

TRANSCRIPT

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL LEGAL AND SOCIAL ISSUES COMMITTEE

Inquiry into Victoria's Criminal Justice System

Melbourne—Tuesday, 21 September 2021

MEMBERS

Ms Fiona Patten—Chair

Dr Tien Kieu—Deputy Chair

Ms Jane Garrett

Ms Wendy Lovell

Ms Tania Maxwell

Mr Craig Ondarchie

Ms Kaushaliya Vaghela

PARTICIPATING MEMBERS

Dr Matthew Bach

Ms Melina Bath

Mr Rodney Barton

Ms Georgie Crozier

Dr Catherine Cumming

Mr Enver Erdogan

Mr Stuart Grimley

Mr David Limbrick

Mr Edward O'Donohue

Mr Tim Quilty

Dr Samantha Ratnam

Ms Harriet Shing

Mr Lee Tarlamis

Ms Sheena Watt

WITNESS (*via videoconference*)

Ms Dianne McDonald.

The CHAIR: Thanks, everyone. Welcome back. We are really honoured and delighted to be joined by Dianne McDonald, who has got a life experience of the justice system and certainly has some strong ideas about how we can improve it.

Dianne, just to let you know that all evidence taken is protected by parliamentary privilege, and that is provided by the *Constitution Act* but also the standing orders of the Legislative Council. Therefore the information that you provide to us today is protected by law. You are protected against any action for what you might say today in this hearing; if you were to repeat it outside, you may not have the same protection. Any misleading or false evidence could be considered a contempt of Parliament.

Thank you so much for being here. This is being recorded, so you will receive a transcript of this hearing, and I would encourage you to have a look at that to make sure that we did not mishear you or misrepresent you in any way.

If you would like to open with some opening remarks, then we will have the broader committee discussion.

Ms McDONALD: Okay. All right. I have written some things down because I would like to focus on a few things. Thank you for inviting me to speak about my submission. My submission consisted of my story, which sadly is very long, and also some changes that I feel would assist victims to make things a little less stressful. What I would like to focus on today is coercive control and what I call revenge intervention orders and how a perpetrator uses them against you.

My victimology does not fit the usual domestic violence intervention order in that I only dated this person. He never stayed overnight. We never lived together, never married, never had children together, but sadly for me police refused to help me without an intervention order. But then, even with one, they considered that it was their business. With everything that was being done to me and the many police statements I made, the perpetrator was also going to centre management at Craigieburn Central to complain about me, but weirdly he was also asking for help to get back with me. I had many, many visits from centre management asking me what was going on. Then he started painting me as a really manipulative, vindictive person. He also then started going around to all the different shop owners, all the managers at different stores in the centre, and they would then come and speak to me.

So after a year of trying to keep my life together—my employment, everything—I had to leave. It was just too much, and I had to leave my management position that I had had for eight years. I was nearly 52 at this point, so it is not easy to find a new job quickly. And all that the police advised me to do was leave my job, move and get a new car.

The CHAIR: Oh, that simple, hey?

Ms McDONALD: Yes, that simple. I do not know where they thought I was supposed to go, because I was being attacked all over Melbourne. I had no safe place. There was no suburb that I was safe in. But I did change jobs and I did buy a new car, only because the damage that was being inflicted on my car at that time was getting very, very expensive. Now, this was also a car that my dad had given me, and he had passed away a couple of months before I met the perpetrator, so I was doing everything in my power to keep this car. But the last attack, with the panel damage and everything—the car was starting to get a little bit old—yeah, it was too expensive, too expensive to fix.

So in regard to moving, that was not an option. I had literally just moved back to Melbourne, in 2013, and had a daughter that did not settle very well into school—did not like the move. She knew no-one. It was difficult for her and also for me, because I would go in and open Big W, get all the money out of the safe, put all that in and then leave work to go home, pick her up and take her to school. Now, school was a 5-minute walk, but otherwise she would not go. She was going into VCE. There was no chance that I could move, because when I finally got her settled so she could focus on her VCE—before then, she was looking at failing VCE due to attendance, so that was not an option. Having said that, to protect both of us I redrew money out of the equity of my home, which meant I could buy a new car, I could put cameras around my house, I could put roller shutters in and also turn my carport into a garage to protect the new car.

So this was all about the perpetrator having control over me, and it worked. I changed my life so I would not be attacked. I stopped going out. I stopped seeing friends and family. I stayed at home so I was safe, my family was safe and my car was safe. This only gave him more power and entitlement.

