

Caity Marsh
Gambling (Exempt Lotteries Consultation)
Department for Culture, Media and Sport
100 Parliament Street
London
SW1A 2BQ

5th March 2014

Consultation on Incidental Non-Commercial, Private Society, Work and Residents Lotteries,
Proposals for Lifting Restrictions.

Dear Caity,

I am pleased to include below my response, as a member of the public, to the above consultation. I note from paragraph 1.11 of the Consultation Document that you will publish responses on the DCMS web site. I have therefore removed personal details from my response.

Question 1 Do you agree with the Government's proposal to permit lotteries that are incidental to commercial events to be run?

No. There are widespread opportunities for people to be involved in gambling, e.g. the many High Street betting shops, the National Lottery etc. There are already issues with problem gamblers in this country, and it seems unhelpful to deregulate so as to encourage even more gambling. As far as fund raising for charities and good causes is concerned it seems less complicated for people to be asked to make donations rather than to be involved in gambling.

Question 2 Is there any supporting evidence that you are aware of that justifies the need for this reform?

No.

Question 3 Do you have any views regarding the expected benefits of the proposal?

No.

Question 4 Do you feel the identified risks warrant the dropping or modification of this proposal? If modification, please state in which way. Please comment on any risks not already identified.

Yes. I would prefer that the proposal be dropped. Please see my comments in response to Question 1 about problem gambling.

Question 5 Is the proposal proportionate to the policy objective of allowing commercial businesses to hold lotteries to raise money for charities and good causes?

No comment.

Question 6 Do you agree with the Government's proposal to allow private society lotteries to be promoted for any charity or good cause?

No. There are widespread opportunities for people to be involved in gambling, e.g. the many High Street betting shops, the National Lottery etc. There are already issues with problem gamblers in this country, and it seems unhelpful to deregulate so as to encourage even more gambling. As far as fund raising for charities and good causes is concerned it seems less complicated for people to be asked to make donations rather than to be involved in gambling.

Question 7 Is there supporting evidence that you are aware of that justifies the need for this reform?

No.

Question 8 Do you have views regarding the expected benefits of the proposal? Do you consider that there could be risks/unintended consequences of the proposal?

As far as risks are concerned please see my comments in response to Question 6 about problem gambling.

Question 9 Is the proposal proportionate to the policy objective of allowing greater freedom to private societies to raise money for charities and good causes?

No comment.

Question 10 Do you agree with the Government's proposal to allow work and residents' lotteries to be promoted for charity or good causes?

No. There are widespread opportunities for people to be involved in gambling, e.g. the many High Street betting shops, the National Lottery etc. There are already issues with problem gamblers in this country, and it seems unhelpful to deregulate so as to encourage even more gambling. As far as fund raising for charities and good causes is concerned it seems less complicated for people to be asked to make donations rather than to be involved in gambling.

Question 11 Is there supporting evidence that you are aware of that justifies the need for this reform?

No.

Question 12 Do you have any views regarding the expected benefits of the proposal? Do you consider there are any risks/unintended consequences to this proposal?

As far as risks are concerned please see my comments in response to Question 10 about problem gambling.

Question 13 is the proposal proportionate to the policy objective?

No comment.

Question 14 Do you agree with the Government's proposal to remove the requirement for promoters of work and residents' lotteries to provide specific tickets?

No. It is appropriate (and assists transparency objectives) for specific tickets to be provided, including the name and address of the promoter and relevant information about the lottery arrangements.

Question 15 Is there supporting evidence that you are aware of that justifies the need for this reform?

No.

Question 16 Do you have any views regarding the expected benefits of the proposal? Do you consider there are any risks/unintended consequences to this proposal?

As far as risks are concerned, if appropriate information is not provided people may inadvertently assist a charity or good cause that they do not support.

Question 17 Can you identify any risks with the Government's proposal? Is there any need for the current information on tickets to be retained?

*First question - As far as risks are concerned, if appropriate information is not provided people may inadvertently assist a charity or good cause that they do not support.
Second question - Yes. Doing this is hardly a massive administrative burden.*

Question 18 Is the proposal proportionate to the policy objective of lifting an administrative burden?

No comment.

Question 19 Do the proposals put forward in this consultation, taken as a whole, strike a fair balance between the public interest and any person adversely affected by them?

No. I appreciate that the DCMS (as part of the Red Tape Challenge) has had to trawl through various regulations with the aim of identifying where there can be deregulation. I am not opposed to DCMS deregulation, in principle, however I would prefer that there should not be deregulation that encourages even more gambling in this country than there already is.

Question 20 Do the proposals remove any necessary protection?

Yes, in the sense that people are more likely to become involved in gambling, and as far as problem gamblers are concerned the issue becomes acute.

Question 21 Do any of the proposals put forward contribute to or open-up any risk of criminal activity?

No comment.

Yours sincerely