

Better for Everyone F+E Con 2024 Video.m4a

[00:00:01] Thank you everyone for joining us here. We're coming together today on the land of the Gadigal people of the Eora Nation. I want to pay my respects to their elders, past and present, and to honour First Nations people with us here today in this room. My name is Leanne Smith, for those of you who I don't know I'm the Chief Executive of the Australian Human Rights Commission. And like the rest of our commissioners and staff, we're thrilled to be with you all for this very important conference that we've been working on for some time now. This panel that you've come to join, amongst the many others you could have chosen, is the panel 'Better for Everyone: Enhancing Australia's Anti-Discrimination Laws.' As many of you will be more than well aware, federal discrimination law has been at the forefront of how Australia has protected human rights and given effect to the environment.

[00:00:56] This is due to our international human rights law obligations. However, in the wake of the landmark 'Respected Work Reforms' aimed at addressing workplace harassment and discrimination, this session is going to dissect the current state of anti-discrimination laws in Australia and propose meaningful reforms to address the many existing gaps. From racial discrimination to gender inequalities, ageism, and disability rights, this discussion is going to address the many existing gaps. It's going to explore the intersectionality of discrimination, its impact on different segments of society, and how proposed enhancements to, say, existing streets of anti-discrimination laws many of which you would have seen in the Free and Equal report will strengthen legal and cultural protections for marginalized communities. So that's what we're going to talk about, and the incredible group of experts we have with us here to start the conversation today. I'm going to name them all and I'll ask you to relate to them. Please raise your hand so everybody knows who it is. Some will be more obvious than others. Robin Banks. Robin is a human rights lawyer and advisory group chair of the Melbourne Social Equity Institute. Professor Noreen Young, Associate Dean in Business at UTS Business School and First Nations Employment and Employment Diversity Leader. Kate Eastman, human rights lawyer and activist, wearing her fabulous shirt today.

[00:02:30] Jacqueline Cassisier, LGBTIQ plus rights advocate. And Associate Professor Sarah Moore, human rights lawyer and academic. I'm only going to introduce them in this brief way because I really want to get into the discussion, but I encourage you all, if you don't know any of our fabulous experts, to take a look at their profiles and bios on the Free and Equal website. Before we get into the lineup, we're going to have a live discussion that we're going to have today. One of our new commissioners, Professor Rosemarie Kayess, really wanted to be part of this conversation today, but unfortunately she's on a plane headed to do work elsewhere. So before we start talking amongst ourselves, we wanted to share a video with some thoughts that Rosemarie wanted to share with each of you about discrimination law and so on.

[00:03:17] So Rose, do you mind starting that video? And Pamela, if you want to turn around. Discrimination laws serve the community very well. Without an overarching human rights act, we have a very piecemeal rights protection in Australia. Federal discrimination law has to do all the heavy lifting in protecting people's rights. Federal discrimination law is essentially a reactive

process and there is very limited proactive. Mechanisms, so we're only dealing with discrimination after the event rather than doing proactive work to avoid discrimination happening in the first place. The recent changes to the Sex Discrimination Act are an outlier amongst the pieces of legislation that we have. And for people with disability, the DDA is fundamentally unworkable these days and that is further compounded by the fact that people with disability have the onus placed on them to drive change and to fight for their rights.

[00:04:48] And that's even within the elements of the DDA that have a systemic framework behind them and require, again, individuals with disability to bring individual complaints if there are breaches of, say, the standards or if people don't meet their action plans. We have no strong regulatory framework to drive proactive action. If I had a wish list, what I would like to see is a strong Human Rights Act, the National Human Rights Act, that covers all attributes and has a strong equality provision but also is complemented by a strong anti-discrimination framework and law. And at the moment, we don't have a strong anti-discrimination framework. The DDA is fundamentally unworkable and we have different tests across most of the four siloed pieces of legislation that we have.

[00:06:09] The decisions in both Slawos and Purvis have made the DDA unworkable in many senses, with both direct and indirect discretion. So, until we get some uniformity, we can't have strong protection of unlawful discrimination. I think it's unfortunate that the Disability Royal Commission's findings didn't indicate that there is a lack of uniformity across our discrimination laws. It's unfortunate that, mainly because people with disabilities throughout the Disability Royal Commission spoke strongly about the need to be seen not as a homogeneous group and to recognize that there are intersections and that intersectionality is a real experience. Intersectional discrimination is a real experience for people. So, we need to make sure that we fix discrimination law in Australia for all people and be able to recognize that intersectionality. If we don't have a uniform approach, then we're not really addressing equality. They're not providing all of Australians with equal protection under the law. It's very difficult to manage it if we haven't got uniformity across all attributes. Until we get some uniformity across the attributes, we can't effectively deal with intersectional discrimination.

[00:08:12] Our thanks to Rosemary for making that contribution in the middle of everything else she has on her plate. We've got two more questions at the moment. So thank you again to our panelists for joining us today. We're going to dive into some questions, but I do want to make sure we have time for some of you to make some comments or questions. So I think we'll have a panel discussion until 12:30 and leave 15 minutes for that interactive engagement. If anybody wants to remind me if I'm going over time, please feel free. So the first question we wanted to open up with is to get the perspectives of our panelists around their experience of how well our current federal discrimination laws serve the communities that they work with.

[00:08:57] So I might start off with you, Kate. I know that you wanted to give some historical perspective on that. Thank you, Leanne. Hello to everybody. I'm delighted to be here and see so many friends and colleagues in the room. So I am only speaking in a personal capacity today. I'm not speaking as a Law Reform Commissioner or in any other capacity. So I'm going to just give you

that reservation. But I think my perspective was thinking about why and how we first developed discrimination law. And essentially, a Racial Discrimination Act is a political device. It was a strategy to constitutionally invalidate Queensland laws that deprive First Nations people of so many rights. The Commonwealth of Australia is the only country in the world that has a law that doesn't have the power to make those laws. And so it was a very innovative step to look to international conventions and the external affairs power to test the Commonwealth's power to make those laws. So our relationship with equality law and discrimination started really as political strategy. And then that strategy was then adopted in our Sex Discrimination Act, where we also looked at international law, as well as other little cocktails of constitutional law. And so I think

[00:10:27] lot kind of more about that, which was going to be by the way. That both things have been articulated in place, and I am. It would be interesting to get the same point, kind of what a bill of rights was about different aspects of international law, and Corn Lastly, How does this certainly start to – I think when I try to different purpose, and we've never stepped back and said, 'What are we actually doing around equality generally?' So, things Rosemary is talking about is this sort of natural consequence of how we've approached the development of equality laws and discrimination laws in the country. So, that setting is important. I always sort of go back and look at the history because it helps me understand why did we take this path, you know?

