

TRANSCRIPT

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY LEGAL AND SOCIAL ISSUES COMMITTEE

Inquiry into Anti-Vilification Protections

Melbourne—Wednesday, 11 March 2020

MEMBERS

Ms Natalie Suleyman—Chair

Mr James Newbury—Deputy Chair

Ms Christine Couzens

Ms Emma Kealy

Ms Michaela Settle

Mr David Southwick

Mr Meng Heang Tak

WITNESSES

Ms Monique Hurley, Senior Lawyer, and

Ms Ruth Barson, Joint Executive Director, Human Rights Law Centre;

Ms Renaire Druery, Acting Human Rights Director, GetUp!; and

Ms Abiola Ajetomobi, Director of Social Innovation, Asylum Seeker Resource Centre.

The CHAIR: Good afternoon. First of all, welcome. Can I get you to state, starting from the left, your name for the record.

Ms DRUERY: My name is Renaire Druery and I am the Acting Human Rights Director at GetUp!

Ms HURLEY: Monique Hurley, Senior Lawyer at the Human Rights Law Centre.

Ms BARSON: Ruth Barson, currently the Joint Executive Director at the Human Rights Law Centre.

Ms AJETOMOBI: Abiola Ajetomobi, and I am the Director of Social Innovation at the Asylum Seeker Resource Centre.

The CHAIR: Thank you. All evidence taken by this Committee is protected by parliamentary privilege; therefore you are protected against any action for what you say here today but if you go outside and repeat the same things, including on social media, those comments may not be protected by this privilege. All evidence given today is being recorded by Hansard and it is also being broadcast live on Parliament's website. Please note that the footage can only be rebroadcast in accordance with the conditions set out in standing order 234. You will be provided with a proof version of the transcript for you to check as soon as it is available. Verified transcripts, PowerPoint presentations and handouts will be placed on the Committee's website as soon as possible. I now invite you to proceed with a brief 5 to 10-minute opening statement to the Committee and the Committee will follow with questions. Thank you so much for being here.

Ms HURLEY: Thank you for having us. I would just like to start by acknowledging that the country that we meet on today is Wurundjeri country and that it always was and always will be Aboriginal land. I think acknowledging this today is particularly relevant to the hearing, given that racist laws and policies have played a key role in shaping the Victoria that we live in today. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people have been subjected to colonisation, land dispossession, the frontier wars, stolen generations and mass imprisonment and live with the ongoing impact of these laws and policies. Racism and its application in the form of hateful conduct continues to be a serious and ongoing problem today.

Today we are delivering this opening statement on behalf of the organisations who contributed to our joint submission to this Inquiry. Those organisations are the Human Rights Law Centre, which is where Ruth and I are from; the Asylum Seeker Resource Centre, where Abiola is from; GetUp!, which is where Renaire is from; the Anti Defamation Commission; and the Victorian Trades Hall Council. We are here today because current laws prohibiting hateful conduct have been largely ineffective in stopping hate. This is for a lot of reasons that include legal thresholds that are too high for people to meet and because anti-vilification laws have focused on whether conduct has incited third parties to hatred and not the actual harm caused to people targeted by hate conduct.

Just last year Premier Andrews said he was powerless to stop a music festival being organised by white supremacist hate groups due to a deficiency in the law, and this year Victoria Police said they did not have the power to remove a Nazi swastika flag flying above a house in regional Victoria. This Inquiry was called in response to Fiona Patten's private members Bill proposing amendments to our anti-vilification laws. In our submission that Bill does not go far enough, and this Inquiry now presents a unique opportunity for the Victorian Government to remedy the deficiency in our current laws and lead the country by enacting best practice anti-hate laws that stop hate in its tracks.

Our government, our laws and our community should have no tolerance for hate. Hateful conduct is contrary to our democratic values and reduces a person's ability to contribute to and to fully participate in society as equals. When hateful conduct is allowed to go unchecked, it can escalate into outright violence. The very real world consequences of this have been highlighted by a number of examples in recent history, including the mass murder of 51 Muslim people in New Zealand by an Australian white

supremacist just last year. The organisations appearing today argue for best practice anti-hate laws that include: enacting new laws prohibiting the public display of vilifying and intimidating materials including the Nazi swastika—the Nazi swastika is a symbol of hate, genocide and trauma and it has also become a calling card for the far right, and there should be no place for that symbol or similar hate symbols in Victoria; in recognition of the negative impact that hateful conduct can have on groups of people not currently protected by the law, expanding the list of protected attributes beyond race and religious beliefs to also include gender, sexual orientation, gender identity and gender expression, sex characteristics, HIV/AIDS status and disability; improving the civil and criminal legal tests for vilification; and enacting a new protection against hate-based conduct that looks at the harm caused to the person targeted by hateful conduct rather than whether a third party has been incited to hatred.

