation. Now, with the pandemic, focus has also moved. In May, we have elections for Rosevears and Huon. In June, it will be the Budget. The best time for this bill to be tabled will be in August, and that is our aim.

I held a preliminary forum to members of the Latrobe Bowls Club and my family. I thought, 'If you are going to take this around the state, you had better make sure it is of interest.' When I returned home that night I asked my wife, 'What do you think?' She said, 'You talk too much', but I knew what she was talking about because it seemed as though there was a lot of information-giving

because I do not have any personal involvement or interest in this subject. I have not had a family member or close friend who has needed this. From a strategic point of view, that is very good because I am not being -

Mr Finch - Emotionally involved.

Mr GAFFNEY - Yes, I am not emotionally involved. The legislation is what I think is the best thing. From that point of view, I have not tried to skew it. She said, 'Michael, what you're missing is something that connects as to why you are doing this.' That night, it was opportune that I had an email from two ladies, Jacqui and Nat Gray, whose mother had passed away in dire circumstances in late September 2019. They said, 'Mr Gaffney, we saw that you were doing a forum in the south. This is our mother's circumstance and we'd like to be able to help in any way we can.' They sent the last diary entry of Diane Gray. When I read that, I said, 'Thank you very much, what you said is very heart-touching.'

The next day I contacted the daughters and asked, 'Do you mind doing a voice over of that?' That has been included in the forum, but was not in the first one I did. It is the glue for the presentation because it shows how some people's lives are impacted by this and it was very important. I met the ladies at the Hobart forum, which was really good, the first time I had ever met them. They are organising a petition and that petition is available and will be tabled in the lower House on 18 August. That petition is online. There are also hard copies. The daughters decided that is what they wanted to do to help with this whole process.

On the other side we have Dying with Dignity, and I am not working with Dying with Dignity other than keeping them involved and forwarding on information to members as it comes to me, because my job is to put forward the legislation.

Stage 2 of the process will be to meet with individual groups. Stage 1 was the 35 forums across the state, including the islands. Stage 2 will be people contacting me individually about presenting the material to groups. At the moment, I have one at the Rural Clinical School on the north-west coast where I will be presenting to both doctors and students. Next week, I have had to pull back on the meeting that was to be held at the university in a couple of weeks time due to the pandemic but we will see where that goes.

I will be tabling a bill on Friday, 21 August and speaking to the bill on 25 August. People will have plenty of time to prepare for that. The consultation bill has been quite good in that issues have been brought to my attention through that process and other people. I will be able to address some of those issues, so the bill presented in August will be one that has been fully debated. If any individual members would like further information, please feel free to come and see me. Thank you for your leniency.

Wattle Group

[11.48 a.m.]

Mr DEAN (Windermere) - Mr President, I bring to the attention of this Chamber an amazing organisation that has been serving the people of the greater George Town and Launceston area for over 35 years and meeting client needs 24 hours a day, seven days a week. They were providing support and activities to over 316 clients under 65 years of age and over 530 clients over 65 years of age. I am saddened to say that this year will be their final year in operation and the doors will close on 31 March this year.

In 2017, the Department of Health and Human Services decided to remove its funding from the Wattle Group, a decision based upon the findings of a questionable and, in the opinion of senior management of the Wattle Group, an incorrect, in many places, audit report written by KPMG. The report, on my advice, contained errors and incorrect information, and these errors were shown to the department at the time the report was published. After much toing and froing between the department and the group and the pointing out of the errors and incorrect information contained within the report the department was basing its decision on, the department refused to change its position of having no reason or obligation to revisit its decision to not enter into a new funding agreement. The group also asked for a meeting with the then Health minister, which never occurred - he would not participate in the meeting which was disappointing for a number of people.

Wattle Group terminated its funding agreement with the Commonwealth in June 2019 as the amount of funding it would receive could not support the required staff to continue. Since that time, all the paid staff except one have been let go and the smaller Wattle Group organisation is run mostly by volunteers. It has also had to sell its original office and downsize or lease the property so as to continue delivery services to the elderly people in George Town. They continued to deliver services to the frail, aged and younger people with a disability and their carers. This included transport at a cost of \$1000 a month for fuel for a further two years. They have delivered over 2500 hours of service for the elderly in George Town in the last nine months with no funding at all. I am not too sure why they did it. This should be commended as KPMG stated it was a poorly managed organisation.

On all the facts of this case and the willingness of the department to accept without qualification or testing any of the disputed facts, it is reasonable to assume it had an agenda here and that was achieved. It would have been better achieved with fairness and openness, rather than discreditation. As I find the whole process unacceptable, I have decided to formerly recognise the amazing work this group has done over the past 36 years.

This organisation should not be able to close its doors without proper recognition of the services it has provided to Tasmanians needing assistance and support over a long period. The Wattle Group's main role is to provide support and advice to vulnerable people. Until 2017, it the organisation was registered with the National Disability Insurance Scheme, until the department had it deregistered. The Wattle Group has received many messages of support during this time and most are of the sentiment of this. I am going to read out a couple but I have many of them.

So tragic to hear that Wattle Group are ceasing all services. You have provided great service to us over the past years, and this gap will not be easily filled. Special thanks to remaining staff and volunteers for all your assistance.

Signed, client.

Another one -

I was a cleaner and applied for a position with Wattle Group. They must have seen something in me and hired me. They gave me training and I now have an Associate Diploma in Business Management. I found them a good organisation to work for, very flexible and understanding and I enjoyed the years I spent with them.

Signed Shelley, Assessment Officer.

Another one -

I am deeply saddened that Wattle Group is closing because for many years I have used Transport to get to my early renal appointments which, as you know, were outside normal working hours. I am not sure what the future will hold for me, but I just want to thank you all for your support.

Signed Max, client.

There are a number of others, and I will not read through them, of similar ilk. I am saddened the Wattle Group has been treated in the way it has by the department, which, in my opinion, has not given the group a fair hearing or fair go and that is un-Australian. I did what I could, short of calling for an inquiry; perhaps in hindsight that is what I should have done. I could still do it.

Neither this department nor the Government has recognised the good service of the Wattle Group over the last 35 years. I recognise KPMG is a well-recognised and credentialed business, but it too makes errors. I can give you a personal experience of an error made in a matter it was dealing with for me. The clients of the Wattle Group are the ones paying the price of the removal of funding. Have they been considered by the department? Does the department care about their loss of service and their welfare? Nothing has been done by them that I am aware of that would demonstrate their concern or care. I am bitterly disappointed in the way this matter has been managed throughout.

I commend the Wattle Group for its work, consideration and care of challenged and vulnerable people over a 35-year period. They did what they could to help these people and put themselves out. Many volunteers worked in this organisation and they have been dealt a severe blow. I thank them for the work they have done. Thank you.

**St Helens Mountain Bike Trail
North Eastern Soldiers Memorial Hospital
Dr Paul McGinity - Retirement**

[11.55 a.m.]

Ms RATTRAY (McIntyre) - Mr President, choosing what to speak on today for McIntyre was a very difficult task. I have gone with two events, but there were quite a few other contenders. I will do my best to get them into this important slot in the future.

It is clear that the north-east is the bike mecca of our state. A recent media article stated that north-east Tasmania is fast becoming the number one mountain bike place in Australia, and one of the top five in the world. With the official opening of the trails in late November 2019, Tasmania now has a new world-class mountain bike trail, comprising 110 kilometres on the doorstep of the Bay of Fires and the township of St Helens.

I was fortunate to have a guided tour prior to the official opening. I thank the Break O'Day Council for arranging my tour. A special thank you to the Trails Project Manager, Ben Pettman, for making the time to show me around when there was so much activity onsite, in preparation for the opening the following week. My tour consisted of the trailhead site on the southern side of the

St Helens township and the surrounding trail. The facilities are fantastic, from the location in what we in the country call 'the bush setting', to the amenities -

Mrs Hiscutt - Did you do your tour on a pushbike?

Ms RATTRAY - No. The facilities are fantastic, from the location in what we in the country call 'the bush setting' to the amenities at the site, to the spectacular shelter and the wonderful pole entrance at the head of the trail. The St Helens trails have added another dimension to the Blue Derby, Weldborough and Blue Tier mountain bike experiences. Now with the Bay of Fires trail you can ride from the mountains to the sea - what a marketing pitch that is.

The cost of the project was \$3.2 million. The St Helens community is already seeing a strong return on investment to their community. This is expected to grow as the St Helens experience adds to Tasmania's reputation as a world-class destination in this high-yielding market segment. Congratulations to the Break O'Day Council on its proactive approach in developing this quality mountain bike experience, and continuing to build on the mountain bike sensation.

Mr President, the next item is bound to be of interest to yourself, given your connection with Scottsdale. Like thousands of others, we were born at the NESM Hospital in Scottsdale. This year, 2020, the North Eastern Soldiers Memorial Hospital will have served the people of the north-east for 100 years. To celebrate and commemorate this significant milestone, the current director of nursing, Wendy Mackay, decided that a book would be an excellent way to mark this milestone. Wendy co-authored *Celebrating a Century of Caring* with Paul AC Richards, a medical historian from the Launceston General Hospital Historical Committee. Paul Richards was aware of much of the NESM's origins and history, and was certainly the right person to work with Wendy Mackay on writing this book.

The NESM Hospital, as the name indicated, was established in 1920 to care for the soldiers who returned from World War I with severe injuries, and officially opened on 17 December of that year. Interestingly, this hospital is one of only three in Australia established to look after soldiers who returned from the war. One of the chapters talks about Tasmania's early nurses. In the early 1900s, Nurse Heazlewood - still a very common name in the area - opened the first cottage hospital in 1907. The first bush nursing orders were in Launceston in 1910. Again, interestingly, bush nurses are still working in our rural areas to this very day, caring for those who need medical care in their home; just the name has changed to 'community nurses'. From personal experience I can attest to the fact that the care by these community nurses in the local area is valuable and a much-needed service.

A quote from the last page of the book sums up well how important the hospital has been, and continues to be, to the north-east -

When the community first mooted the idea of establishing a Hospital in the North East more than a hundred years ago, they were seeking health care that was of a high standard and close to home. Over this time, it is evident that the motto included in the North Eastern Soldier's Memorial Hospital badge of 'strive to excel' has been the forefront for everyone concerned. These past 100 years have shaped a quality health service for the community in the north-east of Tasmania. It is this legacy that will be passed to the future health service and health professionals to continue.

For anyone interested in history, and particularly the history of the north-east, this book is a must-read.

Mr President, this reference to health professionals is the perfect segue to acknowledge the recent retirement of one of our most trusted and admired health professionals to ever serve the north-east, Dr Paul McGinity. Paul retired after 43 years of dedicated service to his patients and the people of the north-east through his practice and his involvement with the NESM Hospital. As an example of his longstanding commitment to his profession, during a recent interview Dr McGinity revealed he had delivered about 2000 babies - including three of my babies, so to say that I have nothing but admiration and gratitude to this wonderful doctor is an understatement.

I do not expect the north-east, or too many other rural communities in our state, will ever have a full-time doctor on call 24/7 as Dr Paul McGinity has been over his decades of service.

To Paul, his wife Anne, on behalf of this community I represent, and more broadly all Tasmanians, thank you for your dedicated service. We sincerely wish you both a wonderful, happy and healthy retirement as you spend quality time with your family, who are scattered far and wide. All the very best. Thank you.

Redpa Football Club - Good Sports Award

[12.02 p.m.]

Ms FORREST (Murchison) - Mr President, late last year, a community-minded and exceptional local football club won the Good Sports Club of the Year for 2019. The Redpa Football Club from far north-west Tasmania in my electorate of Murchison was crowned Good Sports Club of the Year. The club received this award for inspiring positive change and building a healthy family-friendly club. They received \$1000 to mark their achievement.

To receive this honour, clubs have to demonstrate their commitment to building healthy and inclusive environments, where members look to work for each other in the areas of alcohol and tobacco management, safe transportation, healthy eating, mental health and positive spectator behaviour.

Redpa Football Club President Shane Hine, when accepting this award, credited the Good Sports program for its support in making the rural club the inclusive place it is today. When speaking about the award, he noted that for the past 20 years, the club has been working towards shifting its culture, and the Good Sports program has helped them move towards this goal in leaps and bounds.

Having reached the highest level of the Good Sports program, the Redpa Football Club holds regular alcohol-free events, provides safe transport options at events where alcohol is consumed, and has implemented a smoking-management policy.

Redpa Football Club goes above and beyond to encourage participation. For example, they work towards this by running free buses to and from training, and providing dinner for junior players. Erin Franks another member of the club, also spoke about the work the club had done to achieve this recognition, including making the club truly family-friendly, inclusive, safe and fun.

As with many country football clubs, drinking culture can make the club less family-friendly. This is one area in which the club has done a lot of work to promote a safe and family-friendly,

healthy place to play and socialise. Stuart Gale is currently the club's head trainer, and is a past club and association president. The current president, Shane Hine, is also the club's delegate to the Circular Head Football Association, and has a lot to do with that organisation.

Clearly, Mr President, grassroots football is the lifeblood of many regional areas, and a focus on participation at this level is vital for the future of football in this state - especially if there is ever to be a statewide team. I commend the work of all players, volunteers and supporters of the regional football clubs and sincerely congratulate the Redpa Football Club on winning this prestigious award late last year. Changing culture in areas such as this is often very challenging and this great achievement should be recognised and celebrated. I wish the Redpa Football Club all the best for the 2020 season, whatever that may look like.

In addition to this great news, Wynyard Football Club President, Kent Jackson, is working on a new football development program for junior football, the Circular Head football development program. This is partly in response to the loss of the Smithton team. The purpose of this initiative is to tackle some of the disadvantages junior footballers and coaches face living in rural or remote communities in accessing regular and high-quality development opportunities. The program's overarching goal is to provide motivated male and female junior footballers between the ages of 11 and 16 residing in the region with regular access to high-quality development opportunities with a focus on the provision of specialist and specific coaching and learning opportunities. The coaching and learning will address a collection of on- and off-field skills that players need to reach their full potential as footballers and people, generally. It is not only about footy.

In this context, another key focus will be the facilitation of increased levels of enjoyment of a commitment to the game, with the goal of more young people in the region becoming and remaining engaged in the game. The program will provide individualised assessments, coaching and feedback, along with small and larger group training and education sessions. These sessions will target the key football, physical, psychological and lifestyle-based attributes that underpin the development of confidence and competence on and off the field. These sessions will cover on-field skills as well as the off-field skills, including characteristics of a winning attitude, parenting a successful athlete, adolescent mental health awareness and several other health and wellbeing subjects.

I commend the Redpa Football club and Kent Jackson, for his work on this program for the Wynyard Football Club, and for their important work in dedication to junior development and safe environments. Grassroots football is so important to our communities, as is the importance of a family-friendly football clubs.

I appreciate this season for football is going to be significantly challenging everywhere. It is difficult for the fans, families and the players, but we do need to work together as a community to work through this challenging issue with COVID-19. It is serious because a lot of football clubs include older members of the community who support them and volunteer for them. Whilst it is inconvenient, I support the decisions that are being made. I wish these clubs all the best. It is tough in the best of times and this will make it tougher.

MOTION
Poker Machine Use in Tasmania

[12.08 p.m.]

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

(1) That the Legislative Council notes -

- (a) Australia (with the exception of Western Australia), has an approach to poker machine policy and regulation that is significantly different to virtually all similar countries globally, resulting in Australia having:
 - (i) a disproportionately high number of poker machines per capita;
 - (ii) a typical style of poker machine that is regarded as ‘high intensity’; and
 - (iii) a comparatively high level of harm due to the use of poer machines.
- (b) Poker machines typically in use in Australia are designed and programmed to include features that increase the likelihood of addiction, with evidence suggesting that normal use of Australian poker machines is likely to cause addiction in one in six users, these features relate to -
 - (i) spin speed;
 - (ii) bet limits;
 - (iii) maximum jackpot;
 - (iv) near misses;
 - (v) losses disguised as wins; and
 - (vi) return to player.
- (c) It is possible to modify the design and programming features of poker machines to decrease the likelihood of addiction, and such modifications would have little impact on the recreational use of poker machines by Tasmanians.
- (d) The impact of harm caused by poker machine use on Tasmanian health and mental health services, family support services, welfare services, criminal justice system, domestic violence services, housing and homelessness services, productivity and level of unemployment, is not currently measured and monitored by the Tasmanian Government so as to effectively inform policy development and regulation relating to poker machines.
- (e) Data available on poker machine use indicates -
 - (i) at least 23 000 Tasmanians are in at-risk groups (low, moderate and problem gambling);
 - (ii) one in three Tasmanians personally know someone with a serious problem with gambling on poker machines;
 - (iii) 79 per cent of Tasmanian Gamblers Help clients have poker machines as their primary form of gambling; and
 - (iv) 40 to 60 per cent of the money taken by poker machines comes from people addicted to the machines or are classified as at-risk.
- (f) The Social and Economic Impact Study - SEIS - 2017 notes limitations to the collection of accurate and reliable data in Tasmania on -

- (i) the use of poker machines, including accurate frequency and expenditure; and
 - (ii) employment figures related to poker machines in hotels and clubs.
- (g) To date, the Tasmanian Government has not released and made available for public scrutiny and discussion, modelling on the social and economic impact of the proposed new poker machine licensing arrangements to be introduced in Tasmania in 2023.
- (2) The Legislative Council calls on the Tasmanian Government to undertake and publicly release modelling on the social and economic impact of the proposed new poker machine licensing arrangements to be introduced in Tasmania in 2023.