[00:11:08] Things like there's been over 60 amendments to the Sex Discrimination Act since 1984, and so we've had a very sort of piecemeal approach to how we've looked at these issues. Thanks, Kate, and I think it's a good reminder about how government can look to international human rights law as a hook for policy. Robin, I wanted to go to you next because I know this is an issue you've dealt with in your research. Yeah, thanks. So, through my practice, I guess I've been keeping away from privilege law for quite some time, and you know? My view is the law is falling well short of expectations. And part of what I observed was the fact that we don't talk about or think about prejudice in the discrimination law space yet, that's what it's sort of about, addressing.

[00:11:52] We hope whether it's active, you know, conscious prejudice or other forms of prejudice. In my research, I interviewed seventy people across Australia and I'm going to speak particularly from the perspective of disability because I'm here instead of Natalie Wade so I want to ensure that voice is heard here. Everybody I spoke to with disability spoke of the frustration of discrimination laws, the sense that if you managed to get an outcome, it was sort of effectively not enforceable. If you had the courage to take the action, and you had the capacity to see it through the process, then it really wasn't an effective mechanism. Enormous frustration with that element of the Disability Discrimination Act, but also state and territory law. So I guess for me, it's the whole kit and caboodle.

[00:12:44] Another thing was the sort of great hope of the sort of more proactive mechanisms of the DDA had failed partly because of the reliance on individual complaints again. So, despite being called standards and purporting to set standards, they're not standards that are enforceable by a regulator, and instead, the individual has to find a way into that process. So, there's so many things about discrimination law that I think people reflected to me that that were really about how it hasn't met its potential. It's certainly there were many people who said it had made a difference,

so it has a normative effect that's really important. But it's probably not well enough known. It hasn't become sufficiently integrated into the minds of businesspeople and people who run government and other things.

[00:13:36] It's not front and center when they're doing things, and all of that makes it a much less effective tool for the kind of social change that I think was intended either for political or other reasons. Thank you, Robin. Hassan, I wanted to go to you next this question that we're talking about is about how these laws serve the community and I think you had some stories to share. Thank you. I mean, I concur with what's been said. There has been a lot of change and positive change as a result of these laws, and I think it's important in this conversation while we talk about some of the gaps, we don't lose sight as well of the incredible progress that's been made because of the normative place that discrimination laws have taken.

[00:14:19] They've been replicated in every state and territory as well to some degree, including for LGBTI people, obviously. Equality Australia is a national organization that looks after and supports the people who are at risk for the and for equality issues concerning that community in my community, but we know still that gaps in those laws, particularly for religious schools, for religious organizations, have created discrimination against our community. Just over two weeks ago, a teacher called me because she'd been terminated on the basis that her same-sex relationship was a breach of her employment contract. The reason that's allowed is as a gap in the sex discrimination Acting on the Fair Work Act, which also has gaps in it, two acts that don't really talk to each other, and then gaps in the New South Wales law.

[00:15:08] So, if we're thinking about a holistic improvement, I think we do need to look at those gaps that currently exist in the law and start to close them. If we are thinking more holistically, we also need proactive mechanisms so that it isn't incumbent on that teacher who lost her job to bring the complaint. Because we'd have a regulator that stood behind her and said, 'We're going to close that complaint, and her and impose standards, and enforce standards, so that the school couldn't fire in the first place and we've seen when those gaps are closed. We've seen some examples of positive duties, for example, in Victoria, the ACT, nor Northern Territory, a few of those discussions happening.

[00:15:47] It isn't left to that person who's looking for the next job, looking to pay their mortgage, looking after the four kids - now they have to think about how to feed and educate to after the fact, try and remedy the discrimination that they faced. We also took an action and it was successfully conciliated. But even as an organisation that took an action, as a representative of our community, we had questions around our standing raised so There's so many little technical things, and then we had to think, would we crowdfund to cover the cost if we lose if we lodge in court? So just all those little pieces mean that if you're hurt, if you feel humiliated, if you've already experienced discrimination, so many people just get up, walk away because it's too hard to kind of enter that system and it's sort of too late.

[00:16:44] It's a lack of access to justice. Yeah, um, Noreen can I come to you next and get a sense of how you think these laws are serving communities in the workplace context? Well, thanks

Leanne, they're not... sorry, and um, as you said, I speak from the workplace perspective. and i'm reading out what i actually wrote down because i do have a tendency to digress um while they impact the zeitgeist their non-enforceable nature and the utterly dismal failure of the hr industry to deal with their application adequately over 45 count them 45 years means that enforcement of the hr industry is a very important part of the hr industry and i think it's a very important part of the hr industry and i think it's a very important part of the hr industry and and indeed application is patchy and wishy-washy my experience goes to the range of businesses government ngos small large medium employers over The years, and I don't think I have ever seen adequate application of these laws.

[00:17:46] The problem we have is that while they impact the zeitgeist and cult workplace culture, they're non-binding and they are policies at the workplace which it seems to me the Australian community thinks is optional and you can either opt in or or opt out, and you can say what you like at work um and so my experience, my current um focus is on the RDA but I've had experience over many years with the SDA and the DDA as well. As Gassan pointed out, the um inter-jurisdictional crossover is a very important part of the HR industry, and I think it's a very important Part of it is difficult because of the binding nature of industrial law, and that's understood at workplaces. Most people understand if the award's breached and they understand that that is binding that's the zeitgeist issue.

[00:18:40] But the Australian community, due to the dismal failure of the HR industry, doesn't seem to understand that those policies are binding as an employee. I wonder how much that has impacted on um, the lack of understanding of the nature of the human rights act on us as participants in the society. Thanks Noreen, um Sarah, lastly to you - what's been the impact of federal anti-discrimination laws? In a small jurisdiction like South Australia, where you operate, yeah thanks, um I think I agree with what the panelists have said so far that, um, you know federal discrimination law is sort of the most important part of the HR industry and I think it's so important in small jurisdictions because it does that normative work and sets that standard and I think that's critical.

