

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE
Inquiry into greenfields mineral exploration and project development in Victoria

Melbourne — 19 September 2011

Members

Mr N. Burgess
Mr M. Foley
Mr W. Noonan

Mrs I. Peulich
Mr G. Shaw

Chair: Mr N. Burgess
Deputy Chair: Mr M. Foley

Staff

Executive Officer: Ms Y. Simmonds
Research Officer: Mr S. Martin

Witnesses

Mr A. Arbuthnot, Land Management Committee member, and
Mr J. McElwee, Policy Adviser, Land Management, Victorian Farmers Federation.

The CHAIR — Good afternoon and welcome to the Committee. The Economic Development and Infrastructure Committee is an all-party parliamentary committee and is hearing evidence today on the Inquiry into greenfields mineral exploration and project development in Victoria. All evidence taken today is privileged and protected by that privilege. However, any comments or remarks you may make outside this area will not have that protection.

Mr ARBUTHNOT — I am Alex Arbuthnot. My address is Nambrok 3847, which is near Sale. I am on the Land Management Committee of the Victorian Farmers Federation.

The CHAIR — Are you appearing on behalf of the VFF?

Mr ARBUTHNOT — Yes.

Mr McELWEE — I am Jacob McElwee. I live at 12/767 Punt Road, South Yarra 3141.

The CHAIR — Are you appearing on behalf of the VFF as well?

Mr McELWEE — Yes, that is correct.

The CHAIR — The evidence that you give today will become public evidence. Would you like to make a public submission now?

Mr ARBUTHNOT — Yes, thank you. We have already made a submission in writing. Before I speak to the submission, can I table a document or bring it to your attention? It is called *ANZ Insight* and is published by the ANZ bank. The report says that in the next 20 years the income in Australia from commodities and minerals is estimated to jump from \$204 billion to \$480 billion. I think the challenge for us in Victoria and the challenge for us in our regions is how to be a part of that. To some extent I think that underpins a little of our submission. We recognised right from day one that mining, with its associated resource industries, is a primary industry. This nation's economy historically has been built on it and is currently probably still running on it. Certainly, if this report has some merit — that is why I urge you to have a look at it — that will continue.

The CHAIR — The Committee is happy for that to happen.

Mr ARBUTHNOT — I will pass it around.

Even though the Victorian Farmers Federation is very passionate about the protection of farmers rights and the protection of agricultural land and the rehabilitation of that, over the years we have worked with the mining industry to achieve outcomes that are win-win situations for both organisations. I think I can categorically say that our legislation in Victoria is probably the strongest when it comes to rehabilitation, communication, engagement with communities and the protection of farmers rights. That is why I am fairly impressed with the term 'earth resources', although I must admit that it brings up connotations of everything other than mining. However, the term itself does cover the broad range of associated resource industries, with which over the years we have also developed strong relationships, worked and produced guidelines that both parties have agreed to. We as farmers do not always win our point, but we generally have made progress over the years to strengthen those positions.

I have read the mining industry's submission and do not disagree with a lot of information that is in there. We have generally worked towards a market-based approach, and that was demonstrated by the Extractive Industries Act, which was absorbed into the MRSD Act. In the Extractive Industries Act landowners in effect — in inverted commas — had a right of veto or a very strong negotiation position. From the perspective of the Victorian Farmers Federation, we hardly ever heard a complaint. Why? Because the parties worked it out amongst themselves. We have over the years tried to embed those principles in any changes and amendments that have gone on with the Acts. Because the protection of farmers rights does not only cover mining, we have also produced property access information for our landowners that covers pipelines, power generation and mining. Any of these documents are available. They basically say to landowners that these are the things you should look for before anybody comes onto your property.

Coming back to our submission, we recognise that there does need to be growth in both industries. I come from Gippsland. I noticed that you said that Victoria has 20 per cent of brown coal. I must admit, Jacob, that I think it is closer to 16 per cent. It depends how deep you go.

Mrs PEULICH — He was rounding off.

Mr ARBUTHNOT — Anyway, we have a lot of brown coal, a lot of it in Gippsland and a lot of it in my shire, actually — in Wellington Shire. I think the economic future development is how mining and food is going to progress side by side. In Gippsland we are also working on a food plan, and as you know, the State needs to write a food plan and we will need to write a food plan. We look for win-win outcomes. I think we are fairly proud of the outcomes we have received. I would just as soon take questions and have some discussion with the other side of the table than go through my report word for word.

