

Cut Through, August 20, 2026: **Shady or smart? Labor and the Coalition's backroom deals on gambling ads and the NDIS**

All timestamps are approximate

Crystal Andrews (00:25)

Hello and welcome to Cut Through, Cracky Spin-Free Analysis of Australian news, politics, and power. I'm your host, Crystal Andrews, and today we will be talking about a very eventful session of Parliament, which saw two major pieces of legislation passed in the gambling reforms and the changes to the NDIS.

Joining me to pick apart everything that just happened, and it was a lot, is Crikey's politics reporter, Rachel Withers. Rachel, welcome back to the pod.

Rachel Withers (00:53)

Lovely to be back.

Crystal Andrews (00:54)

And media reporter Dani Said. Dani, welcome back after we were on on here not very long ago talking about tips.

Daanyal Saeed (01:01)

They can't keep me off the cut through podcast. Can't keep me out of here.

Rachel Withers (01:03)

You

Crystal Andrews (01:06)

And

we we have brought you back to talk about I guess what what is a bit of a specialty topic of yours and a very, very long, drawn-out journey that has finally come to its conclusion in this sitting of parliament, which is the long-awaited reforms to gambling advertising, which just passed through the House of Reps.

last night as we record, so Tuesday night by the time this episode goes live. Danny, can you catch people up who who might not be fully aware of the actual shape of the final changes that were made? Because this all quite came down to to the wire this week.

Daanyal Saeed (01:45)

Yeah, absolutely. the shape of this bill as it sits now is a little bit different to what it was going to be last week. We did think that this was going to pass the House last week. there were some last minute negotiations between the coalition and the government. The coalition got on board.

Relatively late in this process, this has been a three year process where coalition have quite consistently criticized the government over the shape of its foreshadowed gambling reforms and then its proposed gambling reforms. they have criticized the government consistently over they've taken at several points more progressive positions on gambling advertising reform

than the government. you know, Peter Dutton outflanked the government of the day to the left.

but the bill that has come in front of the house now or has passed the house now includes things like the direct the banning of the direct marketing of inducements for 14 days after someone signs up with a wagering company, the direct marketing of inducements to all customers identified it's at risk of gambling related harm, banning the direct marketing of inducements for three months after a a person deregisters from Bet Stop, which is the government's

self-exclusion register that was introduced in response to the Murphy report which came out in mid-2023. and there's a banning of commissions to staff or affiliates based on customer activity as well. So those sort of inducement-based changes have come I think it's fair to say in response to some pretty explosive evidence that was given in the parliament recently by Luke Bateman, who's a former NRL player.

he's now an anti-gambling advocate. He his journey with gambling addiction has sort of been well documented and he sort of alleged that betting companies gave I I'm gonna be I'm gonna hesitate to use the language inducements, I'll I'll get to why in a second, but sort of gave gifts, if you will.

of of drugs and sex workers and and accommodation and sports tickets and so on to get him to gamble more and bring him to events and so on and so forth because they knew that he was essentially a high-risk gambler and was putting lots

and lots of money through these betting companies.

the reason I hesitate on the language inducements, and this is probably important to bear in mind, is that the language inducements has a specific legal meaning as it's contemplated

by the legislation and that essentially refers to things like bonus bets. so that's a very common way of as the gambling companies told the Senate inquiry into this bill, sort of maintaining customers and and and customer retention. those are things like for example, if the you know my football club the Hawthorne Hawks play on the weekend and I have a sports bet account

Sportsbet might know that I bet a lot on on Hawthorne, for example, and I'll get a text and I'll it'll say, Darny, you can here's five dollars of of store credit essentially to go and bet on on Hawthorne. They start in an hour, you should you should hop on it.

so that's

what an inducement is. They can take all sorts of different forms. but that's a little bit distinct to the sort of the VIP treatment and the

the sort of the shady backroom stuff that was detailed in the Senate and sort of really caught the government's attention, but it has led to these changes and those changes have meant that the coalition have gotten on board and it means that it will more than likely pass the Senate without too many more amendments.

Rachel Withers (05:56)

I think it's really interesting that distinction you point out between that really explosive evidence on those quite disturbing inducements for Luke Bateman and then the stuff that we're actually talking about here, which is like everyday people getting texts from Sportsbet. I I've received them. I've received bonus bet texts from Sportsbet. But I do think that stuff is the stuff that...