Mr President, I begin by acknowledging the Mouheneener people as the original owners and custodians the land on which we meet today, nipaluna, Hobart, of lutruwita, Tasmania. I pay my respects to their Elders, past, present and emerging, and I pay my respects to any member of the Tasmanian Aboriginal community here today. I acknowledge the continued connection the Aboriginal community has with this land, despite invasion and dispossession.

I am speaking today in circumstances that are very different to what I had hoped and imagined we might have at the time of this motion. We are in the midst of an uncertain and very serious health epidemic that casts a certain light on all the discussions we have and it changes the way we feel about being here and having discussions of any sort. We are all concerned about the health situation playing out in our communities, in our families and for ourselves. We are also concerned about the flow-on impacts of this situation we find ourselves in. We do not know what is going to happen to the businesses in our state, to the activities we involve ourselves in, to the way our future might look six months from now. I am very mindful of that as I stand here.

I am particularly mindful of vulnerable people at this time. That is a concern shared by many. There are many people in our community who will be finding this time especially difficult, and their lives will be made even more challenging by the changes to normal, everyday routines, by the stress and anxiety that is caused and by the things that will be asked of them. That will play out in many ways in many families, and information is already being made available to people for extra support services and extra forms of assistance that might be needed in this time.

What this shows us is startling - the interconnection of any issue we might talk about - but it links well to one of the points in my motion that we will discuss today; matters to do with poker machine regulation do not sit in isolation. The way we choose to deal with this product and the way we choose to support people who we know are harmed by it are not things that sit separate to the other core issues of our lives, things like our housing situations, our finances, our employment, our health, our mental wellbeing, our children's lives, their education and their future; all these matters are interconnected. We see that clearly playing out in this crisis.

With these interconnections highlighted so starkly, it shows us that if we fall down in our responsibilities in one area it makes it all that much harder to weather a crisis. We find people who have already been left behind in some sense being further harmed, disadvantaged or left behind.

This morning, when I was doing some radio I made a call that something we should be thinking about as a key of health and social measure is closing gaming venues in this state right now and for the foreseeable future, just the gaming rooms.

Across the next few weeks, the people sitting in front of those machines will not be recreational players; it will not be the people who might be popping in on a Saturday night as part of a greater and more enjoyable activity. Anybody sitting in front of a poker machine over the next short while is going to be somebody who has a problem with that machine, somebody who is addicted to that machine, or at risk of addiction. Their health will be immediately and directly impacted by sitting there, interacting with that piece of equipment and perhaps in proximity with others, even more. Their long-term wellbeing will also be in jeopardy as they continue to lose money to those machines because of the issue they have.

At a time when we are providing stimulus to our community to try to keep our economy ticking along, and provide good economic benefit to a range of areas of our economy, the last place we want to see that stimulus go is into a poker machine.

I called for that on the radio this morning. I am very pleased to note that the message came out mid-morning that one of the measures that will be considered in federal Cabinet this afternoon and that may be included in protective measures is the closing of gaming room venues. That would be great to see and would be beneficial for our state on many levels. I am mindful that people are feeling very uncertain and wary today, even here in this Chamber. There is an awkwardness to the arrangements we have around us, and people may be coming and going and finding it difficult to engage with this motion.

I have modified my speech on the hop to try to help accommodate the awkwardness of that and have this process be given what I believe is the prominence, the respect and the honour it deserves of a really decent conversation, while being mindful of our present situation and people's uncertainty and concerns. I have modified a hard copy on the hop and I may, at times, be struggling to keep a thread if I am skipping past pages I have cut out. I thank you in advance for your forbearance.

Mr President, I first began to learn about our state's policy and regulatory arrangements regarding poker machines in late 2015. At that time, I had recently started working at Anglicare Tasmania as the Manager of its Social Action and Research Centre. While poker machines were a very new area of public policy to me it was an area of longstanding research, policy development, advocacy and campaigning for Anglicare. In fact, over close to three decades Anglicare has published dozens of research reports, policy documents, submissions and resources on the issue of poker machine policy and regulation.

Because of the circumstances in late 2015, matters relating to poker machine reform became a very large part of my paid work role. Over the course of the intervening years, I believe I can lay claim now to being probably one of the most well-informed people in this state on this topic. I say that with particular deference to the superior knowledge of my Anglicare colleague, Margie Law, and to the unique scholarship of Dr James Boyce on this topic along with a handful of others who have longstanding experience and insight.

In addition to the knowledge and experience built in my work over this time, I have also developed a personal, passionate commitment to the potential for positive reform of poker machine

policy and regulation in this state of Tasmania. It is a result of both my expertise and personal commitment I have tabled this motion for us to consider today.

It is timely for us as an upper House to take this opportunity to consider the matters covered in this motion. Tasmania is at an important juncture on this issue. We have an opportunity from 2023 to reshape this policy and regulatory arrangement relating to poker machines in this state. Our Chamber will have a key role to play in the decisions made towards that reshaping and this year we will be called on to participate in that decision-making. The upper House has historically played a very important role at similar moments. It is because of the scrutiny, consideration and rigorous debate by the upper House that the gaming commission was established in Tasmania; that the Community Support Levy was funded and the regular social and economic impact studies were initiated. Each of these were important contributions made by this Chamber and now the Legislative Council has important work to do again.

I acknowledge right now that perhaps there will be people in this room, or listening, personally experiencing harm caused by poker machines. To those people I acknowledge the difficulties today's discussion may present. I apologise for the pain it may cause. While we will be talking facts and figures for you this is a painful reality lived every day. It has been impossible for me to have listened these past four-and-a-half years to the personal stories and not be struck to the very core of my heart by the pain and waste resulted from the presence of this product in our state under the circumstances we allow it to exist.

In speaking here today I plan to recognise and honour that pain which affects so many Tasmanian families. I will make sure we do not just discuss the facts and the figures, but we also directly hear the voices of those who are living this. Although it might be awkward with the adjustments I have made in my speech I am trying to make sure those parts will be retained.

The motion I put to the Chamber in the first instance makes a point about Australia and how it compares with the rest of the world. My motion asks the Council to note Australia - with the exception of Western Australia - has an approach to poker machine policy and regulation significantly different from similar countries. Australia has a high total number of poker machines and higher numbers of pokies per capita, higher bet limits, higher maximum payouts and higher losses per capita. I will provide details on each of those points briefly.

First, let us look at higher numbers of pokies per capita. Most of the figures I am about to share come from the Gaming Technologies Association that produces the world count of gaming machines annually. To start with it is important to note not that not all states and countries permit poker machines. Our local example in Australia is Western Australia. They are permitted only in casino environments not local communities. Other countries and other states in other countries have many similar arrangements, either not allowing them at all or allowing under certain circumstances such as in destination gambling venues.

Looking at the total raw number of machines, Australia ranks sixth by country behind Japan the United States, Germany, Italy and Spain - all countries that have significantly higher populations than Australia. With 0.3 per cent of the world's population, Australia has close to 20 per cent of the world's poker machines. This means when we look at the per capita figures worldwide we are exceeded only by gambling resort destinations such as Macau, Monaco and the Caribbean.

I am going to talk about high intensity. Australia and Tasmanian machines are also different from those you would find in most other countries. They are what is called higher intensity. What

does that mean? In simple terms it refers to how fast you can play and how much money you can lose. Technology means the intensity of all poker machines can be programmed by altering various key functions that relate to how fast and how much money you can lose. These features include bet limits, spin speeds, jackpot limits and more. In the simplest terms, the higher these features are set the higher the intensity of the machine. Because all the features are programmable, each country or state is able to decide what rules and regulations it will set to determine intensity of the machines in their jurisdiction. We will talk more about these features at further points in my motion.

Compared to other countries in Australia our machines are a particularly high intensity. A small example is in the United Kingdom. Venues they define as being closest to the community have very low maximum bet limits of 17 cents and jackpots of \$14 are allowed. They step it up a bit in their machines in pubs. In the UK, a pub can have a machine with a maximum bet limit of \$2 and a maximum payout of less than equivalent \$200. Higher losses in pubs but generally still unable to be devastating losses. To compare the poker machines, whereas the UK has a \$2 bet limit in Tasmania it is \$5. Our maximum payout is set at \$25 000; the UK is only \$200. For further comparisons you can refer to a table Anglicare presented in its supplementary submission to the joint parliamentary inquiry in 2017.

Another quick example of global comparison in terms of jackpot limits is that maximum jackpot limits for poker machines in hotels and clubs here in Australia varies between \$10 000 in New South Wales and South Australia, up to \$25 000 Northern Territory and Tasmania, and no specified limit at all in the ACT, Queensland and Victoria.

Other countries deal with this quite differently. We have heard about the UK with the \$200 limit. New Zealand allows \$1000, Quebec with \$1000, and Ireland at the other end of the scale with \$1. These figures show Australia is a global outlier in regards to the intensity of the machines we allow especially in our community-based venues. We see that result in the level of losses we permit.

The motion mentions higher levels of harm. There are challenges to directly compare the level of harm caused by gambling. This is because of a number of factors. First, the way the harm is defined is different in different jurisdictions. Second, the way the harm is measured is different in different jurisdictions, and third, there is a lack of data measuring the comorbidity of gambling harm with other issues. That is something we will talk more about in this motion.

What can we look at to give us a good picture of the level of harm? It might seem most obvious to compare the prevalence rates for problem gambling between jurisdictions. As I will explain further later on, this is particularly difficult to do and is acknowledged as fairly inaccurate. Other broad indicators we can use for the level of harm includes the level of losses and the accessibility of the machines. Having heard about the comparatively high number of machines that are located here in Australia, including Tasmania, and the comparative intensity of those machines, members will not be surprised to hear that Australia also leads the world in gambling losses. According to *The Economist*, Australians lose almost double the amount lost by New Zealanders, Americans, Canadians and Brits. It is even worse when we look just at poker machine losses from community venues. In pubs and clubs, Australians lose three times as much as New Zealanders and Finns, and six times more than Americans and Brits.

If you would like to see more comparisons, I commend a report to you - which I believe Anglicare provided to all members last week - that contains even further details of these comparisons.

Mr Valentine - In fact they had two or three attachments to that email. Very interesting reading.

Ms WEBB - Indeed. I am going to talk about the matter in the motion, which is point (b). It is about the machines being designed to addict. In fact, the motion says poker machines typically in use in Australia are designed and programmed to include features that increase the likelihood of addiction, with evidence suggesting that normal use of Australian poker machines is likely to cause addiction in one in six users. These features relate to spin speed, bet limits, maximum jackpots, near misses, losses disguised as wins and returns to player.

Poker machines are computers; there is no skill involved. They are programmed by their owners to make money for their owners. They are advertised as fun and entertaining, yet our gaming commission says they can take \$600 from a patron in an hour, every hour, remembering that some of our gambling venues are allowed to be open 20 hours a day. It is no accident that poker machines are addictive. The features that make them so are carefully researched, thoroughly understood and purposefully included in the machine design.

Len Ainsworth, founder of Aristocrat, the leading Australian and world leading pokies manufacturer, told ABC's *Four Corners* in 2000 that the secret to the success of poker machines was, and I quote, 'building a better mousetrap'.

Let us think on that for a moment. The manufacturers of poker machines are, by their own proud admission, purposefully building human mousetraps and making them more effective. This deadly analogy is no accident. I will quote from Anglicare's supplementary submission to the parliamentary inquiry in 2017, where on page 11 of that submission they say -

Machine designers describe two polar opposites in the way people use machines, with many gradations in between. There are action, jackpot or play-to-win people who are willing to lose large amounts of money for the hope of winning the jackpot. For play-to-win people the industry designs machines with dramatic spikes in its payout model to allow occasional large payouts, and where the payout reaches zero relatively quickly, that is the person runs out of money quickly.

Their report continues -

The industry also designs drip-feed machines for what it calls escape, time-on-device or play-to-win-to-play people. These machines are programmed to dispense constant small payouts, known as 'reinforcements' in psychology, that nibble away at a person's money until it is all gone. As a poker machine game designer explains, the industry thinks some people 'want to be bled slowly'.

I note that analogies to mice come up, not infrequently, in talking about poker machines. We have a mousetrap; we are talking about nibbling. I think it will come up again. No wonder people get trapped, lose money, lose their homes, lose their families and, ultimately, lose their lives when they interact with this machine.

As one Tasmanian told Anglicare, 'I do not know why I gamble. I cannot win. There is something that draws me to the machines.' Yes, there is. Machines are designed to drip-feed and

keep you sitting in front of them. It allows time for those one in six people whose normal use of this product will lead to an addiction. The addiction is, in fact, a chemical one. It is driven by the moment of anticipation that occurs when you use a poker machine. It is not even the result, itself, that drives it - the win or the loss - but the few seconds during which the game is in play and the person anticipates the result. During those moments of anticipation, the chemical dopamine is released in that person's brain.

Mr President, you may be well aware that is the chemical that makes you feel rather good. It is the chemical that is associated with most forms of addiction. We have all seen videos, I am sure, of little white mice pressing buttons to give themselves repeated hits of dopamine. Those mice kept pressing the button, forgetting to eat and drink, and ultimately putting their lives at risk.

Poker machines are exactly the same principle. Pressing a button generates continuous moments of anticipation, which releases hits of dopamine in the brain, and keeps the person in the zone. That zone is a place that takes a person away from all of their day-to-day worries and problems.

People who have a history of trauma, or who are experiencing stress in their lives, are particularly vulnerable to developing an addiction to poker machines, because of the relief provided by 'the zone'. The greatest tragedy is that the temporary relief that it provides comes at a cost that is too often ultimately ruinous to that person's life. That is why I am particularly concerned that at times of extraordinary stress and uncertainty, such as the one we are in now, people who are perhaps approaching developing a problem - teetering on the edge of developing a problem - may well be pushed by the extra stress and anxiety further into the likelihood of that happening.

Let us now look at the specifics of those programmable features of the machines that contribute to the likelihood of addiction. I am going to try to speak about them briefly. I have cut material out, so we will see if we can get through it.

Spin speeds and bet limits: these are the parameters of the poker machine's computer that set up how quickly people will lose money. It is not rocket science. The faster the spin speed and the higher the bet limit, the more money the machine is able to take quickly. Our gaming commission here in Tasmania says that with Tasmania's current settings of a \$5 maximum bet limit and a three-second spin rate, a person can lose \$600 in an hour if they continuously press the button and continuously lose.

Granted, this is a theoretical maximum, because the machines have special features that play side games, meaning the person is not always pressing the button. However, it is possible, under the settings that we have allowed the machines to have. Our gaming commission has recommended over many years, including most recently to the parliamentary inquiry in 2017, that Tasmanian spin speed settings should be slowed to six seconds, and the maximum bet limit should be reduced to \$1. Doing this would reduce the maximum theoretical loss from \$600 an hour to \$60 an hour. That is a ten-fold reduction. It is substantial. Just those two simplest of adjustments would make an incredible difference to the safety, health, wellbeing, and in fact the lives of tens of thousands of Tasmanians.

Why then have Tasmanian governments, including this current Gutwein Government, not acted on this straightforward evidence-based, expert advice from the independent body established in our state to provide policy guidance to government? No doubt that is an uncomfortable question. I will be interested to hear an answer to it from my colleagues who represent the Government here today.

What explanation or rationale could there possibly be to not support small adjustments, which do not detract from recreational use, but make an enormous difference to the harm caused to vulnerable players? Surely that would be like not supporting speed limits on our roads or the installation of airbags in our cars, both of which do not affect normal driving, but provide for more safety on our roads to prevent crashes, and a much-reduced likelihood of harm to those in a car if a crash were to occur.

Imagine, if an industry relied on half its profit from speeding and crashing. The poker machine industry in Australia and in Tasmania takes half their profit from people who are being harmed by the gambling, people who are speeding and crashing, half their profits. That is why the large industry operators in Tasmania opposed these measures. I am going to correct that - 'opposed' is far too mild a word. The industry fights these measures tooth and nail, ferociously as if their lives depended on it. But they don't, it is their extra profits that depend on it. It is vulnerable Tasmanians' lives that depend on it.