[00:19:30] But it only changes things on the ground if people understand what it's about and if they can access it in a practical way. And just like the panelists have said, it's now the case that you really do need specialist legal advice to navigate whether you're Going to pursue a claim at the state level or at the federal level or fair work act kind of jurisdiction, and then you also need to navigate these tests. And we have things like comparator tests that really lean into a kind of deficit model of difference, and ask us to compare ourselves to an imaginary normal person. Then we have exceptions that are complicated and really difficult for people to understand: why do we think it's legitimate for someone to do something that, on the face of it, is discriminatory?

[00:20:18] And then we have the cost issues as well. So I think in South Australia, we've got a very very hard working but small Commission and when resources are tight, you have to focus on dealing with the complaints before you, and you can't do that broader educative role that's absolutely needed. And if the normative standard is going to mean anything on the ground, thank you, Sarah. So, the next question we

wanted to discuss was something that Rosemary referred to - 'If each of you had a wish list, what would you like to fix about the discrimination law framework and why?' And Kate, I might start with you again because I know you wanted to look at a big picture.

[00:20:59] I've got a very long list, so I won't take up the rest of the panel's time, but I think I would like

To start with, rethinking the relationship between discrimination and equality, and to really understand that equality can come in a range of different forms. Our discrimination was very much premised on some slightly old-fashioned notions of formal and substantive equality, but direct and indirect discrimination. So, for people with disabilities, that is just a model that doesn't work. So, we need to really be re-visioning our discrimination laws to say, what does it mean to be equal? What does it mean to recognize that difference and diversity is part of equality, and how do we think about inclusion?

[00:21:50] So, that's the first Things, the second part about the next uh moment is our law so marijuana that is about its lovely cities and it's a point Robyn's made is prejudice privilege power and shame all sit under the experience of being discriminated against. And we need to think about how do we make our laws responsive to human experiences? Our laws are very much sort of functional in the sense that discrimination occurs in particular locations and places, so in the same way that we've got work accommodations services, whatever it might be, they're also siloed, and we don't live in that world. So I start my day in my home, I might Experience discrimination for my teenagers in the home, but that's not a place where the law really applies.

[00:22:45] But it does depend on other things that might happen to me there. Then, I get on the train, and discrimination law kicks in there, on a service provider. And then, I arrive at work, so when I get through the The premises, I've been accessed to premises, go up the lift, I'm then in a workplace. When you sort of follow through these very sort of siloed areas where we designate where conduct will be lawful and unlawful, we then get to Sarah's point and that is what exceptions might apply when I'm coming into the building but once I'm in there it's not. And then depending on who I have the interaction with in my workplace, I might have a ground to be complaining about sexual harassment or I might be dealing with a person who's actually not covered by that law at that time.

[00:23:32] And so what we don't have is sort of consistency that's responding to what the fundamental problem is and that is around equality, recognizing discrimination and saying what do we want from these laws. So I think it's really this realisation. Revisioning, I hope that you've got my message quite strongly on that today, I hope. But really, thinking about making our laws serve the purpose for the people who are to be protected, rather than serving the purpose because that's an easier way of drafting or understanding those laws. Thank you, Kate. Robyn, I think you wanted to add some substantive and also some process-related wishes. Yeah, so in my PhD, I ended up with a PhD. I think it's 38 or 35 reforms, and they span the substantive text of the legislation, the overarching purposes of the legislation, and the procedures.

[00:24:27] So one of the things I found in my research was that when we first had discrimination

law in Australia at a federal level, the rate of success for complainants in court cases was about 60%. Same time in Canada it was about 60%. Still about 60% in Canada, lucky them. It has dropped below 10% in Australia. There is something fundamentally wrong with the way our courts are dealing with discrimination law. And it goes to things like evidence, the fragmentation of the experience, a whole lot of things. So my PhD, I sort of came at it from the point of view that psychologists do a whole lot of work around prejudice. They know a whole lot of things about prejudice and how it manifests.

[00:25:08] I want the law to reflect that knowledge, to get to the richness that what a person with disability experiences as discrimination is often not. It's often very different to what an Aboriginal person experiences. And for people with disability, the dominant, or one of the dominant experiences is around paternalism and overprotection. Now, I don't know how many judges would see that as egregious and in contrast to hate speech. It is equally a form of discrimination, but it's much harder argument to make unless our judges understand that richness of those different experiences. So there's a whole lot of recommendations I would make to how we test for discrimination, how we describe it, what kind of evidence judges should be listening to and hearing from.

[00:25:54] There are also lots of really fantastic mechanisms in other parts of the world that are much more proactive than we have here in Australia, that we should be adopting, we should be implementing here, to take the pressure off the individuals because the individuals just don't have the resources. I mean, we're talking about often the most disadvantaged people in Australia, driving perhaps the most core important thing of democracy, the idea of equality. And that seems fundamentally flawed to me. And when it comes to the rate of success, there's a difference between the rate of success for people under the Race and Disability Discrimination Act. It's about a third the rate it is for women who bring, or people who bring sexual harassment complaints, and I'll say women because almost all of them are.

[00:26:38] So over that whole period, sexual harassment complaints have run at about 60% success rate. Disability and race are around 25%. Now, one of the explanations I think for that is that our judges don't understand that experience that people with disability have and racial minorities have as discrimination. Whereas they do understand, for whatever reason, perhaps because they've been told a lot about it, that sexual harassment is a form of very egregious conduct. Thanks, Robyn. Do you want to jump on that? Well, I think that, just to add, this isn't my response, but to add, I think the flurry of attention that has been on, around me too. And there's a lot of women, or people who identify as women, across the country. And so it's a commonality of experience that we'd all gone through over a long period.

[00:27:40] But it also entered, I keep talking about the zeitgeist today, but why? But it also entered the populist discussion, I think. I'm not sure how. And it seems to me there's a hierarchy of privilege within how that all operates. And sexual harassment's number one with a bullet kind of thing, now. So, but again, how did we get to a stage where we had to have an inquiry? What has the human resources industry been doing? For 45 years, well, how many years in the case of, 35 in the case, I think I wrote a thing on this 10 years ago for the 25th anniversary. What have they been

doing? That we had to have an inquiry after 35 years of the Act being in place around workplaces. Not a bad thing.

[00:28:35] Things have worked out well. A lot of the recommendations I'd tidy up a bit and strengthen. But it is what it is. And it's what we've done. It's what we've got at the moment. So, I think there's a hierarchy in sex discriminations kind of acceptable to talk about now. Noreen, what else on your wish list? Well, I was going to talk about what Ghazan's seeking. Do you want to go first? No, no, I want you to because what I wanted to talk about pertains to what we said you were going to say. But, you know, it's impromptu. It's not stitched up. Ghazan. Okay. So, if we could just start again, I would have a very different wish list from where we're at.

