

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

Melbourne — 7 November 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 R. Fraser, Victorian Branch Chairman and Federal Council member, and

Mr G. Turner, Past Victorian Branch Chairman and Federal Council member, Australian Institute of Geoscientists.

The DEPUTY CHAIR — Welcome to this meeting of public hearings of the Economic Development and Infrastructure Committee. Can I welcome Mr Geoff Turner and Mr Rodney Fraser. My name is Martin Foley, I'm the Deputy Chair of the Committee. Our Chair is indisposed today, so he sends his apologies. We have Mr Wade Noonan, the Member for Williamstown, Mrs Inga Peulich, the Member for South-Eastern Metropolitan, and Mr Geoff Shaw, the Member for Frankston.

Thank you very much for your time and trouble today in coming along, gentlemen. We have received your submission and what we might do is, after we go through a few formalities, have you speak to it. Theoretically, we have until 12 noon. We know we have eaten a bit into your time, so we hope you'll forgive us for that. The process will be that we will ask you to give us your full name, business address and whether you are attending in a private or professional capacity. We will have you speak to the document for a little while and then just have a bit of discussion around the key themes from the Committee's terms of reference. Can I perhaps ask you to introduce yourselves for the record, and then take it from there.

Mr FRASER — My name Rodney Fraser, I'm the current Chairman of the Victorian branch of the Australian Institute of Geoscientists and I'm a member of the Federal Council of the Australian Institute of Geoscientists. I'm here in a private capacity, a voluntary-type role that I fulfil.

Mr TURNER — Geoff Turner, I'm a geologist. I have spent a great deal of time with the AIG, both as a councillor and Chairman of the Victorian branch. I no longer hold any of those offices, but I still keep involved in AIG activities. I am a geological consultant, I run my own business. The previous witness actually is one of my clients, and I have quite a few clients in Victoria.

The DEPUTY CHAIR — The respective addresses, just for the record.

Mr TURNER — My business name is Exploration Management Services, of 26 Abel Street, Golden Square, 3551.

Mr FRASER — My address is 44A Jackson Street, Bendigo, 3550. I am currently employed as the geology manager for the Kangaroo Flat operations for Unity Mining. I am not representing Unity Mining today.

The DEPUTY CHAIR — I was going to say, you would be very busy at the moment. Is it in mothballs?

Mr FRASER — The underground operations, but the rest of it is very busy as we are seeking to come up with some new concepts to be able to revitalise the operation, as well as conducting exploration tenements.

The DEPUTY CHAIR — We're in your hands, so perhaps if you could outline some of the key items from your submission and then we will have a chat after.

Mr FRASER — It will be a shared submission. I'll start off with a bit of an introduction and then Geoff will be carrying on with some other parts of it.

I would just like to thank you all for the opportunity of presenting here on behalf of the AIG. We are a national organisation representing over 2500 geoscientists across all disciplines of the earth sciences, including hydrogeology, environmental geology and engineering geology. However, the majority of our members are employed in exploration and mining within Australia.

The AIG regards this inquiry to be of vital importance to its members who work in Victoria and in the interests of all members, in that the removal of impediments and the promotion of exploration will lead to an active and successful mining industry, offering employment opportunities for its members and for the State in general as well as increased financial and community benefits which will go along with it. In our presentation, we focus mainly on the exploration end of the title 'greenfields exploration' and we won't be touching on project development, and as such we have only made submissions on a couple of the items of reference which the Committee has.

A lot of our members work as consultants, as Geoff does, or as contractors, to companies carrying out exploration within Victoria. Their experience working in the State does influence the type of exploration and attitudes of the companies that are seeking to conduct exploration in Victoria, so we regard the AIG as a very significant conduit for information regarding the way exploration is managed by the Government in this state as well as the impediments and advantages of operating in Victoria.

I would just like to touch on the prospectivity of the State. As we know, Victoria has brown coal, mineral sands are being mined in north-western Victoria, and we have a history of gold mining within the State. But prospectivity has an economic component, in that the demand for minerals changes over time, as we have seen in Western Australia with the iron ore and we have seen with the price of oil we pay at the pump for our petrol. But those of us who are old enough can remember times when the price of those minerals was much lower than what they are at the moment.

Mrs PEULICH — We can remember that.

