

Cut Through, April 10, 2026: **Australia's gambling ad ban is here**

All timestamps are approximate

Crystal Andrews (00:00)

Hello and welcome to Cut Through, Crikey's spin-free analysis of Australian news, politics and power. If you have been liking our episodes this year so far, I'd love it if you could subscribe to the podcast. We're available on all major podcast platforms. And if you prefer to watch and are not already watching us on YouTube, you can also find us there subscribing, leaving us ratings and reviews. They're all very small things that you can do to help us grow as an independent media outlet in Australia.

Today on the podcast, I am joined by Crikey's media reporter, Daanyal Saeed to talk about the long-awaited, very, very highly anticipated gambling ad reforms that Anthony Albanese finally announced, just sneaking in before the long weekend last weekend. Dana, you've been covering this story for quite some time. Were you surprised that, ~ you know, that the prime minister kind of

snuck the into the National Press Club speech on the 2nd of April or whatever it was.

Daany Saeed (01:00)

The cynic in me says yes and was a speculation sort of leading into the press club.

And also leading into, let's not forget, he gave an address to the nation the day before.

Crystal Andrews (01:09)

Of course, national address, you know, it's after

all of these, you know, quite significant, unrelated news moments.

Daany Saeed (01:17)

Exactly right. And so he has addressed us all collectively over a number of times over the course of last week. ~ And there are a number of policy touch points for him there. I think it was a little bit of speculation that it would be something like ~ taxes when it comes to gas exports and stuff like that. Again, sort of my ~ wild speculation there would be that

they've probably done a little bit more groundwork policy wise ~ on something like gambling and reform in terms of if we're trying to sort of misappropriate the political term here, throw a dead cat, throw something out ~ ahead of the Easter long weekend to sort of, I guess, give people something to work with and not let them marinate at the Easter branch with ~ sort of...

how hard is it right now, how badly the government might be doing or well the government might be doing when it comes to cost of living. So that is, I guess, my thought process.

Crystal Andrews (02:21)

Look, if that was the

strategy to give the gambling reforms as something positive to be discussed around the barbecue or whatever it might've been on the long weekend, I'm not sure that that worked. But at any rate, this is something that we've been keeping an eye on that we have been expecting to drop at some point. So I think we should get right into unpacking exactly what's going on here and where this might go. So Darnie, maybe you can start by talking us through.

you know, what are the reforms that Labour has proposed that it will make if you can give us a bit of a snapshot of what's on offer here.

Daany Saeed (02:59)

Yeah, absolutely. the core of it is restricting gambling advertising on broadcast television to no more than three ads each hour between 6 a.m. and 8.30 p.m.

and a complete ban during live sport broadcast during those hours. Banning gambling ads on the radio during school drop off and pick up times. Banning gambling ads on online platforms unless you have a logged in account are over 18 and have the option to opt out of gambling advertising. And that's really sort of an important key point that we can, I guess, get into. They'll ban the use of celebrities and sports players in gambling ads. So that's obviously a very common thing. My understanding sort of

in terms of over the course of this reporting is that that will include influencers and online quote unquote celebrities depending on how you wanted to find a celebrity.

odd style advertising will get banned. So again, I'll come back to sports bet because it was quite well known that like Nathan Brown used to play for Collingwood, used to play for Richmond, ~ did sort of spruik to multi. ~

with Sportsbet sort of during sports broadcast, that's going to be banned. Noting as well, this comes after Sportsbet already stopped doing that. The government's been outflanked on progression on this by the gambling companies in many respects. So some of these, the government has come late to the party on.

Crystal Andrews (04:16)

Yeah, I do.

And just to be clear as well, for anyone who's not familiar, guess, odd style ads the finer points of a game that you can continue to bet on throughout a game while it is actually unfolding.

