

Cut Through, August 27, 2026: **Secret numbers of the under-16 social ban and WA's One Nation vs Labor showdown**

All timestamps are approximate

Crystal Andrews (00:15)

Hello and welcome to Cut Through, Crikey's spin-free analysis of Australian news, politics and power. I'm your host, Crystal Andrews, and today I'm joined by my colleague, reporter at large, Charlie Lewis, to round up some of the news items that you all might have missed over the past month. Charlie, it's lovely as ever to have you on the podcast.

Charlie Lewis (00:33)

It's really nice to be back. It's been too long.

Crystal Andrews (00:35)

It has been, it has been. And we have a lot of good stuff to get into in today's episode. do, just a refresher for everybody listening and watching that all of the stories we are going to talk about in today's episode, I'll make sure they are all linked in the description. and these have all been items that we've published in the Snoop over the last month, which is Crikey's daily roundup

Of

tips, news, and absurdities from Australia and around the world, which I write every day with our other colleague Danny Saeed. so Charlie, I know you've picked out a few that you really liked from the past month. I've picked out a few. Maybe let's kick off with one of your favourites, which was an FOI reveal about former, now former commissioner of the NAC, Paul Burreton, who I guess has probably found out that resigning from the role does not stop people.

criticizing your performance while in that role.

Charlie Lewis (01:29)

I mean, how much would you expect the commissioner of the anti corruption commission to understand about transparency? I don't know. Maybe it's not fair. But yes, one of my favorites was snoopied out by our our other colleague, Anton Nilsen. Everyone's getting a shout out today, which is which is great. so yes, as you as you've hinted out there, I think you know, longtime listeners would be very familiar with the work or or or not work of the National Anti Corruption Commission.

One of the most comically self-defeating organizations, I think, in Australian

Crystal Andrews (01:58)

Ha.

Charlie Lewis (01:58)

political history. And as you say, this one concerns former commissioner Paul Burriton, who who departed in May under something of a cloud. I think that's probably not too strong a way to put it. so Anton reported on a set of conflict of interest forms that were submitted by members of the NUC recruitment panel, which included Burreton, over 2022 and 2023 that had been released

under under the Freedom of Information Act. and so under Paul Breton's form, where basically there's a box that's that's labelled I to the best of my knowledge, I have no conflicts of interest, whether it's personal, financial, or professional, with any potential candidate except that which I declare in this box below. That box in Brereton's case is completely grayed out, it's completely redacted. which tells you, I suppose, a f a few things. I mean, one, presumably it's not blank.

You don't generally have

Crystal Andrews (02:48)
Mm-hmm.

Charlie Lewis (02:48)
to erase or cross out anything that's not there.

Crystal Andrews (02:52)
Well

and all and in that in that same set of documents there were other it wasn't just Buritan, there were other appointments and some of them had filled out like, you know, not not applicable in the box and that was obviously not not redacted. You could you could see that they had said

Charlie Lewis (03:03)
Yes.

Crystal Andrews (03:05)
nothing to declare, so clearly something to declare.

Charlie Lewis (03:07)
For sure,

for sure. And so it tells you it tells you that obviously, yeah, that combination of information would indicate there is something in that box, and obviously that it was decided that it was best that the public not know that what that is. and again, we cannot stress enough, this is a body that is aimed at increasing the accountability and transparency in Australia's public square. That's the that's the whole reason for it to exist. that that was what decades of people were calling for.

When they wanted this body. And obviously the we go into great detail about why that hasn't really worked out the way that it did. But it's in it's a really wonderful example. and again, a really

great example of what the Snoop does very well, which is to find these little details that illustrate kind of a wider issue. And of course, in previous the in the last episode that we discussed, Snoops, you and you and Danny talked about the fact that we did managed to uncover emails concerning a media inquiry that the Narc had received from friend of Grikey, Nick Feich, who

Had given them some some very sort of serious interrogation over the years. And they had decided because of that interrogation that they weren't really Braiton in particular was not particularly of a mind to reply to it at all. so again, it is this sort of this incredible stacking of these details that that are so pungent and illustrative of how the NARC kind of achieves the direct opposite of what it was supposed to achieve.