Mr FRASER — I can. Perhaps some of the younger members can't. Therefore, it is important to remember that prospectivity is an ongoing concern. You can't specify that an area that is not prospective may not be prospective at a particular point in time, but it may not be that way in future.

With the gold price, for example, there has been a lot of activity in central Victoria, Ballarat and Bendigo, as you mentioned. At the time that activity was proposed, the gold price was much lower than what it is today. So the central goldfields of Victoria do have a cyclical nature to them which is directly related to the price of gold. Therefore, the history of mineral discovery is due to the development of new ideas and technologies; and with the development of computer processing power over recent years, geophysics has played a very important role and these techniques and technologies have been developed to enable delineation of geology and geological features, which had not been available to explorers in the past.

As I said, an example is brown coal, one other example is antimony in Costerfield. There is now a successful mining operation there, but has been in limbo for a long period of time. So therefore it is important not to ring-fence, segregate, disallow mining or exploration in any particular part of the State, because the development of new ideas may mean there are opportunities in the future. But if we restrict land access to those areas for exploration or mining, it may be to the detriment of the State in the future.

I would like to pass on to Geoff now, who will discuss a bit more about the regulatory environment that operates in Victoria.

Mr TURNER — Back in August–September 2008, AIG conducted a questionnaire into attitudes of geoscientists in Victoria to regulations and this was brought about because we had been approached by our members with concerns about the lengthy processes and rising costs in producing work plans, the number of agencies that were involved in work plan approvals, the variations in requirements not only by different agencies but by different people within a single agency that would change, and also variations in operating procedures and requirements across other industries. In other words, was the mineral industry more regulated than other industries, like the building industry or farming industry and agriculture? So we produced this survey. One of the questions was a comparison with other states and one of the things was that the overall majority — this is back in 2008 — 81 per cent believed that Victoria had the most difficult work plan approval process. Of course, with these sorts of attitudes, this is why around that period and since, Victoria has been on the nose, so to speak, with other interstate companies or interstate operators, which I guess is why you are doing this inquiry, I hope, to address that issue.

There was a question on the performance of the Minerals and Petroleum Regulation Branch, which is now ERD, and there was a lot of inconsistency between officers within the Department. A work plan would be approved by, say, Ballarat officers, you would send pretty much the same work plan for a similar exploration activity to, say, Benalla office and it would be rejected. Even though you have used an identical work plan but you have just changed the activity to suit the project, one officer would accept and the other one would reject. So it had that inconsistency.

Half the correspondents believed that community consultation requirements were reasonable at the time, but the majority believed that the exploration industry is required to do more than other industries in meeting environmental regulations compliance and such. The large number of other departments included DSE, WorkSafe, Parks, AAV, EPA and shire councils. Sometimes some projects required input from all of these, in a lot of cases only about two or three inputs, but all these inputs slowed down the whole work plan process.

There was another question on the promotion and regulation of the industry, that the respondents considered the Department's promotion of the mineral industry in Victoria was average to very poor in performance. Basically what was happening, which was good, was that the industry gave a good tick to the data-gathering work of the

GSE, now GeoScience Victoria, and such programs as the VIMP program, the RVD program and such were very, very good.

What has happened since the survey? AAV has relaxed requirements when working in areas and they have adopted a low impact exploration definition, which means that a lot of the onerous regulations which came from Aboriginal Affairs was improved. So that was good. WorkSafe has removed a lot of requirements for detailed OH&S policies and procedures whenever we submit a plan work, so that has reduced that. Officers within the DPI are a lot more cooperative. DPI or ERD, the mines inspectors in other words, are becoming more cooperative since then. However, GeoScience Victoria has basically dropped most of its data-gathering programs, the VIMP program is now ceased, RVD programs have ceased, a lot of regional mapping programs are stopped. It is considered that the State is mapped, but we never ever finish mapping the State. It's an infinite length of string, geological mapping. But there has been little change in respect of the attitudes and education of officers from other departments, most noticeably the DSE and some local shire council officers.

The DEPUTY CHAIR — Present company excepted.

Mr TURNER — I have to be careful. Never bag people you don't know.