[00:29:22] And the issue is we have a constitutional system that kind of divides in a very unusual way as to where you can get your remedies. We have states and territories that have already passed laws that broadly mirror the same model that we have at the federal level. So, if we're going to rip it all up at the federal level and restart again, what are we going to do about where most people go for their remedies today because it's so expensive? So, I just want to take it back and say there are some quick wins that are on my wish list. There's a costs bill right now in our federal parliament that will protect complainants from adverse costs orders. So, the first thing I'd like to see is that bill passed.

[00:30:07] The second thing is the government promised. They promised to close the gaps on religious schools. We have been talking about it for so long. We now fund them. One in three students go there, and two in five staff are employed by them. It is time for them to play by the same rules as everyone else. Once that's done, and once that's done, I have a long wish list. You know, the test for discrimination doesn't work. But I don't think we should entirely throw it out because I think there is some familiarity with the concept of direct and indirect. So, my vision is for an inclusive test on discrimination which includes those but isn't exhaustive of those attributes.

[00:30:53] I like the idea of a harassment-based provision that sits on its own because it's easier to understand than trying to show how harassment is a form of discrimination. I'd like us to get back to the idea of characteristics and stereotypes rather than just attributes. These are under-realised parts of our acts that are never used. And when I speak to lawyers about, look, you're bringing a gender identity claim. Why don't you bring a sex-based claim as well and say characteristics related to sex means gender stereotypes? And they're holding us all back, not just trans people. And rather than having these debates about different attributes, all of the attributes can speak better together if we think a bit more creatively about the cases.

[00:31:37] The other thing I would say is section 26 of the Sex Discrimination Act, which is effectively a de facto Bill of Rights, is so under-utilised. Commonwealth programs and laws and powers exercised under those laws that are exercised in a discriminatory way can be challenged. And if you go through there's some representative actions that can be taken. So, I think we can be creative as well with what we have. But yeah, there's a long list, but I'd like costs and those gaps fixed. Thank you. That was really helpful. Noreen, do you want to jump on that then? So, what Ghassan said. And I have a kind of, I've been very grumpy about this for a long time because as a

young union organiser, I was an organiser for the Independent Education Union.

[00:32:26] Well, it was the Independent Teachers Association then. And my most, and the story that is, that always sticks in my mind about this. And the patchy and wishy-washy nature of the applicability was this: I was about 25 or something. I was the duty organiser, which meant that you took the phone calls from union members coming in. A gentleman rang one afternoon after school, and you always got the most hairy ones after school. And he said, 'I work in a private school. I'm in primary school. I'm HIV positive.' And it was just immediately post the height of that horrible time. And my doctor has told me not to disclose at work. And I thought, 'I'm not sure.' So, I'm ringing you. I'm ringing the union.

[00:33:27] What do you think?' And I said, 'I'm going to have to go and ask someone because I was only a junior burger.' And I went and asked the secretary of the union. And he said, 'Why don't you ring the Christian brother who is in charge of that particular diocese and ask him what he thinks? No.' So, I did. It went really well. And he said, and if you know anything about the Catholic Church in Sydney, you'll know exactly what diocese that it was because it was a Christian brother. And he said, I will go and talk to my staff and find out who the principal is. Right? So, the culture at that workplace was so dependent on the individual school leadership.

[00:34:14] And he said, and I'll find out if it's safe for the gentleman to disclose, and I'll come back to you. Anyway, he came back and he said, no. That principal won't be sympathetic or empathetic, and will sack the person. Now, this is the CEO of the education thing in the diocese. And it struck me then that, well, and this wasn't the only issue. I learned about canon law. I'm not Catholic. I learned about all kinds of things during those years. But what really struck me then was the selectivity, the selectivity of the nature of whether those things could be applied. So, what Ghassan said, it is an utter disgrace. And it needs to change with immediacy. But secondly, again, it's the optional nature of opting in to whether you comply with policies at the workplace.

[00:35:15] And going back to that example, that would seem to me an absolute classic. That's a great example. Thank you for sharing that. I think that it will make sense. I've got to say, and the lovely man who called rang me about eight weeks later and said, 'thank you for being so lovely.' I was like, that's, well, I was doing my job. But you were exactly right in that advice that you got. Thanks, Noreen. Sarah? Well, I think if I had one wish, I want a strong Human Rights Act. I think that would help us have a different kind of conversation in the community about equality. And I have that wish knowing that human rights law is really different to anti-discrimination law. So, like everyone, I want lots of wishes.

[00:36:01] And I want those gaps to be filled. I think they're probably more practical pathways for us to focus our energy at the moment, too. So, I definitely want to continue focusing energy on fixing those gaps. But when I teach first-year law students, I want to say: We have a right to equality in this country that belongs to everyone in this room; we all should be able to talk about and understand it. And then we can do the next step of saying, 'What does that mean in certain contexts?' How can you realize it and give legal effect to it? And we look to our anti-discrimination law for that reason. And I think we're stuck in a situation where, unless something has happened

directly to you that fits within one of these defined categories of anti-discrimination law, this whole area becomes something that you don't understand and find it difficult to talk about.

[00:36:58] And we get binary good guys and bad guys that make it so hard to talk to. We don't talk to politicians or talk to large groups of people from the community about this concept of equality. So, like Rosemary, I see a great opportunity to use this human rights language, use this concept of rights-mindedness to help us move forward. And in South Australia, I think it's particularly urgent we don't have a Human Rights Act. We don't have the infrastructure. When we get a legislative win on gender identity discrimination, for example, or domestic violence as a protected attribute, we don't realize the win because we can't talk about it and share that and empower people to access their rights. So, I'm hoping that human rights language might be another way we can start a different conversation about this.

[00:37:48] Thanks, Sarah. I think I've got time for one or two more questions to each of you before we open up to the floor. And Sarah, I might stay with you because I think I'll know the answer, your answer to this question. But we wanted to talk about our broad approach to law reform in this country over time. Has our approach been too reactive and not holistic enough or is incremental progress the way to go in a place like this? I don't think I'd say we've been too reactive. We have to take the wins where we see them. And if people are hurting, we have to do something. We have to mobilise around those communities and put the political pressure there and get the change we can realise.

