

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

Adelaide — 17 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

Ms C. Vincent, Chief Executive and President, and

Mr D. Crabb, Policy Manager, South Australian Farmers Federation.

The CHAIR — Thank you very much for being here. I am Neale Burgess, the Member for Hastings. I am the Chair of the Committee. On my right is Martin Foley, the Member for Albert Park, and on my left is Wade Noonan, Member for Williamstown. Welcome to today's public hearing. This committee is an all-party committee and we are hearing evidence on the Inquiry into greenfields mineral exploration and project development in Victoria. The Economic Development and Infrastructure Committee is required to inquire into, consider and report on the benefits and drivers and barriers of greenfields mineral exploration. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege. However, any comments made outside this hearing will not afford such privilege.

Are you going to talk at the same time?

Ms VINCENT — I wanted to do it differently, if that is okay. My name is Carol Vincent and I am the chief executive and president of the South Australian Farmers Federation. This is Deane Crabb, who is our policy manager. I have to say upfront that we know very little about Victorian experience and also coal seam gas, and in the discussions that we had we were asked to come and talk about the South Australian experience in terms of agriculture and whatnot. So rather than just sit here and make sort of a presentation, which is I know what you are expecting, I would feel happier because we are outside of the Victorian experience if you asked questions that you thought were relevant and important to have answered.

The CHAIR — Happy to do that. I need to get you to state your full name and business address.

Ms VINCENT — Carol Vincent, Chief Executive and President of the South Australia Farmers Federation, 67 South Terrace, Adelaide.

The CHAIR — And you are appearing today on behalf of the Farmers Federation?

Ms VINCENT — That is it.

Mr CRABB — Deane Crabb, Policy Manager of the South Australian Farmers Federation, 67 South Terrace, Adelaide

The CHAIR — And you are appearing on behalf of the Farmers Federation as well?

Mr CRABB — Yes.

The CHAIR — If you would like to just do your short presentation and then we can have an exchange.

Ms VINCENT — That would be great and thank you for being prepared to be flexible. The South Australian Farmers Federation is an affiliated group representing the agricultural rural communities in South Australia and obviously our brief is to lobby on behalf of the farming community in South Australia in their best interests. As I know that you are well aware, mining and agriculture have had somewhat of a strained relationship. There has been growing attention in most states of Australia. We believe that it is important to find some balance and it is not good to have a conflict situation between the agricultural sector and the mining sector. However, in saying that we represent the rights of farmers and obviously farmers are not totally happy with the Mining Act in South Australia. The Mining Act in South Australia was written in 1973.

Mr CRABB — 1971.

Ms VINCENT — 1971.

The CHAIR — Now I know why you are here.

Ms VINCENT — In the early '70s, and we think that it is outdated. Life today is very different than it was in the early '70s and that we really should have a total rewrite where we take into account some other issues such as climate change, soil sequestration, and obviously we need to have a discussion that is also reflected in the Act around food security and continuity of food production.

In many years gone by mining in South Australia predominantly happened in pastoral lands and further up north. Over the last, I suppose, 10 years we have seen it creep in closer to the prime agricultural lands that are within quite a close distance to Adelaide. Consumers are much more concerned about what they put in their

mouths than they used to be. They are more sophisticated and are certainly showing that they do not want a totally imported food regime. They want local food and they want access to healthy, affordable domestic supply. Now, to be able to maintain that and also to look at the growing population as well — which will reach nine billion by 2050 — we need to have sensible arrangements in place and sensible legislation that ensures that we are able to maintain our prime food production lands whilst still being able to grow the State as far as mineral resources and how that works and how we can all appropriate together.

A number of farmers would see the opportunity to engage with a mining company. Some of them would see that as positive. They would see that there would be the ability to have some compensation and possibly even sell their land. However, there are also a large number of farmers that are not so happy for that to occur where they want to retain their farming agricultural prices and they do not want it eroded in any way by mining companies.