Crystal Andrews (04:25)

Mm. It's interesting too, I think, how, there maybe for some people who are familiar with the FOI system that listen or to or watch this podcast maybe have submitted some themselves. people who are journalists who s who certainly have done the same, like you know that it is a real gauntlet that you're running about what you have submitted versus what you will get back. I know that certainly many, many journalists who've worked at Crikey have submitted

freedom of information requests and you know, received the relevant documents back only for those to be entirely blanked out to the point where it was like, Well, you may as well not have sent us anything at all. and that's certainly not a new problem. but we have had I think some pieces published on Crikey recently from Rex Patrick who, has

been a a great champion of greater transparency in politics. and also Rick Morton, who's done a lot of fantastic journalism in this space too, just or criticizing and I think pointing out how much worse this seems to have gotten, the concept of either submitting a legitimate request and having that sort of diverted for any of the various reasons that, they can claim to

To not release that information to you, or you know, like in this case, release the information, but there actually not be any relevant detail in there. I think Rex recently wrote a piece for us about auditor general report into sort of like the success rate of the freedom of information system. the report found

for the agencies that it examined, that they were not reasonably conducting searches for documents correctly in 79% of cases. They were not releasing any documents in 57% of cases. they were not meeting the processing timeline. So you know there's like a set a default 30-day period that they need to process the request or let you know if they need an extension. but they were not

meeting

those time frames in sixty-three percent of cases. So I think it just gives people an indication of okay, yeah, the system is there, the system exists and and and it's something that, you know, people might think like we can avail ourselves of. But there are still a lot of roadblocks in getting

the information out and actually having practicing the transparency that, at other times the government might like to say that, you know, it's all about.

Charlie Lewis (06:43)

Yeah, I'm sincerely amazed to hear that the the number of times it misses its deadline is as low as sixty-three percent. In my experience, I've always found that it's a bit

Crystal Andrews (06:51)

Ha ha ha

Charlie Lewis (06:54)

higher. yeah, no, I think that's the thing is that I don't want to get too inside baseball here, but anyone who who

Crystal Andrews (06:58)

Mm.

Charlie Lewis (06:58)

who tr who works in these areas is very familiar with the the banging the head against the wall approach that this often is, the long, long deadlines, the the the costs that are often imposed

that erect this barrier. and of course then yes, we we've I I I think I did a piece a little while back which was like I sort of asked basically everyone to give me their worst ever FOI response where technically they've given you the documents, but and you will you will often see that there is the the heading of the document and then the entire page blanked out. and so I think what's what's sort of nice about this one is that that will only get you so far because even

Release a document with this thing blanked out is illustrative in itself. It still tells people things that presumably those involved would rather not have made public.

Crystal Andrews (07:41)

Yes, it still gave enough detail that there was something behind the gray box. And know, in some ways I think like maybe it's worse to to let people speculate on what what what is behind

Charlie Lewis (07:51)

Yeah, yeah.

Crystal Andrews (07:52)

the gray box than like presumably what the actual disclosure was, which was done, you know, at the time of recruitment. Like it's it's doing everything by the book and saying like these are the conflicts of interest that I declare. so maybe actually this is the worst outcome that they could that they could have had.

Charlie Lewis (08:07)

Quite possibly.

Crystal Andrews (08:08)

FOI logs are, I guess, one of, yeah, as you mentioned, one of our key sources of information for the Snoop and for a lot of the journalism that Crikey does. I think it's of note like how it'll often turn up something that is not necessarily worth like a full standalone piece in its own right, but still information that's interesting to share. And one that we did pick up on recently that really intrigued me.

was a request for the briefing notes that the e-safety commission had prepared for its appearance before the Senate Estimates hearing in May. there was some media about it at the time. That was the one where Julie Inman Grant appeared before estimates and spoke about the teen social media ban, among other things.

they did release the briefing documents and it was quite lengthy, but were two very interesting things of note. The first was that they published the data on how many complaints eSafety receives about online content versus what is actually taken down.

So for those watching on YouTube or Spotify, we'll put this table up on the screen. but for the period of the 1st of July 2025 to the 31st of March 2026, the agency received 34,000 complaints about online content, but only issued 58 formal removal notices. And that only resulted in 31 pieces of online content actually being removed, which

Is really interesting, I think, to sort of illustrate the gap between like what people think e-safety does, which is just like taking down content left and right, versus the reality, which is significantly different. And that's not to say that all of those complaints are legitimate. Like there's a lot more detail in the documents about like how many sort of don't meet the threshold and they categorize what the complaints sort of like fall into. I still thought that was fascinating because it was, I mean, it was way lower.

than than I even expected in terms of the the amount of content that was removed. I don't know, Charlie, if if that's like a narrative that you think is really out there that e safety is this like you know, hall monitor of the internet in Australia.