I'm not going to say the other stuff doesn't matter, but it feels like that's what really matters when we're talking about protecting average people from

Crystal Andrews (06:25)

Mm.

Rachel Withers (06:26)

being lured into gambling of like, you know, open sports, but have a bet, have a bet, here's somebody have a bet. It feels like that is the stuff that is really important. And it is really good that that's been addressed, even if maybe that more explosive evidence wasn't ultimately part of the bill in the end.

Daanyal Saeed (06:42)

Yeah, absolutely. And I guess the other point is and and and critics of this bill say and advocates say continue to say it it doesn't go far enough, some of these touch points about inducements, which also I I should note were a recommendation of the Murphy report, the government on several touch points of the of its own report, know, merely noted them. but the

inducements was a

recommendation of the Murphy report or banning them was. And the critics of this say, for example, that, you know, f a 14-day window won't do anything. You'll just get bombarded with inducements from the 15th day. And then the framework of who is defining what is at risk is also sort of to be determined, and that'll be a really important element of this bill as well, is is there going to be a a blanket standard imposed as to

what an ask risk gambler looks like? Or are the platforms themselves going to be allowed to determine that for themselves? Because we know that the bet stop register, which is sort of essentially a a a well-meaning piece of reform, often has companies companies often breach

their obligations when it comes to bet stop. there there are countless examples of betting companies around the country of all different stripes that will continue to advertise, continue to allow

bettors and customers that have and and individuals who have registered with Bet Stop to gamble. and obviously that defeats the entire purpose of the this framework. And so definition of an at-risk gambler I think is is is going to be important, I guess.

Rachel Withers (08:17)

It's interesting, know, to know that they are finding ways to get around BetStop is alarming because ultimately people who have registered for BetStop are probably some of the most at risk problem gamblers, people who have recognised that they have a problem. And if anything, that's exactly the market that these companies most want to get their hands on. Like that's the people they most want to reach.

I think the other interesting bit that seems to have come from negotiations with the coalition was the ability to opt out of online ads,

which I think is a valuable service, but how many people are going to be paying enough attention to the legislation here to go online and opt out of?

seeing gambling ads online. mean, we'd all opt out of all ads if we could, but will people know to go and put themselves on this opt out register? think advocates are hoping for an opt in register for people who are happy to see gambling advertising rather than an opt out.

Crystal Andrews (09:15)

Yeah, I I think

Darnie, a little while ago you looked at the numbers for the amount of users who had opted out of the gambling, it's like gambling quick service restaurants and alcohol, on SBS during the World Cup, is that right? And and the number of people who had

Daanyal Saeed (09:30)

Yeah.

Crystal Andrews (09:31)

actually availed themselves of that option was very, very low. I don't have the actual numbers to hand.

Daanyal Saeed (09:37)

in front of me. It's and it

Crystal Andrews (09:39)

Save me.

Daanyal Saeed (09:39)

is my news. so SBS's streaming platform, which is on demand, lets you, like Crystal said, opt out of gambling advertising as well as a number of other things. the most the most recent annual report that SBS has says that on-demand has 12.9 million registered users. SBS told me that 16,000 people had used that opt-out feature.

Which

if you

run the numbers on that is absolutely minute.

so I think that illustrates the flaws in an opt-out model.

But obviously an opt in model will similarly have maybe the opposite the opposite sort of effect.

Rachel Withers (10:17)

Ultimately just who's going to

opt in or opt out of anything people generally don't

Daanyal Saeed (10:21)

Exactly. You're adding a a friction point.

Rachel Withers (10:23)

Yeah

Daanyal Saeed (10:24)

Exactly right.

Crystal Andrews (10:24)

other thing that I I I did want to flag about the passage of this bill, because I know we're gonna talk about the sort of deal making between Labour and the coalition. Obviously the specifics of what the coalition was going to support came out of these. I saw it in some cases reported as like rare meetings between Anthony Albanese and Angus Taylor

Daanyal Saeed (10:44)

Mm.

Crystal Andrews (10:44)

that ultimately secured the coalition's support on this, but not all of the coalition. So there were a couple of

coalition members who crossed the floor to vote against the bill in the House, Liberal Andrew Wallace and National Party member Pat Conahan. so they sat with the crossbenches in the independence and also

Rachel Withers (11:05)
Elizabeth Watson Brown, the sole Greens MP.