So with me not going out and about, he started to use the court system against me. The first attempt was in 2015, which was because I was granted a one-year intervention order against him. I went in with evidence and police statements to obtain this order, but for him, he took me to court on hearsay. He told the court he had spoken to my ex-husband and that my 16-year-old daughter had given him the phone number. None of this happened. My daughter would not give out her father's phone number, and especially to him. So I am in court, all alone, and I had to defend myself. I could not find a lawyer to help me because with each lawyer that I rang there was a conflict. Even the women's legal service had a conflict. They had helped him somehow previously. So I go in there, defending myself, and it did not feel that—you know, 'Why was I there?'. Because you know, he was telling the magistrate that my ex-husband said I had an angry and violent temper, and I was this and I was that. None of it was true. Where was his evidence? I was in court all day. Because I would not consent to an order, the magistrate kept halting proceedings to hear other cases, so we had to wait in the courtroom. So 4 o'clock, 4.30 in the afternoon, I finally agreed to an undertaking, to get out of there. I was mentally exhausted.

I had actually taken in with me a witness to what the perpetrator was doing to me at work. She was a work colleague, worked in a different department, but she had witnessed him doing things and had made a police statement in regard to that. So in the end I agreed to the undertaking, not realising what that meant for me, and I was actually held back in court while he was able to leave so that he could leave and be safe from me.

So Sue and I eventually left, it was now nearly 5 o'clock, and we walked back to Broadmeadows shopping centre—that is where we had parked—and Sue went inside. It was Thursday night, the shops were open. And I sat in my car, just going through messages, phone calls and whatever, and I eventually left. When you turn out of Broadmeadows shopping centre, if you go left or right, it does not matter, there are traffic lights to get out. So I am sitting at the lights and I look in my mirror and he is behind me. So I debated whether to just stay there and call 000 or, when the light went green, to just go. Like I said, I was mentally exhausted. I just wanted to go home. So that is what I did.

The second attempt was in 2017. Now, I had obtained a 10-year intervention order. This time the perpetrator was successful in getting an order against me. He took in evidence—I guess I can say this because I am protected—but he actually created it from a Facebook post. Now, you have got to remember the time: 2017. There were lots of home invasions and everything, and people were putting up really violent comments in regard to what they would do if anyone entered their home. So what he did was copy and paste all of—I do not know who they were. We actually had the same magistrate from when I got the undertaking.

So the original post that I had put up on Facebook was in regard to someone being out in front of my home, wearing a balaclava, driving to and damaging, whatever, my house. So what he did, he took out the video that I had put up and put in a photo of himself. He put in a photo of himself harassing one of the store managers at Craigieburn Central. These are all photos that were mine. I do not know how he got them. So the magistrate actually believed that this post was real. By this point I did actually find a lawyer and he was arguing that this post did not exist. His lawyer was saying that once it is on the World Wide Web, it is on the World Wide Web; it does not go away. But we were saying it is not even on there in this format.

The CHAIR: I am assuming it was just a printed version of that in court?

Ms McDONALD: Oh, yes, yes, and he could not prove it online, because it was not there. But the magistrate did not care. He actually said to us, 'That's neither here nor there'. Well, for me it was, because it did not exist. He then told my lawyer to take me outside to talk to me about agreeing to the intervention order. Luke, my lawyer, went to the counter to see when we could have a directions hearing and a contested hearing. So I was looking at nine months for all of that, and the magistrate had made it perfectly clear he was going to give me a 12-month order anyway. So in my head I thought, 'Oh, great. I've got nine months of an interim order, then he is going to give me another 12 months'. So I cut my losses. We went back in there and agreed without admission to the 12-month intervention order. Then the magistrate just said, 'Yes, well done', and he actually smirked at me. Yes, I just felt—you know, 'Whatever'.

But then Max started arguing that he wanted a 10-year intervention order. He was not happy with the 12 months, he wanted the 10 years—argued, argued, argued—and the magistrate finally said, 'I don't do that. One year. Get your paperwork and please leave'. So I suffered with that order for a year. I did not shop

anywhere in Craigieburn. I would go over to Blackburn and see my mother who at this point was now in a nursing home, and I would shop in Templestowe on my way home or, if I needed something quickly, I would drive 15, 20 minutes to Greenvale to get milk or whatever or ask my children to grab whatever I needed quickly. I would not go out anywhere in Craigieburn, because if he could get a photo of me in Craigieburn, he would use that against me and say, 'Well, I took this photo of her and then she attacked me'. So I did not give him any opportunity to be able to do that.