In doing this work, it is important for the Victorian Government to consider how to draft these laws in a way that recognises the reality of intersectional hateful conduct and that makes the complaint process straightforward for people who experience vilification on the basis of multiple protected attributes. In short, we say that our laws need to be fixed so that all Victorians can feel safe and live a life free from hate.

The CHAIR: Are there any further submissions? No? Thank you very much.

Mr SOUTHWICK: Great, I will kick off. Thanks everyone for coming along. I wanted to just take you back to the first reason why the group came together or how the group came together with the Blood & Honour concert that was proposed. Obviously at the time we had a situation of a concert that was being promoted that was effectively using hate speech within the content of their songs. Where do you see the role of police and these laws in these types of concerts that in the current law leave it pretty grey because they are not saying necessarily that they will incite hate? Effectively what do you think is needed to ensure that we can have proper protection and that we do not have these types of groups that obviously deliberately recruit, promote and target individuals with their hate speech?

Ms BARSON: Sure, thank you for the question. In that specific example, it is clear from reading the current RRTA and also from the Premier's comments that the laws were deficient to stop that even though there was really good intent by the Government at the time. Our proposed changes, both to the civil and the criminal laws, would create a situation where it would be possible to change it. Obviously the specific circumstances of every situation would need to be taken into account but, for example, our proposed changes to the criminal vilification test would be that the fault element is amended to cover circumstances where there is intentionally or recklessly a significant risk that a person's conduct is likely to incite hatred. Then for the civil test, if you go to our submission, we say there should be a reformed provision that provides that a person must not engage in conduct that expresses or is reasonably likely to express hatred in all of the circumstances. So I think we definitely agree with the premise of your question that such a concert should not be permitted in Victoria and that both affected communities and law enforcement should have the power to stop such hateful concerts, and our proposals go to that.

I think more broadly the basis of our submission is also that preventing hateful conduct is just as important as changing the law. So the law obviously has a really important role to play in terms of setting appropriate standards, but prevention through education programs is equally important. So ideally we would not need to wait for the situation whereby a concert is announced and we are relying at the last minute on police powers but we live in a state where those types of concerts are not considered in the first instance.

Mr SOUTHWICK: To be appropriate.

Ms BARSON: That is right.

Mr SOUTHWICK: Thank you. Just following from that, you mentioned the banning of symbols and you used the swastika as an example. We saw ASIO make a comment a few weeks ago that with the activity of some of these extreme right groups there is potentially a probable terrorist attack because of what these groups

are currently doing. You cited the swastika as being something that should be banned. We know that the swastika has been used in the past to target Jewish groups. Would you also be suggesting that the swastika represents a broader element of hate and that it is targeted to a whole range of different groups, and banning that is important because of what it represents in a broader setting, not just in one particular group?

Ms BARSON: Yes, in short. Very much we recognise that the Nazi swastika is a particularly offensive genocidal symbol for the Jewish community. It is also currently being used as a calling card for the alt-right movement, which represents hate towards much broader groups within the community. Unfortunately our colleagues who were very much a part in drafting this submission, Trades Hall, are not here, but they had done a good deal of research into online far-right hate groups and support the position that the Nazi swastika has become a calling card for far-right groups and banning it is therefore really important, not just from the perspective of the Jewish community—that is important in and of itself—but also from the perspective of needing to curtail the rise of the alt-right.

Mr SOUTHWICK: Terrific. Thank you.

Mr NEWBURY: Just in terms of following on from David's point, the comments that were made—and I will read them into the record again—were:

In Australia, the right-wing extremist threat is real and it is growing. In suburbs around Australia, small cells meet regularly, salute Nazi flags, inspect weapons, train in combat and share their hateful ideology.

With that in mind, do you see there being a need in terms of timeliness for acting on that specific issue of banning the swastika, or is it something that you would be happy to see go through a parliamentary process for however long it takes and the Government to consider it for however long it takes? Do you think that there is an immediate need to act on that specific issue?