Crystal Andrews (11:07)
Elizabeth Watson Brown sole Greens

MP. I watched the votes in the house and there were some quite sad scenes really of the group of them sitting on, you know, the side of the nose while the bulk of the house was sitting on the side of the Yay's to pass these amendments. I will note that Liberal Simon Kennedy, who had taken a very

public, strong public stance, kind of campaigning against these bills and asking them to be, you know, stronger. He did not cross the floor, so he voted with the party, in allegiance with the the party directive there, which was set by Angus Taylor. And then he was on Sky

Sorry, he was on News Twenty Four later on, saying, you know, it it's not perfect, but it's far better than than what was proposed before. And that's thanks to, you know, that's thanks to the coalition like getting these stronger changes through. I just thought that was that was all worth noting that there were still a few in the lower house on the coalition side who who did not think that this was good enough.

Daanyal Saeed (12:06)
a couple of moving parts there. And it's worth noting as well that as we speak, as we record this, this bill is sort of before the Senate. my sources say they're not anticipating major changes to that. David Pocock has suggested some, but they're my understanding is, you know, his office is a bit pessimistic at best at of

Crystal Andrews (12:23)
Mm.

Daanyal Saeed (12:24)
those getting up because obviously the coalition have done a deal.

Crystal Andrews (12:27)
They d they don't need him now.

Daanyal Saeed (12:28)

Exactly, they don't need his numbers. And Paul Scar has come out, who's a Liberal Senator, and said that he thinks it's fatally flawed and he said he he'll cross the floor in the Senate as well. So know, there are moving parts here, there is dissent within the coalition on this.

Rachel Withers (12:42)

say there is probably dissent in Labor. We know this has been contentious. Some backbenchers have said this doesn't go far enough, but unfortunately for them, they're not allowed to cross the floor in their party. Full credit to the Liberals and Nationals MPs who are doing it anyway. They are allowed to, but it's still a brave thing to do. And I did note that Pat Conahan, the National MP who crossed the floor he was

Deputy Chair of Peter Murphy's review. And it does seem like people who were on that committee do feel extra passionate about this and probably feel a little bit more of an obligation to honour Peter legacy and the recommendations

she made, which we all know this bill falls far, far, far short of.

Crystal Andrews (13:23)

Rachel, the other big development overnight was the Senate passing the amendments to the NDIS. I think that vote went down as 28 in favor and twelve against at the end of the day. So it'll go back to the House of Reps for final approval, but obviously we know that's a mere formality as as Labour has that big majority that'll easily pass it through.

Greens

and David Pocock had their opposition to these changes on the record. Jordan Still Johns for the Greens made some very quite moving actually statements in the Senate yesterday as this was all going down, about how these cuts ultimately will affect real people and

will not necessarily achieve the things that perhaps Labour had intended for it to to achieve and that the Greens still thought could be achieved.

Obviously this was done again in a deal with the coalition to get things through. how did you see that all playing out and what was your take on everything that went down yesterday?

Rachel Withers (14:55)

Yeah, look, I mean, it seems like both the NDIS reforms and the gambling reforms were all tied up in one big deal. As you say, Anthony Albanese and Angus Taylor were having face to face meetings. Labour actually called yesterday the day of deals because they managed to get deals done on pretty much all their big pieces of legislation here, working with the coalition on both. I was sort of trying to like Darnie trying to sift through what actually

changed because of the coalitions agreeing to come to the table. They've been holding out on both of these you know the Greens were of asking the coalition to keep holding out. On the

NDIS reforms which at the end of the day were about cutting the amount of money spent on the NDIS like that was their core purpose. They talk about fraud, they talk about putting in more appeals but it was about

curfewing a whole bunch of people off the under-airs and moving some of that responsibility onto the states. It's not clear what the coalition actually got agreeing to vote these three. I don't think they were particularly up in arms about the changes. I don't think it meant a great deal to them. I think they were holding out just to get something. The one thing they definitely got in this deal was Labour fast tracking the removal of the widow's tax, which...

is this stupid term that has been given to a little unintended consequence of the tax reforms in which people, women, men who become sole owners of a property through death or divorce, we're going to lose access to the grandfather negative gearing arrangements. So the one thing the coalition wants to really point out that it yes, Well,

Crystal Andrews (16:27)

An investment property, to be to be clear on that, not a not a residential property. Yeah.