Now, I will just talk about exploration for a minute. We feel very strongly that exploration on any food producing land should have a time limit, and I will give you an example of something that is happening to a Yorke Peninsula farmer at the moment who is a member of ours who is in an interesting position. His farm is a multigenerational farm and his sons are of the age where they would be coming into the farm business. So it is a multimillion dollar enterprise and it is in prime grain-producing land. So he would produce for quite a large number of export markets as well as domestic supply. There is a company on the Yorke Peninsula that has been there for a number of years and they have done very good work in regard to selling themselves, engaging with the local community and the local councils and the proposition for what they may do in the future is probably viewed as a very attractive one. Now, this particular farmer has had them on his property for over five years. They are not cashed up. They need partners and it is becoming increasingly obvious that the likelihood of them attracting partners is not really, you know, it is just probably not going to happen. He cannot plan and his boys cannot plan for the future. If they move from exploring into mining, three-quarters of his farming property will be taken out.

Mr FOLEY — Open cut.

Ms VINCENT — Yes. So that will disappear. However, he has a dilemma. Are they ever going to have the farming partners, are they ever going to mine? He has said, ‘My boys are saying to me: ‘Well, Dad, you know, we wanted to come into the family business with you, but we can’t’.

The CHAIR — It may not be there.

Ms VINCENT — Exactly. He cannot put it on the market because it has got this hanging over his head. He borrowed an enormous amount of money to buy his father out and set his father up for his retirement. So his business is in limbo because he cannot make any decisions. We think it is very important that there is actually a line drawn in the sand, that there is some surety for farming business owners in the same way that there is for mining companies.

The CHAIR — What are his options if they decide to pursue it?

Ms VINCENT — All he would be able to do is sell to them and he does not want to do that.

The CHAIR — He does not have any choice.

Ms VINCENT — No. Or they might offer to buy him another property, or taking out three-quarters of a property and leaving him with a quarter, which is neither here nor there for him because it has been a multigenerational property and his interest is specifically in that property in carrying on. It is not very far away from Adelaide and it is prime grain-producing land. So we do not have in any of the states — I do not think you do in Victoria, so correct me if I am wrong — none of the states have a food security plan or even a food plan.

Nationally, government is in the process holding a number of consultations and developing a food plan. The states need individual food plans too and they need to get some clarity, not just for the agricultural sector but also for the mining sector as to what they think is important and where the continuity of economic development lies in some of those areas. Food production will go on forever. Most mining has a lifespan. Whether it is 10 years or 40 or even more, it is benign. So in some of these areas the best economic outcome for the State is in

maintaining its food production and its potential food security for the future against imported and foreign investment, imported foods, or is it mining and how do we create some kind of balance that is important.

The CHAIR — Are there no legal options for him at all if they want to develop? Is it just a fait accompli that so long as they pay the going value for the land, he does not have anything that he can say about that?

Ms VINCENT — There were some amendments done to the Act earlier this year. One of the things that we thought was important was instead of legal cases going to the Wardens Court — —

The CHAIR — Wardens Court?

Mr FOLEY — It is a specialist mining court.

Ms VINCENT — Yes. It is obviously different in Victoria. That they went to the ERD Court, Environment Resource and Development Court. There could be an opportunity there, but it would be unlikely unless there could be a proven case that would fit into any of those criteria, but no there are no options. In South Australia whilst there is some discussion in the Act around exempt land, that is only exempt while cropping or whatnot is taking place. As soon as there is an agreement, then they will not exempt any more, but there is no ability under the Act at the moment for a farmer in South Australia to say no.

The CHAIR — So what you are doing is holding up a flag and saying that ‘We are coming to a crossroads where the production of food is going to be more valuable to the community than the production of mining’.

Ms VINCENT — In some areas possibly, but the farmers who want to be able to work with the mining companies and are happy to support that on their land or anyone who wants to sell their land, they should have the option to do that too, but for those that want to maintain food production and do not want their properties eroded in that kind of way, I think there should be some ability around right to farm linked to a food plan to be able to say no.

I do quite a number of mediations with our members and mining companies around compensation, but also around access agreements and where the parties have just sort of not been able to work together. We also work — and I am sure Jonathan and Nigel probably mentioned this, this morning — we work quite closely with SACOME in trying to develop uniform examples of agreements and access agreements and rights for landholders and rights for mining companies so that there is — —

Mr FOLEY — They provided us with copies of various policies.

Ms VINCENT — I thought they would. They are good boys like that. They have fallen on their feet, died and gone to heaven I reckon.

