

SAVE COLONG **Bulletin**

THE COLONG COMMITTEE • A National Wilderness Society

NUMBER 46

SEPTEMBER, 1977

Registered for posting as a periodical category (B)

Price \$1

MR. CRABTREE ON PARK USE

On March 29th Mr. Joseph Glascott reported in the S.M.H. that Mr. Crabtree, Minister for Lands, was formulating a new national parks policy, which would place more emphasis on parks for general public use rather than areas preserved as wilderness or nature reserves. This was interpreted by the Colong Committee as advocacy of roads or other developments within wilderness areas.

On July 21st Mr. Crabtree stated that he was impressed by the accommodation provided for visitors outside Yosemite National Park in the western United States. This, he said "reaffirmed my view that parks are for the people." He would encourage the provision of more public accommodation with motels, hotels and facilities on the boundaries of national parks.

This policy accords very closely with that of the Colong Committee, which has always stressed that parks should be for the people, and should be preserved for the people by restricting development to the boundaries, preferably outside the park boundary. In the case of the proposed Border Ranges National Park we have already proposed State Government encouragement of the tourist industry as one means of providing employment in the vicinity.

In the greatly enlarged National Parks system which Mr. Crabtree proposes there will be scope to cater for a wide range of recreational activities in natural areas. The main concern of the Colong Committee is that, if those activities involve roads, fire-trails or other forms of development, they be excluded from wilderness, or near wilderness areas.

The Committee also considered a report that Mr. Crabtree had suggested that entry to NSW wilderness areas in national parks should be restricted to licensed people versed in bush lore. In an interview with Mr. Vincent Smith he explained that the object of this suggestion was to enable rangers to know where people were going and so avoid expensive search operations. The rangers would be able to give them advice, and he advocated a co-operative rather than a compulsive system.

A system on somewhat similar lines has been successfully used by the Water Board in the Warragamba catchment area for many years. Members of recognised walking clubs are allowed to walk in the area. This might be a more practical scheme than one of licensing, because it would be nearly impossible for rangers to judge the competency of applicants, or to supervise the numerous entries to most wilderness areas.

The system would be a positive advantage if it succeeded in excluding off road vehicles, enforcing care in the lighting and extinguishing of fires, and impressing users with the necessity to refrain from damaging flora, fauna and other natural features.

— Alex Colley.

MR. FISHER ACCUSES THE COLONG COMMITTEE OF LIBEL

Dear Sir,

I refer to your Save Colong Bulletin Number 45 of June, 1977, on page 3 you state "The pressures on Mr. Fisher were so great that he took the unprecedented step of announcing that Levers Plateau would be logged after the election and despite the recommendation of Dr. Milton Moore".

This statement is both false and libellous and I ask that it be withdrawn. The facts are that approval was given and an authority signed by me when Minister for Lands and Forests for the construction of a road on to Levers Plateau on 28th April, 1976 **before the election on 1st May** and following a second inspection of the Border Ranges in late April. It was on this inspection that I announced that permission would be given to construct a road on to Levers Plateau as recommended in the report submitted by Mr. J.H. Brown, M.L.A.

While proof of the above statement can only be obtained from the relevant Forestry Commission file, it is significant that on 26th August, 1976 the Premier, Mr. Wran stated in Parliament that he would table the relevant documents. In fact he said — "The Honourable member for Upper Hunter can say that it is a lie as much as he wishes, but in due course I shall give him an opportunity to prove the veracity of what he has just asserted. The documents will be produced to the Parliament. . . ."

I have challenged the Premier by way of a question without notice and now a question on notice to table this file. The Premier's deliberate refusal to honour his undertaking to table the relevant papers is a tacit admission that he misled Parliament.

I trust that action will be taken by you to correct the error in your next Bulletin.

Yours faithfully,

Colin Fisher, M.L.A.
Member for Upper Hunter

We accept that Mr. Fisher "announced" that permission "would" be given in late April, and that he signed the authority on April 28th. The question for Mr. Fisher to answer is why the press didn't get the news until May 3rd., two days after the election? It is normal political behaviour for Ministers to release popular decisions on the eve of elections, but we know of no precedent for a decision being released to the press after an election while the Government holds office but has no mandate. The inference is clear that the announcement to the press was made late enough to ensure that it did not appear before the election, thus avoiding the loss of votes which an earlier announcement would have caused.