Rachel Withers (16:31)

yeah, to be negative gearing, has to be an investment property with

you know, that you're trying to get a tax reduction on let's not get into what negative gearing is again, but

Crystal Andrews (16:39)

Yeah.

Rachel Withers (16:40)

it was very much just for people who would be potentially losing the grandfathered tax preferential treatment. So that's the main thing that the coalition has got and has been crowing about getting, even though Labour said they were going to fix it anyway.

In terms of the last minute changes to the NDIS reforms, there was quite a lot of them, 63 at the last minute, but it's not entirely clear which ones were secured the Coalition's support and which ones were made as a result of consultation with the community.

Labor has put out a big document laying out what the latest changes are, and they have said made in consultation with the community. The reporting is saying

much of these were requests from the Coalition. And as with any of these backroom deals, it's not entirely clear what is the cause of what.

All we know is that, you know, Labor and the Coalition passed a guillotine motion yesterday to get both this and gambling through both houses quite quickly over the next 48 hours.

So it really is, I think, here a story about Labor and the Coalition choosing to work together.

which is not something we've been seeing really most of this term. Anthony Albanese has been calling the coalition and One Nation the no-olition and trying to group them all into the three right-wing parties. So I do think it's interesting that the coalition came to the table here and they actually didn't seem to have gotten much on either gambling or the NDIS reforms. Again, I don't think they actually cared much about the NDIS reforms. They cared about

fraud, and about reducing expenditure through fraud, but I don't think they cared about like saving anyone from being turfed off the scheme. So there wasn't any of that negotiation going is noteworthy to watch the two parties come together and do a pretty big deal with fairly sketchy details. you know, it was a backroom deal. We don't know what was agreed to.

short of what the parties boast about getting. But it does seem like, especially on gambling, where the coalition had originally wanted Labor to go harder, they really didn't. They really didn't get anything, I would say. This opt-out thing, sure, the inducements Labor had already put into its own national platform at conference last month. So that is something Labor was arguably going to do anyway.

Yeah, think I'm keeping an eye on what this means for their working relationship in parliament going forward. I do think the coalition is trying to differentiate themselves from one nation.

Crystal Andrews (19:04)

I'm quite torn about how this great big deal is actually going to land with voters. I can see

the sort of bragging points that both Labour and the coalition will take from this. Labour will, you know, count this as as being two really significant reforms, something that it can t take and say this was a really productive period of our of our governance. Like we achieved these things, we shored up the NDAS for the future.

you could make arguments either way about whether that is the case, but that that is what they will argue.

And the coalition, on the other hand, will say, we forced Labour to improve these things and they were trying to pass something that was far inferior we stepped in with the common sense to to make sure that these things passed in their correct state. But given that the general

feeling and temperament for the past few years now among the general voting public has been major parties do not work for us. work for big money, they work for corporations, they are not looking out for our best interest. And increasingly you hear from people and they are working together

I'm I'm quite torn on how, core Labour voters and the core liberal or national voters would see this period of deal making and whether it would be like, yes, this is cooperation, this is how Parliament is supposed to work, it is meant to be negotiation and people working together, or will they see this as, kind of a betrayal and perhaps a reason why more people will start to look at other options, whether that be

Greens, independent, one nation, new names that come up over the next couple of years.

how that would play out politically and whether the optics of, backroom deal making, as you say, Rachel, like is actually kind of a danger for both of the major parties here.

Rachel Withers (20:42)

Yeah, I think the biggest risk is probably with progressive voters who vote for Labour and who do that expecting that they will deal with the Greens on social issues. These are about reducing gambling harms and ensuring that people with disabilities can live in dignity. It feels like the Greens should be the natural partner that you work with on those things, not the coalition that is sort of headed down a right-wing path.

that will bother people who voted for Labour at the last election being told, you know, don't vote for the Greens, we can't risk Dutton. Well, yeah, but then you turn around and work with the party that is no longer led by Peter Dutton, but work with that party anyway. I think there's also maybe some risk for the coalition here. I mean, they're already really struggling in the polls. And the argument could be from One Nation, like

they don't stand up to Labour because really they didn't stand up to Labour here. They got almost nothing. They've got very little to crow about here. And I think, yeah, when a party does a deal, there's always criticism of any deal, I'm so sick of hearing like dirty deals because both the Greens use it and the coalition use it when Labour does a deal with either. But if you're going to do a deal and you're going to sort of,

compromise, you better have something to show for it. And I don't think the coalition actually got much to show for it. So it's, it might create an easy point of criticism for One Nation on their right flank to point out like, we'll actually fight for you, not those guys.