Daany Saeed (04:31)

Yeah, the other touch point of this with sports specifically is banning gambling ads in sports venues, in stadiums and on uniforms. So you don't see this as much with AFL, but you do see this with rugby league that I think it's the roosters that have Unibet as a sponsor. The sharks

currently play at Pointsbet Stadium. ~ And so there's a couple of more so with rugby league sort of in strata in stadia advertising that

Crystal Andrews (04:39)

you

Daany Saeed (05:01)

~ sort of will be captured by the new reforms. again, this is another reform that is a bit more prominent, but also to a significant extent has already seen progression before the government had to regulate anything. ~ There was a report in the Financial Review recently, Sportsbet pay their advertising sponsors to not display Sportsbet logos in stadiums because they think they can get a better return on investment through targeted advertising. So again,

Crystal Andrews (05:01)

you

Daany Saeed (05:28)

I keep coming back to Sportsbet because they're the biggest market shareholder, but it sort of shows how slow the government has been to act on the recommendations of the Murphy report that they've been beaten through a lot of these reforms by the private sector.

Crystal Andrews (05:45)

Hmm. And to clarify as well, because I think this is an important point when we're talking about broadcast of, of games and you know, obviously a lot, a lot of these restrictions are for television advertising. That's not just, ~ you know, ~ linear TV broadcast, I guess to use another industry term, we'll try not to get too jargony in this episode. But it's not just talking about, you know, watching a game on, channel seven or Fox Sports or whatever, like this is going to apply to.

broadcast video on demand and streaming services as well as I understand it.

Daany Saeed (06:15)

Yes, yeah, that will be the intent of the legislation. It highly unusual if it didn't apply that way.

Crystal Andrews (06:22)

It also does seem like podcast advertising as well. That's going to come under the ways that the band would be applied to digital platforms or potentially even like the radio sort of style applications. And also an interesting note that I noticed in some of the guardians reporting around this also potentially sporting code websites, including the AFL and the NRLs ~ own apps and

websites, which will be an interesting, again, these is kind of like the finer points of whatever the eventual proposal that does ~ get up and get passed, but want to just make sure we're covering off all of those bases that people know this is what we're talking about.

Daany Saeed (06:58)

Yeah, absolutely. ~ There's lots of nitty gritty in this and that might be again part of the rationale behind why this policy is taken so long is there's lots of moving parts with this. When I spoke to Monique Ryan earlier this week, the independent MP for KuYong, sort of a critic of this reform but has been an advocate for reform generally.

~ she sort of noted that, well, this reform says that there won't be gambling ads during a football game, but my son likes watching the magazine conversation panel afterwards. ~ and that, know, now you can have gambling ads under this proposal there. So there's lots of little touch points like that, that we'll see sort of worked out over the course of, of the legislative process with this proposal.

Crystal Andrews (07:44)

Yeah, and I guess to that point as well, you know, when you run through the list of ~ points like we've just done, it does sound like a lot and lots of those things sounds like good things. But the context that sits behind all of this, is Labour's own report which was conducted by the late Peta Murphy.

her final report and the recommendations that she made about how the government should tackle gambling advertising was handed down in 2023. So, you know, we're approaching three years on from that. How different is this current proposal from Peter Murphy's recommendations?

Daany Saeed (08:23)

really significantly different. The government will tell you that it isn't. But you know, this is cut through, this is a spin free podcast, so I can tell you that it is.

The Murphy report came out in June 2023. Peter Murphy died in December 2023. So she didn't actually see any reform on this. The government then said in 2024 that it was going to have reform at the end of that year. That didn't happen. Then we find out that Anthony Albanese, obviously we had an election in May 2025.

Crystal Andrews (08:39)

you

Daany Saeed (08:54)

that Anthony Albanese had come over the top of the communications minister at the time and sort of made a captain's call and said we're not going to make gambling reform a thing before the next election. They get re-elected and now we're here sort of a year later, I really want to hammer home how much time this has taken to come to this position. But there's three key points that the Murphy report sort of differs from.

proposed reforms on. Firstly, it's not a full ban, right? It is a partial conditional ban on gambling advertising in some contexts. The Murphy Report says partial bans don't work. It is very clear

about that. quotes a couple of experts on that. mostly because gambling companies sort of find ways to get around

Crystal Andrews (09:33)

Mm.