I can give you a couple of examples on these, I guess we've got time. This is personal experience. Late last year, one of my staff attended a site inspection prior to a work plan approval with representatives from the client, the DPI and an environmental officer of the local shire, to inspect drill sites or a drill program along roadside reserves. Roadside reserves are great in Victoria because the soil is terrific, you can see a beautiful grid, we can move along following east-west roadsides and as the first pass inspection, we can quickly assess the prospectivity of a piece of ground and eliminate a lot of areas and quickly focus in just by getting on the roadside reserves. We don't have to approach landholders, who could be a little bit apprehensive about what we do. But once we demonstrate how we operate by working on public land, then they're a lot more amenable to us coming on to their property. It's a matter of education, and we use that as an education process.

The drilling methods and location of holes were presented in detail in the work plan document, but early in the visit it became apparent that the shire officer had a negative attitude to mineral exploration and had not read the document at all. They had had it for about a month. The shire officer then pointed out such potential environmental impacts as disturbance to native grasses, disturbance to trees, water runoff into a nearby conservation area, and all of these aspects had been covered in the work plan, minimise damage to grasses, which we only flattened, we weren't cutting at all. This is roadside reserve, people park on them all the time, but she was concerned we were going to drive a truck on them. Nevertheless, the officer required more information before she could give approval.

Within two months of the site visit and while the required modified document was with the DPI, VicRoads contractors came on to that road and widened it and sealed it to such an extent that the road moved from a back road with minimum traffic to a secondary road with quite a lot of traffic and no roadside reserve which we could actually work on. So the native grasses that the environmental officer was concerned about were gone, water runoff was totally changed, the conservation area had no impact on the road, and that road then had to be abandoned as a tool for exploration. That environmental officer must have known that this project was going to go ahead, that the road widening was going to go ahead, but she didn't inform us. So she succeeded in delaying that exploration program, which could have gone on the following week, we were hoping to get there in the following week after the site visit, she delayed it by such an extent that it became impossible to work. We can't go along to the private land nearby — sorry, we can, but we are reluctant to get on to private land nearby because there are chicken farms and chicken farmers are really — —

The DEPUTY CHAIR — Touchy.

Mr TURNER — Touchy.

The DEPUTY CHAIR — Broiler farmers are famous for being touchy.

Mr TURNER — There's the disease quarantine issues that they always put up, and we don't have an argument against that. The plan was that if we did find something, that would give us more impetus to get on to that, we would put more effort into getting onto the private land. But being absolutely greenfields, we didn't bother putting that effort into getting on to that chicken farm.

So that whole area then is now not explored, and, yes, that environmental officer has succeeded in delaying us to such an extent that we go away. A lot of people, companies, are delayed by similar sorts of actions and they do go away, they go interstate or overseas.

Another one: this was with the DSE: I submitted a work plan for drilling in a state forest early last year, it was in the alpine region in the eastern part of the State. It was identical in most aspects to a work plan which I had submitted the year before but it covered a different area of the same exploration licence, it was on the south side of the Great Divide instead of the north, which meant a different DSE office, so different officer. The work plan was returned with nine comments and requirements. Six of those were already met in the document, so the officer had not read the document. The officer also demonstrated his lack of experience and knowledge of exploration in Victoria by not realising that exploration licences are granted for a limited time. He also required a flora inspection of an old logging track that was to be reopened. That logging track was last used 10 years before, so there was a significant amount of regrowth and wild growth on that track. I spent a day with the flora inspector from DSE on the site visit, who declared that his visit was a total waste of time because the native vegetation requirements were not an issue. To take account of the trees, we had to do replant offsets, and he said, 'You are opening an old road, there's no offset requirement'. So the DSE officer who told us to do this, the controlling officer, he wasted my time and his own office's time on doing that, and that is a whole day lost which my client has to pay for and it delayed the whole approval again by another month.

It comes down to education. We believe that greenfield exploration in Victoria will be improved when the work plan submission process is streamlined. Ideally, this should be in the form of a template submission, preferably web based. The onus will be, and always has been, on the licence holder to comply with the acts, all the relevant acts: the MRSD Act, the EPA, catchment, fire. So basically all you should need to do is notify the Department that you are going to go ahead with the work plan and with your details filled in.

There should be a one-stop-shop for work plan approvals. I hope that you've had this before.

The DEPUTY CHAIR — Once or twice.

Mr TURNER — I am suggesting that it would be in the form of a committee comprised of well-informed officers from all of the departments that are involved in the approvals process, and 'well-informed officers' is the key. This committee could meet fortnightly to do the approvals on their desk, in a similar manner to which licence — there is the licence committee which meets every fortnight to discuss the granting of tenements. So that could be a model which you could base this committee on.

