

SAVE COLONG bulletin

THE COLONG COMMITTEE • A National Wilderness Society

NUMBER 47

NOVEMBER, 1977

Registered for posting as a periodical category (B)

Price \$1

SAVE THE BORDER RANGES SUPPORTERS MEETING

The meeting was held at the Sydney University Union on Sept. 30th. It was attended by enthusiastic representatives from 20 Conservation groups, including one from as far away as Rockhampton and several from the far north coast.

The meeting was chaired by Professor R.N. Johnson, who also chaired the first Save Colong Caves meeting of conservation societies which resulted in the formation of The Colong Committee.

The main speakers were: Mr. Russ Maslen, President of the Byron Flora and Fauna Conservation Society; Professor Ian Douglas, Dept. of Geography, U.N.E., and Milo Dunphy, Vice Chairman of the Colong Committee and of the A.C.F. Henry Gold, wilderness photographer, presented a showing of coloured slides.

"The axe, the cow and the banana"

Russ Maslen traced the history of the destruction of the "Big Scrub" which once covered the lowlands of the far north coast. Not until the early 1900's was it realised that trees were becoming scarce. Mountain areas were then declared State Forests, thereby preserving them from the axe, the cow and the banana." Only one park — Mount Warning, of 5000 acres, was established, national parks being described as areas that were "simply locked up and inaccessible to everyone." When he, John Brown, and others took up the cause of preserving Wiangarie the Forestry Commission tried to refute their claims, or simply deride them.

In 1973 the Hon. Pat Hills declared that the Labor Party would take immediate steps to prevent exploitation detrimental to the environment and natural beauty such as logging activity in the Tweed Range rain forest. The timber industry expressed "deep concern" for their investments and for employment, and were strongly supported by the Country Party. Mr. Freudenstein said: "It is appalling that Labor should choose this time to jump on the conservation bandwagon."

Although Russ Maslen and John Brown carried on their campaign, they became "the bad boys in the timber-oriented communities." Detractors said, "It will be the forest service that posterity will blame if by the year 2023 we have lovely areas of natural forest stocked with native flora and fauna but dire shortages of commercial wood."

When the Government Parties Committee visited Wiangarie forest in 1976, Maslen and Brown were given one hour in Wiangarie Forest. They gave up when they were asked whether they would prefer tourism or a national park.

The grant of \$5,000 by the Australian Government for a study of the Border Ranges gave the B.R.P.S. and Byron Bay Society a new lease of life, and this was followed by the participation of The Colong Committee, the N.P.A. and the A.C.F.

Only 9 more years timber

The Commission had stated that the whole Border Ranges timber supply would last only another 9 years and there had been admission that Wiangarie would last only two years and Levers for another two. Standard Mills of Murwillumbah were already importing whole logs from New Guinea and Samoa.

In the last two months five members of State Cabinet visited the forest and invited Russ Maslen to accompany them. The Heritage Commission also visited it and sought his views.

The Commission itself had admitted that 50% canopy reduction meant that one third of the remaining forest would die, and an internal Commission report admitted that "the better half of the stand is removed, leaving logs of lower value." Regeneration, the report stated would occur in "100 years plus." Another Commission claim was that the trees would inevitably die in 200, 300 or 1,000 years, "so they should be cut. To foresters timber was simply a resource to be 'harvested'."

A recent development was the formation of the Tweed-Brunswick Re-Afforestation Committee, whose current operation would result in 25,800 eucalypt seedlings and 50,000 slash pines being planted; an operation which greatly improved the image of the Conservation Society.

Russ Maslen concluded: "I know that this forest is the most interesting, the most diverse, the most moody, the most awe-inspiring and yet the most tender of any forest I know. . . I know it should be a national park, I know it will be one day. I hope that day will be soon."

Professor Ian Douglas

Professor Ian Douglas outlined the relationship of the rain forests of northern N.S.W. to the typically Australian element linked to South Africa, the Southern element (India, Malaysia and Melanesia) and the Antarctic element. He then described some of the changes superimposed on rain forests by human activity. Constant disturbance, such as burning, gathering of firewood, grazing, or repeated clearing, would lead to "retrogressive" succession and invasion of the area by plants other than trees, such as bamboos, ferns and kunai grass, which now occupy a very large part of what was once the tropical forest area.