Crystal Andrews (22:13)

Donnie?

Daanyal Saeed (22:14)

like I agree with Rachel in that I think the coalition are seeking to differentiate themselves from one nation there is probably I think the the

average reasonable person, the the the middle Australian voter likes the idea of political parties being able to constructively move forward on legislation and have that sort of be whether we agree on the merits of it or not, some form of of

balance compromise position, right? And you you've heard this language from the coalition on gambling. They've adopted that Labour talking point of we're adopting we're striking the balance. We're striking the balance

Crystal Andrews (22:47)
Hm.

Daanyal Saeed (22:47)
on on gambling. We've come

Rachel Withers (22:49)
Let

people have a punt but also balance the other stuff.

Daanyal Saeed (22:54)
Exactly.

Crystal Andrews (22:54)
The individual individual responsibility.

Daanyal Saeed (22:54)
It's it's a false dichotomy. It's a false dichotomy

completely, but this idea of balance is is pushed because the two majors in particular have an idea, have an understanding that the median voter that they are chasing likes aspiring to to some form of constructive middle ground.

Notwithstanding that the Labour Party seems to these days think that a constructive middle ground means that everybody's yelling at you. but that

Crystal Andrews (23:24)
Mm-hmm.

Daanyal Saeed (23:24)
the end that Exactly.

Rachel Withers (23:24)
The middle ground is the center, haven't you heard? Center means middle.

Crystal Andrews (23:27)
Yeah.

Daanyal Saeed (23:30)

but yeah, I think voters are are are attuned to that and I think voters do respond positively to that. the the problem is that the coalition has very little room to move.

and I so I struggle to say you do, like you say, need to have something to show for it so that you can display yourselves when it comes to the next election as as competent parliamentary operators, which sort of has worked for Greens in terms of their image. And and and I think there's a we've discussed on this podcast before that the Greens have benefited from this image of of being competent in the parliament. so there's an element of that, I think, for for the coalition, but you need to have something to show for it. And they

These are these are small reforms. These are these are by no means enormous wins, but they are really significant social bills that will have really important sort of impacts on Australian society as we know it.

Rachel Withers (24:18)

think that's why it was even more essential for the coalition to actually actually get into the nitty gritty and actually have something to show on the bills themselves. mean, I'm someone who likes to see negotiation and compromise. it's done well, and both parties come away with something, we sort of all benefit like, legislation should be workshops, like it should be massaged. It should be.

Crystal Andrews (24:39)

Cooperation.

Rachel Withers (24:40)

Yeah.

but I think in this case with these two bills and they're very different bills because I think the coalition had probably an ideological position closely in line with Labor on one on the NDIS stuff. In fact, they probably wanted to cut it further. But on gambling, they had criticisms. They were making these criticisms for months and months and months. John Howard was making the criticisms and they didn't actually get the results.

And so I think that's where the negotiation ends up just looking like folding.

Daanyal Saeed (25:10)

I've said this for a long time, that think this is a particular concern for the government, which like very nakedly makes policy bifocus group, right?

there was electoral advantage to be had in gambling. was a you got poll in in March. I have not seen another policy on which there is such universal support for, in this case, a blanket

Ban on gambling advertising. It is 77% of Australians, or back in March it was, 77% of Australians outright, it is 81% of Labour voters, it is 78% of coalition voters, it is 88% of Greens voters, it was 85% of independent voters, it was even 66% of One Nation voters, and it's

Crystal Andrews (25:46)

Mm.

Daanyal Saeed (25:47)

72% of undecided voters. However, you slice it, there is enormous electoral advantage in going really, really hard on gambling advertising. and I thought this is an enormous missed opportunity for the coalition to really push the government on this.

I also think it's really dumb politics from the government, but that shows what the power of lobbying does.