— Editor

SENATOR MULVIHILL CALLS FOR ACTION ON KAKADU

On 26 May, Senator J. Mulvihill, Shadow Minister for the Environment, said that whilst he welcomed the expanded Kakadu National Park concept contained in the Second Fox Report, it should be noted that present United States Government plans provided for one third of the state of Alaska being designated protected parklands which is far in excess of the proposed Northern Territory parkland plan.

Last year, Senator Carrick told a Senate Estimates Committee dealing with the Department of the Environment, that when the second Fox Report was received sole responsibility to define the Kakadu National Park boundaries would be vested in the hands of the Minister for the Environment, Hon. K. Newman, and Hon. E. Adermann, Minister for the Northern Territory. 'Consequently,' said Senator Mulvihill, 'I would expect immediate action by them to proclaim the park's boundaries.'

'In view of the environmental dangers to the Alligator River system spelt out by the report and the stringent anti-pollution measures suggested in the event of uranium extraction in that region, I doubt the capacity of the Northern Territory authorities to police such monitoring,' said the Senator. In any case, I would imagine the Australian Mining Council would seek to dilute the safety code on the grounds of excessive costs.'

'Having regard to all these factors the Australian Government would be wise to confine any uranium production to Mary Kathleen mine in accordance with the policy declaration of the Federal Parliamentary Labor Party.'

PARK FIRST. ONE MINE LATER — PERHAPS

The second Fox report is a major victory for the conservation cause. It's not as clearcut a denial of mining as the Fraser Island Inquiry. But never before has an Australian inquiry come out with such an unequivocal demand for the urgent dedication of a major National Park.

Mr. Justice Fox and his two Commissioners have little comfort for the mining companies: '... if mining is to proceed... ' is the most repeated phrase in the Report. The Judge makes it clear that mining development should not proceed until the park has been dedicated. Only one mining operation seems at all feasible to the Commissioners — Ranger — and only under the most stringent conditions ever seen in Australia, including:

- burial of tailings in the mine itself
- higher construction standards
- guarantee deposits
- revegetation of overburden dump and cleared areas
- a number of new supervising Authorities
- more research and monitoring
- amendment of lease boundaries to ensure protection of aboriginal sacred sites.

No mining rush

The Ranger Uranium Inquiry Report sets out to prevent the sort of mining rush which has destroyed natural environments and aboriginal communities in a dozen places around Australia. It envisages one operation only. If two are to be contemplated by Parliament then the second must be started much later to avoid deluging this delicate region and the remnants of its aboriginal clans with white workers and machines.

The Alligator Rivers Region according to CSIRO is the best wildlife area in Australia, possibly equalled only by Cape York. It contains the best collection of Aboriginal Art galleries in Australia — one of the best collections in the world. The scenery is superb, varying from rich coastal mangrove forests to paperbark fringed rivers and an intricately dissected escarpment.

Wide boundaries for park

Mr. Justice Fox has set down a blueprint to save all this. In doing so he endorses almost all the recommendations of the Australian Conservation Foundation, including in the proposed park virtually the whole catchments of the South and East Alligator Rivers. The two uneconomic or marginal pastoral properties, Mudginberri and Munmarlary are recommended for addition to the park through immediate resumption. Consideration is to be given too, to resumption of two further properties in the south, Goodparla and Gimbat.

The park should be dedicated under the Federal Government's National Parks and Wildlife Act. Administration should be by the Federal National Parks and Wildlife Service. These recommendations will give particular pleasure to the former President of the Australian Conservation Foundation, H.R.H. Prince Philip, who repeatedly urged that the most clearcut and professional administration be given this area of such high world importance.

Joint administration

The park should first be dedicated as Aboriginal land. It should be administered in consultation with the Aboriginals responsible for it. Mr. Fox records the agreement of the Aboriginals concerned to this co-operative proposal. He sees the Park as a source of employment for them.

In only one report has Mr. Fox not agreed with Australian Conservation Foundation submissions. ACF said bluntly that mining is not compatible with a national park. Mr. Fox recommends that the best possible park be set up first and leaves the mining decision to the Government.

Already the 1000 or 2000 community organisations which make up the Australian conservation movement have begun representations seeking early dedication of the park. It was first proposed in 1965 by the Northern Territory Reserves Board and promised by each successive Federal Government. Under each new Government the proposed boundaries were reduced to exclude successive pastoral grants and mining applications.

