



## **COOLOOLA COAST BOWLS CLUB Inc.**

THE SECRETARY,  
4463 Gympie Road,  
Tin Can Bay. Q4580  
Ph. 07 5486 4836  
Email. [cp.holmes@bigpond.com](mailto:cp.holmes@bigpond.com)

19 November 2009

Gambling Inquiry-Draft Report,  
Productivity Commission  
Locked Bag 2, Collins St. East,  
Melbourne. Vic. 8003

Dear Sir,

**Re:- Club Response to the Draft Report on Gambling.**

I have been asked by the Management Committee of my Community club to convey the serious concerns of our club and its members on your Draft Report on Gambling.

Our club is situated in Tin Can Bay. The principal purpose of our existence, as stated in our Constitution, is the provision of sporting facilities. We currently own 3 acres of land and our licensed club is situated thereon.

We currently employ 1 casual and 1 permanent part-time employee. We also use the services of at least 2 volunteers on any given day.

We have a total of 310 adult members. Our members visit the club for a range of services and facilities. Apart from gaming, these mainly include playing bowls (4 times a week), socialisation, dining and entertainment. Our gaming facilities include 10 poker machines.

It is in our absolute interest to ensure that our gaming services are conducted in a responsible manner. We subscribe to the Queensland Responsible Gambling Code of Practice and are very much aware of our obligations and responsibilities to people who may have a gambling problem.

While we welcome the gambling inquiry, as it was long overdue, we are very concerned about the negative impact that the draft findings and recommendations would have on the financial viability of our club. This would most likely include loss of jobs, curtailment of services we currently provide to our members and, most importantly, a reduction in our community contributions.

In the last financial year, we returned a total of \$2000.00 in cash donations to such recipients as our local school awards night, Smile for a Child Christmas appeal, several cancer appeals, Legacy, and we regularly purchase items such as pens from the Spinal Injuries appeal. These and other projects were all largely funded through community gambling at our club.

There is no way we can sustain this level of community support if adverse measures such as those contained in the Draft Report are placed on community gaming. The harsh reality for our club would be to simply close our doors, leaving our members and the local community without the much need services and facilities that is made possible through community gaming.

We urge the Productivity Commission to seriously consider the practical reality of their recommendations. In particular, we urge the Productivity Commission to consider the following when finalising its Final Report:

- The rate of problem gambling has declined across Australia because of the extensive measures that have been implemented since 1999. In Queensland, this now stands at 0.47% of the adult population – measured through one of the largest surveys of its kind in the world.
- We need firm data, not estimates, to build effective policy. Therefore, nationally consistent research is needed, if there can be a “true” understanding of the gambling sector. A “one size fits all” approach is not possible because each State is different, with different regulations, tax rates, maturity of market, ownership model & splits between private and community ownership of gaming.
- Gaming serves different purposes in different venues. For clubs which are not-for-profit entities, gaming is a community initiative, which supports a range of community services and facilities. It is critical that there is a strong demarcation between community gaming and for-profit or entrepreneurial gaming.
- While technological innovations open many possibilities for harm minimization, it is critical that any technology is evaluated first and then, based on solid evidence, accepted or rejected. Queensland in this regard is far ahead with its card-based gaming trials. The same also applies to any policy change (i.e. modelling to determine impact and effectiveness of the policy change before accepting or rejecting the policy platform)

Finally, our view is that the Productivity Commission should strive to achieve a balance in the Final Report between the needs of gaming venues and their patrons (of whom only a very small number have a gaming problem). There should also be an acknowledgement of the extensive responsible gaming measures that are already in place, (many of which have produced spectacular outcomes). Some attention should also be given to the concept of personal responsibility as there is a limit to which controls can be placed on gaming venues.

Should the draft recommendations remain unchanged, the Productivity Commission may like to consider how sport and the considerable support for welfare, charities and the like will be funded, as it is highly likely that community clubs will not be in a position to provide their current level of support. In fact, we would expect the demise of a significant number of community clubs should all the recommendations be taken up by respective Governments throughout Australia.

I hope the above is of some assistance in understanding the nature and importance of gaming in community clubs and the impact the draft recommendations may have on community gaming.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Bill O'Rourke', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Bill O'Rourke.  
Chairman of the Board of Directors.