So we need to get some common sense into the debate. We must have balance and we do not want conflicting primary industries that are competitive and that have a really aggressive situation. That is not going to help the mining companies, it is not going to help the farming sector and it is certainly not going to be effective for government in being able to develop a state to move forward.

Mr FOLEY — Could I tease that out a little bit because that is a consistent theme that we have seen in evidence in Victoria, that recognition that there is a space for everybody, but different views as to where everybody fits there. We have seen different positions put around Australia as well. We have started to see regularity arrangements in Queensland and perhaps New South Wales that rank different claims to land.

Mr NOONAN — And Legislation Queensland.

Mr FOLEY — Legislation Queensland.

Ms VINCENT — It is grave legislation.

Mr FOLEY — That essentially rules out in some cases exploration within certain distances, certain types of activity. Talking about food security, all the issues that you have just alluded to, does the South Australian Farmers Federation have a view as to is there a ranking and if there is a ranking, where does that place the

farmers' ability in that food security area to deny access, certainly the valid ones? Do you have a policy position on that?

Ms VINCENT — Within an area we think that the farmers have the right to say no.

Mr FOLEY — At exploration?

Ms VINCENT — Yes. Certainly at exploration.

Mr FOLEY — Currently you do not believe that that they have that ability?

Ms VINCENT — No, they certainly do not. Not in South Australia.

The CHAIR — Why exploration, Carol?

Ms VINCENT — Now I will just move sideways for a minute. I sit as a ministerial appointee to a committee called the Brukunga Mine Site Remediation Review Committee. Brukunga mine site is in the Adelaide Hills and it is a mine that has acid leakage and that was a BHP mine that stopped being in use in the 1970s. So I do have a little bit of knowledge in regards to mining and mining practices and rehabilitation.

A farmer really does not want to go anywhere near the whole process and just wants to continue to grow food. Even with the best mining company who is really sensitive and very sort of polite about working with the farmer and doing all the right things, it is still extremely intrusive to the farm, the running of the farm and the farm practices. It will still encroach on their ability to perform their business in the way that they want to. Farmers know immediately whether they want to be in it or out of it and they will be clear about that. Farmers are pragmatists and they are pretty literal characters; they are pretty black and white. A mining company will know whether a farmer is going to sort of, you know, want to be involved or does not want to have anything to do with them and whether they are going to be a hassle. You know at that point.

Mr NOONAN — What do you make, then, of the other side of the debate which says mining can produce such value for a state, far greater than perhaps the economic return of agricultural use, and the mine will not be there forever, might only have 15 to 20 year life span, but the impacts associated with the state economy just can be so much greater than agricultural use that the sole way of determining whether this is good or bad — by the way I am not unsympathetic about the position you are putting, but this is the counterargument — how do you respond to that because it would seem to me in South Australia that government has made a decision that what have we got here in South Australia, mining, let's go full steam ahead and if we have to tread over others, well, so be it because this is about the prosperity of our economy and, therefore, you know it is about providing benefits to the most amount of people here in South Australia. How do you sort of counter that argument because again we have had evidence from the Victorian Farmers Federation, and they believe that where there is a conflict on land use, farmers' rights should prevail. You know, we know in Queensland they are talking about putting legislation through the Parliament up there which will put some ring around prime agricultural areas so they are off limits to mining and so forth. So this seems to be an emerging issue right around the country where mining seems to be encroaching more and more either on sort of urban built up areas, prime agricultural areas, but that is the argument that is put. The argument is put about the greater good of the state economy or the territorial economy. So how do you respond to that?

Ms VINCENT — Do those people eat that put forward that argument? Do they eat?

Mr NOONAN — And they will all say yes, but you know, if it is a question about where they get their apples, apples can be gained from somewhere else. I mean, there is always an argument. There is always a view that there is another agricultural land across Australia to provide. Now, that might be a completely ignorant view of the world and I suppose that is for you to argue.

Ms VINCENT — Look, there might be at this point in time enough agricultural land to continue to grow enough feed to support our population and to meet export targets, but there will not be if we keep eroding that agricultural land. In South Australia currently we have been hearing for a number of years about this great economic boom for South Australia and how we are all going to live like kings and I will not have to work anymore and be kept in the manner that I want to be kept in by the State Government. However, the truth of the matter is that GDP of mining is still not as high in this state as agriculture. Now, South Australia, in particular,

was built on the agricultural sector. There is a reason why downstairs there is a picture of wool, and it is because that is what put this state into being. Agriculture and mining are the only primary industries. They are being pitted against each other.