Big industry operators know these simple effective measures will work. They work without doubt to significantly reduce the harm caused and that means industry profits will go down. Which brings us back to my uncomfortable question: why would Tasmanian governments, including this current Government, not have acted on this straightforward, evidence-based expert advice and implemented responsible public policy in the best interests of the Tasmanian people? It is because they are making a clear choice. They choose to prioritise industry super profits over Tasmanian lives. Literally, the only reason to refuse to introduce these measures is to preserve the current level of industry super profits.

Every Tasmanian government that has chosen over the previous 23 years to not implement these simple harm reduction measures is responsible for Tasmanian lives being lost. In a crisis, we see today the central importance of government taking responsible evidence-informed measures to protect our community. Imagine what would happen if government just pretended to do this, just paid lip service to the measures they knew would work. Yet the Government's very own consultation paper currently out in the community for comment right now on its proposed regulatory framework says, and I quote -

While the Government's Future Gaming Market policy does not propose any specific changes to the harm minimisation framework, harm minimisation has continued to be front of mind during the development of the changes to be introduced under the new arrangements. The Government and the Tasmanian Liquor and Gaming Commission will closely observe and monitor the operation of EGMs in Tasmania in the restructured gaming market and will act quickly to address any harm concerns.

Why on earth would the Tasmanian people believe this to be true when it has certainly not been true to date? This statement from the consultation paper, along with numerous others, amounts to nothing less than gaslighting the Tasmanian community on this issue. 'Closely observe and monitor', 'act quickly to address any harm concerns' - they are pretending to protect us. They have not done any of that to date. They do not propose to do that in the material they have presented us to date. Why would we believe that could be true?

The reality is the Tasmanian Liquor and Gaming Commission has closely monitored and observed the operation of poker machines in Tasmania for over two decades and has regularly and

explicitly raised concerns about the level of harm. In doing so, it has formed clear, evidence-based views on measures which would produce a genuine reduction in harm to Tasmanians. These views presented to governments past and present have been almost entirely ignored. Virtually the only harm minimisation measures allowed to be adopted in Tasmania are those approved by the Federal Group and THA as the most influential players in that industry.

We find ourselves at a crucial moment where, yet again, this parliament will be the decision-maker on behalf of the Tasmanian people in determining our public policy approach to poker-machines. Yet again, we find the Gutwein Government has turned its back on the best expert advice and is making the choice to put the super profits of industry ahead of Tasmanian lives.

I move on to maximum jackpot and return to player rates. I will not speak in detail about these. I had some quite technical notes to speak to and I will put them aside and suggest that if members have questions about these aspects, such that they cannot support my motion, I would be happy to address them in a summing up at the end.

We have mentioned jackpots already. They affect the intensity of the machine and they affect the losses and the addictive nature of the machine. The return to player rate can be set and programmed. It can be mandated through regulation. We could make improvements to both those things.

Similarly, I speak to the last two in that short list under point (b), which is about near misses and losses disguised as wins. I will not need to speak in too much detail to these. In many cases they are really just what is on the page. We group them together because they are features of the machines that are designed to specifically suck people in, to keep them sitting there. The industry calls these features the drip-feed techniques, as I described earlier.

You can find a lot of material and analysis of these features of the machines from Dr Charles Livingstone who also spoke to the parliamentary inquiry in 2017. He makes these very technical and mathematical aspects of the machines as accessible as I have ever found them to be, at least.

Point (c) in the motion states that it is possible to modify the design and programming features of poker machines to decrease the likelihood of addiction, such that modifications would have little impact on the recreational use of poker machines by Tasmanians. From our discussions so far today, I trust that members here will have a clear sense that there are a multitude of ways that it is possible for us to make poker machines in Tasmania safer and less harmful.

The primary way, chosen by most of the rest of the world, is to only put poker machines in destination gambling venues such as casinos. To me, this remains the best indicated, first choice for Tasmania when the current licence ends in 2023. It could be readily supported as a planned restructure of that industry. Independent modelling has shown that it would be an economic boost to our state and a net creator of hundreds of jobs. It would bring Tasmania into line with Western Australia and we could look to that state, with its comparatively low levels of pokies harm, to see where our state would be headed.

For the purpose of the discussion today, let us say we forgo our best first choice and retain poker machines in Tasmanian hotels and clubs after 2023. Even if this is our choice, there is so much we can then choose to do to make their use safer. Public policy and legislative decision-makers may argue that it is our primary responsibility to do so. We seem to readily accept this

responsibility when it comes to other policy areas, especially when there is a serious impact on health and wellbeing.

I am going to think about road safety here. I see a real mismatch in our approach to the responsibilities of our role in poker machine regulation compared to our approach to road safety. When it comes to road safety we do not discuss the opportunity for harm minimisation with the argument that only a small percentage of people are seriously harmed, so we do not have to think about some of the indicated measures that experts might advise.

We approach these issues on road safety broadly, across the community, across sectors. We make great efforts across all levels of government to make our roads safer and set rules to help us use them safely, such as speed limits. Many people do not reach the limit. They drive along slower because it suits them, but for those who want to drive fast, the speed limit is there as a safety barrier to protect them and to protect us. This is sensible decision-making in the best interests of the whole community. Yet, more people are seriously harmed by pokies in Tasmania than by cars.

Just as we must do everything we can to reduce death and injuries on the roads, why would we not do everything we can in the same way for poker machines? We can choose whether to continue licensing this product and the conditions under which we send it out into our communities. This year in parliament we have that task ahead of us.

I suggest to members that each of us here must answer an ethical question. As a decision-maker, if I am aware that these machines can be made considerably safer for my community, what role will I play to make sure this is done? From our discussion today and from material you have been provided and have access to, 'aware' is precisely what each of us will be. There is so much local research on how Tasmanian poker machines can be modified to make them safer - from our gaming commission, from the Productivity Commission, from numerous academics and of course from local groups like Anglicare Tasmania.

I commend to this place a report that Anglicare has provided that we spoke of already, particularly the report they wrote for the minister, Mr Ferguson, providing evidence for a variety of consumer protection measures. Their proposal builds on the work of the Productivity Commission on our Government's own social and economic impact studies and on our Liquor and Gaming Commission's advice and recommendations.

Another thing to ask ourselves would be, is there a downside to adjusting those programming features of poker machines such as spin speeds, bet limits, jackpot levels, return-to-player rates, near misses and losses disguised as wins? The short answer is no. We can make these modifications with little, if any, impact on the so-called recreational gambler but with a significant reduction in harm to those who gamble regularly and harmfully. Research backs up the claim that recreational players will not be disadvantaged by changes we might make.

Let us break that down a bit more specifically from the research to be clear. We can use the \$1 bet limit as an example. Here in Tasmania our social and economic impact studies that happen every three years provide some insight. From our SEIS in 2014 it was found that more than half the people who identify as having a gambling problem sometimes, usually or always, spend more than \$1 per push. In contrast, more than half the people who gamble recreationally, rarely or never spend more than \$1 per spin. The study found the mean spend by people with a gambling problem is \$4 per spin so the introduction of a \$1 bet limit would reduce their mean spend by \$3 for every push, cutting the harm by three quarters right there.

Earlier research interstate found the \$1 bet limit would reduce time and money spent by problem gamblers while not inconveniencing recreational gamblers. They drive under the speed limit already, Mr President.

The 2012 Tasmanian House of Assembly inquiry into the proposed \$1 bet limit, which had been supported at one time by the Tasmanian Liberal Party, found that 85 per cent of people already bet at or below \$1 per spin. It is those Tasmanians in the 15 per cent who spend more than \$1 who will be protected by introducing this limit, not inconvenienced.

I am going to move on to part (d) of the motion which notes that the impact of harm caused by poker machine use on Tasmanian health and mental health services, family support services, welfare services, criminal justice services, domestic violence services, housing and homelessness services, productivity and level of unemployment is not currently measured and monitored by the Tasmanian Government so as to effectively inform policy development and regulation relating to poker machines.

This is a key point; it is the interrelation that I spoke about in my introduction. Poker machine use does not exist in a vacuum. Evidence, which we will talk about briefly, points to the fact that it is connected to many other issues and challenges that people in our community face. While research and evidence make these connections, our policymaking fails to do that at this point because we do not equip ourselves with the best understanding of what these connections look like.

Each time we sat here in the Chamber in the second half of last year, I asked numerous questions relating to data we might have as a state on some of these connections. I wanted to know what information, data or measurements the Tasmanian Government had at its disposal that might inform us of the connections between gambling harm and other service systems and allow us to make better connected policy decisions across those spaces. Most of those questions I asked remain unanswered on our Notice Paper. Even today, of the answers provided, none of them were in relation to those questions that I asked late last year.

I received one prompt reply though. That was from the Minister for Mental Health and Wellbeing. In summary he indicated that of the questions I asked that related to mental health issues the answers indicated that no informative data is collected on the proven connection that exists in that policy area between gambling harm and mental health issues.

Without answers to the questions I can only believe that there will probably be a similar lack of data that is collected and a subsequent lack of policy consideration that is informed of the impact of poker machine harm in all of these other areas of government responsibility. But I have yet to receive it, so we will wait and see.

In the absence of data from the Tasmanian Government, I am going to address these matters today with what we know from research. More importantly, I will share with you stories from real Tasmanians about their experiences that illustrate these connections. These stories I will tell are snippets from research and advocacy and service provision from across the state. Some of them also come from an open letter to the public during 2016 and 2017. It is an open letter to the then premier, Mr Hodgman. People could sign to support the open letter and they could also make a personal comment if they wished to add to that letter. A total of 6663 people signed that open letter in 2017. More than 1000 Tasmanians chose to put a personal comment with it. The stories and the matters that those comments cover are really informative. I want to draw on some of those today too.

First, let us talk about health and mental health, briefly. Productivity Commission research, as well as the Australian Medical Association and the Public Health Association, all concur that gambling harm is associated with poor health outcomes. People with severe gambling problems have been found to have an incidence of poor health that is twice that of people experiencing low-level gambling problems. That is comparing people who are all in a category of risk. Even between low-level harm gamblers and severe gambling problems, there is a doubling of poor health outcomes.

As one Tasmanian describes, 'I would feel washed out. My blood pressure would go up, my sugar would go up. I couldn't sleep and I couldn't eat. I would have starved if my sister didn't help me out'.

Gambling problems may precede or be a cause of depression and anxiety. About 50 per cent of people with gambling problems experience depression. Around one in five people harmed by gambling report that they are often or always feeling depressed because of gambling.

The Productivity Commission also found that almost all people seeking counselling help for gambling suffer depression. We should expect these impacts would affect service delivery in our health and mental health sectors.

In terms of mental illness, here we all understand people with a serious mental illness can experience a high level of social isolation and find it extremely difficult to participate in the community at times. Research finds an insidious aspect of gambling on poker machines is that it appears to offer people a social activity, an escape from loneliness and often their only chance for social interaction. As one research participant said -

I have had a mini break down recently. I am on anti-depressants just to keep myself on a level playing field. When I am on that level playing field I know the machines are evil. I want to keep away from them but the minute I run out of my medication I am back down there because I am hearing those tunes and they are calling to me and I can't seem to help it.

I am going to touch onto the issue of suicide. Before I do, anyone who feels they require some support is strongly encouraged to ring Lifeline. The number is 131114.

The Productivity Commission found 60 per cent of people in gambling counselling had contemplated suicide because of their gambling. Ten per cent of people in gambling counselling had attempted suicide. One Tasmanian shared her story:

One night I had gone through about \$4 000. I had a packet of Valium and a packet of Seropax. I couldn't tell [my husband] how much I had lost, so I took the whole lot of the tablets. He took me to hospital and at that stage he didn't know why I had taken the tablets.

This lady was hospitalised and tried self-exclusion, but she had returned to the pokies at the local again -

[My sister and I] would talk on the way there about playing on the machines and on the way home we would talk suicide. What are we going to do?

Let us look at the impact on families. First, relationship stress and breakdown. The Productivity Commission found nearly 20 per cent of people with gambling problems felt they did not spend enough time with their family and 42 per cent of people with gambling problems had argued with family over the money in the last year.

The survey also found people with a gambling problem experienced higher rates of relationship breakups than people who do not have gambling problems. A partner of someone who could not control his gambling on pokies told researchers -

... I won't talk to [my partner]. I will say that I am not keeping him for the fortnight and remind him he won't get paid for another fortnight. I will get the kids things and I will go without myself so the kids have things. We just won't talk and we will have a bad relationship.

Another person who gambled said this -

I can't hold down a relationship because of gambling. I will say that I am just down the road to get some milk or bread and will find myself at an Oasis venue and lose all track of time ... I broke up with the mother of my children because of my gambling.

This next experience seems to sum it up -

It's almost like there are 2 worlds - normal people and people with various addictions. I class myself as a normal person but my family look upon me as just ## the gambler. I feel the spotlight is just on that part of me...

Then he explained the effect his gambling had on his family -

... [gambling] has wrecked everything. My marriage has gone and I have been divorced since the end of 1999. We had properties together but they have gone and been sold off. I am currently bankrupt and have been for 3 years. It is pretty awful ... [My wife] had an inkling but it all came out in the divorce proceedings. We get along fine but the reality is the whole world I had is now gone.

This quote is from a man who lives in the seat of Windermere who wrote to the Premier in an open letter -

My wife had a diagnosed mental issue and secretly ran a debt through a financial institution in my name. She wasted almost \$10,000. I am now divorced from her. The various vendors at different pubs and clubs were not interested in helping her and paid lip service to responsible gambling. I could no longer trust her. She said that she felt totally alone whilst being served drinks. No one bothered her. Someone should have. These machines and those that benefit financially, not the punter, are largely responsible for my surrogate debt and the destruction of my marriage.

Mr President, we hear coming from these voices comments people freely provided just a couple of years ago when they wanted the then premier, but really all decision-makers, to better understand what the picture looks like in this state.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 p.m. to 2.30 p.m.

QUESTIONS

Road Safety - Barriers

Ms RATTRAY to LEADER of the GOVERNMENT in the LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, Mrs HISCUTT

[2.32 p.m.]

Can the Leader please advise if the Government has sourced or is aware of any up-to-date research in regard to the use of wire barriers instead of Armco railing on roads?

ANSWER

Mr President, I thank the member for Launceston for her question.

All Australian states have adopted a safe system approach to road safety, which accepts that road users make mistakes and the transport system must accommodate those to reduce serious injury as a consequence of road user error. An important consideration of the system is that a human body has limited capacity to absorb impact force before injury occurs. Available research has proven that wire rope barriers are the most forgiving barrier, with people more likely to survive when in contact with the barrier than with other available road barriers.

Based on harm minimisation, wire road barrier is the preferred barrier type. However, other barrier types such as steel beam or solid concrete are used at locations where wire road barriers are precluded due to various site conditions, such as that the expected deflection of the wire road barrier would exceed the available room to deflect, meaning that immovable objects are located within the deflected zone, and that the barrier must be compatible with the planned end anchor and be capable of having suitable transition to join other barrier systems.

Bridge railing is a prime example of steel beam railing being used on the approaches for adequate stiffness. On tight horizontal radius curves, less than 200 metres, wire road barriers may not be suitable because the required rope tension and height may not be maintained during or after an impact. In these cases, a steel beam barrier fitted with rub rail will be given higher consideration. Rub rail is an extra piece of railing that fits along the bottom of the steel beam and prevents a motorcyclist who loses control from hitting the post. Similarly, on designated motorcycle routes, steel beam barriers with rub rail are given a higher consideration. The Government embraces the safe system approach to improving road safety and wire rope barriers are an integral part of this approach.

AFL Games in Tasmania - Contracts

Mr DEAN to MINISTER for SPORT and RECREATION, Ms HOWLETT

[2.35 p.m.]

At what stage are talks in relation to the renegotiation of the contracts with North Melbourne and Hawthorn, and when is it likely that those contracts will be concluded? Are there likely to be any changes in the current positions of those AFL teams that are playing football in Tasmania? Are the amounts of money being paid likely to be similar?

ANSWER

Mr President, I thank the member for Windermere for his question.

Negotiations are still taking place and I am waiting for an update. As of last week, they were positive. In relation to what has happened with the virus, we wait. I will seek an update for you from the Premier as to when he is having his next meeting with AFL House.

Mr Dean - Will this include when the contracts are likely to be signed off?

Ms HOWLETT - I will seek advice from him and provide you with that information.

Mr Dean - Could you also find out whether the contract period is likely to change?

Ms HOWLETT - Yes. Given the circumstances of what is occurring now, I will need to seek advice from him as to what is going to occur.

Point of Consumption Tax - Racing

Ms RATTRAY to MINISTER for RACING, Ms HOWLETT

[2.37 p.m.]

Minister, the Government has committed to returning 80 per cent of revenue raised to the racing industry from the new point of consumption - POC - tax.

- (1) Of the 80 per cent, what is the total expected return to the industry?
- (2) Can the minister indicate where the negotiations are between Tasracing and the codes on the distribution of the 80 per cent of the POC?
- (3) Is the minister aware that the codes require an increase in stake money to remain sustainable?
- (4) With the greyhound code requiring at least a 5 per cent increase, has there been identified a percentage increase for thoroughbreds and harness racing?