Daany Saeed (09:45)

get around partial bans. find the loopholes. so those aren't my words. That's not my assessment. That's emeritus Professor Mike Doeb, who is the director of the Public Health Policy Institute at Curtin. He made a submission to the Murphy Report at the time. There's more research that says that partial bans don't work. There's an ACMA report that the government's own regulator found in 2019. Partial bans don't work. Academic experts say partial bans don't work. Then the government came out three years after the fact and said, we're listening.

But taking strong action, they keep using, it's their buzzword, it's a buzz phrase is strong action. They're taking strong action and implemented the very thing that their own regulators, their own agencies, their own independent report says didn't, it doesn't work. So that's sort of the first key point. The second key point is inducements.

So basically these are things that gambling operators will give customers to get them to keep gambling. So

Friday morning, I got a text from sports bet. These are targeted depending on the person. don't gamble on horse racing, but here's one. ~ Danielle, for all racers at sports bet, ball right today. If your horse runs second, get up to double your stake back in bonus bets, right? So it's like.

Crystal Andrews (10:54)

So it's kind of like these encouragements

to come back and gamble again.

Daany Saeed (10:59)

Exactly. And then there's a little link to the app and then I can go bet on the races at Ballarat on Friday morning. That gives a store credit, so to speak. And so that keeps me going through the loop. Same with bet returns, right? So a common one is if one leg of a multi or an international language appale doesn't get up, then they'll say, ~ so close, try again.

and they'll give you your stake that you got back as store you can go again and you recycle that money through the system. So that is sort of a methodology of keeping a customer locked in and engaged. The Murphy report recommended that those get banned, just outright. It was a very, it was really short. It's a really short sort of section of the recommendations. There's no mention of that in this reform proposal. The third one and

Crystal Andrews (11:20)

Hmm.

outright.

Daany Saeed (11:44)

This I think is really interesting because labor MPs sort of don't seem to want to engage on this is on pokey reform. And this is a common ~ gambling industry talking point as well, when you criticize the rate of reform on gambling advertising that

What about pokies? I remember when Crikey ran a piece a little while ago, the different AFL and NRL personalities that were on the gambling payroll and had done advertising and done different sort of engagements with gambling industry, ~ we named Damien Barrett, who's an AFL commentator and journalist and co-host of podcast with Craig Hutchison who

as the CEO of SEN, one of the big broadcasters and he has a lot of gambling interests as far as advertising is concerned with his company. And Damien Barrett came out and said, you know, no dramas with me, notwithstanding that he's a journalist doing a gambling ad, but anyway, he says, all good. I stand by it. I would do it again. But what about pokies? It's a very common talking point.

The reason I say this is, and I bring up pokies in this respect, is because these are regulated at state about a national regulator, which is one of the recommendations of the Murphy Report and one that the government hasn't proposed. And it's a really key one because without a national regulator, the de facto national regulator becomes like a cowboy office in some back street in Darwin.

because the Northern Territory has relatively lax regulations when it comes to gambling companies setting up shops and most gambling companies in Australia are registered in the Northern Territory. And so there's been lots of reporting by Four Corners about sort of the compromises and the compromised nature of the Northern Territory Wager and Gambling Commission, I think it's called. ~ And subsequently, you can't have that as a de facto national regulator, but that's what it is.

They haven't, they didn't put out an annual report for like 20 years, almost 30 years. it's a, it's, it's an absurd organization to be given the de facto keys to one of the biggest economic juggernauts that sort of props up a lot of sport and broadcasting in this country.

Crystal Andrews (13:44)

Jesus.

Daany Saeed (14:00)

Those are the 3K reforms that sort of haven't been implemented from the Murphy Report.

Crystal Andrews (14:02)

Yeah.

Yeah. So it's that, total ban on advertising the total, the outright ban of inducements and then the establishment of a national gambling, all gambling sort of regulator that we're, we're missing here. I was just thinking as you were, as you were speaking about that, ~ the Guardian also had another report, during the week about some modeling that had been done.