[00:38:30] But I've been involved in conversations about the consolidation of federal discrimination law with some colleagues here from the Law Council many, you know, a decade or so at least ago. And we need a fresh start. We need a fresh way of thinking about it and talking about it with our political leaders and with our community. You know, but obviously we have to do both things. And the fresh start idea is for maybe people like me, academics – we can have that platform and start that discussion; whereas the incremental reform still needs to be a priority on the ground in each jurisdiction. Thank you, Sarah. Ghassan? I think there's a need for both – the holistic reform. But reality from my kind of day-to-day work is even when you get government commitments, you still have to push them.

[00:39:25] And the political reality has meant that my personal view is as long as we don't go backwards, any step forward is a good step forward. And we should strive further. But even if we get some but not all, then we've actually achieved a little more. And each time it will be easier because then you can point to that reform. The sky hasn't fallen in; all the threats that were made don't materialise. It happens every time. And I feel like I've been doing LGBTI advocacy for a very long time and I can almost predict the playbook every time. It's the same people on both sides. It's the same arguments. You know, first it was 'our kids' when we were talking about rainbow families. And then it's trans people.

[00:40:10] And it's the same things; the same things are said. So I think we aim high, but we do have to take the wins where we can. We have to work together as well. There's something here for civil society. When I've seen it really work well is when organisations coordinate together, have

submissions that are singing from the same song, the same song sheet, even if we're saying something slightly different or speaking from our perspectives. But thinking about those moments where we interact with the political environment, those moments of inquiries, and you know, take some time before the submission is due to talk with colleagues and work together so that you can each share each other's learnings, knowledge, support each other, even if you don't arrive at 100%.

[00:40:54] But that really makes a big difference because when we don't speak as a united voice, it's very easy to divide us up in a political arena. And so, you can get those wins if you work together. Thank you. Robyn? Both. And look, federally, the history of law reform in this space suggests to me that incrementalism is really the only option, which is a horrible thing to say. One of the things I want to respond and support Ghassan's point, Ghassan's comment about the sort of working together stuff. So I'm thinking back to the religious discrimination bill of 2019-20. And it looked pretty unlikely that it'd get through at one point there. And in Tasmania, we formed a coalition and we rejected the idea that it was 'gays against God', because it wasn't, or 'God against gays'.

[00:41:52] We recognised that a whole diversity of communities are affected when religions take narrow views of what equality means. So we had people with disability, we had migrant communities, minority religions, women, women's health. All of those groups came together. And that was really powerful. And certainly, speaking to our parliamentarians, they were sort of shocked, I think, at times about, particularly when they heard that people with disability have to put up with their day-to-day personal privacy being invaded by people laying on of hands and praying for them in the street. Now, that's a shocking thought to me. Maybe it's not to you. But it certainly, I think, shocked a number of people in the parliament that this was an experience that people in contemporary Australia were putting up with.

[00:42:38] And, you know, we were able to find one member of the Liberal Party who was courageous enough to cross the floor and to lead some of her colleagues across the floor; Bridget Archer. And last night, I think somebody asked whether there was anybody in the Liberal Party who'd support a human rights act. And I can guarantee you, that Bridget Archer would be that person. She would have the courage of her conviction. She believes in equality in ways that are profound and deep and wide. And so, you know, we do need to find the champions for the reform to happen. And for the big reforms to happen, we absolutely need to support those champions and congratulate them, and you know, really hold them up as examples to their colleagues of what good politics looks like.

[00:43:21] That the world can be a better place, and they can be a part of that. And at the moment, it doesn't feel like many of them understand that. And so I think to do the big reforms, we need that kind of courage and applause. The small reforms, I think we need to ensure that our politicians understand that this is complex law. And sometimes they stuff it up right royally when they just make a little tweak. They do a little amendment in the Parliament and it's like, what happened there? I'm thinking particularly of the reduction in the time limit. Federally, from what was 12 months to six months, just got caught up in a bill that was a much bigger bill. And nobody paid attention to that. That one went through.

[00:44:07] And I ask politicians, how did that happen? And they sort of go, 'what, did that happen?' You know, they really don't remember it. And judges will say, 'oh, the politicians know what they were doing.' And it's like, really? So I think it's both. I think we have got to dream big. And we've got to be pushing for the big. We've got to do that work; I think, of major reform. I don't think we should rush it. I think we should bring lots of people together to talk about what the possible things are. I think we need radical reform in the discrimination law. So I think that does take a little bit more work. But I think absolutely there are things that have been promised time and time and time again.

[00:44:47] And our politicians need to just get the work done. Yep, Narendra, you agree both? Yeah, both. I really like the fresh start. But I agree with Robyn. And I think we can learn from the Me Too movement because they made sex discrimination a commonality. And they brought people together. They brought women together around that experience. And it now takes quite a brave person to say that, well, you know, Bruce Lemon aside, but a brave person to say that, you know, I think this is OK. I'm a coalitionist and I've seen it be really effective. When I was CEO of Diversity Council Australia and we were bringing it back together because it had been in a pretty bad state, and we needed to have, we certainly needed to, for it to be perceived that we had broad support for diversity practice in Australia's organisations.

[00:45:49] And Tony Abbott was the Prime Minister. And so what we did was we had the late, my dear friend, Anna McPhee, who was a self-described, self-identifying conservative liberal but was close to Tony Abbott and had been the head of the Workplace Gender Equity Agency. She was the chair, and the deputy chair was Sam Mostyn, who was more identified with the work on progressive causes because I knew if we had both of them, no one could touch us. And they didn't. And it now has over 14,000 members. So I am a coalitionist. I think that we have an opportunity, and particularly thanks to disability activists who have created an awareness that this could be any one of us. This is lots of people's kids, that debate aside, about the role of parents.

[00:46:48] But this is our families. And I think Equality Australia did a great job around marriage equality of saying these are our families. These are our kids. These are our nieces and nephews. So I think we need to not be saying we're the marginalized. I believe we are the diverse Australian mainstream. And I think we need to approach it like that. Great framing. Kate, I think you wanted to take a slightly different lens to this question. Do you remember the question? Well, I've probably covered it, sort of earlier in terms of my big picture. I'm conscious of the time and the topics you wanted to hear. I'm happy to keep going. Well, I'm going to throw you a curveball now. Not a question we discussed. Thanks. I know, I know.