Opposition to uranium mining

The Australian Conservation Foundation is unequivocally opposed to uranium mining and export (except minor quantities for bio-medical purposes). ACF believes no practical solution exists to the disposal of the long lived wastes from nuclear power plants. There is a real danger that nuclear material may be hijacked by terrorists. Nuclear power production provides the opportunity for manufacture of the nuclear bomb.

In addition, the uranium mining projects of Arnhem Land threaten one of the four major 'World Heritage' areas in Australia. Mr. Fox is fully aware of the dangers of an unplanned rush into Arnhem Land. In his view the 2000 to 3000 people involved in the construction stage of a single project would be difficult enough to control without an added influx of tourists. So he rules out a build up of tourists to the park.

However, if mining does not take place, then tourism becomes possible. And tourism will provide a much stronger basis for the regional economy than a short term mining operation in a highly fluctuating market.

Every Australian should have the chance, if he wishes to take it, to see his country's best wildlife area and to marvel at one of the best collections of Aboriginal paintings in the world.

— Milo Dunphy

HAWKESBURY VALLEY SYMPOSIUM

The proceedings of the National Trust's symposium, "Planning the Future of the Hawkesbury River Valley", held in March, 1976, are now available at the National Trust Centre, Observatory Hill, Sydney, and cost \$3.00 (posted \$1.50 extra).

MR. FRASER'S URANIUM DECISION

On Thursday, August 25, 1977, the Federal Government announced its long expected go-ahead on uranium mining in the Northern Territory.

Australia's conservative press responded like trained seals. Hundreds of column inches of Government statements appeared in papers like the Sydney Morning Herald on the 26th and 27th. In that paper only about 24 column inches of the opposing viewpoint appeared on those days. So much for 'balance' and 'responsibility'.

There were several serious confusions in the Herald's own statements. On the 26th it said 'All environmental recommendations of the Ranger Inquiry have been accepted by the Government.' But its editorial of the same day conceded that the Government will not adopt Fox Report recommendations regarding sequential development of uranium deposits. The Fox Inquiry's recommendation that the northern pastoral properties, Mudginberri and Munmarlary should be resumed immediately is negated by the Government's decision to dedicate only the eastern half of the park initially. The Herald's map graphically illustrated the point.

The editorial of the 26th admitted that 'It is difficult to share the optimism of Ministers over the enforcement of nuclear safeguards and in particular, over the safe disposal of high-level radio-active wastes. It went on to comment that Government statements in the House and in back-up documents about safe disposal of high-level radio-active wastes are 'strangely bland'.

Thus the Government has failed to convince its most conservative supporters on the major aspects of its fateful decision.

And what of the park? It will be the site of three major mining operations, at Jabiluka, Ranger and Koongarra. If the mining companies' hopes are fulfilled these operations will proceed simultaneously — a mining boom — the very situation the Fox Inquiry tried to avoid. In such a boom will be swallowed the Aborigines, much of the wildlife and the wilderness quality of Kakadu. We have seen it all before. A three hundred foot high waste dump against a six hundred foot escarpment will be no new monument to political decision-making in Australia.

No conservationist read the carefully qualified statements of the Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development, Mr. Newman without a sinking at the heart:

'The Government has decided there should be no exploration, development or mining for the time being in the park area and that any exploration in the future should be carefully controlled in accordance with a plan of management for the national park, as recommended by the Ranger Inquiry.'

Fortunately Labor appears likely to contest the decision. The other threat to the Government's decision is the unprecedented growth of the nation-wide anti-uranium movement.

In the coming conflict one theme should rise loud and clear — that the hundreds of thousands of Australians who are conservationists want an unmined Kakadu National Park.

— MILO DUNPHY

BUSH FIRES IN WILDERNESS AREAS

The Colong Committee is primarily concerned with the preservation of wilderness. There are no wilderness areas in N.S.W. that have not been affected by some form of development, but there are at least 19 areas of 25,000 hectares or more which conform to the definition of wilderness adopted by the New England University Study. Because these areas occupy only 1.3% of the area of the State, the Committee seeks, in addition, to protect many smaller areas of natural bushland with a view to their eventual incorporation in National Parks.

All the areas defined by the New England University Study are in rough country difficult of access and lacking any quantity of exploitable natural resources such as agricultural land, timber or minerals. This is why they have remained in a near natural condition.