Again, it is just revenge and control—all this is about. So for me coercive control is huge. It is a huge issue and it is ongoing. He is still doing things. So he is actually winning at the moment, to a certain degree, because we have recently been back in court. You may or may not have noticed that the programs have been taken down, off air.

The CHAIR: Right. No, I had not.

Ms McDONALD: No—as a result of what he started from prison. So they should be back on air shortly.

The CHAIR: Right.

Ms McDONALD: So all of this, him using coercive control against me, has cost me money—like tens of thousands of dollars. It has affected my employment. The position I have now I am grateful for, and they hired me knowing what was going on, but it was also a massive pay decrease. And lastly, obviously, it has cost me my sanity. Yes, and all this because I rejected him—all this.

So this is why I think coercive control needs to be criminalised. Intervention orders also need to be looked at, especially when a perpetrator has a massive intervention order against them and is then taking the victim to court. They need to see that for what that is. It is just revenge. It is just control. Because you have to be in court, you have to defend yourself. It costs you money that you do not have. I was lucky; I had equity in my home. For the lawyers, I actually borrowed money off my mother to pay for them.

So that is why I am really strongly for coercive control to be criminalised, just so police can be trained. I am quite happy to go to the academy at the grassroots and let them know what it does to a person. You know, I am not physically violated, in a sense. My mental health is, but they need to see what damage that actually causes to a person. All of this is just the tip of the iceberg, because I can obviously go on about this for a very, very long time.

The CHAIR: And we have all got your testimony in front of us as well.

Ms McDONALD: Yes. So I will just finish by asking you to put yourself in my position, to know that this person will attack you but you do not know when and you do not know how. So coercive control is actually life changing, and it has been going on for years. How would you feel living with this?

The CHAIR: I would feel absolutely frightened and terrorised.

Ms McDONALD: Yes, that is a good word—because you do feel like you have your own terrorist, your own private terrorist, and we see how the government looks at terrorism. Well, this is no different. It is no different.

The CHAIR: Dianne, I am sure it is never easy to retell that story and relive some of those circumstances. This notion of the tit-for-tat kind of IVOs on this—there may be circumstances when there is a mutuality, and that might be acceptable, but what should we do? So in your circumstances where you had, in the end, been taken to a point that you had to take out an order against Mr Gardiner and then he turned around and tried to take one out on you, what should have been the response in the courts or at that point?

Ms McDONALD: At that point they should have asked him, 'Have you been to the police? Where are your police statements? What has been happening to you?'. But the first time it was all hearsay—that he had spoken to my ex-husband. And, for the record, I actually get along really, really well with him, and we all catch up as a family for birthdays and Christmas celebrations. There is no ill feeling whatever. So, yes, they should have asked, 'Where is some physical evidence? Where are your police reports?' against 'What is she doing to you?'—not just 'what she might do to you that you are in fear of your life because of what her ex-husband said'. That does not make sense. How can a magistrate believe that, when there is no record of me ever, ever,

ever being violent? He has an extensive history long before, you know, what he does to women; there are also other things in his history that are incredibly violent.

The CHAIR: Do you think any of that was looked at or viewed by the courts when he made his application?

Ms McDONALD: No, no. I think it should be. I think his history should play a part in it, just so the magistrate can get a better picture of what is going on, what is his history? What is her history? Look into mine as well. I am quite happy for you to do that. There is nothing there. You are not going to find anything. You are not going to find anything. But with him, it would have been massive—

The CHAIR: Yes. So what you are asking is that more care is taken when these orders are issued?

Ms McDONALD: Yes, yes. I would always go armed with evidence. I would take in witnesses. I would take in my police statements, footage, the flyers. For the first intervention order I obtained I only had one flyer, and the second intervention order I had five more.

The CHAIR: When you say ‘flyer’, this is something that he had printed?

Ms McDONALD: Yes, he had created it, and we do actually know what facility he was using to do that, but they would not help us. I do not know what you saw on the show, if you saw the programs; they showed the flyers that he was putting up. In a nutshell, there were apartments being built, and one of the venues where he was putting these up on their front windows was right near a train station—so a lot of foot traffic, a lot of tradies going to one of the venues for drinks and everything—and he was basically offering my services. He was trying to get me raped using my photo, my phone number—everything: if they wanted a good time, then this is what I would do for them. So they actually got worse. They were the ones in the beginning. They actually got worse.