Ms BARSON: What is really important, zooming out, is that it is critically important to act on the rise of hate in our community. Banning the swastika is just one step in doing that and should not be done in isolation, because what we ultimately want is best practice laws that see a reduction in hateful conduct and that are accessible to affected communities. Simply banning the swastika is not going to get us there, and there is a risk that if we rush that reform, that single step, we miss all the other really equally important steps that need to be taken and we miss the opportunity that is currently before Victoria, which is to introduce best practice anti-hate laws.

Mr SOUTHWICK: Just clarifying James's point: not to be done on its own, but I think he was referring to that along with a whole range of other things as we go. I think what James is pointing out is the rise of the right and the concern about these far-right groups and the concern that this is being used as, as you say, a calling card without police at the moment having powers to be able to effectively shut that down.

Ms BARSON: It is really important that that is addressed, but our position is that that needs to be addressed within the suite of reforms that we have proposed in our submission.

Mr SOUTHWICK: Yes. A whole range of things.

Mr TAK: Thank you for your submission and presentation. With online social media vilification, you already made some recommendations to address this specific issue. Do you have a view on how Victoria could effectively regulate this issue, especially the cross-jurisdictional?

Ms HURLEY: In terms of online vilification we support what is in the Patten Bill in terms of giving powers to the Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Commission to apply to VCAT for orders to help identify people that are trolling online. That is our main submission on that point.

Mr TAK: Thank you. To follow on—for example, say, if the villifier is in another state, how do we make it possible?

The CHAIR: To take action.

Mr TAK: Say, if the victim is not actually in Victoria.

The CHAIR: For instance, if something has happened in, let us say, New South Wales, how would it be enforced in Victoria?

Ms BARSON: That is not something that our submission went to unfortunately.

Mr TAK: That is right.

The CHAIR: I might just follow on with a question. Your submission recommends extending the anti-vilification protections to protect other groups not currently protected. Would you just be able to just for the record extend on those other groups?

Ms HURLEY: Yes. Obviously the reason we are here today is because hateful conduct is on the rise across Australia. In recognition of the negative impact that hateful conduct can have on groups of people that are not currently protected—acknowledging that the law only currently protects people who experience vilification on the basis of race and religion—we think it should also include gender, sexual orientation, gender identity and gender expression, sex characteristics, HIV/AIDS status and disability. In terms of coming up with definitions of what those attributes mean, we think that that should be done in consultation with affected communities and best practice definitions should be adopted.

The CHAIR: Your submission discusses this—and we have heard it in a number of submissions in relation to real data and, I suppose, collecting data—but do you have any particular suggestions on how the collection of data could be better achieved?

Ms AJETOMOBI: I feel that there is a lot of data already because the level of intolerance of the community is rising as well. So many people have been here for a long time, some are newly arriving and some of us, like me, are actually having children that are going through the same. So I think there are a lot of complaints already through the police, through the proper authorities, that have formed enough data to be able to explore and understand the issues more broadly and also to be able to inform the review of the legislation. I believe there is enough data, because even last year I think was really amplified or elevated due to the different racial issues that happened in our state—African gangs is one of them. I know a lot of people made personal complaints as well as a family, as a community. I feel that that data needs to be revisited to be able to inform what the new law would look like as well as how do we collect effective qualitative and quantitative data moving forward.

The CHAIR: Just to add on to that, we have heard a lot of comments about the reluctance of especially ethnic communities and Muslim communities to actually report because of the navigation of the system, the time it will take, the complex process.

Mr NEWBURY: Awareness of the law.

The CHAIR: And awareness of the law—the list just piles up. In particular, my question goes to the Islamic Council of Victoria's submission, and it did state that unfortunately there had been an alarming increase, after Christchurch in particular, in relation to hate attacks on the Muslim community. One of the concerns was that they had a record of the complaints that came in, but they felt that it was triple—that it was not the actual reality of what was going on. So my question is: is there a real problem of, 'Yes, we have got them recorded, but are we getting the reality of what is actually occurring in our communities?'