Except perhaps in rain forest pockets all natural areas are subject to bush fires. The first question to be answered is "are fires harmful to wilderness?" Simple observation provides the answer that fires, however caused, are capable of wholly or partially destroying wilderness because they reduce the flora to charcoal and deprive surviving wild life of its habitat and food supply. Simple observation also confirms the fact that the burning off of vegetative cover exposes the ground to erosion. This results in increased run-off with resulting stream siltation, rising flood levels and the undercutting of stream banks. Outside wilderness areas vegetation has been removed not only by burning, but by clearing and overstocking.

All over Australia flooding and stream siltation is on the increase. It is invariably attributed by the locals to heavy downpours. The real causes have been vividly described by Myles J. Dunphy O.B.E. (see N.P.A. Journal June/July, 1977) as follows:

In the mountains and ranges of N.S.W. the Great Scour began in the 1917-1922 period. It might have been caused or triggered off by an aberration of climatic conditions, but it is more logical to believe that the cause was a sudden downturn in the balance of nature: that nature had done its best for about a hundred years to repair the damage caused by people who did not have some intelligent respect for the country, and that nature suddenly struck back. The late Frank Craft, topographer, said it started about 1917. He saw a lot of country and was a good observer. The present writer's first-hand evidence agrees with the statement. And there is corroborative evidence. Preceded by a series of bush-fires, the floodwaters tore out the beds of mountain streams, ripped out banks that had been in place for centuries, piled gravel and excavated rock spoil in the mouths of lateral gullies, clogged some rivers with sand that filled the rock holes and gave some beds an even grade which resembled a sandy road: it covered the bedded lapstones, raised the beds to a higher level, increased the speed of floodwaters and the power of ripping action on the verge scrub along the bases of the slopes.

Some streams were ruined in one flood, others by a repetition of floods. Some were changed to rocky gutters. In the process of quickened devastation begun by bushfires, strips of rainforest along streams and ferny bank covering gradually disappeared. Originally damp, deep gullies became more susceptible to bushfire.

Quite apart from the original morphology of ranges, mountains and tablelands, an incredibly long process, the land damage which is so evident now is the result of European settlement and the European method of land treatment by means of axe and fire. This generation is paying for the onslaught of the process too long continued.

Long-time bushwalkers, who have been observant, will confirm Myles Dunphy's description. On most catchments the three agencies of destruction — burning, clearing and overstocking — operate together, but there are several catchments in the Sydney Region which are still little exploited for rural purposes, where the effects of fire alone may be observed. The Macdonald, Colo and Grose Rivers, and Wheeny and Mangrove Creeks, have become sand silted, particularly in their lower reaches. The Cox stream bed, once rocky, is now mainly gravel from the granite country as a result of all three agencies. The banks of the Kowmung have been badly eroded, partly because of clearing for rural and forestry purposes.

It is claimed that whereas wild fires damage the wilderness environment, control burning does not. The only difference between the two is that "control" fires, if, in fact, controlled, damage the trees and larger shrubs less than wild fires. Whether frequent "light" fires do less damage than more widely spaced wild fires is open to question. Frequent light fires leave the ground exposed for a longer period and may permanently reduce fauna dependent for cover and sustenance on forest litter and undergrowth. The dessication resulting from control, or any other type of fires, may well render the vegetation more susceptible to subsequent wild fires.

Control fires lit from the ground and kept in hand by a ground party could probably create at least partially effective breaks, thereby reducing the effect of wildfires. This cannot be said of "control" fires started by the dropping of incendiary canisters from the air. These fires simply burn until they die out, perhaps days later, and there is no means of assuring how long they will burn, or what they will destroy. Whatever their title or purpose, all fires do a great deal of damage to the natural environment.

The main argument in favour of control burning is that fire always has been, and always will be part of the Australian environment. This may be true. Some fires are caused by lightning and therefore it is probably that fire prone areas have been burnt from time to time, even before the arrival of the aborigines.

The frequency of fires lit by the aborigines and the damage they caused has never been assessed, and it would be difficult, though not perhaps impossible, to do so. It is probably that their fires caused much less damage than those caused by the European settlers. A disastrous wild fire could well have burnt out a tribe's territory leaving it with the choice of invading another tribe's lands or starving. Mountain catchments, such as in the Blue Mountains, probably escaped most of the aborigines' fires because of difficulty of access and hunting in such areas. The aborigines used fire, and continue to use it, much as do the Europeans and most of the rest of the human race. Fire clears the "scrub" and encourages the growth of grass and young shrubs which support grazing animals. It could also be used as an aid to hunting, or simply to clear the undergrowth so as to facilitate movement.