The CHAIR: Thanks, Dianne. I will hand over to Kaushaliya. Thank you. Kaushaliya.

Ms VAGHELA: Thanks, Chair. Thanks, Di, for your time today, and I am really sorry to hear about everything that you have been through. You also asked the question: what would we do if we were in your position? I do not think any woman should have to go through what you have been through—or any men. No-one should go through what you have been through.

Ms McDONALD: It can happen in reverse, exactly. It can, yes.

Ms VAGHELA: Yes. Now, I understand that although your experiences with police have been mixed, you have had some very positive interactions with police officers. Can you tell us about those? I imagine you would like to see all police act that way.

Ms McDONALD: Yes. As soon as a person goes in and makes a statement, they should be believed, they should be taken seriously. I never was. They all thought it was petty. They actually knew him. They had a long history with him so they knew what he was like, yet for three years I struggled on my own. It was only that I went to like a town hall meeting. Both political parties were asked to attend and only the Liberals did, and they stepped in and helped me. I saw them after the meeting and asked—pleaded—for help. So then I was assigned a sergeant and an informant. But what happens with police is they get moved, they get transferred a lot. So I then lost all that help that I was starting to get.

Then after court one day Max Gardiner went after my youngest daughter at her workplace in Broadmeadows. He was there, wearing what he wore in court; he had his court paperwork with him. He was in the store for 9 minutes looking for her, asking anyone where she was. To this day, I do not know what he wanted. I knew court had not gone very well that day. He had actually perjured himself in saying that someone else was driving the car, that it was not him driving behind me. I had footage, two witnesses, and we went back into court. He had to then say, ‘No, it was actually me that was driving the car’. Now, nothing came from that. He was convicted and he paid a fine, which I was told was a massive fine, so I was thinking thousands of dollars—but no, it was \$800. Usually a fine for a breach is \$250, so when police told me it was \$800 they said that was a good outcome. But for me, I am like, ‘He would have just gone and EFTPOSED that straightaway and moved on’.

So after I rang Ed O’Donohue the second time, after he went after Shania, he went back to Lisa Neville and Lisa organised for a detective to be assigned to me, and that is how Detective Norris got involved. She got

involved after the first attack on my youngest daughter, but she was there for the second, and Max actually went to jail after the second attack. He went to jail for that one. That was in 2018.

Ms VAGHELA: So do you think police are well equipped to work out whether stalking is serious or not?

Ms McDONALD: No. I kept getting told it was coincidence that he was in the same area as myself, even to the point where I would take backstreets from Craigieburn to get to Blackburn when my mother was still living at home and we were meeting at a nursing home to look at it, to maybe put mum in there, which we ended up doing. But he was right there, along Fitzsimons Lane in Eltham. Why was he there, at lunchtime? I had left work early, so normally I would have been at work. So I had to keep pulling over, and my sister is ringing me, going, 'Where are you? We've got this meeting. We're at the nursing home. You need to be here', and I am like, 'I'm being followed. I'm trying to lose him'. So each time I went to police they would say, 'It's a coincidence you're in the same area at the same time', no matter where I was in Melbourne, not just in our local area that we did live in—

Ms VAGHELA: Yes. So it was always a coincidence. So what would make the police well equipped to work out whether the stalking is serious or not? What should be done?

Ms McDONALD: Well, by this point I had had dozens of reports. When are they going to take it seriously? I would walk into Craigieburn police station and report and let them know. I would take photos, or I would call 000. When did they take it seriously, because I was only dealing with one police station at that point? Further along a lot of other different police stations got involved, but initially I would be walking into Craigieburn to make these complaints.

Ms VAGHELA: But what should we give to police to make sure that they are well equipped to understand whether it is a serious stalking or not? If they do not have the understanding, then what should we do so that they have that better understanding?

Ms McDONALD: But how can they not have the understanding when they can see you coming in all the time with another report, another lot of footage or photos? You know, I would go in with dash cam footage. Why is it on me to continually be going in there?

The CHAIR: I know. If police cannot get that, they are not ever going to get it.

Ms McDONALD: To be honest, you never actually see the same informant; you see whoever is on the desk, so then you are in there for hours explaining what has been happening to you since it began.

The CHAIR: Bingo. I think that is—yes.