Mr FOLEY — I am happy to start. Thanks for the time, Alex. As you said, the Minerals Council relied a lot on the historical relationship with the VFF in how it went about dealing with one of the issues in the terms of reference about conflicts between exploration and other land uses. Whilst we have not seen a lot of conflicts, as you say — I am sure it is partly due to good leadership from the VFF — one of the items suggested to us is that, with the exception of coal, we have not really seen a lot of big-time applications, but we are starting to see that. Even then I am not convinced that that is necessarily the case, because if you look at where all the tenements are around the State, large areas of Victoria have been subject to exploration licence applications with remarkably small amounts of community disputation and indeed a lot of community support the further out you get from metropolitan Melbourne; yet other states, particularly at the moment with new forms of exploration coming through, are not as fortunate. We are seeing a substantial amount of disputation, it would seem — you do not know until you go and have a look — around emerging issues like the coal seam gas issue in Queensland and New South Wales.

Our New South Wales friends — the New South Wales Parliament — are currently conducting an Inquiry into coal seam gas. Your New South Wales brothers and sisters — the New South Wales Farmers' Federation — has put in a submission which takes a fairly quantum leap in the public debate in this area. Just to quote from it, it says:

This submission advocates that, as a first step, farmers in NSW should have their basic property rights upheld through legislative changes which will allow them to refuse access to mining and CSG companies.

It goes on, but essentially it is arguing that when it comes to coal and coal seam gas it is a qualitatively different issue to broader issues of exploration and that there should be an as-of-right refusal to allow exploration. Did the VFF have a view on that and whether it would go down the centre path or how it got to this point in New South Wales so as to allow that to occur?

Mr ARBUTHNOT — There are a number of issues I would like to cover in your presentation. I think historically we have had some fairly strong, very public community resistance to some of the mining programs. I can particularly recall filling the Horsham hall with protests against some proposals there by what is now Rio Tinto to use solution mining, where they pump down chemicals to absorb some of the minerals. I can recall not being able to drive down the main street of Avoca because I was up there to address the community on mining issues. I think historically we have had some controversial issues, and what that did — because there was a lot of subsequent policy — was allow us to perhaps get enough focus to be able to put some of these farmers rights issues into our legislation and into our documents. The same advice is what I am giving New South Wales and Queensland: while you are using this issue, use that opportunity to strengthen up your legislation, because it will drop off the media, and when it drops off the media you should hopefully have used that opportunity to strengthen some of those land-holder rights. I would also have to say — and I sit in the National Farmers Federation task force looking at this, representing Victoria — I have been to Dalby. We will go to New South Wales next month for our meeting. Many of the issues up there would not have arisen in Victoria because of our Acts. Our Acts cover the water issues, the EPA issues — the use of those chemicals in fracking would not be allowed here.

I think the Victorian (Minerals Council of Australia) — submission raises some of the issues regarding water rights. Even to explore you have to buy a Water Right Licence. I have a little bit of empathy, I might add, with the mining position on this, because the mining position will say that the water they are pumping out onto coal seam gas is actually in the coal. They call it new water. You and I would know there is no such thing as new water, but it is water that is uncharted in some respect. I must admit personally I have a little bit of empathy for their argument; however, in my district I have seen some exploration of coal seam gas where the mining company actually rang me up to say, 'Where can I buy a Water Right?', and I said, 'Put an ad in the paper like every other farmer does'. It had to go and buy a Water Right even to explore. I might add that that exploration

did not go any further. The farmer whose property it is on was able to negotiate the use of that water, and he has a centre pivot spraying his lucerne, so there is a win-win situation.

There are 40 ELs in Victoria looking at coal seam gas, and they do it under the Mining Act, which is different to other states, where it comes under the Petroleum Act. If there was a lot of activity — and we have seen a little bit in the Otways, I might add, with Mantle, I think — there would be pretty strong community objection here to mining activities.

I am a little bit disturbed about the ‘mining bashing’, as I put it. I think we might have touched on it in our submission. I have certainly touched on it with other presentations. The social licence to operate — and it comes back to that report a little bit, I think — is one of the biggest challenges. Even for agriculture we have already seen what has happened on the news with offshore exports of cattle. The social licence for both of these resource industries to operate is something we have to pay a lot more attention to.