ANSWER

Mr President, I thank the member for McIntyre for her questions. I know she is a very keen supporter of the racing industry and all three codes, and I have had the pleasure of having dinner with her at the Launceston Greyhound Racing Club in recent times.

- (1) Yes, I did announce a point of consumption tax with the Premier on Hobart Cup Day. The racing industry is to receive significant benefit with the announcement of this. It is the single biggest investment the industry has had. The return to the industry will be \$4 million.
- (2) That \$4 million will be divided between the three codes and we have made a commitment to increase stakes, toward animal welfare and to put money into infrastructure over the sites. I have met and will continue to meet with key stakeholders of the three codes.
- (3) We are trying to come to an agreeable decision as to where that money will go and we have definitely made a commitment to increasing the state's animal welfare and also infrastructure, but we are yet to determine the actual figure. We will certainly be making that announcement in the coming weeks and I will let you know.
- (4) In relation to your question about greyhounds and the increase in stakes, I can very comfortably say there will be a much bigger increase than 4 per cent. We did have an election commitment of 4 per cent each year over four years, so the increase would be 16 per cent as an election commitment. I will certainly get back to you in due course when I finalise the details in the coming weeks.

Thank you, member for McIntyre, for your interest in the industry. It is a very important industry in Tasmania. It employs over 5500 people indirect, over mostly regional Tasmania.

[2.41 p.m.]

Police - Blood Exposure

Mr DEAN to LEADER of the GOVERNMENT in the LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, Mrs HISCUTT

- (1) How many police were assaulted by being spat on, bitten, scratched or had blood contact - in other words, exposure to blood contact - over the last decade? I am advised that those figures are available for the last decade.
- (2) How long were the victim police required to wait for medical results relative to those assaults or contacts to show that they were all clear?
- (3) New South Wales is currently considering legislation - I think they are well down the track to preparing it - to compel any offender committing these assaults to have an immediate blood test. Is the Government considering such legislation here? If not, why not?

ANSWER

Madam Deputy President, I thank the member for Windermere for his question.

- (1) I have a table which is easy to read. It highlights the number of reported incidents resulting in bodily fluid exposures involving an assault by an offender. This data is taken from the department's workplace, health and safety incident and early notification reporting. The data show a decrease in these types of incidences over the decade, particularly in the past two years.

For example, 2019 recorded the lowest number - 21 incidences of bodily fluid exposure for the decade. Starting at 2010, the number of bodily fluid exposures was 47; 2011, 52; 2012, 32; 2013, 33; 2014, 33; 2015, 28; 2016, 33; 2017, 33; 2018, 26; and 2019, 21.

- (2) The Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Management does not keep data on how long police officers wait for medical results related to bodily fluid exposures. Departmental protocol when this type of assault or contact occurs requires any police officer with a needlestick injury or blood exposure to -
- notify their supervisor and complete an incident notification form;
 - undertake the following baseline pathology tests: HBV antibody, HBV antigen, HCV antigen, and HIV1 and HIV2 antibodies.

These tests may be undertaken at the hospital or by the police officer's own doctor. Pathology results are to be forwarded to the police officer's doctor, who will provide information, counselling and advice regarding the results. It is usual practice for the department's WHS team to follow up with each affected person to ensure they have followed the correct protocol.

- (3) The New South Wales legislation is yet to be passed by their parliament and has not been evaluated to determine its impacts. The Government will always consider any legislative amendments aimed at protecting those who protect us.

[2.45 p.m.]

Canine Coronavirus

Ms RATTRAY to MINISTER for RACING, Ms HOWLETT

Minister, I read in today's *Mercury* that there is a canine coronavirus. I am interested, given that Tasmania holds three race meets a week. Does the Minister see this will cause concern for the racing industry? Not only for greyhounds, but for the other codes as well, given that obviously it is a virus that not only affects humans, but also affects animals. I think it is on page 31 of today's *Mercury*. I am interested in the Minister's response.

ANSWER

Madam Deputy President, I thank the member for McIntyre for showing such interest in my portfolio.

In relation to Tasracing, I was pleased yesterday that Tasracing and the Office of Racing Integrity were able to obtain the unanimous support of all racing clubs across the three codes in allowing race meetings to go ahead in Tasmania with no spectators. I am not sure if you are aware of that. It will only be essential personnel, no spectators.

Ms Rattray - The same as the mainland set-up at the moment.

Ms HOWLETT - Correct, that is right. Greyhound canine coronavirus is a highly contagious virus in dogs, which causes diarrhoea and vomiting. The mortality rate is low, with puppies and young dogs being most susceptible. It is important to note that the virus is not related in any way

to the current coronavirus - COVID-19 - affecting humans. There is no relation whatsoever. I am aware the outbreak started in Western Australia in December then spread to Queensland, Northern Territory, South Australia, New South Wales and Victoria.

Unlike parvovirus, the mortality rate is low with canine coronavirus. Puppies and young dogs are the most susceptible to this disease. All states other than Tasmania have been affected, with some of their race and trial meetings cancelled. Due to the mainland's recent outbreak of the virus, the Office of Racing Integrity reminded all greyhound participants to update their hygiene and biosecurity practices, in consultation with their veterinarians, to prevent further spread of the virus.

Greyhound racing participants have been requested to avoid dog importation where possible. If not possible, the greyhound would need to be isolated from the general population for a period of 14 days.

I can reiterate: animal welfare is a high priority for government. The Office of Racing Integrity is continuing to be proactive, working closely with racing integrity bodies, vets and the greyhound industry to ensure we minimise the risk of spreading the virus in Tasmania.

It is imperative that we work together to stop this virus entering Tasmania. The Office of Racing Integrity has diligently sent notification, via text messages, of the virus outbreak interstate to all Tasmanian greyhound owners and trainers.

I can confirm that there have been no deaths and no reported cases of the canine virus in Tasmania. I thank the member for her question.

Special Operations Group

Mr DEAN to LEADER of the GOVERNMENT in the LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, Mrs HISCUTT

[2.49 p.m.]

I was going to leave this question until tomorrow, but I will ask it now. The Premier refers to the Special Operations Group in the State of the State address, saying that four officers will start the first stage of our full-time Special Operations Group.

Will the Leader please advise -

- (1) Are these numbers the same four we were advised of about 12 months ago? It was in the Budget of last year, from memory. Are they the same numbers or are these an additional four being talked in the State of the State?
- (2) If so, what has caused the delay in confirming the positions being operational?
- (3) When will the positions commence?
- (4) When will we likely see a full-time, fully operational permanent SOG in place for rapid response and to support high-risk police operations which are happening almost daily?

ANSWER

I thank the member for Windermere for his question.

- (1) On 1 November 2019 the Government announced the allocation of four police officers in 2020 to commence the implementation of the first stage of the full-time core Special Operations Group capability for rapid response and to support high-risk police operations in Tasmania.
- (2) There is no delay. The four SOG positions are scheduled to be allocated prior to the end of the 2019-20 financial year. The Government's main focus will always be to have police on the beat. The majority of the additional number 109 of the 125 are being allocated to frontline duties at first response main police stations and in regional and rural stations around the state.
- (3) An expression of interest is current for the inspector in charge of SOG and the remaining three positions will be advertised in the *Tasmanian Government Gazette* dated 19 March 2020. It is envisaged all four positions will commence in April 2020.
- (4) The Government has committed to establish a full-time core SOG capability during this term.

Water - Accurate Sale

**Ms RATTRAY to LEADER of the GOVERNMENT in the LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,
Mrs HISCUTT**

[2.52 p.m.]

Given that water supplied through all irrigation schemes in Tasmania is sold by the megalitre and yet irrigation schemes are set up on a flow rate, have there been any discussions on whether the more accurate sale of water should be as a flow rate and not a megalitre as is the current arrangement?

ANSWER

Madam Deputy President, I thank the member for McIntyre for her question.

I must admit the flow rates and megalitres are two different things happening there. Tasmanian Irrigation - TI - administers the sale of water entitlements that are currently a combination of a total volume entitlement - that is, the irrigation right expressed in megalitres per season - and a flow rate entitlement, which is a zone flow rate delivery right expressed in megalitres per day. These are separate contracts and individually tradable.

The combination of total volume flow rate and season length define the overall scheme capacity for any given scheme. It should be noted that when TI is working with irrigators - particularly through the water sales process - the consideration of flow rate is constantly reinforced. The consistent message is that flow rate is the primary aspect irrigators should consider in determining the entitlements they wish to purchase. In exploring this issue, TI has to date not identified a practical option that would allow for the flow rate and total volume to be disaggregated and sold on a differential basis. This is because of the associated impact on the capital costs of schemes as well as the practical scheme operational issues, so farmers need to carefully consider how much water they need delivered in a certain time.

Environmental Flow Setting

**Ms RATTRAY to LEADER of the GOVERNMENT in the LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,
Mrs HISCUTT**

How and what factors are considered in determining what the environmental flow will be set at in our rivers and streams?

ANSWER

Madam Deputy President, I thank the member for McIntyre for her question.

Throughout Australia environmental flow assessments are used to estimate the quantity and timing of flow requirements to sustain aquatic values in riverine environments. Typically, water management planning and other natural resource planning processes use environmental flow assessments to make informed decisions about water management. There is no single standardised method for estimating environmental flows in Australia or in other countries. Instead, several methods are available and their application is often tailored to meet the specific requirements of each assessment. Environmental flow assessments have been undertaken for a number of Tasmanian rivers and streams using the most appropriate methods available at the time. Tasmanian catchments that require environmental flow assessments are prioritised using information on current water use, river and estuarine health indicators and water management planning activities.

For each assessment the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment identifies water demand at different times of the year, and uses the most appropriate environmental flow assessment method. Generally, a desktop approach is used to determine environmental flows in smaller systems where water use is minimal and more detailed field base methods are employed in catchments where there is a high demand for water.

The overall objective of environmental flow recommendations is to ensure sufficient water is made available to support the needs of the entire riverine ecosystem. Recently, DPIPWE has developed the Tasmanian Environmental Flows Framework - TEFF. This framework reflects the growing understanding in the scientific community that riverine ecosystems are more than just channels and in-stream biota. It comprises a range of components such as riparian vegetation, flood plain wetlands, geomorphological features and estuaries which depend on a range of flow components present in a natural flow regime.

TEFF is used in catchments with high water demand and provides a flexible approach whereby assessments can be tailored to suit the ecological characteristics of different catchments. This process involves four main steps. They are -

- Identify fresh water ecosystem values in each catchment in order to define the objectives of the environmental flow assessment, and develop conceptual models that identify the ecosystem processes that support these values.
- Identify representative river reaches, conduct assessments using hydraulic and hydrological models to characterise physical habitat and biological diversity of the system, and identify specific flow events that relate to these attributes.
- Conduct hydrological analysis of flow data to define the pattern of occurrence of important flow events and the availability of important habitat for fauna.
- Recommend a flow regime that meets the objectives of the environmental flow assessment, including rules for water abstraction.

It is important to note that environmental flow assessments describe the importance of different flows to the aquatic values of riverine systems. It is critical, when interpreting environmental flow assessments, that they are considered in the context of the community's environmental, economic and social objectives for the river or the rivers being examined. Thus, assessments provide an

essential input to DPIPWE's water management planning process. However, all water users within a catchment are considered by DPIPWE during the development of water management plans. During this process environmental water requirements are negotiated and implemented as environmental water provisions which aim to balance economic, social and environmental values within each catchment.

Ms Rattray - A simple question with a very complex answer.

CYDA - Requests for Information

Mr WILLIE to LEADER of the GOVERNMENT in the LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, Mrs HISCUTT

[2.59 p.m.]

Documents obtained by advocacy group, Children and Young People with Disability Australia, under right to information laws, show dozens of employees in Queensland and New South Wales have been investigated for violence, abuse or neglect towards students with disabilities in the past two years. Tasmania's Education department rejected CYDA's request for information on grounds the scope was substantial and an unreasonable diversion of resources.

- (1) How many Department of Education or Teachers Registration Board employee investigations have been conducted in the past two years concerning violence, abuse or neglect towards students with disabilities?
- (2) How many employee sanctions by the Department of Education or the Teachers Registration Board resulted from the investigations?
- (3) If any sanctions were applied, what were the sanctions?
- (4) What resources are being made available for the Department of Education to participate in the Royal Commission into Violence, Abuse, Neglect and Exploitation of People with Disability?

ANSWER

Madam Deputy President, I thank the member for Elwick for his question.

Before I deliver the answer, I will say that we are over-inundated, with 30 questions without notice this week. I do not think we will answer them all in the time allocated.

As to Mr Willie's question, there seems to be some confusion as to why the CYDA application was refused. The department advises that the RTI application by CYDA was deemed refused pursuant to section 19(1) of the act due to a lack of communication and response from the applicant within the specified time period under the act. CYDA was contacted numerous times, requesting it refine its application because it was deemed to be too broad-ranging. Having no further contact from the applicant despite assistance and suggestions being provided to refine its application, a final section 19(1) decision was sent to the applicant on 11 April 2019.

To specifically answer your questions -

- (1) For the school years 2018-19, the Department of Education had one Employment Direction - ED - No. 5 investigation regarding allegations against a teacher. The teacher resigned before the completion of the investigation, so a sanction could not be applied. ED No. 5 investigations are of matters between the head of agency and the employee, and the department does not give out public information regarding specifics.
- (2) As the employee resigned before the completion of the investigation, a sanction could not be applied.
- (3) No sanctions were applied.
- (4) The Support and Development Division within DoE will take the lead on the work required for the Disability Royal Commission under the leadership of the Deputy Secretary of Support and Development. The Inclusion and Diversity Services Unit will be responsible for providing the majority of expertise and staffing to undertake the work in collaboration with the Legal Services Unit and the Education Performance and Review Unit. The initial meeting of the Disability Royal Commission interdepartmental committee will take place late November and may indicate any further resources the DoE may need to consider for 2020.

MOTION

Poker Machine Use in Tasmania

Resumed from above.

[3.03 p.m.]

Ms WEBB (Nelson) - Madam Deputy President, earlier I was speaking on point (5), the impact of harm caused by poker machine use in Tasmania on other areas of our service systems. I had noted that we do not have a great deal of data available from the Government that show the links that are there. I am speaking to the research and what it tells us about these links. I am also illustrating that with a range of stories and comments made by Tasmanian people. I had been speaking about relationships as an area of difficulty, and that would be something that would tally through to our family support systems, to our family court systems, child protection, those sorts of areas.

I will follow on from talking about relationships and those impacts, and I am going to talk about domestic violence. I am not going to share stories here. Let me clearly state that the underlying cause of family violence is gender inequality and gender-based discrimination in our culture and our community. This is a really complex area, and to discuss and make claims about factors which contribute to causation is problematic. What I will do is share with you some research we have that provides some indication that there is a link between poker machines and domestic violence.

National research, which included Janet Patford from Tasmania as a researcher and Tasmanian data, found half of those receiving treatment for problem gambling reported an experience of domestic violence in the previous 12 months, either as survivors or as perpetrators.

Research in Victoria, which looked at a nine-year period, found a direct link between the accessibility of poker machines and family violence. This research by Markham found areas with

no poker machines had 20 per cent fewer family violence incidents and 30 per cent fewer assaults overall compared to areas with at least 75 poker machines per 10 000 people. That was the comparison; no poker machines and at least 75 per 10 000 people. I believe that is a similar ratio that we may have in Tasmania, statewide.

The recommendation from this research from Victoria was for family violence to be considered when licensing decisions are made in relation to poker machines. Here in Tasmania, we should consider poker machine licences in the context of our state's domestic violence framework. We have devoted a lot of attention and investment and real community focus to addressing domestic violence. We should consider reducing accessibility to poker machines through reducing opening hours, for example, and reducing the number of machines, particularly the number of machines or venues concentrated in certain areas. We could remove them entirely from particular suburbs or from suburbs, broadly, which would be my preference.

We could decide to look at our family violence figures and map them against our poker machine distribution. Perhaps we need to think about reducing access to poker machines in particular areas. What I am suggesting is that we have an opportunity to consider this in a structured way. The best way to do that would be to apply the community interest test, now available to us. We could apply that community interest test to each of the new licences the Government proposes to give individual venues in 2023. The Government has dismissed this option on no credible grounds, I would suggest.

We have a current single licence for operating poker machines, which ends in 2023. The new model will mean new licences to be issued. The community interest test is there to be applied to new licences, so every individual license proposed under the new model should have a community interest test applied. It would be within that context that we could consider matters such as domestic violence and a range of others. Local communities, including local governments and other leadership organisations, could have a role to play in having input into the granting or otherwise of those licences. To not apply the community interest tests to the new licences to be given to venues after 2023 would be a further disenfranchisement of the Tasmanian community. It takes away communities' rights to have their voice heard and have a say in the future of what goes on in their local suburb. That is exactly what the community interest test is supposed to be about; giving communities that say.