The approvals process should be assessed on outcomes, not on methods. So the outcome of a drilling program should be — which is the way I operate, not that it's industry best practice by any means, but I try to be — the outcomes should be that there is no evidence that a drilling program had been there after a given period of time, say two or three seasons has passed. The site should be cleaned up so that there is no way the average punter, if you like, could see that an excavation or a drilling program had been through that area. Those are outcomes.

Mr FRASER — One of the issues we have with the various government departments is that they are very prescriptive in the type of work that can be carried out, as in specifying the use of hand tools rather than machinery. As Geoff was just saying, it is the outcome that is the important thing, not how it is achieved. If someone wishes to use machinery, if it achieves the desired outcome, why should there be a restriction? This is one of these prescriptive conditions and quite often we have multiple government departments specifying the same thing, as Geoff mentioned before about the same document.

Mr TURNER — If such a committee is not seen as workable or desirable, then the DPI must embark on an education program of officers within its department and within other departments who are likely to be called on to support this committee, and assess work plans. GeoScience Victoria must embark on substantial data-gathering projects, such as detailed gravity, seismic and other geophysics programs, to assist industry working now in technically difficult areas. As we have moved on, technology has enabled us now to explore in areas that were considered far too difficult even 10 years ago. At the moment, I have a drill program going right now — I hope — where we are looking for gold under about 100 metres of alluvial cover, and we are getting fairly successful in that. There are a couple of companies where there have been good gold discoveries in this sort of environment in the last 10 years. They haven't developed yet, but we have shown that we can find gold in these technically difficult areas, but we do need more assistance from the survey to help with them.

The DPI must do more to promote the mineral industry in Victoria. The onus is on exploration companies to go into community relation exercises and to keep the community informed, but the DPI does nothing. They put out a couple of books explaining what the exploration and mining process is, but they don't seem to be out there educating people in schools or in public areas. That is an issue, we need support from the Department.

I would like to finish off with: if this government is keen on promoting the mineral industry in Victoria, that attitude has to be pervasive throughout every department. There should be no anti-mining sentiment in certain departments and there has to be this proactive or pro-mining sentiment so that we can have the help rather than meeting obstructions all the time.

Mr FRASER — Just to summarise, in the sense of what Geoff has just been saying. GeoScience Victoria has been doing very good work over the years and, as Geoff said, has assisted in gold discoveries in northern Victoria, the mineral sands developed out of one of the projects, and they have been doing some excellent remapping of the State. But as we said at the very start, geology is an evolving science. New technology, new ideas, new concepts mean that every part of the State is revisited, the geological terrain, the prospectivity of it is revisited constantly over time, it is not something where you can say, 'We have done that, that's it, we will never need to do it again'. That has been an attitude in the past, back in the 1950s: 'Gold mining is finished, we'll never go there'. A lot of records were lost at that time simply because of that attitude. Hopefully, we have learned from that.

Constant updating of databases using geophysics and geochemistry throughout the State needs to be looked at. The development of the computer-simulated 3D geological model of the State, they have commenced that and we understand that is under threat through budgetary restrictions at the moment, but that is a powerful tool for informing prospective explorers as well as existing explorers of potential areas within the State.

The role of the one-stop-shop: I have looked at the submissions by the Minerals Council, by AusIMM as well, and they have gone into much detail about the one-stop-shop. We are fully supportive of that type of approach, the actual methodology. We think that DPI should be the responsible body in this. It not only applies to development projects, but for exploration as well. As Geoff outlined the various problems he has had dealing with the various regulatory authorities, it needs to be coordinated so that explorers have a simple, clear, transparent process of seeing where their permission to explore through the work plan is and also the rate at which those things have been improved.

Another thing which the Mineral Council and AusIMM emphasised in their reports was the concept of multiple land use. Again, we are saying the prospectivity of the geological terrain of the State is assessed constantly and is also determined by the mineral cycle, the prices of various minerals, but that doesn't preclude the multiple use of the State. It can be used as farmland, mining, back to farmland, whatever, conservation areas, mining, back to conservation areas.

Rehabilitation, as you may have heard from the Mineral Sands or Iluka, some of that is excellent work. That type of thing also occurred in areas of forest land as well, various mining companies, where they have rehabilitated and it is actually higher standard than what it was previously.