Ms VAGHELA: Thanks, Chair.

The CHAIR: Thank you. Tania.

Ms MAXWELL: Thank you, Chair. Hello, Di. It is lovely to see you again.

Ms McDONALD: You too.

Ms MAXWELL: I guess, for those who do not know, Di has had an extensive history as her submission indicates, but I would encourage everyone to watch other programs that Di has actually been on, which tell her story in more depth.

Di, just to reflect back on—you know, you have talked about vexatious claims with IVOs. You have talked about the length of time to obtain a hearing.

Ms McDONALD: Yes.

Ms MAXWELL: Now, those two things just alone create a very unsafe environment for a victim who is reporting stalking. You have talked about coercive control. Most of us know that it is a very contentious issue at the moment, and I am wondering whether, one, you think that evidence of coercive control should be allowed to be provided in a courtroom, whether it is by the victim themselves or organisations that are working with the victim—so from a professional perspective, they can provide that information? Also, when you take out an IVO, what do you see as being a satisfactory time from the time you take it out to you actually going to court?

And obviously you have said that the alleged offender should also be coming to court, and in order for them to do that IVO against the victim that they should have to have some evidence. So what in a safety sense, I guess, would you see as an appropriate time? Because we are hearing at the moment it is approximately 12 days.

Ms McDONALD: It took me a little while to go in and speak to the clerk at the counter. I had no understanding of what an intervention order was. The policeman that I originally spoke to said, 'Just go to the court and get an intervention order'. Well, what do I do? You know, I had no idea, so I just walked up to the counter and asked the clerk and filled out the paperwork. She looked over it, and I was lucky on the day in that Broadmeadows court was actually quiet. I went in there after work. It was about 3.00, 3.30, and she said 'Take a seat. I might be able to get a magistrate to see you straightaway'. So I went in and just kind of told them what was going on—I had police statements, I did not have any of the flyers at that point—and he granted the one-month interim order, and then in July of 2015 we all met and I eventually was granted the one-year order.

I think as a victim there should be someone that is helping you through this. The clerk at the counter when I checked in said, 'Go upstairs and you will have a duty lawyer assigned to you'. Great! I had my aunt with me and went upstairs. We waited and waited and waited for the duty lawyer. She came out and she said, 'Really sorry, we can't help you. We're actually helping'—what is it, I have gone blank—'the applicant'. I have forgotten what he was called; I have just gone blank—anyhow, helping Max. So then they advised me to go downstairs to legal aid, and, you know, that is a minefield in itself. Then, when I eventually did go downstairs, they said that they too would not—I am an applicant—be helping an applicant. So yes, they gave me no advice—no nothing.

So as nervous and stressed and anxious and everything as I was—my first time ever in a courtroom—I had to do all this on my own. So yes, and that is pretty well how it played out for several years.

Ms MAXWELL: So it is pretty clear that one of the initial needs is to have that support that can advise and inform you what is happening now, what is going to happen in the future and about the processes that you need to—

Ms McDONALD: Exactly, yes. I was relying solely on taking my cues in the courtroom from the clerks sitting in front of the magistrate to know when to speak, to know when to offer up evidence. I had no clue. And obviously I was speaking from my heart about what was happening to me, you know.

Ms MAXWELL: Dianne, one more question I wanted to ask you: obviously the VLRC are doing the inquiry into stalking, which came out of the tragic death of Celeste Manno. Are you putting in a submission?

Ms McDONALD: Yes, I have done that. In between, I think, lockdowns 5 and 6 we were able to have a meeting. So I did have a face to face with Tony North, QC, and Marie Barnard. We had a meeting for 3½ hours, and I left thinking it was really productive. And I would actually like to be in Parliament when it is tabled and next year see the outcome of it. I have also spoken to Aggie, Celeste's mum, about this. If we are both there when it is being tabled and voted on, it might be a good influence.

The CHAIR: Indeed.

Ms MAXWELL: I will leave it there, Chair, at the moment.

The CHAIR: Matthew.

Dr BACH: Thanks, Chair. Many thanks, Ms McDonald. I might come to a matter that is not unrelated to the matter that Ms Vaghela asked you about regarding your experiences with the police, and that is your experience with magistrates. In particular, when you opened up and you shared with us your quite horrifying story, you spoke about some of your difficulties with magistrates. That goes very directly to our terms of reference.

Ms McDONALD: Okay.