I am going to move on to housing and finances. Housing and homelessness, really, but it connects to finances. Gambling can cost a lot of money, yet surveys often show more than half of people who gambled did so because of a dream of winning, but for people who develop problems with gambling there is usually no point in a win. As one man in Tasmania described -

[My biggest win] was about \$500 or \$600 dollars I think ... [I didn't spend it that night] but the next morning I was back at the pub ... There is no point to a big win because I put it all back in.

This man explains further -

When I was 21, I had nine cars, one boat and I owned everything. Now I have absolutely nothing. You do win, you can win, but in the long run you don't win. It's just a big, big loss.

It is common for gambling counsellors to see people after they have got a big pay out and that is described in this Tasmanian women's story -

About 5 years ago I did \$80 000 in 2 ½ months ... I had just finished work and got a payout ... I was taking out \$2,000 a day at one stage and couldn't wait to get near a poker machine.

Here is another quote -

An addicted gambler doesn't budget. You are sitting there in a world of your own, on another planet. You would walk out with nothing.

Spiralling into debt is well recorded in the research. Here are two Tasmanian stories I will read from Anglicare's 2005 report, *House of Cards*.

Ben frequently accessed personal loans and credit card cash advances to pay for his gambling. When he was married and in full-time employment Ben estimates that he spent 20% of his income on gambling. Since his divorce and experiencing period of unemployment and now casual work, Ben's expenditure on gambling accounts for about 40% of his income. At times he has had difficulty paying rent.

Ben said, and I quote -

I probably had about 9 personal loans at one time and about 10 credit cards. At a peak time, personal loans were probably about \$80,000, credit cards probably about \$30,000 - \$35,000 ... Because the creditors were after dollars, my car has been repossessed and my credit cards.

Another woman told Anglicare -

As well as the depression, because you have got no money to stay there and play, you have got no money to feed the children. You have got no money to buy the medication they need for their asthma or whatever and you've got no money to pay your rent or electricity bill or telephone or your car registration or whatever and, it is like, 'What do I do now? How am I going to cover this?' Well maybe if I scrounge a few dollars from your kids' bank account you can at least buy some bread and milk and they can have toast or whatever. Or maybe you have built up a reasonable sort of credit rating, and so you can go and borrow a couple of hundred dollars to buy your groceries or pay your bill or whatever. But then you are still way behind the eight ball because it still takes you so many months to pay the money back that you have borrowed and you never catch up in your own self respect, your own mind and your financial situation. You never get that back.

Although the data is patchy it is estimated at least 10 per cent of the demand for homelessness services is a result of gambling harm. The Productivity Commission estimates people who do not have a problem with gambling spent less than 2 per cent of their household income on gambling while people with a gambling problem spend 22 per cent.

As we well know, it is hard enough in this state to pay the rent or a mortgage, let alone when a fifth of your income is already been taken. Research from academics in the University of Sheffield have looked at homelessness problems among over 50s. They did a study in Boston Massachusetts, Melbourne, Australia and four English cities. This was interesting because it revealed patterns of homelessness in over 50s to be quite broadly similar across those three separate continents except

in Australia where a link between homelessness and gambling was identified that did not exist in the other study areas involved.

Of the 125 homeless people from Australia surveyed as part of that study, 38 per cent mentioned gambling as a cause of their homelessness problems. In England and Massachusetts, in the study, only 4 per cent cited this as a reason.

I am going to speak now about work. It is not hard to imagine that gambling affects people's work. Gambling problems will have a flow-on effect to productivity, maintaining and gaining employment. In this state this is an important issue for us to consider. About half the people in gambling counselling report losing time from work or study due to gambling. People could also be at work but not concentrating due to the stress of their gambling losses. A Tasmanian man describes this -

I went into hospital with internal bleeding from an ulcer due to the stress of it.
Also, when I was working -

He mentions his profession but I am not going to -

My mind was not fully on the job and so I injured myself and spent a week in hospital as a result of that -

Here is a quote from another person -

The thing is you would have 2 personalities. Like at work I'd be happy in everything. I was in customer service and you wouldn't tell anyone at work you would hide it all. You wouldn't say anything you would keep it to yourself.

Here in Tasmania we do not have a good understanding of the impact that poker machine harm is having on our levels of employment, underemployment and productivity. Certainly, the fact an increasing number of Tasmanians are underemployed and would be experiencing stress from that situation places them at a heightened risk of poker machine addiction as we will know from the research and evidence.

To talk now about children. It is connected to relationships and to families, but it is also a separate matter for consideration. Again, the Productivity Commission found that for every person with a significant gambling problem, on average 0.6 children are living in the same household. A significant number of participants in the Productivity Commission studies spoke about the impact of their parents' gambling on them as children when they experienced a sense of neglect as a consequence of insufficient food, or because of family instability due to gambling.

I quote from the Productivity Commission's report -

The most immediate concern for children's welfare in problem gambling households is poverty. Problem gambling eats up resources that otherwise would be spent on all household members - from family entertainment, a serviceable car, a pleasant home, holidays, and even food.

The following quotes are from an Anglicare study that illustrate this -

Sometimes, I go into my daughter's room to get money, but she sleeps with her wallet under her pillow so I can't get it.

Mr President, you can imagine the shame. This quote makes that shame quite explicit -

The kids have gone hungry and gone without, and that's where I have realised that it's not right and I've left them at home in my house on their own, doors unlocked so that I can get in quietly when I get home at 2 a.m. or 3 a.m. in the morning without waking the neighbourhood.

I have actually left those children at home, where anything could happen to them, to go off and gamble. I am ashamed of that. I am disgusted with myself that I have done that, but the compulsive need has been there to go out and try and get a little bit extra, even though I know I'm not going to get that extra money, I am going to blow it every time.

...

As a result of all of this I have lost 2 things that are very dear to me. The first is my 14-year-old's trust in me, because I've gone through her bank account and cleaned it out. She earns her own money and I will go into her room when she goes to school and grab every cent I can and I am off down to those pokies again.

She is frightened now, and when she gets her money she goes out and spends it on whatever junk she can find because she knows mum will get it if she doesn't.

She can't hide it; she can't take it to school, she's not allowed. And I have lost my own self-respect. I want those things back and I am finding it very hard to earn those things back, and I am trying my hardest.

Mr President, that is a really confronting story to hear. That woman was incredibly brave and vulnerable to share that story.

It is tempting, I think, for a lot of people to then blame individuals for the sorts of choices it appears that parents might be making with stories like that. What I am encouraging us to look at is the fact that those choices are made within the context that we set and make available to people in our community.

We make these machines available in the community, and we make them available at an intensity that allows people to devastate their lives, and their children's lives, to that extent.

We do not have to do that. We could choose differently for our community and people. Our fellow Tasmanians would not have to be faced with that situation and those choices, when they are experiencing a medically diagnosable addiction.

The very last thing I am going to talk about in this section is crime.

Again, there is a dearth of data on this issue in this state. SEIS did actually look at the effects, to some extent, of gambling on crime in Tasmania in one year. It was prompted by Anglicare releasing their research, *Nothing Left to Lose*, in 2010. That *Nothing Left to Lose* report found -

Ordinary people are doing things they would not ordinarily do, that is, committing serious crimes because of a gambling problem that leaves them with nothing left to lose.

The report looked at 41 cases heard in the Supreme Court of Tasmania over six years in the early 2000s. Half of the offenders had no prior convictions. There are numerous statements by judges that the gambling left them nowhere to turn. There was comorbidity with drug and alcohol and mental ill health. The crimes were serious ones. What I want to raise here is the role gambling addiction and the easy accessibility of poker machines in many cases played. This is not just a cost to the individual: 35 of the 41 cases saw the person get a custodial sentence. Anglicare calculated, I believe, at the time that the cost to the prison system of just those cases was at least \$4 million. There were also the uncounted costs for the police time and the court system. Six of those imprisoned had dependent children. Child protection was then involved.

As one judge said in sentencing -

In common with so many others who have committed like crimes, you deluded yourself that the next gamble would result in a win that would enable you to repay the money that you had taken.

Another judge said -

The catalyst for your offending was your gambling. You began with having just a social bet. You were feeling pressure at work and became depressed. Your rate of gambling increased. You were using it as a stress reliever. Your gambling spiralled out of control and you began to steal to cover the addiction. The stealing escalated over time. You used significant parts of your income on gambling, and additionally borrowed large amounts which were also lost.

Mr President, most of us will recognise elements there we have already talked about today in a typical experience of gambling harm - something that begins with non-harmful behaviour, but because of the nature of the machines, becomes harmful behaviour, both through their accessibility, and the features that actually allow people to become addicted; the fact that we allow those machines to take so much money so quickly.

The Productivity Commission warned us, in fact, that faced with mounting financial difficulties in gambling-related debts when all these legal sources of gambling funds are exhausted, problem gamblers may then resort to illegal activities to obtain money. It is right therefore for us to consider that, when we are making public policy on this product. It is difficult to estimate the number of people with a gambling problem who are committing crimes relating to their gambling, as many people do not admit it, and we do not generally ask them to reveal it in court.

South Australia is an interesting situation. There they have recognised the very tangible connection between gambling and crime. They have introduced a gambling intervention program court. It is one of their therapeutic jurisprudence approaches in their court system. We have some of those here in our state; we do not have one that focuses on gambling. However, in South Australia they introduced that program. It provides the opportunity for somebody who has committed a crime that was related to their gambling problem to engage with monitored assistance and behavioural change programs. The participant must attend court regularly. The magistrate

reviews their progress and encourages the participant to keep heading in the right direction, and warns them if they do not, they may then well go to a custodial sentence.

All types of gambling are treated through that court. The program provides support and case management, access to services such as housing and financial, employment and relationship counselling.

I am looking at an article that was written two years after the court was established, by one of the magistrates. The magistrate observes that over the past two years, only two participants have failed to complete the program successfully. Much of the success has been attributed to the one-on-one therapy and support that is provided in a range of ways. He notes, I think quite rightly, that South Australia can be proud of having the first and only gambling intervention program court, that it is helping save individuals and families and to prevent reoffending.

I am certain that South Australia is far from perfect in preventing and minimising harm from poker machines. I suspect they are much like here, and other states in the eastern seaboard, where the industry is just as politically influential and powerful. The establishment of that court is at least a clear acknowledgment of the connection between gambling harm and the social issues. It is an acknowledgment of the broader cost of that harm.

Clearly, if we focus on first principles, it is better to avoid a problem, rather than manage it after the fact. Effective and compassionate intervention programs are to be applauded, but it is a failure of good policymaking to neglect to first fully implement the suite of straightforward, evidence-based expert advice prevention measures that we may know to be available.

I know that many of the stories and voices I have shared today have been shocking. Some of them have been very sad. I shared them so that in our discussion we are not to lose sight of the real lives and experiences of Tasmanians who sit at the heart of this issue.

We are encouraged to think by industry of these poker machines as harmless entertainment. The industry has even equated them to a trip to the movies and an ice cream. That was in the context of a parliamentary inquiry and others may remember that.

We can categorically say that poker machines are a dangerous product and they are regarded that way globally. They are a product that puts health, families, livelihoods and lives at risk. As legislators tasked to establish appropriate policy regulation of this product, how can we, on the one hand, support government investment in health, mental health, suicide prevention, family violence, law and order and employment services and support and, on the other hand, neglect to make every available effort to reduce the risk of harm and the severity of harm that pokies cause to Tasmanian families?

In future, when we look back at these neglected opportunities we have had to reduce harm caused by this product, I think we will do that in the same way that we look back now at the lax and ill-informed regulation on cigarettes in decades past, except that we could have - we should have - learned a valuable lesson from our experience. We should have learned that big industry operators gaining super profits from an addictive product will go to great trouble and expense to block effective regulation of their product.

We should have learned that governments must actively and transparently resist the influence, political and financial, of those big industry operators, but it looks to me like we have not learned

those lessons. We will look back at this hand-in-glove relationship between the poker machine industry and the Tasmanian Government that we have seen for many years with horror and incredulity; I believe most Tasmanians already do. In this Parliament, this Chamber, if we allow yet another opportunity to be forgone for Tasmanians to step away from the tainted influence of a destructive poker machine industry in 2020, shame on all of us. This is a product that will never be on the right side of history but each of us here can be.

Point 1(e)(i) of the motion talks about data, with at least 23 000 Tasmanians in at-risk groups. I need to make a correction. I apologise to members. When I wrote my motion last year I had not yet updated my calculations and my go-to numbers from the most recent SEIS and Census figures. It means my figure of at least 23 000 Tasmanians in at-risk groups is a little out. Unfortunately, with the newer figures, the number is higher. This is because it is a prevalence across the whole population and our population has grown and, because the prevalence for both problem gambling and low-risk also increased between 2014 and 2017, what we are seeing is the estimated number of Tasmanians in at-risk groups sitting at almost 27 000 Tasmanian people. This consists of about 2300 problem gamblers, 5400 moderate-risk gamblers and a whopping 19 000 Tasmanians who are currently called low-risk gamblers. We will talk more about those categories in a moment.

What is worrying for me and should be worrying for the Government also is that the prevalence for the total of these at-risk groups has increased since the 2014 survey. Prevalence for the most extreme category of problem gambling has also increased since 2014. This is not an indication of a successful approach to harm minimisation. Even if those numbers were to stay steady, I would make the case that this is not an indication of a successful approach to harm minimisation. Despite empty government claims of national best-practice harm minimisation, what we are currently doing is not working - if by using the term 'working' we mean reducing harm caused to Tasmanian people. This Government appears content to benchmark us against the devastating failure of harm minimisation we see in other Australian states. Bizarrely, they regularly trumpet that we are the best of this appalling bad, globally worst, lot. For a start, they can only make this claim by pretending that Western Australia does not exist. I challenge the Government to back its claim of best practice and prove how and where its harm minimisation efforts have led to a reduction of harm in our state. Prove that your approach is working. Make the case. Explain to us why you are content to enable the continuation of increasing levels of problem and at-risk gambling in Tasmania. Make that case.

As I know you will roll out that trite line that Tasmania has, nationally, best practice harm minimisation, I challenge you to add the next line of your argument and then add the line after, which should explain to us with meaningful evidence how your lack of action on proven evidence-informed advice amounts to best practice. Make your case, make it to the Tasmanian people who you disrespect with sound bites to hide policy failure.

I am going to return to prevalence and the way we try to put a number to these at-risk groups because that is what we are looking at in the motion. I will clarify what the at-risk groups mean so that we are clear, as we talk about the numbers, what we mean by them. The SEIS provides this information. It says that both moderate-risk and problem gamblers are more likely to use a poker machine in a pub or club than in a casino, for example. It tells us they are likely to gamble 150 times a year. That is three times a week.

What is also of serious consideration for public policy are those categorised as low-risk gamblers. Low risk is perhaps a misleading description for this category. Despite how it may sound, it does not mean that they are at low risk of a problem. It means that they are already

experiencing issues with their gambling but the severity of those issues is so far comparatively low with, say, problem gambling. Every person in the category that is called low-risk has some concern about their gambling. They might articulate feelings of guilt or they might say they find it hard to stop but they are not gambling three times a week. Their gambling has not yet become uncontrollable. To give you an indication, this low-risk group is described by the SEIS as people who spend about the same on gambling in a year as a typical Tasmanian household does on electricity.

I want to talk a little bit about the second point. It says that one in three Tasmanians personally know someone who has a serious problem gambling on poker machines. It is hard to imagine that we would not set an explicit goal for ourselves to reduce the prevalence and impact of gambling harm in Tasmania, especially when that 2016 survey that was conducted of 1000 people around our state found that one in three Tasmanians personally knew someone with a serious problem with poker machines. I know that is what the survey showed because I commissioned it. It was an independent survey undertaken by EMRS and we did it because we had been doing surveys for decades that showed at least 80 per cent of people did not feel that poker machines contributed positively to their community and wanted to remove them or reduce them.

We had that figure, we used that figure and it was becoming a tired figure and I wondered what else we could find out. It might give us more of an indication about how many Tasmanians are affected so we surveyed and what we found was this; one in three of us personally knows someone. I will give you some examples of those. This is from a woman who lives in the seat of Rosevears. She wrote, and this was all in the open letter that was sent to the Premier in 2017 -

I know first-hand the trauma wrought by the pokies. My husband drained our joint bank account before his death in September this year. I urge you to remove this scourge our communities.

A man who lives in the seat of Elwick wrote -

My mother has some dementia and lives in a unit in Glenorchy. All she wants to do is go to the Elwick Hotel and lash out on the machines. We cannot stop her and she is very determined to go there as much as possible. Her excuse is she needs something to do but she will not accept help from Veteran Affairs. Get rid of the machines as most people that go to these hotels - the elderly - seem to outnumber the younger people.