Charlie Lewis (10:10)

Yeah, a a a ratio of of less than a thousand to one in terms of complaints to actual material getting removed, which is yeah, remarkably low, remarkably low. I mean, yeah, I I don't think the average person necessarily gives the E Safety Commission that much thought. I mean, I suppose again, with the as you hinted at there, the the teen social media ban I think has gotten people thinking a lot more in general about the regulation of of who sees what on the internet, probably more recently.

But I do think to those people who who think about these things a lot, kind of the but perhaps more the the culture warrior kind of set of this, the idea of being able to regulate the internet in this way is considered, yes, sort of a kind of grand act of censorship. But but obviously

this shows the limitations of that. Did they talk a lot about I guess as as you say, they they've they went into a little bit about the criteria that they that they went into? what meets the criteria for them? And and I guess how much discretion do they have to decide whether something sh has to go

Like i is there a mandate in place where they have to remove certain certain material?

Crystal Andrews (11:08)

S so the way that the process works as I understand it is that they are able to issue the notices to individuals. And so could be issuing a notice to a like a platform, like if it's a Facebook post, like that could go to Meta or it might go to an internet service provider, or I think depending on the nature of the complaint and

the type of information that they're provided in that complaint. That could be to like the individual. So if you, Charlie Lewis, had posted something, they also could know, issue that request to you directly. And I guess there's a bit of a back and forth then in terms of, either platform or individual or internet service provider or what have you saying like, you know, no, this content is fine because of like these reasons. So I think there is a bit of a back and forth.

it didn't go into so much detail in the briefing notes about like what those legislative thresholds are, except that they exist, right? And that that obviously content has to meet a certain standard before that they can intervene. it did say that the vast majority of the content that's complained about is what they call illegal and restricted content. I think that that also includes, I believe, child sexual.

abuse material and things of that nature. So I think it like very much depends on how it is categorized, what it actually is, know, what recourse they have to like issue a notice to whom, and what the result of that sort of like back and forth and what that investigation is. it it would be quite a complex gig, right? to be working within this agency.

Charlie Lewis (12:36)

Yeah. Yeah.

Crystal Andrews (12:37)

I was sort of interested a little bit in the there's a categorization of content that's like cyberbullying and harassment, but they split that between adults and children. So they consider the cyberbullying of adults differently to children, which I think makes sense. and there was quite a significant amount of complaints under that category that did not meet the legal threshold.

of what could be taken down, which I also think is quite interesting because I think in some spaces e-safety is presented as like a path of recourse for people where it actually really isn't and and I'm not saying that it is underperforming or overperforming in that role, but maybe it should not be presented that way in some instances. The other thing that I thought was worth pulling out of these briefing notes is the

question around how many reportedly underage accounts have been taken off social media platforms in Australia since the introduction of the teen social media ban. so people might recall that when this first came into force in January, eSafety said that four point seven million accounts had been removed. And then they gave another update in March that said a further 300,000 had been taken down sort of like since they've been enforcing this legislation.

since then, there have been some requests made for e-safety to break down that number further, and particularly by saying how many from each platform, how many have been taken off Instagram, Snapchat, TikTok, etc. but the briefing documents contained a letter from the Commissioner Julie Inman Grant to Communications Minister Annika Wells, making a public interest immunity claim, which is essentially a request to keep that.

data secret and to keep that breakdown secret. And her argument was essentially that if the platforms are aware of the precise scope or direction of e-safety's investigations, then they would try to conceal or subvert those investigations and try to shape their responses accordingly, which I don't know if that is if a platform-specific breakdown would.

you know, would give too much of the game away. But like that is the claim being made to keep that information private for now.

Charlie Lewis (14:46)

that is odd and I think it it maybe sort of hints at what a useful cudgel or a useful cloak, I guess, the social media companies really are in this debate, because there's

Crystal Andrews (14:56)

Mm.

Charlie Lewis (14:56)

nothing you could say about them that the average person wouldn't believe is true. no level of evil that you could accuse them of that someone will go, Hey, now that's going a bit too far. So

Crystal Andrews (15:04)

Ha ha.

Charlie Lewis (15:04)

in it and and rightly so. but yes.

as you were first telling me, I like, that seems yeah, that seems reasonable but as you say, doesn't necessarily track in terms of the details of the argument. They know that they're being looked at for this stuff. Of course they do. They could not know. How does knowing how many people have been removed from their particular platform affect that response? I don't see that it does.