Crystal Andrews (26:03)

They they could have

Rachel Withers (26:03)

Mm-mm.

Crystal Andrews (26:04)

just they could have just done it themselves and owned it and taken it as you say, as you rightly point out, Darnie, all of that advantage. but we have now bills that we have on what you both point out are very important social areas. Before we move on to the final segment of the podcast, I did want to point out the far less

consequential in terms of actual legislation that is likely to be passed. But I think something that happened in this sitting of parliament that is that is really worth everybody knowing about. And it was quite a small moment, so it might have slipped under the radar for a lot of people. But Liberal national MP Lou O'Brien reintroduced a, quote unquote born alive anti-abortion bill into the Parliament. This is the, I think the third or fourth time this particular

bill sort of redrafted and re massaged has been introduced to federal parliament over the past few years. for people who don't know, this is based on the bogus idea that there are many, many babies who survive an abortion, are born and left to die, abandoned on the side of the hospital bed. and the bill is an attempt to force doctors to provide quote unquote life-saving care to these

babies. this is, I can't stress enough, not something that is a concern within the healthcare system. when this bill was attempted to be put into parliament previously by George Christensen. I think he was the first. And then it was Ralph Babbad and Matt Canavan also may have had a go at this as well. You know, we've had doctors, bodies and and health groups come out and say the

basis for this, the facts underlying this just do not exist. This is just unnecessary. and so, you know, people might be thinking like why you pointing to this bill that is most certainly not going to go anywhere? it's probably very unlikely to even be debated. This is just going to fall by the wayside. But I think it's important because it is part of this renewed push that we're seeing in Australia of

people trying to chip away at reproductive rights, chip away at access to abortion in Australia. There is a push by these very well moneyed Christian lobby groups in the States that sort of see Australia as the next target. And in Crikey we've had Prudence Flowers and Barbara Baird, who sort of specialise in this area, write some fantastic pieces about sort of the campaign to advance these here. but it it's worth I think just keeping an eye on, you know, like we have a

Coalition MP trying to introduce this into Parliament. On that same day, the Australian Christian lobby organized like a protest on the lawns of Parliament where they had knitted baby socks or something like that and and but put them in the formation of a cross. But Barnaby Joyce attended that. Matt Canavan attended

that. Like that there there are some high profile politicians who are quite happy to get on board with this. So I I do think it's something that people should at least be aware, is bubbling in in the background.

Rachel Withers (28:46)
Yeah,

I think it's really interesting that these moves, like there was also the bill previously, all rallies about preventing selective abortions,

Crystal Andrews (28:57)
Sex selective abortions, yeah.

Rachel Withers (28:58)
also a thing that's not happening, that there's no evidence that is a problem. But it's interesting that the people who are trying to ignite a culture war around abortion, at this point, I think only feel brave enough going at it by making up kind of false flag.

conspiracies and attacking those and not yet going after the right to abortion. But as you say that certainly where they'd like to be actually going, but that is still not fortunately palatable in Australia and we should keep it that way.

Crystal Andrews (29:28)
Yeah, absolutely. it's part of a I think a strategy of incrementalism where they're just trying to chip at things that might sound reasonable to people. You know, the sex selective abortion concept to a lot of people, I'm sure sounds very reasonable. Like we we don't want children

aborted just because they are girls. again, the their healthcare bodies are saying, not only is this not happening, but I mean I've done a little bit of writing about that particular campaign.

But what it is actually aimed at is the the early testing you have done in pregnancy, the NIPT test, which tests for chromosomal abnormalities, that can be done at 10 weeks. That's generally now when you'll find out whether or not a fetus is a boy or a girl. And that's actually the thing that's in their sites. They they don't want women to have access to that sort of healthcare information about.

their child and about themselves early on in pregnancy. So if that's the only way to tell, you know, what the gender of your child is, well, we we can try and get rid of that and force women to carry pregnancies that they may not want for medical reasons to term. Anyway, a small thing I think that people should should keep their eye on because it's not going away anywhere soon. Before we wrap the episode, it is time for our Snoop segment

with

Crikey's tips hog Coshon, who's always on the lookout for juicy tips and curiosities to investigate further. Rachel Darney, who wants to go first with a with a tip for the pig to turn his attention to?

Daanyal Saeed (30:51)
I can fade the pig.