Then a woman who is from the seat of Windermere expressed some fear for her mother. She wrote -

My mother took up playing the poker machines in her late 70s. The clubs were very happy to have her visits and her money. She possibly had early signs of dementia and for that reason her gambling was out of control. She lost a lot of money and did not seem to care. For family members who had to watch this behaviour it was terrifying.

Perhaps the first time her mother went to play pokies we might have thought of her as one of the apocryphal nannas who want to have a flutter with her \$20. As this lady demonstrates, there is no way to know what will come from a simple flutter for nanna or for anyone else that sits down in front of these machines.

From the seat of Murchison, we had a man write in terms of his sister -

After 20 years of problem gambling my sister committed suicide by overdosing on prescription medication she had become addicted to. In the final 20 years of her life she was in and out of jail on fraud and other related charges. She was desperate to feed her habit.

Also, in Murchison a woman wrote -

I watch my father blow his age pension every fortnight on the pokies. I supply the food and cook his every meal so I know he at least eats every day. He can't afford to fuel his car up, struggles to pay his car registration. A brother pays his vehicle insurance, another brother pays his house and contents insurance. Pokies are a trap and need to be limited or removed from a lot of areas.

These are the messages that show us what that one in three looks like. They come from our people in our communities. One in three Tasmanians. These Tasmanians are the people whose voices need to be heard when we are talking about regulating in the best interests of our state.

I will talk about the figure of 79 per cent, which is point 1(e) in my motion. Seventy-nine per cent of Tasmanian Gamblers Help clients have poker machines as their primary form of gambling. You do not have to spend too much time on this. It is a straightforward figure. Gambling support collects data from gambling services including the reasons people are there to seek help - 79 per cent of the Tasmanian people seeking help for harm by pokies.

These numbers tell us exactly what is happening here in our community, yet there is still this perception that persists of sports betting or online gambling as being huge problems that should take our attention. The reality is at this time, the numbers tell us it is still poker machines in this state that are the clear and present danger of causing the most damage.

Also, unlike sports betting and online gambling the licensing and the regulation of poker machines is a matter for state parliaments. It is a matter for us to determine to regulate and to make decisions for our community. While we are quite laterally wondering about the development of new technologies with gambling and have a right to be concerned about increases that may occur in those forms, this need not and should not serve to divert us from our important responsibility when it comes to poker machines. We can walk and chew gum on this and it is particularly important we do not put aside our responsibility and role when it comes to poker machines, because that is where we can make a tangible difference.

I have discussed the issue of poker machines with thousands of Tasmanians over the last five years and without fail every time I can guarantee somebody will raise the matter of other forms of gambling. There is a lot of misconception about.

The assertion made when I engage with people about it is that if we were to take away people's access to poker machines they would transfer their problem to another form of gambling. It is a really commonly imagined scenario. I want to be clear here on the record that research tells us it is a false perception. It is actually a wrong thinking. That is not what research tells us happens. Poker machine addiction, problem gambling on poker machines, is a very particular dynamic. We talked about it earlier. It is to do with the design of the machines, the features that create the moment of anticipation and all those other things. Research has looked into whether the same effect people

seek from that addiction would be replicated in other forms and encourage them to move to them. So far, the research tells us no.

This is often used as a bit of a red herring argument by industry and perhaps by others who are pursuing their own interests. It is often though just a genuine question from people in the community. It is worth clearing up and I come back to the data, the 79 per cent. We know only one in 10 people actually seeks help. Even if we are looking at people in our gambling support programs, which that figure does, we are not capturing everybody who is harmed by gambling or poker machine gambling. There are a lot of people who need but are not actually seeking that help yet. The hidden nature of this problem is difficult for us. It makes it difficult for us to discuss it. It makes it difficult for voices of those who are affected to be heard.

There are two things I know about this from working at Anglicare, interacting with frontline services, the workers who are there, who are really engaged with this issue in a very tangible way and the people they assist and support. One of the first things I really learnt quite clearly talking to frontline workers is that it is incredibly hard for people seeking help. They pretty much have to hit rock bottom before they are able to then come and seek help. Then the process of managing an addiction is incredibly hard. Both counsellors and support workers who assist people to do that are doing a wonderful job. They are very skilled at what they do. But for the person themselves, it is a daily struggle. It is a daily struggle to be climbing the mountain of addiction and facing up to the difficulty every day of not using poker machines.

When they have to be in a local community where those machines are placed everywhere, it is particularly difficult. People addicted to poker machines will tell you they fall asleep hearing pokies jingles and they wake up hearing pokies jingles. Even people in Risdon prison who have had a pokie addiction will tell you that continues throughout the time they are serving their time.

A second thing I learnt from frontline workers is a little bit harder to describe. I will try to summarise it effectively; I find it quite fascinating. Workers develop a relationship with the people who they help. Anglicare has all sorts of services, apart from gambling support, all sorts of other social services. Workers in all those other social services talk about when you form a relationship and develop trust between the person you are assisting and the worker, all sorts of things over time begin to be disclosed. People may disclose things such as mental illness quite readily now. We have normalised this in our community conversations.

Family violence is coming to be disclosed, I am given to understand, more readily now too. We are also quite proactively working as a community around the way we talk about and support this. Workers will talk about people disclosing drug and alcohol issues. That is a challenging thing to disclose. We frame them as a health problem now and offer support in a non-judgmental way. The anecdotal stories I heard from workers more than once show the very deepest thing disclosed after building trust and after time spent assisting and supporting is a poker machine addiction. It is a pokies addiction that has the most shame, that sits buried and hidden most deeply for people who are experiencing it as a problem, not just for the person who may have the problem, but for their family members. They might be coming for financial counselling because they do not have any money left to pay the bills. They need help to figure out what they are going to do with their budget. Family members who are affected by the issue still feel the shame of it.

I find this really fascinating. I have no research to explain it at all. I would be really keen to see it. The best I can do is probably speculate a little about whether there is a connection to the way

we talk about these issues in public, the way we have our public messaging about them and what that means in terms of what you say to the people who are affected by them.

We have done really increasingly well on those other issues I mentioned in improving our public conversation. Then I think about our public messaging about poker machines and about poker machine addiction and the first things that come into my mind, and I am not sure what comes into yours, are things like - 'gamble responsibly' and Responsible Gambling Awareness Week and 'know your odds' and so on. In each of those cases, the framing of our public messaging makes the person the problem. Even 'know your odds' - because if you did not know your odds then it is your fault. Certainly, 'gamble responsibly' makes it your fault. It implies you have an issue with that activity and it is the result of a personal failing.

Responsible gambling is a really important concept. It is really important and possible for us to legislate and regulate gambling responsibly. The responsibility element is important for us to attach to our role. It is also really important to attach it to the role of those people who are providing gambling services - the operators. Responsible service of gambling, responsible operation of gambling are the really important concepts to talk about.

If I had a gambling addiction and were told it was my fault for not being responsible, I would have a pretty huge amount of shame and would probably want to keep it pretty hidden too. That is my speculation on that phenomenon.

On providing gambling services responsibly and perhaps tying into this issue around hiding and shame, I want to say something about the visibility of the gambling problem. Staff in pokies pubs know who is having a problem. They know because the person is like that white mouse we talked about earlier and their dopamine hit button. The person who has a problem with gambling comes in every day. They are there before the place opens in the morning. They do not stop to eat or drink and do not go to the toilet. They do not show any satisfaction from a win and just put the win back into the machine and keep going until it is all gone.

The staff know the people they see exhibiting those behaviours and then they see it again the next day when they come and the next day after that. The staff can tell those people have a problem. One Tasmanian describes it really well. This is what they say -

[We would arrive] at 10 o'clock and go home about 4 or 5 pm. Sometimes [we would play pokies for] 5 to 7 hours. Depends on how much money we had. We didn't even eat or drink tea, coffee or alcohol. I don't drink. The majority of them sit there for hours.

Another woman says -

No, we wouldn't even go to the toilet. We would have kept playing the pokies if we had sold things in our houses to get the money.

A man describes spending many hours at the venue -

I have been there when it opens at 9 am and there until it closes at night. I just keep on going back.

The venues where these people, those voices, where they were gambling, they should have noticed them. They should have intervened.

Another man who chased his losses would go to gaming venues as often as could, sometimes three times a day. He would drink the occasional glass of water, but never eat and he would try to last up to four hours without going to the toilet. When he was skipping work, this man would stay at the venue for only a short time; however, he was often surprised by how long he was at the venue for. This is what he says -

[I would play the pokies] until my fingers got sore. You think you have worked out the system because you're watching them for so long. But that is absolute rubbish. I could do up to \$400 in one session but then I would stop because I would be physically exhausted ... You think you have been there for 30 minutes but you will have been there for about 3 or 4 hours. It's really strange.

In all of those stories there were venue staff who could see what was going on. If these patrons had staggered to the bar and slurringly asked for drink, they would not have been served yet what those venue staff were seeing every day was the gambling equivalent of intoxication. Currently, we do not effectively hold venues to account for responsible service of gambling. We give it lip service; it is part of training; it is there in the mandatory code; it is supposed to happen - but when you hear stories like that, and we could go out right now and hear stories like that all over this state attached to every venue, you know it is not working. We are not holding them accountable enough, when it can be seen so very clearly.

We have come to the final data point in the motion, point (1)(e). This is the shortest one yet: 40 to 60 per cent of the money taken by pokies comes from people who have a problem. It is now well accepted that somewhere between 40 to 60 per cent of the losses come from people who are at-risk gamblers. The Productivity Commission, our Tasmanian SEIS, and our gaming commission do not question the fact, so let us take it as a given.

One thing we can note, though, is that half the money - about 40 to 60 per cent - going into machines is coming from a cohort of people who are addicted to the machines. They are the ones who make the most money for the gambling businesses. They are the star customers, they are the ones who are not eating and drinking, they are the ones who are not going to the toilets, they are the ones who are there at 9 a.m. and still there at 2 a.m. maybe. They are the ones who are not being provided with gambling services responsibly.

Moving onto point (1)(f) in the motion, the SEIS. We talked a little earlier about prevalence studies, and now I will explain a bit more about their limitations. I am not an expert in correct methodology and I make no recommendations about this. My main concern is that, given their known limitations, the government continues to misrepresent findings from our prevalence studies. I would like to correct the record on that.

Every three years, the Tasmanian Government funds the Social and Economic Impact Study into Gambling in our state. The prevalence part of the SEIS involves a phone survey to landline and mobile phone numbers. The survey takes about 15 to 20 minutes to complete, and you could expect that the more you gamble, the longer you are probably going to be doing the survey, because you will have more details to provide.

How accurate are the prevalence surveys? They are self-reported data, so that is immediately going to present some challenges. Sarah Hare from Queensland's Schottler Consulting is a well-regarded prevalence study expert. She was in Hobart last year for the National Association of Gambling Studies Conference, and participated in a discussion about prevalence studies. Sarah Hare earns money consulting doing these prevalence studies. She certainly was not suggesting they were of no value at all. What she did say, which has relevance for Tasmania to consider, is that self-reported data are very inaccurate. These surveys ask people to estimate the amount of time and the amount of money they spent gambling in the past year. They need the respondent to provide that information across all sorts of gambling in our gambling prevalence study - pokies, races, Keno and lotteries.

I do not gamble, so for me to gauge what it would be like to respond to such a survey is problematic. I would have to replace it with something I could relate to more easily. I would replace it with, say, something like my alcohol consumption. You can imagine along with me, if you like. If we were doing a prevalence survey about alcohol consumption, these are some of the indicative questions that would look like the gambling ones we might have to answer in that survey.

We would have to answer: how often in the past year have you had an alcoholic drink? How many times did you drink each week? How many times did you drink at home? How many times did you drink in a pub? How many times did you drink at a restaurant? How many drinks would you usually have each time at each of those locations? How much did you usually spend each time?

They are just indicative questions. I do not know the exact format of the questions in our gambling survey, but it would be something like that, so we know where people gambled, how often they gambled at each of those places, and how much they spent. That is what gets presented to us in the SEIS.

As I ran through those questions, I do not know if you were thinking along with me, but what did you think about how you would go with accuracy on the questions? Personally, I would be challenged on two fronts. One would be remembering, but the other one is that I know I get squirmy when my GP asks me to estimate my weekly alcohol consumption - and if I had to answer those detailed questions, I would be pretty far off the mark.

In addition to the questions like those, in gambling surveys there are also screening questions for problem gambling. Things like: How often have you felt guilty about your gambling? How often have you borrowed money for your gambling? From all the answers, the survey then characterises each respondent as a non-gambler, a non-problem gambler, and one of the three 'at-risk' groups, so we would fall into one of those categories.

Now, ask yourself: if you did have a problem with gambling, how relaxed do you think you would feel during those 20 minutes or so while a stranger asks you those questions?

Mr President, I do not know about you, but I think I would feel relatively uncomfortable. Sarah Hare, the prevalence expert, agreed with the premise at that conference session last year that it is highly likely that a problem gambler would get distressed and could hang up or refuse to answer questions.

When the Tasmanian survey for the 2017 SEIS was conducted, the same number of people who were ultimately found to be problem gamblers hung up. We do not know why they hung up. It could have been anything. They might not have had time to do the survey. It could have been

that they had gambling problems. We will not know. Those people who hung up will not be represented in the data, necessarily. We could have missed out on the experience of many people who do have a serious gambling problem, because answering a phone survey is just too hard for them. Again, the accuracy of the information on the experiences of problem gamblers is very likely to be under-reported. The SEIS makes it clear that these limitations are there, and that figures are underestimates. That is good. Every time we use those SEIS figures, we should remember those limitations. We should see them as, at best, a minimum indication for problem gambling, not a maximum.

When the government, for many years now, has been talking about the tiny percentage of Tasmanians who are harmed by gambling, and relate that to the SEIS figure of 0.6 per cent of people being problem gamblers, I think they should be honest about their own government's funded research and say, even just to be slightly more accurate, that it is at least 0.6 per cent of Tasmanians who are problem gamblers. Even that small tweak to language would represent more honesty from the government on those figures.

In fact, there is a different way, and it is an interesting one, that we could get an indication of how much of an underestimate might be in these SEIS figures. We can look at self-reported spend on poker machines in the SEIS, and we can see how that compares to what we know are the actual losses. What people said they spent, when asked on the survey, versus what we know was spent in the same time period, we can extrapolate out from the survey, then compare the two figures. It's probably a little bit 'back of the envelope', but we have given it a crack. We can get the real figures from the Liquor and Gaming Branch's monthly report and from the gaming commission's annual report; we have that.

If we extrapolate out from the self-reported spend in the SEIS, we find that it is just about 28 per cent of the actual losses that we know occurred in the same time period; 28 per cent. It is a pretty big underestimation of the spend. It is just giving us a flavour, I guess, of accuracy. Unfortunately, while the SEIS does admit their limitations, they do not adjust for the under-representation. Based on the self-reported figure, the SEIS comes up with a figure that is substantially lower for average losses for Tasmanians than the actual figure. SEIS says about \$655 per person; actually, it is probably well over \$2000. It is a huge difference.

Particularly interesting, though, was that when you looked at different forms of gambling, where the information was collected in the SEIS, there was not the same underestimation from other forms. It turns out that in answering questions about Keno, the survey respondents' self-reported spend was pretty close to the actual total spent for Keno. It was actually 92 per cent of the actual total, pretty close - compared to the pokies estimate, which was just 28 per cent. I wonder if there is a connection there to that element of shame that I spoke about earlier - shame at how much money might be being spent? Perhaps it is more of a link to that experience of losing track of time and awareness that we heard described by some of those addicted gamblers.

I am going to just skip ahead. I think we should always admit that we have limited accuracy to the data of exactly who is being harmed in those prevalence figures. If we admit there is a limitation there, we take it as indicating a certain thing. We acknowledge the underestimation. We believe that it should be higher.

I think it would be good to have a clearer picture. I think if we collected information in association with those other services we talked about earlier, and whether people accessing those services or our service systems also had issues or matters relating to poker machines affecting them,

we would find that filled out our picture as well. There are all kinds of ways we could get a picture of what is going on there. I would like to see that set as a goal, that we find tangible and meaningful ways to better paint that picture for ourselves as legislators and regulators and on behalf of the community, so that we know what is going on.

The next point in the motion talks about employment. I put this in here because it was such a matter of discussion. It was such a contentious issue at different times, as we have discussed the issue over the past few years, particularly in the context of the 2018 election campaign and it is one that heightens feelings about this issue. The Anglicare submission to the parliamentary inquiry in 2017 made the point that the Productivity Commission found that the impact of the gambling industry on employment is neutral because, if the gambling industry did not exist or was smaller, money would be spent in other industries where employment would be created.