Malayan forests

Until about one to two hundred years ago, climax forest covered the greater part of the lowland tropics. Only in a few large densely populated areas had the vegetation been extensively cleared. Two hundred years ago the Malay Peninsula was almost all forest covered. The time was now in sight when there would be no forest in West Malaysia below the 1000 m. contour except one or two national parks and perhaps a few other biological reserves.

In all parts of the humid tropics accelerating changes in the last 20-30 years had been due to improved access and to

improved machinery — bulldozers and power saws having taken the place of bush knives and hand axes. This had resulted in very large scale lumbering operations such as pulpwood production, (usually not planned on a sustained yield basis and with little regard to proper land usage after the removal of the forest) in the replacement of mixed forests by monocultures and, in tropical America, large scale replacement of forests by cattle ranches.

From rainforest to weeds

In Australia the transformation of the bulk of the country's rainforest landscapes took place in little over 100 years. Climatic changes and fires had, in earlier times, greatly affected the range of rain forest coverage. Clearing for agriculture and the exploitation of timber by the Europeans meant the loss of nearly all the tropical rain forest except in areas most difficult of access. Much of the land cleared had greatly declined in fertility and was now unused, being too overgrown with weeds for grazing and not supporting forest trees. The pastures of the dairy country had become less productive and of lower quality, largely due to decreasing organic matter in the krasnozemic top-soil. The decline in dairying had been most marked in the least accessible, most rugged terrain such as the upper Tweed Valley on the slopes of the Border Ranges. Weeds such as lantana, crofton weed and groundsel bush continued to spread until the reclearing of the land cost more than the cleared land could realise on the market.

Professor Douglas then dealt with planning criteria in the Border Ranges, making a case for properly co-ordinated land use assessment and management, not only on a state and national level, but in the context of global conservation of rainforest. "It is no longer sufficient," he said "to allow the different land management agencies controlling different parts of the area to make independent decisions about the future of the area." On the global scale he stated that "If any country can be said to have the great responsibility for ensuring the preservation of rain forests it must be Australia, because Australia is the country which can most afford to do so."

The whole Border Ranges area

The issue to which forestry planners should be paying attention was "where will trees be growing 20, 30, 40 years time?" It might well be suggested that "much of the land that was cleared should be reforested, and reforested quickly, to provide for these future timber needs." It was also necessary to examine the trend in the growth in demand for national parks. Other considerations were the geology of the Mount Warning volcanic shield which represented "a most beautiful and striking feature of which there are relatively few examples so well preserved in the world" and the need for sites for scientific study larger than at present existed. He suggested that "An extension of the protected and preserved area of the Border Ranges would allow a zoning within the National Park or wildscape area so that some areas could be kept absolutely undisturbed and could be used for wilderness or scientific studies. Other areas could be used much more intensively for a wider range of recreation. This form of land management planning must be applied to the whole of the Border Ranges area, not just to the forest parks."

On reforestation and employment he said: "Perhaps instead of paying unemployment benefits to the people laid off by the sawmills the Federal and State Governments should together think of investing in the future and encourage unemployed timber and mill workers to seek employment in planting new trees in declining agricultural areas which were cleared of forest about a century ago. This replanting could save subsidies from agriculture."

In conclusion Professor Douglas referred to the need for survival for the local community and the relevance of the

timber industry to be considered "not as a mining operation... but as a conservation or agricultural activity engaged essentially in managing land and cropping land wisely."

Milo Dunphy's paper

Milo Dunphy outlined the work already put into the saving of the Border Ranges, including submissions, site visits, publicity, letters and meetings with Ministers, buying of shares in Carricks, printing of posters, employment of a photographer, and articles in the Colong Bulletin and elsewhere. He outlined the growth of pseudo-conservation groups which are in reality anti-conservation. Each appears to have contact with the Association of Country Sawmillers. They include the Neighbours of National Parks, Mr. Oliver Moriarty's National and Regional Parks Association, the Eden group called "TREES", the exotic HOO HOO and the Conservation Society of N.S.W., recently expelled from the N.C.C. The Conservation Society he said, is trying to form an Environmental Bureau consisting of representatives of environmentally destructive industries such as the Mineral Sands Producers Association.