Coal seam gas, from a farmer’s perspective, is not as intrusive on your land as a lot of other mining operations; the only structure on your land is the wellhead. It is fairly short term — when I say short term, I mean 10 or 15 years. We have seen that with mineral sands mining in the Mallee. If the land gets rehabilitated back after 10 years, most farmers are quite happy to accept that in the life of their farming operation. What disturbs me about coal bed seam gas and future mining and exploration — mainly mining — would be the number of pipelines across the farm. There are pipelines connecting pipelines, there are pipelines to export the water and then there are pipelines to export the gas. On the one farm I visited on Dalby there are pipelines to store the gas. I said, ‘Why store it?’. It was because they only feed it into the generator at peak period. All of these pipelines would require easements, and to me the number of easements is a major concern. In an intensive state like Victoria we should seriously look at, and I put this on the table, utility easements.

We have farmers now in the Western District and even in the Koo Wee Rup swamp in Gippsland that would have six, seven or eight easements on their properties. It does devalue your land. Personally the VFF has worked to allow other options, other than selling your easement. The Acts do not stop you from renting an easement, and the challenge here is to almost change the culture of people and lawyers who would advise landowners so that they looked at the option of renting their easement.

If you do want to sell your easement, I always advise farmers to specify the easement use that the company can have. As committee members would know, a company, if it owns an easement, can use it for anything and can sell it to another company. The other point I always advise farmers on is to have a clause in there if the activity for which the easement was used ceases, so that the easement then comes back to you.

The CHAIR — Is the reversion taken up very often?

Mr ARBUTHNOT — No. With coal seam gas pipelines it will be.

The CHAIR — It has not been appropriate so far.

Mr ARBUTHNOT — No, it has not been. Under the *Pipelines Act* it is different from the Mining Act. To even explore under the Mining Act you have to get a licence. Under the *Pipelines Act*, to get your licence you have to demonstrate your ability to do the job, so what we see is pipeline companies coming in and approaching farmers, working out a route and then, if they do not get it, it is all forgotten. I think a farmer goes through a lot of stress actually. The idea of getting a licence to explore, which is a right that no one else can move in on you, to me, from a landowner’s perspective, is a much better way to approach the resources.

Mr FOLEY — Do you think the New South Wales counterparts submission is an ambit claim, or is it a genuine response to what they see as a qualitatively different issue when it comes to coal seam gas? And does it have any implications for Victoria?

Mr ARBUTHNOT — The question has come up in Queensland. In fact the current Government has indicated protection for cropping land. For the National Farmers Federation, picking winners in land use could be a very volatile and controversial subject. I have urged the farmers in Queensland particularly to look at the fine print. If you look at the fine print, there are probably a lot of clauses that are way out. When you think about how strong the mining industry is in Queensland, you cannot imagine the mining industry not containing very

strong legislation. However, it is very important that farmers' rights are protected and that they should try and negotiate some of those clauses that we have in our acts.

We have put on the table to the mining industry that, following the adoption of a national food plan and perhaps a Victorian food plan next year, food security — and this is in the ANZ report that I have tabled, and I recommend you have a look at it — is going to become a major issue. I have flagged to the mining industry here that there could be some no-go zones for food. Let me give you an example. The Macalister Irrigation District, which I irrigate in, is a very important food production area, and there is coal under my land. A journalist asked me if I should have the right to veto. Yes, I have no objection to farmers having a right to say no, as long as they have the right to say yes, too. I would earn a lot more from a coal seam gas well on my farm than I would from milking cows, and I would not have to get up at 4 o'clock in the morning to milk 400 cows.

Mr NOONAN — It is good for you, though it is probably not good for your health!

Mr ARBUTHNOT — However, the bigger question is the production of food and agriculture. You will have read how much the mining industry does earn for Victoria, which is not a lot of money compared to agriculture. I would think in the future probably we could look at some no-go zone areas.

Mr FOLEY — High-value, high-production, high-worth places?

Mr ARBUTHNOT — Yes. I must admit, and that is why in response to the question 'What would you do if somebody wants to explore on your farm?', I said do not have any objection to exploration providing they sign the agreement and pay me for the use of my asset. We have tended to shift from 'compensation' to 'payment'. Compensation has the connotation of covering costs and damages. Over the years we have tried to shift to use of asset, use of your time and all those factors. We have had some quite good achievements progressing on these lines.

The CHAIR — You said earlier that you had read the Minerals Council's submission and you agreed with most of what was said there. Were there particular points that you took exception to?