Just how much damage has already been done to our environment by the use of fire we don't know, though there is a strong *prima facie* case for believing its effects to be catastrophic. How much of the desertification of the arid inland has been due to meteorological causes and how much to burning? Constant destruction of ground cover means higher ground temperatures, more rapid desiccation, reflection of the heat of the sun and, probably, lower rainfall. How much of the recovery of the arid inland over the last 10 years has been attributable to the fact that the aborigines have abandoned it and how much to meteorological causes? How much soil impoverishment in the higher rainfall areas has been caused by erosion of fire exposed soil? We have no answer to these questions, though careful research might provide one. In view of the damage caused by fire, the fact that it has been destroying our natural environment over a long period is no argument for claiming that it should continue to do so.

It is generally agreed that most fires are started by people. This is evident from Forestry Commission records and the statements of brigade captains. The practice of control burning rests on four unstated assumptions concerning public behaviour. The first is that the law will not be obeyed. If the provisions of the Bush Fires Act were observed, no wild fires would be started by human agency. The second is that the Act cannot be enforced. No Act can be fully enforced, but this Act could be enforced much more effectually if funds were available for its enforcement — i.e. for better policing of its provisions. The third is that fires start in unsettled bushland, the only areas in which control burning by public authorities is practised. This is manifestly untrue, because these areas are uninhabited and hence the main cause of fires, people, is not present. The fourth assumption is that Local Government will not use the powers conferred on it, i.e. Councils will not require land owners, or occupiers, to burn breaks on their own land and will not "enter upon the land" and do it themselves if their requirements are not met.

It is notable that the Act requires the "burning" of breaks. Breaks can, of course, be made by mechanical means, even with hand tools. Most of the cleared land in N.S.W. was created by the use of axe and mattock. Burning is simply the easy way of clearing, if you don't mind what happens to the flora and the fauna and the soil.

The logical means of controlling fires would be to clear, not necessarily burn, inflammable material from the places where fires are most likely to start. These are the places

frequently used by people, i.e. urban areas, roads, picnic places, camping areas, etc. Urban areas are the places which the control burning is primarily designed to protect. If these areas were kept clear of inflammable material, buildings and other property would be protected much more effectively than by control burning in bushland miles away.

Fire risks to homes could be greatly reduced by better town planning. This would mean land would not be zoned urban, or remain urban, unless cleared of inflammable material. One of the principal reasons for bushfire losses of homes is the scatteration of development, houses being built in sparsely developed areas, consisting largely of vacant uncleared lots. Strip development along ridge tops, with bush frequently growing up to the back door of houses is common. The lesson of such unplanned development should have been learnt long ago.

The enforcement of the Bush Fires Act, the voluntary or compulsory clearing of urban and near urban land, and town planning with the aim of minimising fire risk, require determined effort by State and Local Government authorities and some expenditure of funds. How much cheaper and easier to set alight to the bush in some remote area where no fire is likely to originate and hope that somehow it will protect the urban areas. It is even easier, and much cheaper, to drop incendiary canisters from an aeroplane and hope that the fires so started will go out before reaching any "property".

So called "control" burning of wilderness, which is, in fact, uncontrolled, because there is nobody on the ground to control the fires started from aerial fire bombing, is, therefore, a cheap, easy and ineffectual means of protecting the property around it. The creation of a break between the wilderness and the developed areas and the removal of "fuel" from the vicinity of buildings, a procedure fully provided for by law, is the only effective means of minimising fire risk.

— Alex Colley

TAKEOVER THREAT TO MINES DEPARTMENT — ARGYLE ST. TYCOON MOVES IN

Mr. FREUDENSTEIN: I ask the Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Mines and Minister for Energy whether thousands of jobs and job opportunities have been lost to the workers of this State since Milo Dunphy took over the management of the Department of Mines in N.S.W. I ask the Minister whether this is particularly so —

Mr. F.J. WALKER: On a point of order. I submit that the question is framed in an argumentative tone. We all know that Milo Dunphy, who is a leading conservationist and a constituent of mine, has no relationship whatever with the Department of Mines. I submit that, by using that argumentation, the honourable member is out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the honourable member for Young knows the manner in which to ask a question. I shall give him the opportunity to put the question again.