Ms AJETOMOBI: Yes, I would say that we are not getting the reality because there are a lot of people that are feeling reluctant, and I think you have outlined some of the reasons very well. What I would like to add to this list is the lack of justice and also lack of appropriate understanding of what the outcome of the process looks like. So when people make complaints and there is no clarity on what is going to happen and the consequence of their actions for the people if they are found to be guilty, which has not been very successful given the grey nature of the legislation—I think those are the things that are deterring people from actually being able to express themselves and seek justice. I believe strongly that once there is legislation and the recommendations are adopted it will give not only responsibility or accountability to everyone that has racially

been attacking others, it will also give people a bit more confidence in being able to speak up and speak for themselves, yes.

Mr NEWBURY: Can I just ask on that point: do you believe, then, that there is a basic level of awareness that the laws exist but it is what happens in terms of the process that is the real issue?

Ms AJETOMOBI: I think there is a basic knowledge that the law exists, but the exclusion of the law in terms of not including all the different demographics that are needed to be included in there is one of the reasons why this law may not be applicable to some and applicable to the others. I also believe that even within the confinement of the law people are still not feeling the level of confidence or assurance that the law would protect them. So it is the same as it does not exist, if that makes sense.

Mr NEWBURY: It does.

Ms BARSON: I would also just add to that that the way the current laws are drafted so that essentially you need to prove some type of conduct on the part of the third party makes it almost impossible/redundant for somebody to bring a complaint because it is so, so difficult to prove, and that is evidenced by the low uptake of complaints and the under-utilisation of the law. So it is also in the crafting of the legal tests, and that is specifically the recommendations that our submission has sought to address.

The CHAIR: If I could just add on, your submission notes that Western Australia has offences in its criminal code on public display, and my colleague David has spoken about and you have adequately spoken about the Nazi flag issue, but to your information have there been any prosecutions, and how effective has that been? Do you know of any cases?

Ms BARSON: We would have to take that on notice.

The CHAIR: Okay, thank you.

Ms HURLEY: The other aspect to our submission that is important is the earlier version of the RRTA—that is also in our submission—whereby a similar provision was actually included in that Act. That is at point 91 in our submission, ‘Distribution or display of threatening or vilifying material’. That was in the 1992 Victorian Bill that was before Parliament that then lapsed.

The CHAIR: Right, okay.

Ms HURLEY: It lapsed for no apparent reason that we could find, but it just lapsed in terms of it seemed to stop being a priority of the government of the day. So it is something that was contemplated by the Victorian Government in 1992 in the Bill, but the Bill in its entirety was not taken up at that point. There are two provisions that we have pointed to, one in Bill form, one in Act form in Western Australia, that the Victorian Government could look to to enact a similar provision. The one point that we would make is that both of those provisions reference race and religion rather than the broader attributes, and we think it is really important that this provision banning hateful material extends to the broader attributes that would, we hope, be protected under a new Act.

The CHAIR: Okay. And you support including a broad definition of what constitutes a public act in the *Racial and Religious Tolerance Act* similar to the New South Wales definition. What would be the benefits of this approach? And if you could, just elaborate a little bit more about the New South Wales approach.

Ms HURLEY: Is that the definition of conduct?

The CHAIR: Yes.

Ms HURLEY: We think that that will help. Broadening the definition of public conduct to a definition similar to that adopted in New South Wales will help clarify that prohibited conduct includes any form of communication, conduct or distribution or dissemination of material to the public. It will also clarify that conduct can constitute public conduct even if it occurs on private land. And so a provision like that would go

some way potentially to banning displays of symbols like the Nazi swastika, but not far enough in our submission.

Mr SOUTHWICK: Can just elaborate on that? So you are saying that the New South Wales definition would not go far enough?

Ms HURLEY: So this would be the definition of conduct that would then be interpreted in conjunction with the other provisions.

Mr SOUTHWICK: And you would also require to ensure that it be explicit—

Ms HURLEY: Yes.

Mr SOUTHWICK: Thank you.

The CHAIR: Just on a final question from me, your submission recommends a new offence to prohibit conduct that is intended or reasonably likely to cause a person to have reasonable fear for their safety or security of property. Can you expand on how this would be different to the current serious vilification offences versus, you know, any other offence in other Australian jurisdictions—the new offence?

Ms BARSON: The new offence, and your question is how would it be different—

The CHAIR: To other jurisdictions in Australia. To other offences, I should say.

Ms BARSON: In Australia or in our submission?