Daany Saeed (14:16)

Mm.

Crystal Andrews (14:26)

by the Office of Impact analysis out of the Department of Premier and Cabinet about the existing proposal that Labour intends to take to Parliament. And I think that they said the analysis shows it would reduce the annual spending by gambling companies on advertising by \$62.7 million a year or just 0.8.

percent, that would be the financial kind of impact there. So I think that that does give people a flavor of like, where this proposal sits in terms of its, how ambitious it is. It's, it's kind of, projected impact in its current state. But as you said, you know, there are some, some really big criticisms. And I know that you've spoken to a few people who want it to go much further. You've spoken to David Pocock.

Monique Ryan also gambling reform advocate Mark Kempster. it sounds like their criticisms are largely the criticisms that we've just sort of talked about, that there is a really ~ robust and substantial report that Labour itself, produced and those recommendations are good and we should be implementing those recommendations and nothing less.

Do you have a sense of particularly how the Senate crossbench especially might try to shape this proposal once it actually starts to go through that process of parliament, because of course, know, Labour has total control of the lower house. And so, it's fair to assume that

the bill that it would take would get through the lower house quite easily, but in the Senate they'll need to work with others to get anything ~ under this banner passed. Was there a sense of what maybe a POCOC, what the Greens, like what people might be asking to change?

Daany Saeed (16:08)

It might also be worth mentioning just on that Office of Impact Analysis report, context for that 0.8 % figure, that analysis also said that if we implemented a ~ full gambling ban, that we would see a 1.4 % drop. So you're seeing roughly like a 50%, just under a 50 % difference in terms of total spend.

Crystal Andrews (16:27)

Mm.

Daany Saeed (16:31)

~ So that is the first thing to bear in mind there. The other thing that I think is really important to bear in mind is that they measured a social cost benefit or social benefit in like a dollar amount ~ to sort of the Australian economy and to the Australian population. And they basically measured this at somewhere in the region of \$120 million in terms of sort of money that you can

Crystal Andrews (16:54)

Wow.

Daany Saeed (16:56)

come back into the Australian economy can be, know, our net benefit to the economy. It's triple that if you implemented a full reform as recommended by the Murphy report. So I think it's worth noting that sort of we're looking at a reform that if you want to quantify, and it's not easy to quantify these things, but if you want to quantify them, we're looking at a proposal that is one third to half as effective as it could be.

and as effective as it was recommended it should be. So that's what we're looking at. Now in terms of the crossbench, like we've got a couple of different things here. So if you're moving past, so the government sort of what, 28 votes in the Senate plus the president, you need 38 plus one to get legislation through the Senate. So you're looking at, you've got, many coalition MPs are there? Enough.

Crystal Andrews (17:22)

Mm.

Daany Saeed (17:48)

there's enough coalition MPs. you have coalition support, you'll get something.

Crystal Andrews (17:50)

that they can, yeah, they can

work with a coalition or they can work with a progressive coalition of sorts.

Daany Saeed (17:56)

Exactly. the coalition have

broadly speaking, sort of supported gambling advertising reform for a little while. They supported sort of a full ban for an hour before, an hour after live sports broadcasts. They haven't given a lot of detail to that proposal. It's not really clear where they sit on the current reforms. The current Shadow Communications Minister, Melissa McIntosh, hasn't sort of, she said a couple of things over the last couple of years. She is in favor. She has been pushing the government from a progressive perspective on gambling ad reform.

Crystal Andrews (18:15)

Hmm.

Daany Saeed (18:26)

much of that is the opposition being the opposition sort of cynically criticizing where they can be ~ and how much of that is a a principal position we'll find out. ~ The Greens have been really critical of this proposal and this is the other thing is you've got 10 Greens senators so if you get the support of the Greens more than likely that legislation passes but the Green spokesperson on this is Sarah Hanson Young

Crystal Andrews (18:49)

Yes.