Milo Dunphy concluded by listing 9 of the many conservation conflicts with the Forestry Commission. These were: The Border Ranges, Terania Creek, Black Scrub (Bellingen State Forest), Walcha pine plantations, Mt. Werong and Erskins Creek, the Three Brothers, Eden Woodchip, the 5 Forests, the 85,000 acres excised from Kosciuszko National Park, and the 30 State Forests which conflict with wilderness areas identified by the U.N.E. Calling for reform of the Forestry Commission he said:

The Forestry Commission was not appointed as the liquidator of our forests. Its Act should be amended to spell out a new and conservative role:

- * The first object of the Commission should be to preserve, maintain, enhance and expand our remaining natural forests for their wildlife, catchment protection, scenic and public recreation values.
- * The second object should be to produce timber from plantations on redundant rural lands cleared in the past.
- * The Commission should encourage private plantations.
- * It should undertake major researches in wildlife, catchment protection etc. to provide adequate management information.
- * To do this it needs an expanded Commission of six — say 3 foresters, 1 independent scientist and 2 representatives of the conservation movement.
- * The Commission should no longer be exempt from the normal requirements of other authorities such as the prohibition on clearing trees from slopes over 18°.

At the same time the conservation movement needs the funds for the studies which are vital to a proper claim on the remaining natural forests:

- * an outdoor recreation study.
- * a study to identify the samples of ecosystems which must be set aside for reference.
- * an endangered species study.
- * a rainforest remnants study.
- * a wild and scenic rivers study.
- * a trails study.

The meeting concluded with resolutions calling on the State Government to preserve the Border Ranges as a national park, and endorsing Professor Douglas's proposal for comprehensive land-use planning and Milo Dunphy's proposal for reform of the Forestry Commission.

Christmas gift opportunity

NEW BOOKS ON THE ENVIRONMENT

Display and sale at:
Total Environment Centre
Third Floor
The Argyle Arts Centre
18 Argyle Street, Sydney.

Major Australian publishers display their newest and most popular publications on:-

- wildlife
- nature conservation
- the environment
- the outdoors

Bargain book counter also

Daily from 25 November until
23 December - 9 AM to 5 PM

Profits to Total Environment Centre
Phone 274714

FLOGGING OUR MOUNTAIN FORESTS

The Forestry Commission of N.S.W., a self-styled conservation body, has been in serious conflict with conservationists for a decade. Although the Commission states that its primary objective is "to manage the forests of N.S.W. for the benefit of the people of N.S.W.", many feel that its purpose is to "get the timber out" to provide cheap raw material for forest industries and to exploit rather than to preserve the forests it manages.

In an attempt to explain its policies and general philosophy, the Commission, in October, 1976, produced a 40 page publication: "Indigenous Forest Policy". Although the Commission states that there is "an increasing tendency within the community to question many of the material objectives of modern society, including the emphasis given to timber production as an objective of management", nevertheless the plaintive comment is that the pressures come from "an articulate few who can effectively express their opinions, while the voice of the majority, who cannot or will not commit themselves, remains unheard."

The Commission has a major problem over the next 20-30 years in that, due to forest mismanagement and interference by politicians, there will be a massive deficit of hardwood sawlogs. Their understandable response is to maintain sawlog yield at the highest possible level by intense rather than selective logging. The reason is fairly devious; logging on a sustained yield basis is uneconomic and in consequence the mountain forests will be logged "to the limit of their economic accessibility". In simple terms this means that the Commission will licence the mills to get into the sensitive steep mountain forests, cut every "millable stem", and then get out, perhaps hoping the abandoned forest will regenerate over the next 100 years. Is this a responsible attitude for a government instrumentally charged with managing our publicly owned forests?