Finally, it is just the active promotion, promoting value to the State and to the communities of the extraction of minerals and the responsibility of government and industry in carrying that out. The onus at the moment is on the companies to carry out the community education and relations programs, but we have seen very little support from the Government, very little underlying information being disseminated by the Government of the value of that to the State, and we believe that is important and there should be more emphasis put on that.

The DEPUTY CHAIR — Thank you very much for that contribution, gentlemen. We have about 10 minutes for a bit of an exchange, perhaps, on some of those issues.

I might lead off. The whole issue of pre-competitive information and data is one of the key items for our consideration and there seems to have been a very good reputation of DPI and GeoScience Victoria in this area. Whilst acknowledging that, you are perhaps saying there are more recent examples of — I'm sure I can go back over the transcript and see — but there was a bit of a change of emphasis or a change of resourcing in that area in terms of modernising and keeping up the data. Could you explain that a bit more?

Mr FRASER — It's the constant evolution of processing. I'm sitting here with a tablet computer, so I can now access through the Internet that information that DPI put out, if I had the link to the website, but it's also the development of the techniques used in that, they also evolve at the rate of technology.

So it's not something where the data from five years ago is the best data you can ever get; the data today would be better than what we had five years ago. So it's a constant process of keeping up to date and better detail, better clarity in that information, which does then lead to exploration undercover, the work that Geoff has been doing, and also in other terrains, so you can see further under the cover into the rock. So it is important that pre-competitive information, which covers the whole State, continues to be collected and maintained in a publicly-accessible form.

Mrs PEULICH — Are you suggesting that the rate at which information now changes, may change, is a faster rate?

Mr FRASER — Whatever rate it is, we just have to acknowledge it does change.

Mrs PEULICH — I understand. You're saying it needs to be kept up to date if it is going to be useful?

Mr FRASER — That's what I am saying.

Mrs PEULICH — But does it actually change at a faster rate?

Mr TURNER — The data itself doesn't change.

The DEPUTY CHAIR — What is there is there, presumably.

Mr TURNER — What is there is there. The data points, for instance, usually in first pass, are quite sparse. You come in and you get closer and closer and as you increase your data coverage or data density, you are going to get a lot more information coming out of it.

The classic example of that was the gravity data in this state in, say, 2000 was part of an old GeoScience Australia and GSV collaboration and that was collected on about a one-by-two kilometre spacing, just along existing roads. So we have good gravity data, and that is fine.

Some companies had collected their own gravity data north of Bendigo because they realised it was a good tool for exploring undercover. GeoScience Victoria got on to that concept, they got hold of their company data and then they improved it with their own projects, only immediately north of Bendigo and this is part of what is known as the Bendigo-Mitiamo Gravity Project. Directly from that, I can tell you that the Mitiamo gold discovery was made. So basically it was an increase in data density that led to that discovery.

Mr FRASER — The concept of exploration licences, I'm sure you are familiar with that, the companies only hold certain areas of land. So what happens outside those areas, even though even it's in the same geological region, is where we see the role of GeoScience Victoria being.

The DEPUTY CHAIR — It is the role of the State to provide publicly accessible information and data. What I'm trying to get at is: is it simply because the technology demands and opportunities have increased or is it because there has been an active pulling back from GeoScience Victoria in that area? Are they still doing what they have always done?

Mr FRASER — It should be maintained at past rates. We understand there is some reorganisation within the Department of Primary Industries, or the Earth Resources division, and we are fearful that it may be pulled back rather than being maintained at the current rate or even improved, which is what we should all be striving to do.

Mrs PEULICH — Under whose portfolio is that?

The DEPUTY CHAIR — DPI, Earth Resources.

Mr NOONAN — Your 2008 survey of geoscientists in Victoria, is that publicly available or, if it's not, are you able to supply a copy to the Committee for our reference?

Mr TURNER — Yes, I've got it here.

Mr NOONAN — If you could supply it to our executive officer at the conclusion of the hearing, that would be useful, because one of the statistics that jumped out was the 81 per cent that rated Victoria as the most difficult place to sort of prepare a work plan. I was interested then, Geoff, in your comment in relation to this idea of template submission work plans. Can you tell us whether they exist in other jurisdiction of Australia?