Daany Saeed (18:54)

And she described the prime minister as caving to the gambling lobby on this. said that the the labor has squibbed it on on gambling reform. It's weak. I'm quoting from her now. ~ It's weak and it's gutless and it leaves young Australians to be groomed by gambling predators. This proposal is riddled with loopholes that will benefit the gambling companies and allow them to continue their insidious targeting. So unless there's some really significant changes to that legislation, it's difficult to see the Greens supporting it now.

where this gets a little bit more granular is your independence and your one nations. So Lydia Thorpe has previously called for a total ad ban. I suspect, again, she's obviously a former Green, I suspect it doesn't get up without amendment ~ to get Lydia Thorpe support. Jackie Lambie is one, obviously her Senator for Tasmania. There's a lot sort of conversation around the impacts socioeconomically down in Tasmania of gambling.

Crystal Andrews (19:27)

Mm-hmm.

Daany Saeed (19:50)

~ And so that is something that is, she's pretty consistently voted in favor of reform on. ~ Interestingly, Tammy Tyrrell used to be a Jackie Lambie Senator, now an independent of her own accord has of previously voted against reform, sort of up and down on this. So Tammy Tyrrell's vote will be interesting if it gets to that point where the government is forced to negotiate here. The third independent obviously is David Pocock, who has sort of, like we've discussed, has led the way on criticism of it.

I think there's a stronger chance that David Prococke will be shooting to the wall of his than him voting in favor of this legislation as it stands. The other option of a wild card, is One Nation. a lot of the previous divisions in the Senate in recent memory on this, they actually just haven't been there.

Pauline Hanson just hasn't been in the Senate. There is Malcolm Roberts for a lot of this stuff. ~ So it's not really clear where One Nation sit on this. ~ It would actually be a really interesting

conservative litmus test, given how One Nation are polling at the moment to see sort of where they sit on gambling advertising reform I can see that being a really interesting political litmus test for One Nation, but...

that would require them to sort of engage substantively on policy for a change.

Crystal Andrews (21:08)

Yeah, it certainly doesn't ~ at this stage, at least, and you know, obviously there's, there's a ways to go. Like this won't even be brought to the, to the next sitting of parliament. To me at this stage, it doesn't seem like there won't be, there won't be some negotiations, some maneuvering and, you know, amendments and concessions and those types of deals that would be done to, to pass it through because yeah, I mean, it really is the broad based support.

for a total gambling advertising ban. It's there. It is not only among those in parliament as we're discussing, but also the general public has overwhelmingly been supportive of a total ban for years, for quite some time. And I think that the interesting part of all of this to me is, would think for a Labour government that has such political power in the lower house that it does.

it has about a safer government as you could have, ~ that this would be a really easy win because it is a politically popular idea that they could, you know, be the ones to introduce the public wants this, a lot of those in parliament actually want this. So I definitely, maybe naively like I was a little bit surprised that it didn't go as far as it should have gone. And as you've mentioned, like, you know, even sports bet has made some of these

more progressive changes to how it conducts its own gambling advertising without even having been told to. Such is the public demand for a change in this arena. And so, I mean, this is kind of a speculative question, Darnie, but I am curious to know, like, what is the government's argument for going so slowly and like taking such an incremental approach to a very, very popular idea?

that it seems like almost everybody wants. I mean, this is not, we're not talking about a ban on gambling here. Like adults are still free to gamble. It's just the advertising. you know, we've talked a lot on this podcast about other ambitious reforms that people want that there has been, you know, experts calling for things like changes to

tax reform or how housing and the investment structure around that works. I can understand the hesitancy there those are very complex systems where no change there is without its costs. This to me seems a lot more straightforward. So I'm just wondering if they've made some arguments about what they're afraid of breaking by going for a total ban.

Daany Saeed (23:33)

I understand that when we're sitting on a podcast and we sit down, it, it can look like two progressive people saying, yes, everybody supports this.