[00:47:34] But I really do want to give people a chance. So it's a quick one. And you won't be held to your responses. But as you all know, the PJCHR reported last Friday, or the report was tabled. And there wasn't a specific recommendation related to discrimination law reform, although there was a broader recommendation about reviewing all existing laws. So we're thinking about that at the Commission, about how we move forward. In terms of federal discrimination law reform, what do each of you think in terms of how we push forward, how we take it forward now? Any thoughts on that? Well, maybe just to respond to some of the points, because we delved into some of the

politics of it. One thing I would say is, never assume what people think from any side of politics, right?

[00:48:30] I have sat in so many rooms, closed doors with MPs who have surprised me from across the political spectrum. People are first people. And if you engage with them, you ask them, you understand the values that drive them, the interests that are at play, the pressures on them, you actually are able to see opportunities than if you just see them as siloed by party or by kind of politics. And I think that's a real risk for us as well, to assume that we only speak to the people who agree with us, and we only speak in a way that we think everyone else has to agree. And so when I walk into a meeting with an MP, some of them are actually very much minded by the idea that an employer shouldn't be invading into the private life of their employees, right?

[00:49:22] And that's how you'll get the argument on removing the exceptions for religious schools. Others will see it about child welfare, and you've got to create an environment where you don't take away opportunities from kids that will never come back again, because if you're denied that role as a prefect or whatever, you just hold someone back for the rest of their lives. So don't, I think, ever assume where the potential are. When those five members of parliament crossed the floor, you know, we were having conversations about that about two years before. And we built up the conversations to understand what the issues were, to educate MPs who were very time-poor about where the lines were and why it mattered, like why that Statement of Belief clause really went too far.

[00:50:15] The sadness I have is that we ended up that debate with actually a stalemate. There were no protections for people of faith, and there were no removals of the exemptions in our laws. And so I think reaching out to the unlikelies is as important as reaching out to your friends, because unless we build that broader alliance, they will always - the people who are opposed to this reform - find nice and nifty ways to get a letter together that makes them look like there's a lot of them with different stripes, and then scares you know the kind of politicians from action. So I would just say, talk to people that you're think of the people you wouldn't usually think of speaking to and open a conversation. And that is the hard work.

[00:51:02] That is. Who else has any ideas about how we move forward? Yeah. Part of me thinks that we need to get the procedural stuff right, really right. So the lack of regulatory mechanisms, both vested in the Human Rights Commission, but also co-regulatory approaches that mainstream compliance. So the only situation I can think of in the federal system where this is sort of happening is under the premises standards. Where the National Building Code is the regulatory tool and builders, developers, all those other people have to comply with it. And it's got the disability, discrimination standards embedded in it. And that co-regulatory model seems to me, it becomes part of industry's day-to-day work. And we need to do more of that. Like, I can't believe you can get a licence to operate an airline in this country and blatantly not comply with transportation law.

[00:52:10] Or requirements of the DDA. But you can. We've seen it happen. Bonza, I'm pretty sure, didn't comply. Tiger, when it came into Australia, was pretty blatant that it wasn't going to make sure its flights were accessible. That should never happen. Like, we've got regulatory regimes

that we should be using, not just the Human Rights Commission. Because sadly, the Human Rights Commission is not front and centre in everybody's minds, as you've said, Noreen. It is absolutely about the Human Rights Commission having the capacity to co-regulate with others. So I think all of that procedural stuff needs to be done. I do think there's a gap, and perhaps I should have said this earlier. I find it absolutely astounding that we have equal employment opportunity legislation - it's not called that anymore - that only applies to gender.

[00:53:03] Women are not the only people who experience barriers to equal employment opportunity. The rate of pay and the rate of employment for people with disability and for Aboriginal people in this country, and for racial minorities, is way below par. Yet we don't expect businesses to do that work across the different attributes. We say we're going to silo it for women, or for now, gender, but we're not going to require them to think about all the other groups who might be experiencing barriers. So that to me is a really – it's not an easy reform, but it should be a reform that we could achieve that would make, that would fill a really big gap, I think, in the capacity of our discrimination laws to do the work they need to do.

[00:53:52] And I sit on the fence around a single act, multiple acts, except for the issue of the intersection of attributes, which we've got to fix. It's just a stupid situation. Okay. I'm going to be very radical here. We will not get any real shift or change in federal discrimination law unless we have a very difficult conversation about the Human Rights Commission, its structure and how it operates. So, the Commission's structure is inherently siloed, and the work it does in discrimination is inherently secret. We've talked today about the difficulty of access to justice and complaint handling. I've been doing this for over 30 years. I think on my count, I'm up to about 6,000 discrimination cases. So people do use the law, but I'm also the holder of the most incredible secrets.

[00:54:46] So I can sit here and hear about how bad the law is and people don't get justice and whatever, but I've also got all these secrets where I can tell you, probably from some people in these rooms as well, that discrimination law has made a profound effect on people's lives to their benefit and to the good. But our model is very much the same. It's very much based on the secrecy around conciliation and that's attached to the fear of them busting out of conciliation and going to court. And so part of this is the structure of the Commission itself. This Commission was established after the old Commission, which was a policy Commission from 81 to 86, and the structure that we have reflects a structure that was developed in 1986.

[00:55:30] Guess what else happened at that time? We had a proposal for a Federal Bill of Rights. Ta-da! So we have the same thing that we're having now, and we've set up the Commission to reflect a structure that was going to incorporate that model, back to Bowen and Gareth Evans, and we've been stuck with that model, but it's completely siloed. So the frustration everybody's talking about around intersectionality will continue unless there is in effect a very significant restructure and rethink about the Human Rights Commission. So I'm sorry to that. I'm not trying to sort of make you all lose your jobs or anything like that, but I just think we really seriously have to have a look at this structure because it's not working any longer.

[00:56:12] It doesn't reflect the original model, which the subject-specific commission has actually ran the discrimination complaints in their particular area until 2001 when we went sort of to the new court post-Brandt system. So that has to happen. Otherwise, I think we're going to remain siloed, segregated and lose the opportunity for genuine reform. So, sorry, that's my controversial point. No, it's great, Kate. And, of course, one of our recommendations is a review of the Commission's structure because, as our President says, the Human Rights Act is the hole in the doughnut that the Commission was built around, and I think a lot of us would agree with you that that structure and function needs to change. I'm going to open to the floor unless anyone else has a fantastic suggestion for how we move forward.