Mr ARBUTHNOT — They talked about the fact that the mining industry only covers 4 per cent, and I did read later that mining activity only covers 2 per cent of land. The inference there, on the subject that I just put on the table of no-go zones for food, would probably mean we would have a strong difference of opinion on that issue. The current amendment — what is that extra licence called?

Mr FOLEY — Retention licence.

Mr ARBUTHNOT — The retention licence. We worked for many years to reduce the number of tenements. I think we would raise questions probably about companies that sit on exploration licences, or even MLs. But I noticed in the new amendments they talk about 'activities' don't they, as well as 'expenditure', so I would give that a tick in that area.

I would also strongly support a lot of what they say about regulation. They have made presentations and reports to committees before; let us get on and do it. With a general industry hat on — and I have reported this to the leaders now, and I reported it to the last Premier, I might add — if you talk to industry, industry will continually say, 'Victoria is a hard place to do business in'. I know that for the Jabiru mine, which I notice it says is in north-east Victoria, but Benambra was in Gippsland when I last looked, I talked to a representative from that mining company, who said to me that he was just dealing with Parks Victoria for the licence on public land and he had to deal with seven people around the room from that one department. I think there are some pretty good examples in that report on the cost of regulation and the cost of red tape. That is not only a mining industry issue; that is the general feedback I get from most industries. I think I quote somewhere about the chap who took his tractor up to Kununurra and had to get 14 different permits. This is not only a Victorian issue, it is an Australian issue, and I think we do make mention of that in our report.

Whenever there is a review of legislation I am always a strong advocate for trying to harmonise some of these things across state borders. Even industry and farmers now see this as their policy to protect against climate change; that is to spread your assets around the country. Kidman did it, the Aboriginals did it and we do it now, and if you do that, you do not want these huge regulatory costs and costs of writing reports.

In many respects governments do not have to do a lot in an expenditure sense to help industry. If they can make it easier to do business, to me that is not a cost. We have a fair bit of empathy with industry because I can see some of these issues happening on the farm as we get bigger, and surely as we are getting bigger the last thing I want is to get a Planning Permit if I am changing my land use. I have probably lost some friends within the farming community who were pretty anti-mining, but we actually historically have supported the fact that there is no need to get a Planning Permit for exploration activity.

I think we mentioned it in our submission and we certainly mentioned it when we met with DPI for a briefing on coal seam gas. This is certainly fracking and underground coal — —

Mr McELWEE — Underground coal gasification.

Mr ARBUTHNOT — Which are new technologies, and I did raise a question as to whether we would need to look at a planning mechanism there for exploration. I must admit I heard Tony Burke on *Lateline* a fortnight ago on this question of coal seam gas, and he was briefed very, very well and he handled the questions very well too. I think, as with new technology, and it is questionable in the brown coal industry as to whether coal seam gas will be a big industry in Victoria, but it is new technology. Obviously Canberra is looking at it to be a \$50 billion industry for Australia, and if you read the ANZ report I tabled you will see it is going to be part of our future resources. We need to develop policies once again that are a win-win for resource industries and a win-win for farmers.

Mrs PEULICH — Certainly much of what you have said has been consistent with a lot of the views that we have heard during this inquiry. The strong view is that Victoria is a place that is hard to do business in for the very examples of not just overregulation but the process that you have just outlined anecdotally, and Victoria's prospectivity is therefore impacting on how attractive it is to future business.

You have called perhaps for the consideration of the establishment of no-go zones with a view to protecting land that is rich in terms of food production and agriculture. Mr Foley mentioned that planning and land-use issues become more complex the closer they are to population centres, and earlier we heard Environment Victoria saying that we ought to set up no-go zones for environmentally sensitive areas. Now by the time we overlap that I am not sure how much left there is going to be, given the initial concern about Victoria being a hard place to do business in. So my question is this: how do we strike the right balance between helping the industry progress and capitalise on what you have indicated is a potential for significant growth, recognised by the Federal Government as well, and some of these other concerns which are obviously legitimate? Is there a mechanism?

Mr ARBUTHNOT — I believe all land should be available for exploration, and that includes public land. In fact I am very supportive of mining on public land; if they are mining on public land, they are not mining on farmland. I do not believe public land should be a no-go zone. After all we do market our national parks for other commercial activities, such as for people visiting and for tourism. If you look at what Alcoa do in the Darling Range in Western Australia — which is like mining in the Dandenongs here; it provides Perth's water supply and is in a national park — they completely restore it to its original habitat. If you are over there do visit it, it is bauxite mining and they want to mine it for 200 years. That is why they do it. I believe it is possible to have very strong win-win situations for the environmental movement and for environmental outcomes as well as for agriculture.