The CHAIR: Well, first of all if you want to just touch on your submission and then, I suppose, talk about the differences that it would make compared to other jurisdictions—whether or not there is a difference.

Ms HURLEY: This is something that the Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Commission also recommended, and it came out of the review into the laws in New South Wales. And so in that framing of the words it is an act:

... that is intended, or is reasonably likely, to cause a person to have a reasonable fear in the circumstances for their own safety or security of property, or for the safety or security of property of their family or associates.

And so in the review the professors explained that:

The alternative to intent—a reasonable person's awareness of the likelihood—ensures that a perpetrator of racial vilification is not able to rely on their own lack of awareness, insight or wilful blindness as to the effect of their conduct, or on a belief that what they said was true.

And so we recommended that this is something that the Victorian Government should consider further.

Ms BARSON: And so perhaps to ground that in an example, the family that was flying the Nazi swastika flag in regional Victoria, if they for some reason had said, 'We didn't know of the history and the offence that it would cause. We're just flying this for'—whatever inexcusable reason that they came up with—but essentially had some type of pleading of ignorance around the extent of harm that it would cause, this law would say you cannot rely on that ignorance.

The CHAIR: Right, okay, that clarifies that.

Ms BARSON: Does that clarify it?

The CHAIR: Yes, absolutely.

Ms BARSON: My understanding is that it puts the test for the law on the reasonable fear that it induces as opposed to the person's knowledge or lack of knowledge.

The CHAIR: That makes sense, yes. That clarifies it.

Mr NEWBURY: I was just going to say, looking at the New South Wales model which you identified before and I guess a hybrid approach of specifically referring to either the Nazi flag or other materials, what other things would you potentially consider being included, specifically?

Ms HURLEY: In terms of offensive symbols?

Mr NEWBURY: Yes.

Ms BARSON: I feel like we would have to take that on notice. That is just really conjecture on our part, I think.

Ms HURLEY: Yes, and I think it would be important when drafting the law, in terms of making sure that it prohibits symbols like the Nazi swastika, to not prohibit just that but to allow for evolving things that happen over time and if other symbols become as offensive.

Mr NEWBURY: I just meant: you identified the Nazi flag and the Nazi symbol, and I take it that, in terms of the New South Wales model, you would actually propose to hybrid and insert that as a specific example, but when you mentioned 'other' I guess I wondered whether you had thought, when you suggested 'other', what that might mean.

Ms BARSON: It was not because we had considered other hate symbols. It was really coming from a drafting position whereby ideally Parliament drafts laws based on principles as opposed to them being based on trying to outlaw something that is happening right here, right now. If you draw out the Nazi swastika and say, 'What are the principles that we are trying to prohibit?', that is a better approach to drafting law because then it allows for unforeseen similar things to eventuate in the future. It kind of future-proofs the law if you draft it from the perspective of principles rather than from the perspective of saying, 'Just prohibit the Nazi swastika'. That was a conversation that we had had with the Jewish Community Council of Victoria, actually, that really opened our eyes to the importance of not just prohibiting this single symbol but recognising that we only know what we know right now and we want laws that in the future have the potential to also prohibit equally offensive and harmful symbols.

Mr SOUTHWICK: Just in terms of clarity from that, would you concede that it is important to be explicit about the Nazi symbol because that is something that is here and now, and by giving explicit understanding that that is problematic then police can effectively act, as opposed to a broader—

Ms BARSON: Yes, that could be an example that is provided for in the drafting of the Act, but we would very much support the provision not being drafted with the approach of just banning that symbol. It could be used as an example for demonstrating the level of hate that is required to substantiate that provision. Does that answer your question? Yes, we would support it being—

Mr SOUTHWICK: I suppose I am trying to understand the issues at the moment with New South Wales, because it is quite vague in terms of what they have got, and trying to get to a point where police at least have direction to be able to act as opposed to having a broad contextual thing about symbols of hate not necessarily caught up in police being able to act because it is not explicit in their powers.

Ms BARSON: A way to address that so that it is explicit for the police is to draft the provision based on principles like the provisions that were used in the 1992 Bill and the Western Australian Bill and then at the end say an example of material that will likely incite racial hatred or animosity—whatever the words that were used—is the Nazi swastika. That makes it abundantly clear—

Mr SOUTHWICK: That that is what you are talking about.