Crystal Andrews (15:23)

Yeah,

like there are other sort of arguments that you could make, I'm just not sure that saying, you know, it's four point seven million and like twenty percent of those are from TikTok,

I don't I don't understand how that is revealing

Charlie Lewis (15:33)

Yeah.

Crystal Andrews (15:34)

too much. so we will certainly continue to keep an eye on that. It's been, one of the topics I think that Crikey has championed coverage of over the past few years, and we are not gonna stop anytime soon.

speaking of Annika Wells, who's had a very busy little period with the the somewhat delayed passing of the gambling reforms. Charlie, there was some snoop coverage that caught your eye.

Around this topic.

Charlie Lewis (15:58)

Yes, so speaking of Anakin of Wells and industries that everyone hates,

Crystal Andrews (16:01)

Ha ha.

Charlie Lewis (16:02)

this so this isn't really an individual Snoop. This is kind of maybe more of a a theme that the Snoop has been covering very well, I thought, in the last month, which is as you say, the the debate around the proposed gambling reforms that have that have recently passed. the the real locus of all this for me was the testimony of former NRL player Luke.

Crystal Andrews (16:20)

Mm.

Charlie Lewis (16:20)

Bateman in front of the Senate inquiry into that legislation, talking with incredible candor about his experiences as a as a as a problem gambler, essentially, as a high-profile problem gambler and how he was offered things like access to sex workers and drugs and things to sort of keep him as part of that world. a lot of details stood out apart from the the obvious kind of shocking ones. there was the fact obviously

That he hadn't heard at the time. We we got in contact with him to see if anyone had contacted him from the government and no one had. The Prime Minister hadn't. Wells hadn't. and I thought that was actually an even bigger revelation than perhaps it seemed at the time, because he's not an activist. He's not a radical of any description. He is a very mainstream figure. He's a a very nice looking sports person who tries to help

encourage young men to read more. He's the kind of guy that politicians usually quite like having a photo taken with. And

Crystal Andrews (17:15)

Mm-hmm.

Charlie Lewis (17:16)

you get the sense that to keep their distance from him when he was talking about this, it really does point to the fact it must mean a great deal to them to not do more on gambling, given what it would gain them to do more on gambling.

There's a lot of criticisms that are leveled at the the Iapanese government over its two terms that despite its huge mandate, it doesn't seem to be all that keen on on big sweeping progress. And of course the the counter is always that it's it's difficult to sell a lot of these things now, particularly with a a very hostile press and a very kind of

jumpy electorate. But this is not that. I think every poll they do, everyone agrees that these things bet it ought to be better regulated.

the the fact that you know there was a a pi there was a bipartisan across the actual parties themselves of cr criticism from the Li Liberal Party as well as as as certain Labour members as well as the as well as the cross branch. So there's a universal understanding that these changes need to happen. And it must mean the great deal

To the government not to do that. For one reason or another, it must mean a great deal to them to keep things closer to what they already are.

Crystal Andrews (18:21)

you're so right in in pointing out that, you know, I I can't help but think had this been the early part of 2025, that Luke Bateman would have been the type of personality that Labour was courting as part of its election campaign. And it did a lot with, you know, social media influencers and creators, podcasters, like it was doing lots of outreach.

in that vein to these young people with generally progressive ideals and values and beliefs with large social media presences who were sort of, you know, relevant at the time. it had been maybe like January or February twenty twenty five, they might have been

saying like, yeah, let's sit down and and have a discussion and and let's video it for your social media channels about like what the reforms are gonna be. You can ask us questions, you know, no holds barred because we wanna take people along the journey for this. And that mood is very different. Very different now.

Charlie Lewis (19:16)

Yeah, absolutely. Absolutely. And and I think, you know, there's a a few other details that kind of came up was obviously the fact that when it was reported on in the News Corp racing masthead, that that article is

Crystal Andrews (19:26)

That's right.

Charlie Lewis (19:27)

plastered with with gambling ads. which I think again gets the sense of the pervasiveness of the problem.

Crystal Andrews (19:32)

it indicates some of the vested interests who obviously had more sway than not only the public, but many, many members of parliament, many civil society groups, like yeah, there there was some big money saying, you know, hey, maybe lean back

on these reforms a little bit. I I do think it's quite interesting though, and and

Darny, who has been, you know, prolific on this beat, has made this point several times on the podcast that even gambling companies themselves on particular parts of this legislation take a more progressive approach or

Charlie Lewis (20:09)

Yes.