Mr TURNER — I have been told that they exist in South Australia. Actually, I have been to the South Australian website and, yes, there is a template there, but I don't know what happens once you have put your work plan up on that website and how fast it gets approved because I don't have any projects in South Australia. I guess there is a web-based template where you put in your details, the nature of your program, what you are doing to do and where, and that is submitted as your work plan.

Mr NOONAN — We could have a look at that. The second issue is: Geoff, you mentioned the example of the exploration, you gave two examples. The first one, I think, was the one where you talked about the roadside exploration of the surfacing of a road, but you also made reference to speaking to local landholders who were a little apprehensive about what this exploration process might involve and I think you indicated that, after you spoke to them, there was a greater degree of comfort in relation to the information that you were able to furnish them. Right throughout this inquiry, we have received submissions, usually from aggrieved landholders, about the fact they haven't been able to get information, they have had to source it, they have been contacted by journalists, that was the first they had known of it, and therefore there is this great unknown, if you like, which naturally leads human beings to be apprehensive, which is fair enough, I think. This question about who then provides the degree of detail in relation to the potential impacts to landholders is perhaps a more interesting one, where you essentially put a case that you are probably in a better position than some government official might be to actually explain what the potential impacts are. I just wonder whether you can comment on that because again if we are asked as a committee to make a recommendation about this — where do people get information, do they go to the DPI website or do they go to the mining company or the mining consultants — there are some differences, obviously, in that process but there has been some real criticism, I suppose, of mining companies who just disappear in the face of the level of community pressure because they don't want to cop the heat. But indeed what you do is you put an argument forward that you are probably in the best position to provide information to landholders about issues which might be associated with access to their land.

Mr TURNER — Yes, you're dead right, we are in a good position for that. But then the landholder could say, 'Yes, but you're giving me a biased story, an untruthful view of what you are going to do, because you just want to get on to my property'. So you can get that. We find that, by demonstrating what we do on the roadside, it does help, and yes we do. But because of the nature of the exploration licence granting and the way we manage the licences, it is prudent to take out as big an area as possible because that gives you plenty of room to reduce, that's the nature of reduction requirements. Which means that within any exploration licence, there are going to be certain areas where you will never ever go and often you will find it is those farmers who get apprehensive and they suddenly realise they have had an exploration licence over their land for three or four or five years and any minute now the bulldozers are going to come in and start digging up, so there's that attitude.

Mr FRASER — This is where we see the role of DPI providing that background information: what is an exploration licence, what does it entail people to do, how would it normally affect people? Then Geoff comes along, that person would have that information or it would be easily accessible to them.

Mr TURNER — Of course, a lot of assessment is done as desktop assessment anyway, so we never ever go out on to the land, because we have got the information from GSV, for instance, we have got their geophysics data and we can assess that.

Landholders can find out who has an exploration licence on your land, for instance, just by going to the DPI website — there's a map called GeoVic, but the average person probably doesn't know how to operate that. Perhaps a simplified exploration licence map on the website would be good, so that landholders can go in there and say, 'This is where my property is', and you click in and find out who the tenement holder is and addresses and contact names, et cetera. That would be good, just to make it a little bit easier. It's there now, but you have to that technical ability or desire to get in there and to chase that up. I tend to be a bit cynical about farmers who get in the paper and say, 'I never knew there was an exploration licence here'. If they never knew, they're probably not in the target zone.

Mrs PEULICH — You answered the question earlier, but I just wanted to clarify: did you say that DPI was pulling back?

Mr FRASER — Well, we're fearful.

Mrs PEULICH — Do you have any evidence of that?

Mr FRASER — They are reorganising the Department from the current departmental structure, it ties in as part of their review. So we're fearful that there will be a pull-back.

Mrs PEULICH — Why would you be fearful of that, given that this inquiry has actually been instigated and encouraged by the Government?

Mr FRASER — Just anecdotal things that have occurred and we have heard about. We can't say from anyone, but people are fearful of change.

Mrs PEULICH — But there is no concrete evidence?

Mr FRASER — Not that I can present to you.

The DEPUTY CHAIR — Gentlemen, can I thank you very much for the opportunity of providing your submissions and the evidence today. You will receive a draft copy of the transcript within the next fortnight or so. Whilst it's open to you to correct minor errors and typos and the like, the substance will be maintained, and we look forward to hopefully providing a report incorporating some of your concerns.

Mr FRASER — Thank you very much for the opportunity to present.

Witnesses withdrew.