Ms BARSON: that the Nazi swastika is prohibited, but the drafting of the provision allows for other hate material to be included within it. Because it goes to your question: no, we are not in a position to say and we have not done a thorough assessment of what are equivalent hate symbols—if there are even equivalent; it is a bit of a macabre exercise, really.

Mr NEWBURY: I just wondered when you said ‘other’ whether there was something that came to mind specifically.

Ms AJETOMOBI: I would probably add to that and say also: as part of best practice I think it is good during the amendments to consult with relevant ethnic communities and for them to actually inform what those symbols are. For some communities it is not only symbols; there are some words, or foul language, that are prohibited or can give them that sense of racial attack. Those things are what should be considered, because I think it would be much more beneficial if the communities were informing that process.

The CHAIR: I just had one final question. A previous submission stated that the RRTA and the *Equal Opportunity Act* should be placed together. The witness called it a ‘one-stop shop’. What is your view about that suggestion?

Ms HURLEY: We did not take a position on that in the submission.

Ms BARSON: No, we have been agnostic on that question. We are aware that there was a question raised about that in other submissions. The thrust of our submission is essentially that the Government has a historic opportunity to improve the laws. We strongly argue that our submission represents what best practice laws would be—that is, improving the current criminal and civil test. It is introducing a new harm-based test—that is really important because that is the linchpin of what will make these laws accessible to affected communities; it is introducing a criminal provision that prohibits hateful materials, like the Nazi swastika; and it is expanding the attributes. The key point that we would like the Committee to take away is that none of these suggested reforms are sufficient on their own. Only collectively do they achieve the desired goal of stamping out hate.

The CHAIR: Thank you very much. I take the opportunity on behalf of the Committee to thank each organisation for the work that you have contributed in your submission. It has been extensive. Our next steps will be—

Mr SOUTHWICK: Through the Chair, sorry: can I ask one last question?

The CHAIR: You had another? Okay, then. We will allow it.

Mr SOUTHWICK: Just back on the timeliness, I want to finish where we started—that Blood & Honour concert. I believe it is proposed to be an annual event. Through, we believe, the pressure of the community it did not go ahead, but we are very close to it kind of coming again. How important is it to ensure from a timeliness perspective that police do have the powers to ensure that a concert like that does not go ahead, bearing in mind the kinds of messaging that groups like that aim to effectively give to the followers that they look at targeting?

Ms BARSON: Absolutely. We do not want a concert like that going ahead, but the caveat would be we need to make sure we see the forest for the trees. We need to make sure that these laws are holistic and all encompassing and that this reform is done well, and that should be the overriding consideration. I agree that there is—

Mr SOUTHWICK: If there was a weighing up between an interim measure just to stop that going ahead, if it was proposed for next week, versus saying, ‘Oh, we’ll just wait until the following year’—

Ms BARSON: It would be our position that the interim measure does not go far enough and that it would be myopic to just introduce one part of this reform, because it is really important that this reform occurs in the context of the entire reform of the Act. It goes back to what we were saying: that the goal of the reform should be to reduce hate in the community and to make this accessible to communities, and only by introducing a package of reforms—dealing with how substandard the civil and criminal tests are in the act, introducing a new harm-based test, expanding the attributes and prohibiting hateful material like the Nazi swastika—do we achieve that aim. I think we need to make sure we do not lose sight of the forest for the trees.

Mr NEWBURY: Just to add to that—sorry.

The CHAIR: Last question.

Mr NEWBURY: Did you just say you would oppose an interim measure?

Ms BARSON: I think we would rather frame it in the positive—that we would strongly support a holistic approach to reforming this Act, and it would be a missed opportunity to only see hate through the lens of making a single reform. Hate needs to be looked at in the entirety of its manifestations in the community, and that should be the goal of reviewing this Act. It should not be ‘How quickly can we just fix one thing?’. It should be ‘How quickly can we fix the whole thing?’.

The CHAIR: Thank you. I think you have answered the question, going back. The next step will be that we continue on with our public hearings to receive submissions and evidence. At the end of that process we will deliberate and put forward some strong recommendations, and a report will be handed to the Government. So I really do take the opportunity on behalf of the Committee to thank each and every one of your organisations and yourselves for being here today. It was a very good submission. I thoroughly enjoyed it, and I know my Committee members did as well. No doubt you will get a copy of the final report if we do not see you before then. Thank you again.

Witnesses withdrew.