I believe that if — and of course there is an absence of we talk about right to farm, but there is an absence of right to farm legislation in any of the statements and there is also this absence of the food plan — but I believe and our organisation would believe that in the primary agricultural lands close to Adelaide if farmers were left with their communities to assess whether they wanted mining on their properties or they wanted to continue to grow food, that there would be enough balance there to provide balance. There would be enough farmers that would be happy enough to mine and enough farmers would not mine and not grow food to level it out. Would you agree with that, Deane?

Mr CRABB — Yes.

Ms VINCENT — You are part of MNN, we are not members of the MNN. We are the only state that is not.

Mr NOONAN — But you would be watching the space fairly closely naturally in terms of the interest in this issue for various reasons. Do you think that there is a lack of coordination amongst the various Farmers Federations about how to approach this issue as an emerging issue or do you think it is already well developed, it is just that each of them have to deal with state or territory governments in relation to essentially negotiating for amendments to be placed in acts of parliament which might give better protection for your members.

Ms VINCENT — I think that the state farming organisations have in the past tended to work in isolation to each other. However, over the last year there has been a concentrated effort amongst all of them to hold regular meetings with their presidents and CEOs and the CEOs having phone hook-ups every couple of months to try and establish some common ground around a number of issues including policy and discussions around these kind of things. So I think that we are better organised than we used to be and that we have more of a commitment of trying to find a unified voice through all of this. Each state, of course, has a different legislation, so we are going to need to deal with each organisation by state. However, how we approach it with each of our states we can build some new conformity into that and also with our state legislators getting some common legislation throughout each of the states.

Mr CRABB — I do not know whether you have spoken to anyone in the State Government, but the State Government itself has a 30-year plan for Adelaide and the greater Adelaide region, but north of the Barossa, down to the whole Fleurieu Peninsula and then one of the arguments of that 30-year plan to protect all the agricultural area in that area.

Mr FOLEY — From urban encroach?

Mr CRABB — Yes, but also environment and anything and they have got now bills in Parliament to protect the landscape in the Barossa Valley and also McLaren Vale.

Mr FOLEY — Have you got that policy position to protect the agricultural land close to Adelaide, is that land exempted from exploration for minerals?

Mr CRABB — Not at this stage, no.

Mr FOLEY — Is that a concern for the farmers?

Mr CRABB — There is more concern. Some people want to conserve the landscape and the viability of the farms that are actually farming in those areas, so there has got to be some give and take about how you protect the landscape and you have got to have viable farms and we are still waiting for that with the State Government, but you may have to talk to the State Government about that. These are the food producing areas of Adelaide, prime agricultural land in South Australia. Obviously we want to stop urban encroachment but also mining as well.

Mr NOONAN — Just back to the compensation arrangements, Carol, sitting here it almost sounds as though it is like a broker trying to resolve some of those issues. How many get to that based on how many property owners would be affected or your members specifically. How many of those would you have to deal with each year, and what is the nature of the sort of discussions that you have during those processes? Is it about

money, is it about your members do not want to walk at all, the generational farm issue? Can you give us a bit of a real-life example of the overall quantity and what the disputes tend to be about?

Ms VINCENT — Okay. In the final analysis most of them are always going to be about money. But I suppose the issues for each of them are different. Some of them are quite basic, and early on it is where a mining company has been perceived not to be following proper process and meeting with farmers and farmers feel that they have been taken advantage of the situation and so we go in and try and negotiate, talk through the issues, get the emotion out of it and then rework an agreement that everybody was happy with and some commitments of how they would do that.

One of them has been an ongoing one, and it is in the pastoral country, and these people love their property and they feel quite a close spiritual connection and they are finding it difficult to have the company there at all. So that one has swung from some basic issues around when the company is there in regards to lambing and shearing and whether they are using access tracks and that kind of stuff right through to how much those farmers should be paid for loss of production and whatnot and compensation, and the other one was they got to the point where the company had made an offer for the property, but they could not come to an agreement around the figure and the implications.

Mr NOONAN — Just as sort of all the things that your federation has to deal with each year and the policy points that you put to government, where does an issue like this factor in terms of your priorities as a federation and where do you see it sort of going forward? Is this something that will emerge more and more and be pushed up a list of your members in terms of priorities?