Crystal Andrews (20:10)

a focus of more social responsibility than the government even does. And from the hot off the press's le latest installment of the Snoop,

Crikey founder Stephen Main actually little bit of social reporting from the AGM of Points Bet, which is a gambling company. And the CEO Andrew Cateroll at that AGM was saying that the Australian government should crack down on the unlicensed sort of international betting

companies that are increasingly operating in Australia and finding ways to get around the restrictions that apply here. So again, it's just another example of actually the figures within this.

sector, gambling industry big weeks are saying we need more, you know, we need more of a crackdown. Yes, of course, like part of the motivation for him saying this is that if you get rid of these international players, it's more money for the for the local companies to take. I'm under no illusions that it's sort of completely altruistic, but I I do think a telling example of where, yeah, g the gambling companies themselves call for regulation or in some cases actually take the action even without

government policy forcing them to, which is just kind of un unfathomable. It's it's tough to get your head around.

Charlie Lewis (21:18)

Yes, yes.

Yeah, for sure. There is that sense that in many in many areas that you know, there there's a state capture going on, whether it's, you know, fossil fuels or or any number of things where the companies are too big and they cannot be controlled. this is the companies sort of, yeah, somehow being greater advocates for their own regulation than than the regulators.

Crystal Andrews (21:38)

I wanna shift everyone's focus very quickly to a upcoming state election, the WA by-election for the seat of Secret Harbour. Charlie, both you and I are from Western Australia.

Charlie Lewis (21:51)

Yeah.

Crystal Andrews (21:52)

and this area I think is of note, even though you know it's a by-election, so just just one seat in the WA state government, but it is

being closely followed and watched by everyone as almost, you know, every election from like local on up is these days because of One Nation's campaign to win this seat and to take it off the hands of in this case the West Australian Labour government. so for those who are not familiar with the region, I've been referring to Secret Harbor as Andrew Hastys territory, even though

It's a state seat. It's sort of in his neck of the woods of his federal seat, which might give people a bit of an indication of the sort of outlook of the of the voters there. but it had it has been held by outgoing Labour MP Paul Papalia for a really long time. I think almost 20 years, he's been in that seat. So obviously serving his community quite well and he's retiring for personal reasons.

Crikey contributor and independent journalist Jesse Noakes has been covering this campaigns for his own publication and also a little bit for Crikey. And he got this fantastic, fantastic moment where he turns up to a pre-polling station earlier in the week, hoping to speak to the new Labour candidate, Georgia Tree, who is a former Woodside employee. And I think she was also an advisor for Madeline King.

who's Labour's Federal Resources Minister,

Charlie Lewis (23:19)

So yeah.

Crystal Andrews (23:20)

so you know, hence the connections. And she literally once he reveals that he's a journalist and he's gonna ask some questions, literally legs it, runs away,

abandons like the pre-polling meet and greet, abandons speaking to her potential constituents and just flees the scene. It is really bizarre.

Charlie Lewis (24:37)

I believe the the way that Jesse put it was that at the the sounding of the word lobbyist is about the time that she sort of turns on her tail. Yeah, look, I mean I think there's a lot there's a lot that's interesting, about this as you say, this is this is not because obviously Western Australia in terms of the makeup of its parliament is is pretty unusual in in Australian

Crystal Andrews (24:57)

Mm.

Charlie Lewis (24:57)

and world and history terms because of

we're still sort of living in Mark McGowan's Western Australia in in a lot of ways. listeners probably will remember that during the COVID lockdown, Mark McGowan was handed a wipeout that reduced the Liberal Party to two seats in the lower house. and they have been slowly but not all that surely working their way back from that pr process ever since.

Crystal Andrews (25:16)

No, not convincingly.

Charlie Lewis (25:19)

Not really, no. and they ha they had quite a disastrous

turn out at the last state election and and underperformed even by the very low bar that have been set for them. I guess so I guess as you might expect, they they're not really being talked about as a candidate in this particular by-election. It's very much One Nation or or Labour. And I

alwa I do wonder about the longer term implications of this stuff, because I think we've sort of talked a bit about the the kind of arc that that One Nation often goes on with these

explosions of popularity. And obviously the most recent one is is something new. it's both a height and sustain

Crystal Andrews (25:51)
Mm.