But the numbers bear that out. The Australia Institute did some polling last year, three quarters of people support a total ad ban. More than just over three quarters of people support that. There are people who have come out now who are conservative, explicitly conservative people. People who get paid, who are employed by the gambling industry, who've come out and said that this is a, know, gambling ad reform is needed and it's too much. I spoke to one person who was, again, paid like the livelihood is in

gambling and punting and betting and racing and wagering and they were like this is getting ridiculous. It was the word for word their language. There's a guy, Benny Scarf, he's a betting influencer, that is his literal job. he goes out and makes viral videos, he's paid for by Tabcorp to go out and make outrageous bets and that's his thing. And Tabcorp has a youth bookmaker called Dabble for which

they sort of, ~ he does affiliate marketing, all well and good. This is a man who has expressed explicitly conservative political opinions. He made a statement on social media after this announcement came out and said gambling advertising reform is absolutely necessary. It's getting too much. And then immediately after that, he reposted Senator Ralph Babbitt. So like this is the scale and the width of political support for this reform is extraordinary, which is why

to answer your question, people, when I ask labor people, when I ask staffers, when I ask people in the industry about this, it is so easy to come back to, it must be vested interest. If you asked, I asked Monique Ryan about this and that's what she said, it was vested interest. People keep coming to vested interest, the government is just beholden to the stakeholders that are employed by this.

Anthony Albanese has a very close relationship with Peter Vlandi, who's the chair of the Rugby League Commission, and who is vehemently against reform in this space. He similarly has a really close relationship with Andrew Dillon, who is the CEO of the AFL and whose organization gets in excess of \$50 million a year from product fees, which are the cut of bets that these big sports codes get from the bets placed on them.

the Saturday paper put out an excoriating ~ editorial last week following the reforms and actually came out and said, you know, maybe Peter Volandes gave his permission. That's maybe that's why this is the timing is because Peter Volandes said it was okay.

It's a pretty extraordinary suggestion. ~ But the reason it's not that outrageous is because this reform has taken so long. I put that suggestion to pitiful Eddie's he didn't take me back. So make it that way you will. ~ The other sort of, if you listen to the government on this, the talking point about why they take so long changes depending on who's answering the question and the mood that they're in.

Crystal Andrews (26:28)

I'm not, I'm not totally surprised.

Daany Saeed (26:43)

But sometimes Anthony Albanese has spoken about the revenue models for big broadcasters. this is right, that ~ wagering advertising in particular represents a not insignificant proportion, dwindling proportion, but a not insignificant proportion of ad spend for a lot of big broadcasters. And he didn't want to tip that upside down. The big broadcasters obviously sort of...

put their fingers on the scales and jump up and down whenever their revenue models are affected. And we've seen that ~ not just in broadcast, but media generally. We've seen this with the news media bargaining code as well, that they will kick up a stink and it will affect the government electorally. And they will make issues everybody else's problem, ~ given the opportunity.

Crystal Andrews (27:28)

Just to, just to spell

that out as well, you know, we're talking here about predominantly seven, seven West, is Kerry Stokes, nine, which is obviously nine. ~ but then also Foxdale, right? Which is, ~ our dear friends in the Murdoch family. ~ part of their, part of their stable. Or was I should say, actually, of course. Yeah. Now, now under, ~ the stewardship of Dazon.

Daany Saeed (27:34)

Seven and nine, the big free to air.

or was, yeah. Yeah, it was.

Yes. ~ But again, these companies like very happily will kick up a fuss when their revenue models are affected. like News Corp, for example, you know, not that long ago, got into a fight with Facebook over news media bargaining, decided coincidentally, that they would like to run a campaign protecting kids. And all of a sudden, kids were banned from social media

And they did it initially because News Corp kicked up a stink over its revenue model as being affected. this government is very responsive to that. So I can understand why the government doesn't want to poke that bear. The other side of this, again, if you ask government is they say, well, the sporting codes prop up

grassroot sport off the back of this and we would hate to see you know kids lose access to grassroot sport. Grassroot sport is so important for the community. ~ The response to that from progressive groups and from reform advocates is that it's a really sad state of affairs when kids sport is propped up by gambling. ~ But it's not entirely untrue. Depending on the sport we're talking about it's not entirely untrue that a grassroot sport

is in part subsidized by gambling money and B, that taking it away particularly the NRL and the AFL could see an excuse to lower funding or to pull programs and to reduce investment on the basis of things like lost product phase. So there is that.