Mrs PEULICH — It is the issue of the no-go zones.

Mr ARBUTHNOT — I have said it will be put on the table; there is no question about that. I also sit on Charlie Speirs's Clean Coal Victoria committee, and I know he is looking at areas and advising the current Government of where there is not or may not be the social licence to explore for brown coal mining. What flits through the back of my mind is that maybe a similar committee could advise the Government. If food security does become a burning issue, and with the population increases that are predicted for this state, you can see that what we are talking about is going to be more and more difficult to win in the social licence context.

I think the population predictions are very, very light. The one I often quote is by 1935 we will have 3000 new people a week coming into Melbourne. That is a lot of people. The impact of that out there on agricultural — —

The CHAIR — That would be 2035?

Mr ARBUTHNOT — Yes. The impact on agricultural land is unbelievable. Agricultural production is going to get more and more intensive. I probably come back to our rehabilitation policies, which need to be absolutely strong. The rehabilitation policies and our current Act clearly say that land, where possible, has got to be restored back to agricultural use. We have seen a very good and successful operation of that with mineral sands in the Mallee, and you cannot tell where the mine was. So those policies need to be entrenched and demonstrated; otherwise the community is not going to allow you to do it.

That is why I also think in relation to coal — and I think I have mentioned this — we need to look at some of the biological programs. The Chairman of Landcare Australia is also Chairman of a company called MDB, and is looking at biosequestration of carbon. I understand there is work going on looking at bacteria to eat the coal and distribute its methane instead of using fracking, and I believe this state should seriously look at that because I think it would help us win the social licence to do some of these things.

Mr NOONAN — There has been a great focus on this issue of competing land interests, and I must admit even when the Minerals Council came along they painted a mature picture of the relationship which exists between farmers and the Minerals Council, so it is interesting to hear your perspective on that. But you do make it very clear that food security is an emerging issue. You may be aware that the Leader of The Nationals in this state has essentially made it very clear that where there is a competing interest farmers' rights should prevail. I gather you agree with those statements.

Mr ARBUTHNOT — Yes.

Mr NOONAN — To be a little clearer for the Committee's benefit, what is the incidence of private landowners, or farmers, not consenting to mineral explorers entering their land? I appreciate you probably know this because you have put out a guide that gives landowners a strong sense of what their rights are. That is the first part, and then, to what extent is mediation between private landowners and mineral explorers by the State Mining Warden or a determination by VCAT a common occurrence in Victoria?

Mr ARBUTHNOT — I have been involved in a number of them over the 20 years. I would not say they are a common occurrence and, if policies are being practised, neither should they be. That is why I reiterate that we would look at strengthening the clauses that allow landowners flexibility to negotiate so that parties can come to an agreement. Come back to the right to say no. Yes, our Act allows you to put in an objection to the Minister. We are adamant at the Victorian Farmers Federation that no-one should come onto your property without signing that access agreement and pro forma agreement in the back of that policy because of insurance and other legal issues.

We do not own the minerals. We understand the Crown owns the minerals. We own the bit on the top which you drive your truck over. In terms of the right to say no completely, I have always advised, 'Be very careful you are not the last person left with a mine all around you. Do you still want to live there?'. If you go to the mining company and say, 'Can I have my compensation now?', the mining company might say, 'No, you can stay there'.

Mr NOONAN — I suppose the question for us is do we fix the system that is not broken? If you are not saying at this point that there are overwhelming numbers of disputes, we do not want to get too far ahead of ourselves all the same. That is an important point. If you are saying to us there is not a vast number of these disputes occurring on a regular basis, that is an important point to make to this committee, because we get a sense about how it is really working out there.

The second issue for us is that you say you are not against mining — you take a pragmatic view about this — but you also talk about the need to work towards a market-based approach. Then you are talking potentially about value of land use or what is under that land. How do you do that in a realistic way when it is identified potentially that what sits underneath land is of much higher value than what can be done with land above the surface?