Charlie Lewis (25:51)
is is greater than anything we've seen previously. So it is so it is a new situation, but we have seen previous bursts of kind of electoral success for one nation that have ended up with every single person quitting the party or having to resign from parliament or things like that. So I I don't know obviously how this will play out, but I do wonder if one nation do very well in this, whether that actually isn't the worst news for

major parties because having a lone one nation lower house member with limited power and a lot of time to do nothing but potentially say the odd quiet offensive thing might not be the worst thing for the major parties to kind of reiterate why they got their role in the first place. yes, it will be interesting.

Crystal Andrews (26:30)
Yeah, that is that is a good point. They will be, you this lone person, in the West Australian Parliament, which is just completely dominated by Labour. And I guess in that way, it's like is it so different to the federal House of Reps? Not really. And David Farley's sort of having his own struggles there. I I do think it's sort of interesting that the conversation is even in this place. So at the twenty twenty five state election, I think one nation only got like eight

just over eight percent of the primary vote. So the fact that they are being spoken about in this way for this by election is phenomenal. Like the this is an amazing turnaround of fortunes. for what it's worth, Jesse seems to think that the One Nation candidate actually will get up and that Labour's selection of a, you know, a a gas industry

lobbyist really has been the thing that will lose them this seat. the idea of implementing a a tax on gas exports is broadly like very popular across sort of the political spectrum. Although I I think it's interesting because the West Australian economy is a resource economy. And so the values around that and the ideas around that

tend

to be a little bit different there. but that election is taking place. the polling day is this is this weekend. So we'll have the answer soon enough. And I'm sure there'll be lots of analysis and breakdown that follows on whatever it is that happens there. I think we have time for one more, Charlie, do you have a fun tip to round out the episode for me?

Charlie Lewis (28:05)

I do, I do. This is something I spotted earlier this week. and I think like a lot of the Donald Trump era of politics, maybe increasingly so, I'm still not a hundred percent certain that I haven't just dreamt this, that this isn't just something that I

Crystal Andrews (28:17)

Ha ha.

Charlie Lewis (28:18)

that I conjured completely whole club. but there was footage I saw kind of going around on social media. Again, I kind of thought it might be AI. I genuinely did.

Of US Health Secretary Robert F. Kennedy Jr., who in in and of himself is an extremely surreal figure. He's a, apart from anything else, a health advocate who looks and sounds like he's never drunk a glass of water in his life. But he was announcing a kind of the framework for an autism safety missing persons kind of alert system, which they want to put in place. And obviously his

Personal relationship with public health and autism is not particularly inspiring. There's a lot of awful conspiratorial talk about how Tylenol or vaccines potentially cause it. but while he was giving this address, about a minute in, his phone sounds, and maybe we should just show the footage because we could we could and promise that we have not altered the extremely loud.

Crystal Andrews (29:14)

Ha ha

Charlie Lewis (29:16)

sound that comes out of his phone that he has to turn off.

it's very much in keeping with his approach to science, shall we say.

Crystal Andrews (29:44)

I you're right. when I saw this, actually every time I see any footage of RFK Jr. I do have to really ground myself and be like, no, this is real, this is real. It's what he really sounds like, it's what he really looks like, this is what he's really talking about. And yes, that is the phone quacking. That is the phone quacking

Charlie Lewis (30:04)

Ha ha ha.

Crystal Andrews (30:04)

in his pocket.

It's amazing as well because this isn't the first time that it's happened. I think it happened again at a at a press conference or some sort of know, event that he was speaking at earlier in the year as well. I saw like a similar kind of clip going around.

So also unbelievable that he hasn't changed it in that time to

Charlie Lewis (30:40)

No, no.

Crystal Andrews (30:42)

something more like palatable and also still hasn't got the hang of like putting that thing on.

silent or like handing it to a minder as you go up to, make your big announcements as you as you do in this like very important portfolio. The whole thing is like really bizarre.

Charlie Lewis (30:56)

It is, it is. It's all very man of a certain age, apart from anything else.

Crystal Andrews (31:00)

the US, it's just like every item in the Snoop that we drum up from their political sphere is something that is wildly entertaining, deeply concerning, and does make me like a little bit thankful that quite the same level of absurdity is not so much a day to day

occurrence in Australian politics. Although I'm sure lots of people listening to this podcast probably, you know what, leave it, leave your response in the comments if you disagree with me there. But just the sheer the sheer amount of times you have to ask yourself, is this real? Or did someone manufacture this? Is yeah, we're we're just reaching untold levels of sanity checking at this point.

Well, Charlie, thank you so much for taking some time to catch up on the last month of news with me. I really appreciate it and and we'll get you back on cut through very soon.

Charlie Lewis (31:53)

It was great. I can't wait.