The Institute of Foresters held a Seminar at Port Macquarie in July of this year to discuss this policy statement and some of the professionals thought it highly impossible. R.G. Florence of the A.N.U. Department of Forestry felt that "short term pressures and management standards should not unduly prejudice the more positive multiple purpose roles that land can play in the future" and went on to question "how well these expressions of concern for the non-material value of the forest, and consequently the long-term changes in management objectives, are catered for in the policy statement".

Many of the younger foresters, aware that the lack of emphasis on non-wood values is because the senior Commission staff bow to political pressures, have become quite disenchanted. Typically over-cutting to satisfy a

market commitment takes the form of a crown licence quota being given well above the sustained yield of the forests so that they are over-cut in order that the sawmiller with political pull can continue to operate profitably or sell his quota.

The "Indigenous Forest Policy" statement is silent on the reasons for these supply pressures and the economic facts of life which have inevitably resulted in the current philosophy of "flogging" the mountain forests by intensive logging. There is no explanation of why "the present level of cut cannot be maintained", or why "the rate of logging necessary to maintain established industry is greater than their current sustained yield capacity".

Florence expressed his concern that "the standard of planning and practice will in fact, be such that the ecological integrity and the future roles of these forests will not be unduly prejudiced. The public has the right to expect this of a public authority managing a public resource". He concludes that the heavy cutting of previously inaccessible steep mountain forests is not fully compatible with multiple-purpose roles and values and urges the Forestry Commission to "progressively raise standards of planning practice".

Local forestry is already protected by import duties and subsidised via the annual losses of the Forestry Commission, now running at some \$20 million a year. This means that we would save a good deal by importing more timber, rather than producing it ourselves at the expense of the consumer and the taxpayer. We are in fact subsidising the destruction of our native forests, and the industry has made a request for further assistance. If this is granted in the form of tariff or subsidy it will mean that the 'mining' of our forest resources will be accelerated and the demise of the local timber industry brought nearer. The only form of assistance which will save the industry is expenditure on reafforestation.

REPLIES TO NEIGHBOURS OF NATIONAL PARKS ANTI-PARK CAMPAIGN

In a letter published in "The Bulletin" of Oct. 8th (i.e. The Consolidated Press weekly), Mr. T.J. Evans of Mungay Creek Willawarrin N.S.W. writes:

"If we are to have any worthwhile wildlife and natural scenery I think most unselfish people would accept that natural areas must be increased. The threat to primary production comes not from the small area dedicated to national park nature reserves, but from the vast tracts of land that are being operated inefficiently to allow pseudo-farmers to collect tax concessions at the expense of the rest of the community."

In regard to weeds and destructive animals he points out that "there is no such thing as a weed in a balanced natural environment. The weeds, both plant and animal come from those areas where this balance has been interfered with."

He concludes that "There are many people who are willing to relinquish their land for exclusion in the national parks system... My own property is available to the NPWS whenever they feel they want it. Though I would be sad to leave, it would be a rare opportunity to make a contribution to Australia's heritage rather than take away from it."

The Hon. W.J. Crabtree, M.L.A., Minister for Lands answered a question from Mr. J.M. Mason, M.L.A. as follows: (Hansard 25/10/77)

"I have informed Neighbours of National Parks publicly and by letter, and I inform them again in this forum of Parliament, that I am willing to discuss their problems with them. For the information of all honourable members I make it clear that not one piece of private property has been resumed for the Blue Mountains National Park, and that not one notice of resumption has been

served on a private property owner in that context. The honourable member for Blue Mountains in asking his question has done a service to his constituents and others who might be concerned about this matter If at some future time a property might be required, I shall be willing to negotiate with the owner."

In a letter to the "Bulletin" (Consol. Press) of Nov. 12th Mr. D.A. Johnstone, Director of N.P. and W.S. stated that there had been very few cases of resumption and only one case in which the court had been required to determine the amount of compensation.

RAIN FORESTS

A publication by the National Parks and Wildlife Service

Reviewed by Alex Colley

Since the Colong Committee adopted the preservation of the Border Ranges rain forest as its principal conservation objective in July 1975m the subject of rain forest has been very much in the news. Whether the N.P. and W.S. publication "Rain Forests" was inspired by our activities we shall never know, but the Service and the publishers (Rodenprint Pty. Ltd.) are to be congratulated on a first rate publication, attractively illustrated by high quality colour and black and white photographs, many by N.P. and W.S. staff.