Ms VINCENT — Yes. We have seen an increase in member contact around mining-related issues in the last year, a significant increase. Most of the work that I have done individually has been in the last year and they keep coming. They just keep coming and I imagine that is going to continue to happen unless we can put some good planning and some good legislation into place around some of the issues that I have spoken about today.

Mr FOLEY — And by good planning, good processes, you see that to be based on the right of the private landholder, the farmer, to deny the entrance in circumstances?

Ms VINCENT — Yes. In certain areas of South Australia.

Mr FOLEY — So not the leasehold country, but private freehold type.

Ms VINCENT — No, only the prime production land that is close to Adelaide, but only those lands.

Mr FOLEY — So for leasehold country out a bit further — —

Ms VINCENT — I think you have to have real clarity about what the arrangements are, but I think yes, I think closer to Adelaide they should have the right to say no. Our organisation would say all farmers should have the right to say no.

Mr FOLEY — But you are practical people. You will negotiate.

Ms VINCENT — We have to find some balance. We have to find some balance that everybody can live with to be able to move forward, both with food production and mining in South Australia.

The CHAIR — I do not know what the ratio would be of your increased complaints about mining as opposed to actual progression into mining, but it would occur to me that so long as there were some reasonable guidelines at the point of exploration, it would seem to be a better time to put the protection in at the point of wanting to mine. That way the State is aware of what is under the ground, so is the farmer and so is the mining company and if then negotiations could come about with the miner being able to have some strength in that negotiation, that would appear to me to be a better opportunity and a better outcome for everybody.

Ms VINCENT — Why?

The CHAIR — At this point in time when you are exploring nobody knows what is there. With some more knowledge, and look it may be at the extreme, it may be that I, the farmer, has the opportunity to say no at the point in time of actually going on to mining, but without the knowledge of what is in the ground, then the

farmer does not know what his negotiation stance can be there, the mining company does not know what the negotiation stance is there and nobody has any idea of what is under the ground. If you take it past the point of exploration and as I have put in as a precondition, that there was some protection about how long you could be there and how intrusive you could be, then you would have the extra knowledge and everybody would know in what situation they were, then it would be a question of how much protection is there for the farmer once everybody knows what is under the ground. I would have thought that would be a better outcome.

Ms VINCENT — I understand what you are saying. We would say that we still think that it would be a far better situation for the farming sector, especially primary food producing lands, that they have the ability to say no to exploration. However, if that was not going to be the case, then we must say that there has to be a very firm timeline about how long that exploration process can be. To be fair to the South Australian legislation, there is some ability; they do deal with sort of to some degree with intrusiveness and work we are doing with SACOME and the Government's mineral resources sector. We all work quite well together trying to ensure that we do not have conflict situations, but where everybody has got agreements that they are able to live with.

The CHAIR — Just taking on from what you said about certainty, I would have thought if you say no before exploration there is no certainty for anybody at this point in time when the farmer wants to continue to farm. That may change at a later date. If that knowledge was in the bank as far as the farmer was concerned, 'I know I've got this under my land', I would argue that that would give him or her greater certainty for negotiation further down the track so long as the protection was there at the point of before mining.

Ms VINCENT — We will never agree with you. However, we will say what I said before; we think that they should have the opportunity to say no at that point. However, if that is not part of the legislation, then a very clear timeline on how long an explorer can hold that lease before they come on.

Mr NOONAN — So I mean we are really trying to tease this out, as you can tell, in detail. We have been provided some notes to suggest that in the latest round of amendments to the Act, the Mining Act here in South Australia, you sought some further protection for agricultural land by requiring that freehold pastoral and livestock land be exempted from livestock operations. Is that correct?

Ms VINCENT — Yes.

Mr NOONAN — You would have put a view to government. What sort of response did you get to that? Were they completely dismissive or were they willing to listen and try and understand this and perhaps go into a level of detail about where you might see that to be operational?

Mr CRABB — They were not completely dismissive, but the mining was the flavour of the month and they kept it pretty straight and narrow. They wanted to make sure they were on mines. We did have amendments passed in the Upper House and got the Liberals on the side and got amendments through and then the Liberals backed down in the Lower House and we lost some of those amendments.