Crystal Andrews (29:26)

But this

is an indirect relationship where we're talking about it's, you know, it's that the ~ grassroots competitions for kids are linked to and dependent in many cases on the funding from the professional national codes. And it's not so much that gambling money comes in and goes straight to your local kids league. ~ But yeah, that they...

Daany Saeed (29:30)

Yes.

Mm.

Crystal Andrews (29:51)

would choose to make the cuts there than in other places, which I think, you yeah, as you say, it's quite a, it's quite a sick idea actually, that kids grassroots sport is so dependent on gambling monies that we cannot have the reforms on advertising that we

Daany Saeed (30:09)

the TV rights deals are the other moving part

They make the world go round. So the AFL is operating on a one and a half billion dollar deal at the moment. And the NRL is currently in negotiations for its deal. And Peter Landy is, like I mentioned, chair of the rugby league commission, chief sort of.

Crystal Andrews (30:15)

Mm.

Daany Saeed (30:30)

chief advocate for Rugby League, over the weekend, and I think this is fascinating timing, has again been vocal about the impact that gambling ad reform will have on Rugby League, and the News Corp papers leaked, got leaked reports that's

Rugby League was entertaining a four and a half billion dollar seven year deal for the next stage of its rights agreements. And Peter Bedell from the Korean Mail sat down with Peter Blandys and Peter Blandys spoke about all the different suitors that he had for Rugby League and how all of the big media executives had gone over to Vegas for the start of their season and how great it was going and we're really looking forward to getting a bigger deal than our rival code in the AFL and look how great Rugby League's going.

So I think that's a really fascinating set of affairs where the broadcasters are saying, are crying poor and saying, we won't function. The government's saying, look how poor the broadcasters are. They won't be able to function without this gambling money. Simultaneously, Peter Vlandes

is out here saying, I'm going to have, you know, deal that's three times bigger than the AFL's deal. ~

And I've got money coming out my eyes and my ears and, you know, I don't know what I'm going to do with all this money ~ on the same weekend that the gambling ad reforms are announced.

So when we come back to the government's justification for taking as long as it did, and like, again, it's an extraordinary amount of time. It's true governments were. It's true terms. Had the government not been reelected in 2025, there is every chance that there would have been no reform. And I don't think you can justify to a body politic that, we were working on it.

Crystal Andrews (32:15)

Yes, look, it certainly, you know, the feedback at least from crikey readers and you know, other people that you've been speaking to, I've been speaking to is certainly that this was not the proposal that many hoped for. ~ there is still, you know, that's not to say that these

policies as they are is what will be implemented at the end of the day. If people are wanting to continue following this, Darnie, what's kind of, what's the timeline we're looking at here? What happens next from, where we're at right now.

Daany Saeed (32:44)

The proposed reforms are gonna kick in on the 1st of January, 2027. That's when the government is wanting to introduce things. And so before that, you have things like exposure drafts, which is sort of ~ the first time we might get to have a look at a bill and how...

mechanics of it might play out. So things like how do we define a celebrity? How do we define a public figure? what do we count as a radio broadcast? we including podcasts? we all of these sorts of things? What are the mechanisms by which we're going to make ~ companies introduce opt out features? Are we going to provide like tax incentives? Are we going to ban, you know, are we going to ban them from the marketplace?

We'll see how responsive the government is to criticism on this when the exposure draft comes through and when it starts taking submissions and so on and so forth. ~ But ~ to be continued, this is not a saga that is going away anytime soon.

Crystal Andrews (33:42)

Yes, they've given themselves the rest of the year to work it out. We will continue following it for now. That's where I'll call time on the episode. Dani, thanks so much for chatting me through it today.

Daany Saeed (33:54)

Thank you so much for having me, Crystal.