Dr BACH: I wonder what you would advise us as to what potentially could be done to lead in future the—sadly—many Victorians who find themselves in a not dissimilar position to yours, having experienced awful, awful things like stalking and coercive control. What do you think could be put in place to seek to ensure the most empathetic and supportive justice response, especially from magistrates?

Ms McDONALD: Yes, because I can tell you I did not get that. There was no empathy, no nothing. In regard to that magistrate that I saw in regard to both of the intervention orders being put on me, one of the MPs

also organised a tribunal hearing for me with victims of crime. For me, a tribunal hearing—because I know nothing, I thought that there would be several people chairing that and listening to what was happening to you and looking at your evidence. The same magistrate actually walked out. He walked out, and I instantly knew that it was going to end badly—and it did. He shut us down straightaway. He said, ‘Come back when you’ve got a case’, and again he smirked at us and we left. So I did not even approach victims of crime again until Max Gardiner was in prison. So my dealings with magistrates, for a lot of the time in the early days, were really not very good—not very good. The initial magistrate that I had—he was a lovely, lovely man, and he granted me the 10-year order. So he was great. Eventually I think he moved to Melbourne away from Broadmeadows. But, yes, this magistrate that we had at Broadmeadows repeatedly sided with the perpetrator. Sadly, he never, ever looked at anything that we had to offer in regard to counterclaiming anything. I am not the one with the record. Surely magistrates can see what has been going on. Look at both of our names, and, yes, maybe have a little bit more empathy for the victim. Or even when he can see that someone is being taken to court because they have already got an order on the person that is now trying to get an order on them, look at the history. Yes, empathy would be really, really nice, because I never, ever got that. Never got it.

Dr BACH: No. I hear that. All right. Many thanks. It is appreciated.

Ms McDONALD: Thank you.

The CHAIR: Thank you. Sheena.

Ms WATT: I am the lucky last one, so thank you, Chair, and thanks, Ms McDonald. What is really clear to me is that you are enormously persistent and determined to get justice. I would love to say that that is in fact the case for all victims, that they can pursue their case as diligently as you have, but we do know that that is not always true. I just wonder if you could share with us some thoughts on what supports you think should be in place to encourage victims to come forward and continue with their complaints, because it is a long, hard road as you have made very clear to us.

Ms McDONALD: It is a very, very long, hard road, and my reasoning behind telling my story, going public, is so nobody else goes through this. It is too late for me. I have lived this life and continue to do so at the moment, but I do not want anyone else going through this. So if somebody goes into a police station and they do not have any bruises, they do not have any broken bones or anything, but they are telling you these stories of absolutely horrific things that are happening to them, take them at face value, maybe have someone there that can support them, and then follow them through the whole chain of going to court to get an intervention order, to explain to them how it all works—rather than trying to figure it out for yourself when you have got no clue. Their perpetrator might be somebody like mine that has decades and decades of history of doing this, and you cannot find a lawyer to help you because there is conflict. People did not believe me. I went to my local MP, and I ended up calling a person in front of them that they gave me a piece of paper to call, and I said, ‘This is how it plays out for me’. It was exactly how I said, and they could not believe it. Once you are told there is a conflict, they basically hang up on you, because they are unable to offer any information as to what that conflict is. I was proving to people that I was not getting any help and this is why.

So I think at the grassroots if there is somebody there to help a victim, to guide them, to help them obtain legal counsel should they need it and just walk them through absolutely everything—that would have been a godsend for me, so I just know it would be for anyone else.

Ms WATT: Thank you.

The CHAIR: Thank you so much, Dianne. I think that you have not only told a really powerful story, but I think you have also given us a lot to think about in moving forward and how we can make things different going forward.

Ms McDONALD: Thank you. Thank you for allowing me to speak. Hopefully some changes are made.

The CHAIR: Yes. I think all the work that you have done, not just with this committee, is absolutely going to effect change.

Ms McDONALD: Thank you. That is nice to know.

The CHAIR: Yes. I think you have been an advocate, and I know you have certainly had an effect on the five of us—there is no doubt—and probably all of those who are listening. Thank you. As I mentioned at the

outset, you will receive a transcript. Ultimately that transcript will go up on our website, and obviously your testimony will be part of our report. Thank you very much.

Ms McDONALD: Thank you, everyone.

The CHAIR: This concludes the day. It has been a tremendous day. Thank you, everyone. Thank you, committee. Thank you to the team behind us. Good afternoon.

Committee adjourned.