Mr ARBUTHNOT — Just coming back to the disputes, I find that the most imperative issue, which is very relevant at the moment, is information to landowners. I have heard the talkback sessions. I almost feel like saying, 'Can I go and talk to these farmers?', because I know they do not understand the information. In terms of the booklets we have, there is no point sending them out. Nobody opens them unless the issue is on their farm. I would like to think that if there is an issue the Victorian Farmers Federation is known well enough that

we have some information. Ring the VFF. Notwithstanding that, I think the department too should have a lot more information available to landowners.

Mr NOONAN — On the question of the market-based approach, which you talked about earlier, in fairness what does that actually mean?

Mr ARBUTHNOT — From a farmers rights' perspective it allows you to negotiate, firstly, an acceptable payment system. But it is not only that; it is how they are going to mine and where they are going to mine. For instance, with coal seam gas, when I visited Dalby I did not see why any of them would need to be placed on those very high, rich soils. Why could they not have been placed on the poorer soils, given there is no such thing as marginal land — there are only marginal farmers — and on land that is less productive?

There is the siting of the pipelines. In other words, the farmers rights not only cover payments; they also cover where you are going to do it, what are the access tracks and the rehabilitation. One of the points we have not actually won yet with the Mining Department is that I believe landowners should sign off on the rehabilitation plan. They need to consult with us. I notice that the public land managers sign off on them. Why cannot the private land managers? That is what I talk about with rights.

However, in a macro sense, if food is going to become an issue — and I mean this in a macro sense — the tiny State of Victoria produces about 25 to 26 per cent of the nation's food, which is more than Queensland's food production, as I keep reminding my Queensland friends, so we might have to —

Mr FOLEY — It is all those hardworking dairy farmers.

The CHAIR — I wish we grew bananas.

Mr ARBUTHNOT — I am speaking in a macro sense. We might have to seriously consider that food production will become so important for this state that we might have to have the debate on no-go areas.

Mr SHAW — You might have covered some of this, but as far as the Victorian Farmers Federation is concerned, what can you do for your members to be able to promote opportunities that mining and other alternatives might have for your members on their land?

Mr ARBUTHNOT — For some of our members that might be an almost impossible challenge, but certainly the information and that access agreement. Firstly, in terms of information, what are your rights, what can you negotiate and do not be frightened of the *Land Acquisition and Compensation Act*. There are some players out there who often use that as a threat. You never threaten a farmer. My advice to the mining industry is to not try spin or any threats. Trust is the most valuable asset you can have in a relationship. If you can demonstrate that, you find farmers are pretty willing people to do with business with.

The *Land Acquisition and Compensation Act* needs to be looked at, I might add, because I think some sections need to be updated. We would support what is outlined fairly clearly in the Mining submission — the Mining Warden should sit within the Small Business Commissioner's area. It should cover all of the resource industries, not just mining, in my opinion. I think farmers understanding those mechanisms would make the majority of land-holders a lot more comfortable to feel that their rights are protected.

Mr FOLEY — In terms of the whole thing about providing information early and building the trust, we have had a few submissions and suggestions that farmers have not been aware early enough in the exploration process. Does the VFF have a view that that should be strengthened or does it work okay and is it up to the individual farmer?

Mr ARBUTHNOT — I think that is a fair comment. We are hearing this in Queensland and New South Wales, too. I know that exploration does have to be published in the papers. This is certainly the case on-farm. The initial exploration is done up and down roads and so on, and it is a deliberate step to go on to a farm. I think farmers would like to know about what is happening before somebody knocks on their door. Our advice always if somebody comes to the VFF and the Minerals Council of Australia, Victorian division, we would always recommend to their members that they come and talk to the VFF. If we talked to them we would advise them to contact the local VFF President or the local Landcare group and talk to these people about it rather than seeing it in the paper.

The CHAIR — Thank you very much, Alex and Jacob. You have obviously contributed well. In around two weeks you will get a transcript of what went on today. You can make some adjustments if you believe there are some typographical errors, but you are not able to change any of the substance of what we have spoken about.

Mr ARBUTHNOT — Chair, can somebody write down the name of that ANZ report, because this is my only copy and I have scribbled all over it?

Mr FOLEY — Yuki can take the link and we will take it from there.

Mrs PEULICH — Is that on the Web?

Mr ARBUTHNOT — Yes, and I can send you the link. It is worth looking at.

Mr FOLEY — Like you say, that is why the VFF has a reputation for having sensitive, pragmatic people.

Mr ARBUTHNOT — Thank you very much.

Witnesses withdrew.