We could literally take the gambling industry away and the reallocated spending would create the same or more jobs elsewhere that would replace those that may disappear. This was also reinforced in the work of Professor John Mangan. He is an independent economist who provided an independent economic analysis of taking poker machines out of Tasmanian hotels and clubs. That was also provided to the committee in 2017. That report from John Mangan found that there would be a net gain of potentially hundreds of jobs to our state if we were to take poker machines out of pubs and clubs. Even his most pessimistically modelled scenarios showed net job creation for our state.

I take this opportunity to make it quite clear that pokies create no more employment than would otherwise be replaced by gambling money spent elsewhere in the economy. The money spent elsewhere would likely give us more employment, more bang for our buck. Victorian research tells us that for every million dollars spent on poker machines only three jobs are created. For every million dollars spent on beverage service, eight jobs are created. For every million dollars spent on food service, 20 jobs are created. We can see that other key parts of the hotel business and the broader hospitality industry are much larger drivers of employment than poker machines.

The state Government's SEIS, economics professor John Mangan, the local independent economist John Lawrence from the north-west of this state and academic news sites that reviewed this, like *The Conversation* and the RMIT ABC *Fact Check*, all concur on the actual number of jobs in Tasmania that relate to poker machines. Despite all the claims and the figures that fly around, from all those sources, all of them independently concur. They all say there are about 240 full-time equivalent jobs as a result of poker machines in hotels and clubs in Tasmania. That is a little more than a bit over two full-time equivalents on average for each of the pubs and clubs, but that would not be evenly spread.

These are important jobs for those who have them, but it is agreed by all those independent sources and it is confirmed by the Productivity Commission's findings that, even if poker machines were removed from pubs and clubs in Tasmania, these 240 jobs would not likely be lost because the venues would restructure their business and, in doing so, retain or create additional jobs. If you wanted to start talking about peripheral jobs as somehow being attached to pokies in pubs, people like the cleaners, delivery drivers or the suppliers, something in the vicinity of 74 per cent of the pubs in Tasmania do not have pokies. Presumably, those 74 per cent of pubs also sustain those very same peripheral jobs. If the pokies pubs no longer had pokies and had to restructure their businesses, perhaps to a model more like the other 74 per cent, they would still support those same peripheral jobs without pokies.

When a major party took the policy to remove poker machines from pubs and clubs to the 2018 election we saw how the poker machine industry responded and it was all, pretty much, centred on this issue of jobs. I am going to use the words of Dr James Boyce to talk about what happened in that campaign in relation to jobs. I want to quote from a recently released paper James has prepared as something of an update, the final chapter, if you will, to his award winning book, *Losing Streak*. I understand that James has sent this paper to all parliamentarians, so I know that he is more than happy for people to see it, to share it and for anyone who is interested, to interact with them about it. I commend the paper to all Tasmanians. Dr Boyce brings his historian's eye, his scrupulous research and his extensive knowledge of the subject to bear. The heading is, '2018 Election Campaign: A Mandate for Change'. James writes -

The Liberal party election policy opened with a line adapted from the 'Love Your Local' campaign funded by the large poker machine hotels and the Federal Group: 'The Gaming Industry estimates that around 5000 jobs are at risk if Electronic Gaming Machines are removed from pubs and clubs'.

This employment forecast was repeated by the Treasurer during the election campaign.

The Liberal claim was radically different from the findings of the Social and Economic Impact Study, funded by the government itself, that were released prior to the Liberal policy ... (The SEIS was publicly released in early January 2018 but was available to the Government since before Christmas). This found that 'there are an estimated 240 FTEs employed relating to EGM operation' in hotels and clubs.

The Liberal claim was also fact checked by the ABC/RMIT Fact Checking Unit and found to be false. This was not surprising given that it included every job in the Federal Group and large pubs, only a small minority of which had anything to do with poker machines, and many of which would benefit from their withdrawal. Thus, for example, every job in the casino was assumed to be impacted, even though the casinos would have a monopoly of poker machines in Tasmania if they were taken out of hotels. The only possible consequence of the ALP giving the casinos a monopoly on poker machines was that poker machine profits would substantially increase in casinos. Just how jobs at the \$2000 a night Saffire or other high-end hotels, such as Henry Jones and Macq1, let alone the Federal Groups' to transport company, were to be negatively impacted by a policy on poker machines was also not explained.

Becher Townsend of Fontpr that developed the campaign told the Fact Check Unit that the employment claims were based on a survey he undertook, in which he asked pubs and clubs with poker machines what the impact on jobs would be if poker machines were withdrawn. Every expert consulted by the Fact Check Unit, as well as everyone who commented on the issue publicly, condemned this patently self-serving methodology. Mr Townsend claimed to the Fact Check Unit that he resorted to the survey in the absence of other data. In fact, the ABS publishes data on this specific question. Furthermore, by legislation - every three years Tasmania undertakes a Social and Economic Impact Study into Gambling. A number of these have addressed this question, not just the most recent one

referred to above. All had direct or indirect employment figures in the gambling industry dramatically below the figure suggested.

Even more disturbing is that despite the magnitude of the lies told by the poker machine industry, the stated Liberal party policy and the Treasurer's commentary during the campaign, went beyond even what the industry itself, what the industry itself claimed.

The Liberals claimed that around 5000 jobs were 'at risk'. Even the gambling industry only suggested that this number of jobs would be impacted, during the Fact Check investigation, Becher Townsend from Fontpr admitted that the claim that 5100 jobs were 'at risk' was incorrect. Yet this was the very claim made by the Liberal Party and the Treasurer.

In going beyond even the outlandish claims made by the poker machine industry itself, the Liberal Party and Peter Gutwein clearly misled the Tasmanian people.

The grossly exaggerated employment claims were made *after* the latest facts were available to the Government through the release of the SEIS. Even after the mistake was highlighted, and the Factcheck unit had interviewed Becher Townsend, the Treasurer made no attempt to correct the record. The Liberals policy continued to clearly state and be aggressively sold to the Tasmanian people on the basis that 5000 jobs were 'at risk' unless poker machines remained in hotels. Since the SEIS, the authoritative report meant to guide public policy which the Government itself paid for and commissioned, left no doubt that this was incorrect, and the Treasurer refused to amend his position even after the PR firm that invented the '5100 jobs impacted' claim acknowledged these jobs were not 'at risk'. The Liberal Party cannot be said to have a 'mandate' for their poker machine policy. Any mandate is always conditional on accurate policy information being provided to voters.

I am going to end that section there from the paper from James Boyce, although James goes on to point out that was not the only inaccuracy or potential lie provided during that election campaign. There were also claims put Federal Group website that just 24 per cent of gambling expenditure in Tasmania occurred via EGMs in the financial year 2016, whereas the true figure was actually 58.6 per cent.

Claims are made we have fewer pokies per capita than all other Australian states. We actually have more than Victoria and about the national average when you take out New South Wales as the outlier, the saturation that is there. The other thing, of course, was we had a repetition about that prevalence matter, the misrepresenting the prevalence figure, that 99.4 per cent of Tasmanian adults are not problem gamblers. Now, we know that is not true. We know at least 0.6 per cent are problem gamblers, at least. We certainly do not know that 99.4 per cent are not.

The self-serving deliberate lies told by both the industry and the Liberal Party during the 2018 election campaign are actually a disgrace, but they are really a tragedy. To take the issue of jobs in this state, to twist it through lies and fearmongering into a weapon is nothing but the basest political opportunism. All of us here know jobs are a real sore point. They are a vulnerability in this state. Far too many Tasmanians are either out of work, underemployed or are in insecure work, perhaps particularly in the poker machine industry. Many Tasmanians already feel worried about their jobs.

Tasmanians working in pokies pubs and clubs and working in the casino were flat out lied to and manipulated by their employer and by the Liberal Government. Even Tasmanians working in other companies that do business with those pubs, clubs and casinos were lied to, told their livelihoods were also at risk.

I know for a fact that this very month still Federal Group is telling suppliers and associated businesses they should feel scared for their business if the Government's pokies policy does not go through. While this continues to be a despicable lie, we can in some sense understand a private business attempting at all costs and by any means to hang on to the lucrative super profits it has become accustomed to. I would say the true dishonour here is in what took place with the Liberal Party, its base betrayal of the Tasmanian people and of our democratic foundations, which are now indelible stains on the annals of our state.

I have come to the final part of my motion about the modelling. It is the core and point (1)(g), then number (2) fit together, I will speak to them briefly. Point (1)(g) says -

To date, the Tasmanian Government has not released and made available for public scrutiny and discussion, modelling on the social and economic impact of the proposed new poker machine licensing arrangement to be introduced to Tasmania in 2023.

Then that flows on to point (2) of the motion, which says -

The Legislative Council calls on the Tasmanian Government to undertake and publicly release modelling on the social and economic impact of the proposed new poker machine licensing arrangements to be introduced in Tasmania in 2023.

Late last year, when I tabled this motion, there was very little information about the proposed new model. All we had were a few pages from the Liberal Government election policy, which was essentially identical to the THA/Federal Group proposal tabled at the parliamentary inquiry in 2017. Only a couple of weeks ago we have seen the Government release a consultation paper on its regulatory framework, which is based on its policy. Submissions close tomorrow on that paper. The material presented to us for consideration in the Government's consultation paper includes still no modelling or evidence of the likely social or economic impacts of this licensing model and regulatory framework on the Tasmanian poker machine industry, on a broader Tasmanian hospitality industry, on the Tasmanian community, or on the Tasmanian economy overall. None of that is discussed, presented or alluded to.

The consultation paper has no references to sources of evidence, data or research that may have informed the material it presents, or supports the decisions made on the policy and regulatory elements that are there. No indication is given in this paper of the process that was used to develop, first, the policy, and now this regulatory framework. It does not mention any role played by key stakeholders who might have been involved or consulted.

We do not know, for example, from this consultation paper whether all parts of the poker machine industry in the state actually know what is in it, understand what is in it, and endorse it. We do not know that; it does not say that. Consultation questions are absent from the consultation paper. It gives us no indication of where input from the public, or from other key stakeholders, might actually have another opportunity to inform or shape or change what is there. It certainly

does not present any overall cost-benefit analysis, for the state, of the proposed changes under the licensing model.

Given these deficiencies, the value - and I would suggest even the authenticity - of this consultation process is in question.

With regard to the Gutwein Government's policy framework, which the paper seeks to give effect to, the consultation paper explicitly states, 'matters specific to the Government's policy itself are out of scope of this consultation process'.

In a *Mercury* newspaper article yesterday, the Leader of this place is quoted as saying -

We have now taken details of our proposed future gaming market reforms out to the community for open consultation, which is ongoing.

Even Ms Webb is welcome to make a submission.

I would first like to thank the Leader for that invitation - that even I may make a submission. The Leader will be pleased to hear that I have indeed prepared one. In it, I raise over 50 unanswered questions on the material presented and omitted by the Gutwein Government in that consultation paper. I will be making that submission tomorrow. I would also like to take this opportunity to correct the Leader on what she said in her media statement.

The Government's policy on future gaming market reforms has not, at any stage, been taken to the community for open consultation. It has never been subjected to appropriate scrutiny, assessment and public examination. To date, there have been no details made public on the policy's development process, nor the evidence base that informs it, nor the social and economic modelling that underpins it, or even on the real policy objectives, in detail, that it aims to achieve.

Let us remind ourselves how we have arrived at this moment, because I think we have skipped some steps. Exactly four years ago today, on 17 March 2016, in a ministerial statement to parliament, Peter Gutwein, then Treasurer, set out a range of principles that were to guide the gaming reform process in Tasmania. A notable point made in his statement that day, four years ago, was this -

The processes that led to the development of the earlier deeds caused concern in the community and cast a shadow over the appropriateness of the structural arrangements. The Government does not want a repeat of this outcome. There needs to be a fully transparent public consultation process that enables interested Tasmanians to have their say on the future structure of the gaming sector post-2023, with the Government's policy position as the starting point.

On that same day, the former premier Mr Hodgman issued a media release that also emphasised the importance of a transparent process. It said -

Today the Government announced a new way forward for gaming in Tasmania which makes a clean break with the secretive ways of the past.

The Hodgman government and now Gutwein Government have completely failed to honour that statement. There has been no process by which the Government's policy has been appropriately

scrutinised and assessed in an open, public and accountable manner. In fact, interested Tasmanians, as I mentioned, have been specifically excluded from having their say on the Government policy, even in responding to this current consultation paper.

The industry-written proposal, which later was adopted by the Government, is not reflective of the evidence, the findings, or the recommendations made by the joint committee in 2017. The principles were taken to that committee for examination by the government and the committee diligently spent many months going through submission process, hearing processes and consideration of that material based on those principals initially taken to the committee, then they were presented right at the end with that industry proposal which it did not have time to examine. That industry proposal is what then became government policy, not the principles that were taken to the committee in the first place. So while the committee itself did not have an opportunity to examine that industry proposal dropped at the last minute literally on the table of the committee, they did actually seek some expert advice on it; they sought some expert comment on that industry proposal which subsequently became the government policy; they sought it from the Tasmanian Liquor and Gaming Commission and Synergies, the research group that was helping the committee across that time.

The Tasmanian Liquor and Gaming Commission's thoughts on this industry proposal which became government policy are actually documented; they are documented in the appendix of that committee's report. The committee attached it in the appendix and it is on page 201 in appendix D. The Tasmanian Liquor and Gaming Commission, the independent body that was created to provide expert advice to the Tasmanian Government, actually raised in their assessment of that industry proposal numerous concerns that it was not the most suitable option for our state. They had concerns about individual licensing models. They had concerns about the rates of taxation and many other matters - it is all there to see. There is nothing to tell us what the government has done with those concerns and all we know is the Government took that proposal upon which concerns had been raised by an expert independent body and now it is the policy that we have before us right now, the policy that we are not allowed to comment on.

I think something is missing from that sequence of events. I think a lot of openness and transparency is missing from that sequence of events. I think there is absolutely no way in which the Tasmanian people or us here as legislators can have confidence that this policy is actually indicated as the best option going forward and is the best option we could hope to achieve on behalf of our community, and we cannot have that confidence because we have never been given the opportunity to examine it. That is simply not good enough. We need to go back to that step that allows for the Tasmanian community to develop the confidence and the trust that this is the right way forward and that is why in my motion I make the call, there at the bottom, the call that says in point (2) that we call on the Tasmanian Government to undertake and publicly release modelling on this social and economic impacts of the proposed new poker machine licensing arrangements to be introduced to Tasmania in 2023.

Mr Valentine - Can I just have a slight bit of clarity on that? To undertake and publicly release modelling - is it undertake the survey and release the modelling?

Ms WEBB - No, I actually put both those words in there because I am not sure whether they have done it for themselves. We would hope that the government would have modelled what might occur as a result of its policy in various social outcomes and in various economic outcomes and so not just say who gets what in terms of divvying up the thing but if we change to this model what would it mean to our broader hospitality industry, what would it mean to the pubs that do not have

poker machines, what would it mean to our economy overall, those sorts of things - to ask what are we likely to see if we put this in place. I would hope they had done it and that is what has informed their decision-making to produce the policy they have. If they have not done it, I am calling on them to do it. The undertaking part of that is to say, if you have not done it, it should be done - do it, and then release it so we can all see it.

Does that clarify what I mean there?

Mr Valentine - I think it is both modelling and the actual work behind that.

Ms WEBB - Absolutely.

Mr Valentine - I was unclear on that. Thank you.

Ms WEBB - If we just keep it as simple as possible. I want to know how do they know what will come about in terms of social and economic outcomes if this policy is put in place. They should do work and present work that shows us what we could expect. If we do not have that information, certainly for us in considering our job here, how can we do the job we are sent here to do by our communities? How can we undertake the scrutiny? How can we undertake rigorous assessment, holding the Government to account, if we do not have the information available that shows what we could expect to see from this policy? That is the essence of this call.

Mr President, having spent two decades working in the social services sector, public policy, advocacy, research and the past five years talking with thousands of Tasmanians about the harm caused by poker machines in this state, I am deeply concerned we are not just missing an opportunity to make things better, but that we are actively heading towards an outcome that is far worse. It is incumbent upon the Government to demonstrate to the Tasmanian people that is not the case.

[4.27 p.m.]

Mr VALENTINE (Hobart) - Mr President, I too acknowledge the original custodians of this land at the start of our parliamentary year and indeed echo the words of the member for Nelson in that regard and pay respect to their Elders - past, present and emerging - and also acknowledge they have suffered invasion and dispossession.

With respect to the motion before us, it has had a good airing from the member for Nelson and quite clearly it demonstrates the level of engagement the member has had over the years in this area. Yes, it is a long offering but then it is a big space in terms of the social impact of these sorts of facilities in our community. I want to thank her for such a fulsome treatment of the motion and think it has been an important offering. Lots of research has gone into this and indeed Anglicare has demonstrated it is in touch with those who are affected by gaming machines and know the pain people are going through in relation to this.

Looking at the motion we have had significant offerings that cover many things and I do not think there is a lot left to say. It is interesting to hear there is a disproportionately high number per capita of these gaming machines and of course because of that disproportionately high number there is an opportunity, even more so, to impact on those with a gambling problem in a greater way.