Mr. FREUDENSTEIN: I ask the Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Mines and Minister for Energy whether thousands of jobs and job opportunities have been lost to the people of N.S.W. since the Government came into office? . . .

Mr. HILLS: The Honourable member for Young was, I suppose, one of the worst Ministers for Mines and Energy that this State has ever seen. When I took over this portfolio, the inefficiency, that was lying around because of this former inefficient Minister for Mines and Energy was quite extraordinary. To suggest for one moment that thousands of jobs have been lost in this State because of actions of this Government — for example, in connection with sand mining — is an utter and deliberate lie being peddled round the State by the Leader of the Country Party and his cohorts. Seven jobs have been lost in N.S.W. because the Government did not make a decision in connection with Myall Lakes until last Tuesday. The Government has preserved the Myall Lakes area as a national park for all time, thus preventing its continued rape, which had been authorized by the former

Government. We have assured the protection of the jobs of the people who work for the mining companies that received approvals from the former Government for not only mining leases but also development applications. . . .

*Parliamentary Debates (Hansard)
9th June, 1977. No. 65.*

U.S. FORESTERS SHOW THE WAY. AUSTRALIA FOLLOWS

Looking at the overall course of U.S. forestry, one can discern a trend from the use of virgin timber first for firewood and then for lumber, to the use of second-growth for pulp, plywood, and particleboard, and then to the use of third-growth declining size and distribution, as well as other woody materials, for silvi-chemicals. In other words, there is no real commitment to sustained production of timber for lumber. Instead, changing markets and increasing capital investments in mechanization are pushing the industry toward shorter and shorter growing cycles and more and more processing. In the meantime, the soil base is disturbed more often, producing more erosion. In many forests with fragile soils, soil is eroding at rates 100 to 1,000 times faster than it is being formed, suggesting that only two to six growing cycles are possible before all the soil is essentially gone. There is also reason to fear that vital nutrients are being leached out of many sites as a result of rain wash after excessive clearcutting.

—Sierra Club Bulletin, April 1977.

MORE POSITIVE ENVIRONMENTAL DECISIONS IN THE U.S.

Strip Mining

For over seven years environmentalists have worked to protect the nation's lands from the ravages of uncontrolled strip mining. Legislation now provides such protection by establishing a joint state-federal regulatory system. It includes the following provisions:

- 1) Prime agricultural land must be restored to its pre-mining productivity, and the operator must prove his ability to do so before a permit is issued
- 2) owners of land underlain by federal coal are protected by requiring their written consent prior to mining operations
- 3) Strip mined sites must be returned to their approximate original contour without leaving highwalls
- 4) A fund for the reclamation of "orphaned" strip mined lands will be set up from fees charged on mined coal
- 5) While it will be easier than environmentalists wanted for operators to obtain permits for "mountaintop mining" (the process of cutting off hilltops to get at buried coal seams), there will be tougher standards governing its practice, especially regarding the placement of spoil
- 6) public hearings and notices will be required in the permit process

Study on Wild and Scenic Rivers

Interior Secretary Cecil D. Andrus, responding to President Carter's environmental message, has sent to Congress a legislative proposal asking that 20 river segments be authorized for study as possible additions to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. The rivers would be protected from federally licenced or financed water resource developments while they are being studied to determine their suitability for inclusion in the system.

Congress would evaluate the findings of each study, conducted under the direction of the Interior or Agriculture departments, and determine whether to enact legislation to place them in the system as Wild, Scenic, or Recreational Rivers, or some combination of these categories.

Endangered American Wilderness Act

In its long-awaited testimony on the Udall-Church "Endangered American Wilderness Act of 1977" the Carter administration outlined a strong new policy for National Forest wilderness. Assistant Agriculture Secretary endorsed the legislation, supporting all 22 areas in the bill, at least for study.

In what observers termed a "historic day" for wilderness policy, Cutler told the House Subcommittee on Indian Affairs and Public Lands: "The nation's wilderness has become a vanishing resource. The Carter administration has committed itself to provide protection for these lands within the wilderness system. This department will pursue that goal with a new sense of urgency." Cutler stressed a balanced policy, which will also include "new initiatives to increase the productivity of non-wilderness forest lands, public and private."