[00:56:58] Sarah? I just wanted to say I think thinking carefully about what we're asking the community to do across a range of these different issues is important. So, I think that the strategies of working with politicians on the recommendations that have already been made must be the priority. If we're asking the community to mobilize, particularly in small jurisdictions, particularly in areas where the service delivery pressure is immense, we have to be pretty confident that we'll get something this time. So I think it's important that before we ask for a big, big new conversation around something, we think about that. And so I'm trying to, you know, remember that and what I'm suggesting about a Human Rights Act.

[00:57:42] Like, I think if we're going to mobilize around a Human Rights Act, then we have to think about what we're asking people on the ground to do, what stories we're going to use to support these ideas. And the same if we were to say, let's consolidate anti-discrimination law, we're asking people to turn away from their frontline job and do something part of this inquiry. And we just have to be careful about, you know, the ask that we're making. Thanks, Sarah. Maureen? Yeah, I just wanted to put my two cents in, speak from a blackfella perspective. I agree with Ghassan about never make assumptions about people. And I think, I think that's right, except as it pertains to First Nations people.

[00:58:36] And I think that there's a growing realisation and understanding that we're diverse and that we're not what you think we are. But even in the human rights sector, it's taken me a very, very long time for people to understand that we're very diverse and that we're not what you think we are. So I'd just like you to think about that for a little while. Thanks, Maureen. OK, we've got some time for questions. I think we've got a microphone. So hands up. And if you're comfortable to introduce yourself, that would be great. I see someone has a hand here. Hi there, Paulina from Fitzroy Legal Service. I'm just interested in the panel's view on the fact that, in my view,

[00:59:23] the discrimination legislation that we have takes a very all-lives-matter approach to things, in that a man is equally protected from gender discrimination as I am, and I, as a white woman, am equally protected from racial discrimination as an Aboriginal woman is, even though the structural and historical power behind that conduct is wildly disparate and has a wildly different impact. And I'm interested in your views about whether that has contributed to the issues that you've discussed today in terms of how the law has developed, but also in whether it has contributed to the normative power of these laws in terms of the message that it's sending about what is the evil that they're trying to address when it's so kind of generalised. Who would like to

start off on that? Absolutely.

[01:00:14] That's because we look at discrimination on a comparative basis, and we have to have a benchmark against which we're comparing. And for the most part, that benchmark really reflects a white male experience and it comes from - the way in which the most powerful person becomes, in effect, the benchmark for comparison. So we're not looking at different treatment, but we're looking at the extent to which that experience reflects, I think, as somebody said, the sort of hypothetical experience. So that comes from our definitions, and while they're there, that will remain the same. Effectively, all you're seeking to do is level a playing field, but a playing field that doesn't actually respond to the particular person's experience. That's a very sort of narrow, individualised model of looking at discrimination.

[01:01:09] So I think the question's excellent and that's the answer to it. While the definitions are there, it's not going to change. I'm just going to invite Noreen to...? It's a really good question. I think we, if we look at when the acts were formed, we're going to see that there was a lot of discrimination in terms of what the comparator was at the time and it was a straight white man. But I've also got to say it's been a bit - for a long time it was a bit lonely during, for example, the Women on Boards feminism period of the Human Rights Commission that was very; where the focus, the focus of the commission was on promoting upper middle class white women to boards. I think I was the only person who ever said anything publicly.

[01:02:01] The only one. So there becomes, and I understand why people bought into that. I understand the politics of the time and the situation. However, I think we need to take a collective responsibility for the commission; for example, and for the way the acts are utilised. So, yes, it does take an all lives matter. The comparator was white straight men. I think, for women and gender-diverse people, there's a lot of work to do, very practical work to do now, to move that perception of what women are and what women want out of the human rights framework because that's what has been put forward for so long. And I think they, those voices, those voices dominated around the respect at work piece as well, got to be honest.

[01:03:07] So now that there is community discussion around intersectionality, some of us have always been intersectional and have always talked about working class, I mean, I come from working class background, that's one of my intersections and I've certainly always identified as a black working class figure. I've always been a feminist with some cultural diversity thrown in and I think that's becoming okay now. But we need to future proof and we need to take responsibility. So next time that the focus of the actual Human Rights Commission is women on boards, can you all say something? Because it was really lonely. Thanks. Liz, I see another hand there, but I'm going to let Robyn respond to this while you take the mic over there.

[01:04:00] So the exception, of course, to that All Lives Matter is the Disability Discrimination Act, which is not a symmetrical situation. And I mean, there are a couple of others that I think of, and I can't remember; I'm so not good at sex discrimination federally, but the whole family responsibilities were for a long time quite asymmetrical, as my recollection, that effectively only women could... No, it wasn't? No, it was only family responsibilities in employment. That's right, it

was only in employment. So disability is an interesting example. We don't have an Act that says it doesn't matter what your abilities are; you're protected from discrimination. Because nobody, I think, can think of how you'd frame that, which is a really interesting challenge, that if we can do it with the DDA, can we not do some more work that says this is about prejudice, it's about historic prejudice, therefore it should be about those claims that are raised under that kind of model.

[01:05:00] And for me, it's very topical because of the Lau case against Mona, which infamously found the green room is in breach of discrimination law. You know, there's a case of a man challenging an art piece and saying, 'I, as a man, am discriminated against by this art piece.' Well, my argument is, no, he wasn't. He had an experience of that piece of art. He had, in fact, the intended experience of that piece of art. And her point was to shine a light on the experience of exclusion, the very fundamental form of prejudice that women experience. And the tribunal members sort of said, 'Oh, but that doesn't happen anymore.' I was like, 'Really? You're clearly not a woman, because we know it does.' So I do think it is important to think about ways we might remind people that these laws are supposed to do something to change the status quo.

[01:05:58] It's not about empowering power; it's about challenging power and stereotypes of different groups. Thank you. We have a question over here. Hi, I'm Mish Pony from Scarlet Alliance, the Australian Sex Workers Association. And so this is a follow-on from that question, where in states and territories, we are seeing some states and territories introduce protections for under sex work and sex workers as a protected attribute, whereas other jurisdictions are not. They are going for that broader trade professional occupation. In the New South Wales Equality Bill inquiry, one of the arguments against what we faced against introducing specific sex worker protections was that it was a form of exceptionalism. Does anyone on the panel agree that anti-discrimination protections should avoid that kind of exceptionalism and be more broad? Or should we be targeting discrimination where it occurs?