Some basically say - well, people need to take responsibility for their actions.

I would like to read from a previous offering in the Legislative Council, going back to 1993 with the Gaming Control Bill. Indeed, at that time the deed of agreement was attached as Schedule 1 to that particular bill, the first iteration of it, the deed. A particular member made this statement; it is one way of looking at life. It is not necessarily something that I agree with. They said -

I only want to say that the reason I rise is to put a point of view in regard to the propositions that have been put forward by certain honourable members who are opposed to this legislation. In opposing it, I think they have tended to highlight the negatives and the negative impacts that might possibly flow from the action proposed.

Personally, I hold the view that from time to time it is necessary to intrude on the rights of individuals to protect them from themselves. But I further hold the view that every time we do that, every time we take that action, we weaken society in some way. If we do not give individuals the right to choose between right and wrong, and if we do not give individuals the opportunity to choose the wrong thing, then we never give them the opportunity to choose the right thing either. The more often we take that decision-making opportunity away from people, the more we weaken society, and the more we make society susceptible.

Society is only going to be strong, and continue to be strong, if the individuals are strong and they face up to their individual responsibilities and if the individuals are forced to choose and choose to do the right thing. As the individuals gain that inner strength, our society generally is going to become stronger because of that.

Mr President, I find that a difficult concept to agree with. In fact, I do not agree with it, because it is like saying people cannot help themselves for all sorts of reasons. Some people might be OCD, some people might be autistic, some people might have a disability. We do not turn around to them and say, 'Look, you are responsible for your own existence; you are responsible for the things you can and cannot do. We will not do anything as a society to help you out.' I guess, at the end of the day, what sort of a society are we to become if we follow that sort of premise that I have just read out? I have not mentioned the person's name, because they are not here to defend their position and I do not think that would be fair.

I then move to the second component -

- 1(a)(ii) a typical style of poker machine that is regarded as 'high intensity'; and
- 1(a)(iii) a comparatively high level of harm due to the use of poker machines.

I will read an offering I made in this House back in October 2017, in response to something that the member for McIntyre West said. Referring back to that *Hansard* on Tuesday, 17 October 2017, I said -

The member for McIntyre west told us you can place 69 online bets in the space of 80 minutes during an NRL match. The member was drawing our attention to the fact that quite a significant number of bets can be placed in 80 minutes.

We find that it is possible to have up to 1200 bets an hour, or an average of 654 an hour, on these particular machines.

At that particular time, I referred to a chart that was put forward by Pat Caplice, of Rein in the Pokies. That was to the inquiry led by Mike Gaffney, member for Mersey. It is a gambling intensity effect chart, as provided to *Hansard* from the group's verbal submission. It did not appear to be in their physical submission, but it was provided to the inquiry nevertheless. It shows that with a bet size of \$5, if you sat at those machines and you just kept pressing and pressing and pressing, you would have an hourly turnover of \$6000. I think the member for Nelson may have covered some of this, but the return to the player would be 85 cents in the dollar, with an expected loss of \$900 in that hour. With a bet size of \$5, if there was an average of 654 times in that hour, the turnover would be \$3270 with 85 cents returned per dollar and an expected total loss of \$490.50. You covered the dollar bets.

Ms Webb - I did and I used more conservative figures. Our gaming commission says you could technically lose \$600 on Tasmanian machines in an hour. That is less than those figures given there, but I was trying to make sure I was giving figures based on our gaming commission's advice. As far as I'm concerned, \$600 is not a normal price to pay for an hour's worth of reasonable, normal entertainment. You could probably pay for some very special entertainment, but not reasonable day-to-day entertainment.

Mr VALENTINE - Mr Caplice was drawing the comparison between \$1 bets and \$5 bets at that time -

Ms Webb - Massive.

Mr VALENTINE - and talking about doing 1200 spins an hour. The hourly turnover would be \$1200 with a return to the player of 85 cents and an expected loss of \$180. There is a significant difference between \$5 bets and \$1 bets. With an average spin of 654 an hour with a \$1 bet you are getting an hourly turnover of \$654 and the return to the player would be 85 cents in the dollar and a loss of \$98.10. The machines that we have are high intensity, there is no question about that. Pat Caplice made further comment based on the committee *Hansard* of 28 February 2017 on the first page of his hearing. He said -

From a gambler's perspective, these aren't theoretical losses. In real life, they are expected losses. That is what you expect to lose. If a gambler goes in and bets at those odds it is what they expect to lose as an hourly rate. It is not theoretical. It is expected.

It is something that was backed up by Greg Farrell from the Federal Group, that it was on paragraph 112 of the inquiry report. In his comments on the limited probability of winning on electronic gaming machines in the context of it being a form of entertainment, he said -

People who play gaming machines, by and large are investing in it like investing in time. Most people are aware of the \$20, \$30 or \$50 that they are taking to that session. They may win and if they win that is great. The majority of people are playing with an expectation that they are not going to win. They are not going to make hundreds of dollars in winnings and make a jackpot. They are going to have an enjoyable time at which they are going to meet their friends and have a coffee.

I made the point: would you go to have a coffee and meet your mates if you were going to lose, in the worst case, \$900 an hour, \$490.50 an hour, \$180 an hour or \$98.10 an hour? I do not think you would. It is as it is. It is a high-intensity environment and we all know about the captive nature of these machines. The member for Nelson has put a heck of a lot of preliminary aspects of this motion, but it is that point (2) that is important -

The Legislative Council calls on the Tasmanian Government to undertake and publicly release modelling on the social and economic impact of the proposed new poker machine licensing arrangements to be introduced in Tasmania in 2023.

That is the nub of the motion. I go to another component of my offering relating to the impact of harm. There is the cost of rehabilitating gambling addicts. We have been told it could be as high as 15 per cent, some that are part way there, and another 15 per cent of gamblers on poker machines. So there is the cost of rehabilitating gambling addicts, and in some cases the cost of treating prisoners who have committed crimes to feed their gambling habit, and that happens; we see it in the paper often. It will not put bread on the table for some families, because they have spent the family cash on poker machines. The member for Nelson has dealt with that.

Then there is the cost of other services to assist families suffering stress and anxiety because a partner or a member of their family is an addict. There is also the cost of addressing the family violence that may result from that stress and anxiety in families.

It is interesting that originally the Community Support Levy was supposed to be up around 8 per cent, but it ended up being 4 per cent, and I want to delve into that a little. With respect to this particular legislation coming forward, I think it is expected the casinos will pay 4 per cent of -

Ms Webb - Three, in fact.

Mr VALENTINE - Three per cent of the Community Support Levy; clubs 5 per cent, and pubs 6 per cent.

Ms Webb - Clubs 4 per cent, and pubs 5 per cent.

Mr VALENTINE - And the casinos 3 per cent? At the moment, all machines are taxed at 27 cents in the dollar, and pubs will increase to 32 cents in the dollar. As far as casinos are concerned, that is unknown as far as I am aware, unless the member for Nelson can correct me. That is currently under negotiation, but it could be as low as 20 cents in the dollar.

Ms Webb - It could be. That is what the industry proposed in their proposal, which then became government policy, but the elements were negotiated behind closed doors.

Mr VALENTINE - The money that comes out of the Community Support Levy, whether it is from the casino or the clubs or the pubs, is at different rates. I am told in Rein in the Pokies by Pat Caplice that of the Community Support Levy, 25 per cent goes to sporting groups, 25 per cent goes to community groups, 25 per cent goes to research such as the Social and Economic Impact Study, and 25 per cent to addressing resulting disadvantage, and the Government is to guarantee a minimum of \$8 million a year. That is what I was told over the phone this morning when I was inquiring into that. I do not have any verification on that. If I am incorrect, then maybe the Leader might clarify that.

Ms Webb - I am sure the Leader may clarify, but I am happy to speak to it when I sum up.

Mr VALENTINE - When you sum up you could, yes. Just to point out that 25 per cent of what is collected in the Community Support Levy is actually going to address the problems that gambling on poker machines creates. It is important that we have the information before us to critically analyse the impact of these machines on the community, when we are dealing with the legislation. We cannot do half a job. We need to know that detail to ensure that we can make a conscious decision as to whether there are going to be unintended consequences as a result of the legislation going through. I support the nub of this motion, which is to ask for that, as we have gone through it.

I point out again that the Government does not have a mandate on this. I have often spoken about this in this Chamber, that they have a mandate to put in on the agenda. We need the Social and Economic Impact Study to be fully informed as we examine the legislation that is putting their policy into place. It is not a mandate to make it happen; people vote for all sorts of things during an election. There could be umpteen numbers of policies. Does that mean the Government has a mandate to do every one of those policies? To my mind, no, they have a mandate to put it on the agenda for examination and scrutiny.

I remain to be convinced it is anything other than that. It does not matter which government is in power, whether it is blue, green, brindle, brown or whatever you like. It is the way it is for me. We are here as a House to review legislation to look for those unintended consequences, to sort that out, to scrutinise it properly, not simply something the Government can stand up and say we have a mandate to put this in place and so therefore you shall pass it. I really do not believe that is the case.

Ms Webb - Can I clarify something with the member for Hobart while he is on his feet? I have just picked up on something you have said that there is perhaps a misunderstanding on what I am calling for. I am not calling for the Government to do their regular socio-economic impact study; I am not calling for the same thing. I am calling for something quite different, that is actually relating -

Mr VALENTINE - You are asking for the modelling. If we do not have the modelling we cannot get the understanding of what the impact is.

Ms Webb - Different from that regular one they normally do which is about prevalence.

Mr VALENTINE - That happens every three years but as we discussed before, it is the modelling you are after on this particular policy so we can then properly understand exactly what the impact is likely to be. I understand what you are saying, because if we were just calling for the normal three yearly study it may well be insufficient or flawed.

Ms Webb - There is no imperative for the Government to do anything with it anyway.

Mr VALENTINE - I believe we are on the same page. Maybe I expressed it the wrong way and apologise if I did.

At this particular time, some are more vulnerable, especially as we are going through this coronavirus issue. They are worried about their earnings. They are worried about putting a meal

on the table for their kids, wives and families and partners. They might even be more inclined to visit poker machine venues in the hope they can win and find all they do is make the situation worse. We all know the odds are stacked against them. We all know when we look at the figures that pubs, clubs and casinos are not in this for nothing - they are in there to make money. They make money out of those who use the machines.

As a state there is no doubt we should be doing what we can as a parliament to interrupt the spread of the coronavirus. We are all united in that vision to protect the vulnerable, so should we not do what we can to protect the vulnerable when it comes to these sorts of things? It is important we need to know what the modelling is to be able to make the call on the full impact of the policy through the legislation coming before us. The question raised there will be other forms of betting that come in just as bad as poker machines or worse. We are dealing with what we have before us, we are dealing with the legislation putting policy into play. We are not dealing with other forms of gambling at the moment so we have to concentrate on this.

When legislation comes before us dealing with other forms of gambling then we will turn our mind to that as individual members. Basically, all I wanted to point out was a couple of those things with regard to the Community Support Levy. When you look at the levels and you look at the split as to where it is to go, sporting groups, community groups, research, and then address it, you think to yourself, I reckon the overall cost of problem gambling to the community is going to be a lot more than the Community Support Levy will ever provide. I support the motion.

[4.50 p.m.]

Ms FORREST (Murchison) - Mr President, I have a speech prepared for this contribution but, in light of the Leader's email, I would like to move that this debate stand adjourned. We can come back to it next week, assuming we are here next week. This Chamber is not conducive to social distancing. I instance the closeness of members in this place. There is absolutely no air movement in this place. Members are sharing a podium. All those things are creating an infection control risk. As a health professional, I know what I am talking about. I would like to move that the debate stand adjourned. I am happy to wait till next week to speak on this.

There are other members with other business. I believe the member for Windermere may not be proceeding with his. We should practice what we preach. The lower House have made a determination on the length of sittings. I have been in here for more than the recommended time today and the Leader certainly has, even though she does not have many friends over there with her, that is okay. I move that, in the spirit of trying to minimise the risk to all of us in this place and noting that we interact with members of our community and with our families, all of us have vulnerable members of our community and family who we will be dealing with. There are vulnerable members in this Chamber now. I am one of them and just about everyone else is. I would like to move that we adjourn on that basis, not because the debate is not important. It absolutely is important. I would like to take that measure.

[4.52 p.m.]

Mr WILLIE (Elwick) - Mr President, we are quite happy to support the adjournment. It is sensible in light of what is happening around us. I support the motion.

[4.52 p.m.]

Ms WEBB (Nelson) - Mr President, it is the motion that I have put up. I realise I have taken a reasonable amount of our time today. I am also quite happy to support that we adjourn the motion to pick up at another time.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

[4.53 p.m.]

Mrs HISCUTT (Montgomery - Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council) -
Mr President, I move -

That at its rising, the Council adjourn until 11.00 a.m. on Wednesday
18 March 2020.

Motion agreed to.

Mr President, it is a health issue and that now is the time for us to vacate and get some fresh air. Before I move an adjournment, I remind members of the Duties Amendment Bill briefing tomorrow morning at 9.30 a.m.

Mr President, I move -

That the Council does now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The Council adjourned at 4.53 p.m.

APPENDIX 1

Tasmanian Health Service Average Paid FTE 2017-18 to 2018-19

Hospitals	Salaried Medical Practitioners		Nurses		Allied Health Professionals		Administrative and Clerical		Domestic		Rural Medical Practitioner		Visiting Medical Practitioner	
	2017-18	2018-19	2017-18	2018-19	2017-18	2018-19	2017-18	2018-19	2017-18	2018-19	2017-18	2018-19	2017-18	2018-19
Alcohol and Drug Service	2.22	2.18	12.51	13.69	0.00	0.00	1.05	1.03	4.65	4.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Beaconsfield	0.00	0.00	13.90	14.52	1.12	1.11	3.98	4.02	15.59	15.60	0.10	0.14	0.00	0.00
Campbell Town	0.00	0.00	13.69	14.20	1.34	1.45	3.41	3.66	20.68	18.60	0.14	0.15	0.00	0.00
Deloraine	0.00	0.00	17.27	17.49	0.40	0.44	4.22	4.16	9.85	9.99	0.58	0.61	0.00	0.00
Flinders Island	0.00	0.00	13.07	13.55	0.00	0.00	2.30	2.44	9.30	9.49	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
George Town	0.00	0.00	16.36	17.13	0.00	0.00	2.77	3.15	8.23	7.71	0.72	0.76	0.00	0.00
Health West (Queenstown)	0.00	0.00	15.83	16.13	0.00	0.00	2.72	2.62	20.34	20.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
King Island	0.00	0.00	14.02	13.71	0.00	0.00	3.63	3.67	11.43	11.83	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Launceston General Hospital	236.73	255.65	988.57	1031.80	192.57	200.02	370.43	377.63	321.59	330.94	0.00	0.00	14.49	14.18
Mersey Community Hospital	31.94	38.12	179.92	188.88	21.16	20.74	77.51	75.46	62.64	63.31	0.00	0.00	3.23	3.89
Midlands	0.00	0.00	14.27	14.33	0.00	0.00	2.99	2.90	15.53	16.14	0.16	0.12	0.00	0.00
Millbrook Rise	2.52	2.43	27.90	26.61	0.97	0.79	2.00	2.08	24.04	24.27	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mistral Place	0.08	0.50	10.56	10.80	2.80	2.20	0.00	0.00	4.86	4.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
New Norfolk	0.00	0.00	15.70	17.21	0.00	0.00	3.13	3.14	4.94	5.80	0.37	0.17	0.00	0.00
North West Regional Hospital	78.77	83.45	317.68	337.07	60.79	62.26	151.61	152.09	95.16	91.63	0.00	0.00	3.59	3.79
Roy Fagan Centre	2.88	3.88	33.75	31.86	0.01	0.14	1.14	1.25	31.81	31.27	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Royal Hobart Hospital	468.17	501.63	1388.64	1485.02	388.14	418.91	562.07	584.99	469.54	522.17	0.00	0.00	15.48	15.28
Scottsdale	0.00	0.00	19.75	19.59	1.84	1.59	4.53	4.60	6.38	6.65	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00
Smithton	0.00	0.00	17.20	17.57	0.00	0.00	2.11	2.10	6.84	6.51	0.71	0.72	0.00	0.00
St Helens	0.00	0.00	14.47	14.58	0.52	0.98	2.78	2.84	5.23	5.51	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
St Marys	0.00	0.00	13.97	14.01	1.33	1.01	2.94	2.87	6.01	5.78	0.23	0.23	0.00	0.00
Tolosa Street Centre	0.08	0.50	11.83	13.91	0.00	0.55	1.19	1.54	4.35	6.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Wilfred Lopes Centre	3.41	2.24	35.52	35.65	2.73	2.67	4.11	4.04	21.00	20.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