Rachel Withers (30:52)
you

Daanyal Saeed (30:53)
I'm really curious about One Nation's Victorian candidates. There's I I think just a lot of their Victorian campaigning is really fascinating. Obviously, it's probably the first state election that they'll be taking really seriously and that they'll be taken seriously in. and this is in today's Snoop, One Nation have unveiled a whole host of new candidates and the

Headline amongst them is a former Essendon Premiership player, John Barnes, who'll be contesting fittingly the k the electorate of Essendon. so John Barnes played in that legendary 2000 side, which is incidentally the last time they were good. but the that is held by Danny Pearson, who's the retiring Labour MP, and he sort of nominally holds that seat on 12.5% margin.

my understanding of Essendon is that that is sitting significantly more marginal and Labour are sort of more worried about that than twelve and a half percent suggests. so that'll be really interesting. The interesting and I guess notable thing about John Barnes is that he was one of the say he was a ruckman, Ruckford, and he finished in 2001. He was one of the lead early sort of members of

that late 2010s AFL concussion case for for explayers. And so he said in 2018 that he suffers from s from seizures, from epilepsy, from violent fits of rage. he his wife gave an interview to the Herald Son where she was like he threatened our child in a I believe it was a spasm of violence. so this is like this is a man who like very plainly has been very o on the record and open

About the sort of impact that his brain trauma has had on him.

and so I think that's a I guess a really notable thing in that he is an advocate, but he i is also on the public record saying, I can't shower or bathe myself, I can't drive, I can't be unsupervised.

obviously, sort of a really big part of his being a candidate at all is is his footballing background. So that'll be interesting. He is currently a Mooney Valley councillor as well. other one is Garner Smith, who's running the Murray Plains, and he has made some sort of I'm I think fair to say, some fairly grim remarks about women and sort of was brought in front of a misconduct committee.

in 2022, over some remarks he made about Dustin Martin allegedly groping a woman so that is sort of the last time he made headlines and he has been unveiled as a candidate in Murray Plains as well. So there's all sorts of of different candidates that are popping up and we'll continue to investigate all of them.

Crystal Andrews (33:37)

Rachel, anything for Coshon this week?

Rachel Withers (33:40)

Yeah, this is just something I spotted in the hour before coming on here from Kevin Bonham, the sophologist posted on Twitter that he noticed that the United Australia party has applied to change its name back to Clive Palmer's United Australia party, was, mean,

Crystal Andrews (33:56)

wow.

Rachel Withers (33:57)

the United Australia party has changed names and tried to rebrand itself multiple times. But I wonder if this is a sign that

Clive is hoping to capitalize on this kind of like getting behind an outsider, having a leader who to a certain group of people. He's probably looking at Pauline Hansen and going, wait, why didn't I get any of that? Because of course that's Pauline Hansen's One Nation party. So yeah, I think we should always keep an eye on Clive, but particularly at the moment to work out what he's planning to do. Probably not at the...

the federal election, certainly.

Crystal Andrews (34:35)

That is interesting because he actually did he might have been teasing this for a little while. He

did an interview with one of the News Corp tabloids. it must have been the Courier Mail, if he's in Queensland, where they he was doing like a car show. He has like this incredible, you know, garage full of vintage and and rare

cars, sports cars, I guess. and they went up and and then did like a tour of his collection and did an interview with him. And I'm pretty sure he hinted at it then as well or

Rachel Withers (35:07)

you

Crystal Andrews (35:07)

said something about, you know, how much he might spend on a on another election and, you know, whether Pauline Hansen and One Nation's Rise had given him ideas about like, yeah, also trying to play that outsider role. So

it looks like developments, there's some movement happening

Rachel Withers (35:23)

Mm-hmm.

Crystal Andrews (35:23)

there.

Daanyal Saeed (35:24)

We're back, baby! It's

twenty it's twenty sixteen again, let's go!

Rachel Withers (35:29)

Uggghh

Crystal Andrews (35:29)

All all things old and you again. Okay, well, Darnie, Rachel, thank you so much for chatting through a very big fortnight in politics on Cut Through. It's it's a pleasure as always to have you both.

Rachel Withers (35:41)

Thanks, Crystal.

Daanyal Saeed (35:42)

Thanks so much, Crystal.