[01:07:00] I'm happy to answer that. I think it's a case by case basis. I think we need to name discrimination how we see it. So, you know, just like going around it doesn't address the normative change that you want to see in law. So, New South Wales is another example that homosexuality was the attribute, not sexual orientation. And at that time, homosexuality was illegal. So, in putting in that attribute, you named the prejudice that sat behind it; you were addressing. I think where it all falls down, though, is with the comparisons that need to happen. And so we've had to think about this with sex characteristics as an attribute versus intersex status. Even within gender identity, when you think about trans women and trans men, and we have gone round in circles to try and work out how the hell we are going to mount an argument where the experience of trans men, for example, is very different from trans women.

[01:08:00] And you're asking a comparison to be made by people of a different gender identity. So do we put trans men in the 'not' category when trans women are on the inside? These are the complexities of actually mounting a claim. And so what I think we need to first do is deal with the comparison, and then the attributes follow. Because unless you deal with this issue where we're constantly comparing who's the most discriminated or who is, you're not actually dealing with the person before you. You're always dealing with a class of assumptions about the attribute, but not

actually. Even in disability, I mean, what does that even mean when we think about how varied that attribute is, let alone race? And we've had courts trying to work out how you do a comparison between an Italian and a Greek.

[01:08:52] Both of which might have different experiences of discrimination in different contexts. So I think we need to deal with the comparison test or the comparator test that remains, and then think about how the attributes are defined to make sure that we're not doing these really artificial comparisons. I can see our colleagues from the ACT sitting there going, 'Yeah, we don't have comparisons.' And if you have a look at the developments in the ACT and the examples, and the innovation in the ACT, it's fantastic. It's a great model. So even things like it's unlawful not to make a reasonable adjustment. You don't have to compare anything to anybody. So good on the ACT. And just while we're talking about places like the ACT, I hear people say we should only have federal discrimination law, and I'm going to just push back really hard against that because it is the, particularly the social, not the smaller jurisdictions, but it's the state and territory jurisdictions that drive the change.

[01:09:56] The ACT, Tasmania's got some really lovely little bits in the legislation that we really enjoyed using. And that hopscotch effect is so vital to law reform in this country. So absolutely reject the idea that we just have one, and everybody just be beholden to the federal jurisdiction, apart from the fact you'd never get the feds to do it. We really need the kind of work that happens in the ACT to be able to be watched by other people and go, 'oh, we could do that, we could do that.' But I just wanted to respond to you, not to lose attention from your question. So Tasmania's always had lawful sexual activity, which I think was introduced probably around homosexuality, but has been used, certainly in my experience, much more by sex workers to protect their equality rights.

[01:10:45] So people being thrown out of hotels and other places because they're engaging in lawful sexual activity. And I guess one of the benefits of a slightly broader framing, but not as broad as trade profession, is that it can do some more work than you perhaps expect it to. But I think it's always worth thinking: Do we need the specific? Can we find something slightly broader than the specific? Or do we go with something that's so white-bread that nobody really knows why it's there? Yeah. We are over time. I would love to take another question, but I think I'm getting a bit winded up. We're going to lunch. Can we take one more question? And we can't have everybody respond, so we'll be targeted, Liz, I promise. Please.

[01:11:37] There's a microphone coming around the back now. Can I also just note that I've just clocked Susan Price, who was the only other feminist I know of who spoke out publicly against the women on boards period in Australia. I think she's a brilliant feminist. Love you. Hi. Sam Connor from People with Disability Australia. Thanks for taking my question. Just a quick one, combined with mine and Heike's, is that what do you do when discrimination is embedded in a business model or in, you know, everything else? So, you think about sheltered workshops, which still pay women with disability two bucks an hour and it's legal, and Heike? Cases like King and Jetstar, where the court has argued that if your operating model discriminates against people with disabilities, then the unjustifiable hardship part of the Disability Discrimination Act kicks in and

you're fine.

[01:12:35] Something we could, I hope, not ever imagine, that you would have a business model that discriminates against women and you could get away with that. But with disability, going back to the prejudice that both Rosemary and Robin mentioned, somehow you do get away with it. So how do we fix that? Who wants to take that? This is partly where I think co-regulation is really important, because I don't think an airline should be allowed to have a business model that is fundamentally discriminatory. I don't think they should be able to get a licence to fly. And I think the same is true of other forms of business; that we should regulate them. When Uber was the big thing, the next big thing, we had debates in Tasmania about Uber being allowed to operate in Tasmania and some of us pushed really hard for the state government to deem Uber a public transport provider for the purposes of the standards.

[01:13:24] Uber said, 'Oh no, you don't need to do that.' They said, 'You don't need to do that.' And the government said, 'Oh no, we don't need to do that.' And if they had been regulated in that way, then maybe the sort of complete failure to address physical accessibility of services, and in Tasmania there are not enough wheelchair-accessible taxis, the market was severely undercut by Uber being introduced, and so the market doesn't work anymore. For people with disabilities. And that was permitted by the failure to regulate Uber as a public transport provider. So I think we need to really tighten up on those other industry regulatory mechanisms to say to them, 'hang on, you should be paying attention here.' This isn't just the Human Rights Commission's domain; this is everybody.

[01:14:09] Can I just, I think it links in with the business and human rights model, and we can take from what we've sort of seen with the interest in business and the corporate world, on both modern slavery, human rights, and business, and the positive duty and sex discrimination, to actually see a different way about thinking about these issues. Because if business is only looking at it from what is their obligations in response to a complaint that's made, then that creates a very sort of adversarial style model where one side's defensive of its position and the other side is advocating really from a very limited power base of one person. One person against a larger organisation. So this is where the business and human rights model provides a very sound basis, and that needs to be part of the conversation in terms of a new Human Rights Act.

[01:15:01] If we just stop it at the door of government or public authorities, then the issues that you raise will not change. If we start to think about the relationship between business and government in a human rights framework, then those systemic and substantive changes can occur. They may take time, but you've got a framework to have the discussion, to deal with regulation, and you look at the very elaborate industrial fair work laws, there's civil penalties in there. There's a range of levers and different ways of achieving change, rather than just a complaints-based model. I think where we started, the onus is on the individual to advance their rights, and often they are up against some strong and powerful forces. Look, I have to wrap it up. What this conversation tells me is there's room to keep this conversation going, and we'll take that on board and think about the ways we can keep this conversation going. I know some of you had questions you didn't get to. Thank you to all of you amazing panelists. And thank you to all of you for joining us. Enjoy lunch.