— Sierra Club News Reports 15th July, 7th July, and 13th May, 1977.

U.S. PRESIDENT LEADS CAMPAIGN FOR WILDERNESS

"In his May 23 environmental message, President Carter said that the National Wilderness Preservation System "must be expanded promptly, before the most deserving areas of federal lands are opened to other uses and lost to wilderness forever." Along with other initiatives, the President promised a "vigorous wilderness program" for the BLM and directed that federal agencies expedite preparation of additional wilderness proposals for Alaska, the East, and the National Grasslands. The President also gave his endorsement to the top-priority Endangered American Wilderness Act, H.R. 3454.

— From National News Report of the Sierra Club, 13th June, 1977.

ANOTHER GOOD REASON FOR A GREATER BLUE MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

The Hon. K. G. Booth, M.L.A., Minister for Sport and Recreation and Tourism, answering a question in Parliament on 7th June, 1977 . . .

" . . . On coming to office and making an investigation of the Department of Tourism I was staggered to discover the lack of attention, promotion and finance that had been given to the department by the former Government. The Hunter, metropolitan and Illawarra areas had been completely neglected. It should be borne in mind that 6 per cent of the workforce of New South Wales is related to the tourist industry. That demonstrates that it is a highly labour-orientated industry, which deserves better consideration than was given to it by the previous Government. In the year 1975-76 in New South Wales eleven million trips were undertaken, to the value of \$560 million. The most popular areas were Sydney, the North Coast, Illawarra, south-east and Hunter. Therefore, the three neglected regions are among the most popular tourist areas of New South Wales."

FOR NEW SUBSCRIBERS ONLY

The Secretary
The Colong Committee Ltd.
18 Argyle Street
SYDNEY, 2000

Dear Sir,

I enclose \$2.00 being my subscription to the Save Colong Bulletin to Dec. 1977.

I enclose \$ being a donation to the Colong Committee's Fighting Fund.

NAME: Mr. _____
Mrs. _____
Miss _____ (Block letters)

ADDRESS: _____
_____ (Block letters)

Post Code _____

SIGNED: _____ Date: _____

MEETING

THE LAST RAINFOREST

TO SAVE THE BORDER RANGES FOREST

Meeting of representatives of community organisations at
the Sutherland Room, The Union, University of Sydney
On 30th September, 1977

Registration: 7p.m.
Meeting commences: 7.30p.m.

Chairman: Professor R.N. (Peter) Johnson

Speakers invited include:

- Prof. Ian Douglas (Geography University of New England)
- Mr. Russ Maslen, President Byron Flora and Fauna Conservation Society
- Mr. Milo Dunphy, Vice Chairman, The Colong Committee
- Slides by Mr. Henry Gold.

The Colong Committee was elected in the Sutherland Room in 1968 to spearhead the campaigns of community organisations opposing limestone mining in Colong Caves Reserve. The Reserve is now included unmined in the Kanangra-Boyd National Park.

The Committee's second campaign defeated plans for a pine plantation on the Boyd Plateau. The Plateau is now included in the National Park.

Despite numerous inquiries, reports and submissions, the logging of the last rainforest in NSW continues. Most of the rainforest is included in two State Forests: Wiangarie and Roseberry. Eighty percent of Wiangarie State Forest has

already been logged. This superb rainforest will be eliminated unless the conservation movement undertakes another co-ordinated campaign of the sort that won Colong and the Boyd.

Your Society's ideas and co-operation are needed at the Meeting. you are invited to send **two voting representatives**. Observers from your society are welcome too. Please complete the form attached and ensure your representatives present it at the meeting.

The last rainforest in NSW is worth fighting for!

REGISTRATION

*Complete this form and
present at meeting

FOR 'SAVE THE BORDER RANGES RAINFOREST' MEETING
SUTHERLAND RM., SYDNEY UNIVERSITY UNION, 7 PM 30 SEPT. '77.

BLOCK LETTERS PLEASE

SOCIETY

ADDRESS FOR MAIL

..... POST CODE

SECRETARY OR OTHER
OFFICE BEARER CONTACT

ADDRESS

..... POST CODE PHONE

REPRESENTATIVE (1)

ADDRESS

..... POST CODE PHONE

REPRESENTATIVE (2)

ADDRESS

..... POST CODE PHONE

SIGNED FOR SOCIETY DATE