Mr NOONAN — That is interesting.

Ms VINCENT — South Australia is really lucky in the primary industries mineral resources sector. The department that acts on behalf of the government with us that is PIRSA. I think we are really lucky in that PIRSA are really sensitive towards the farming sector and the agricultural sector and that the reason that there is probably not as much conflict in South Australia as there could be is because of their understanding and their knowledge and their preparedness to work with the sector for good outcomes for both agriculture and for mining. I think if you took some of those people out of the equation we would have a very different situation in South Australia than we do.

Mr NOONAN — Just on the amendments, what was the nature of the amendments that got through in the Upper House then?

Mr CRABB — Sale; you could make it so when you explore, you had to have the option of buying the lands if you wanted that as a compensation issue, that exploration, rather than just going in and do it, the mining company would be obliged to buy the lands.

Mr NOONAN — At the exploration stage?

Mr CRABB — Yes.

Mr FOLEY — There was a view that a long-term exploration lease that was not perhaps acted on potentially devalues the asset.

Ms VINCENT — Yes.

Mr NOONAN — So they were the principal amendments that got up and got knocked out in the Lower House.

Ms VINCENT — Yes.

Mr NOONAN — So there was no amendment that got up around the protection of agricultural lands broadly?

Ms VINCENT — We did put that forward, but it did not get up and they were ongoing conversations, but we are having those conversations with both government and the opposition at the moment and we will continue to have those because I think that we have seen within our membership an increase in issues in regards to mining. We are going to continue to see an increase and until we have serious legislation around food plans and around right to farm policy, but farmers have responsibilities within a policy like that too, it is just going to increase.

Mr NOONAN — So you have got a long-term government here in South Australia. I do not know when your next election is

Ms VINCENT — 2014.

Mr NOONAN — So it sounds like if there was a change of government, you would seek to pursue those sorts of amendments again.

Ms VINCENT — Look, we would, but I think the opposition have made it quite clear that they probably — well no, not probably — that they certainly support mineral resources and exploration and mining in this state and it is growth and, you know, the ability for it to contribute to the sector. I do not think they see the world very differently than their Labor counterparts. I will probably get a phone call from them now, but I think, you know, we can be quite clear about it.

Mr FOLEY — From the evidence you have given, you have negotiated one thing with them upstairs, and to have that bowled over in the Legislative Assembly by presumably government and opposition benchers.

Ms VINCENT — They were both together.

Mr FOLEY — And the evidence may well support what you say.

Ms VINCENT — There is every indication — not in regards to miners, but there is indication from the new premier and minister for agriculture — what they have done is taken resources and put them separately and they have included regions. So I think there is some ability to have some better strategic planning in the way that we develop our regions and our rural areas and I think there has been some commitment made by the Premier that he values agriculture and he values food production. So I think there are opportunities for discussion and maybe to see the world a little bit differently in regards to a plan for food production.

Mr NOONAN — Just a final question, really quick one, have you had any experience with mining companies rehabilitating rural land following the completion of their exploration and mining work and if so what has that experience been?

Ms VINCENT — It has been negative and it has been really positive. It has been both. That is dependent on the mining company and their compliance with what is expected of them in South Australia, and the area within government that looks after this kind of thing. Once again, they have been very, very good at following up and demanding the mining companies honour their responsibilities in rehabilitation.

Mr NOONAN — Thank you.

Ms VINCENT — Can I just ask you, what parties are you?

Mr NOONAN — You should guess. See if you can guess.

Mr FOLEY — See how you go.

Ms VINCENT — You are a Liberal.

The CHAIR — I am.

Ms VINCENT — You might be National Party Liberal too. Are you Labor?

Mr FOLEY — Yes.

Ms VINCENT — I am sorry.

Mr FOLEY — My grandmother would turn in her grave.

The CHAIR — Which is the only reason he is Labor.

Ms VINCENT — I would have thought you were a Liberal but you might not be.

Mr NOONAN — You have got one out of three.

The CHAIR — They are both Labor.

Mr NOONAN — Any more questions?

Ms VINCENT — No.

The CHAIR — This will become a public record at some point. You will be sent a transcript. So please feel free to change typos. We are just very grateful that you took the time to come and talk to us.

Ms VINCENT — Thank you very much.

Witnesses withdrew.