Unlike the Forestry Commission the N.P. and W.S. does not promote its policy nor represent itself as a land use authority. Nevertheless the message of the book is pretty plain — rainforests are beautiful, fragile, fast disappearing, and worthy of preservation for recreational and scientific purposes. The publication is written by experts and provides much needed scientific information both for conservationists and for the decision makers. It is in four sections entitled "An Historical Perspective", "The Rain Forest System", "The Fauna", and "The Present and the Future". Although it covers all types of rain forest, most of it is relevant to the Border Ranges, and there is a lot of material to support our campaign to save what remains of these forests. The editorial concludes: "... The issue attempts to focus on this State because of the N.P. and W.S.'s jurisdiction. But more so the rain forests of N.S.W. are a unique ecological phenomenon. In this State, the species of the forests reflect influences from the tropics to the north and the Antarctic to the south — each reaching their attenuated limits in N.S.W. in the "McPherson Overlap".

In "An Historical Perspective" the rainforests of 1840 are described by Allan Fox, and their destruction of the "Big Scrub" by Harry Frith (C.S.I.R.O.) who writes: "Until 1842 no white man had penetrated it and, until 1862 no farmer had dug its soil. But by 1900 the forest was gone and its ashes, washed into the deep red soil, had left not even a black stain on the surface. There have been few more rapid and complete ecological disasters in Australia's long history of thoughtless destruction of its resources." Of cedar he says: "As the cedar cutters passed on. . . the forest itself remained. Cedar seedlings germinated and saplings grew. With protection and management the resource might have regenerated and controlled harvesting become possible. But the farmers came and the rain forest, the cedar's habitat, was destroyed totally and irrevocably." Because of the short lived fertility of rain forest soils and the decline of the dairying industry much land soon became relatively unproductive. Land of low fertility on steep slopes was overrun by the weed tree, camphor laurel. "Meanwhile civic authorities encourage tourists and indeed the district has much to offer. How much more it could offer the tourist if substantial areas of The Big Scrub remained to relieve the monotony of grass paddocks and to let the now mainly urban population of Australia experience the teeming life of a sub-tropical rainforest? And how valuable would be the production of high quality red cedar and other timbers?" He concludes: "Rainforest

now remains only in isolated pockets in the ranges or on mountainsides. The only sizeable areas left are in the north-east of the State, in the Border Ranges. Much of these have been logged but could still be rehabilitated if society would recognise that their long term value to the community as conservation reserves outweighs many fold the relatively small monetary value of their timber." Two photographs on page 11 demonstrate the results of clearing the Big Scrub. The first is a steep landscape of stumps and skeletons of ringbarked trees. The second is the silted bed and eroded banks of the Richmond River near Kyogle.

Allen Strom describes the destruction of the Illawarra forests. He writes "Unfortunately, little effort was made to set aside simple areas of the Illawarra rain forest when it was available and today land covered with rain forest — crown or freehold — does not exist in any abundance, particularly on the coastal plain. It is no doubt trite to remind readers that efforts for preservation have rested with enthusiastic members of the general public, more often than not, badgered rather than helped by administration."

George N. Baur (Forestry Commission) predictably re-iterates the well worn case for selective logging, "balanced" harvesting, roading, picnic facilities etc. Alex Floyd, in his section on Regeneration, takes the argument further by inferring that the Forestry Commission knows better than the Almighty. "If our rainforest is not **managed** correctly" we will end with "Alien plants continually tightening their grip . . as each original plant eventually dies until the forest is no more. Preservation of rain forest involves much more than simply locking it up like a relic in a museum." How on earth did rain forests survive before the Commission came along to manage them? Floyd illustrates reforestation of cleared rain forest with four photographs, showing the first stage with a growth of annual weeds, the second the growth of secondary shrubs such as poison peach and ink bush, the third, fifteen years after logging, with a growth of wattles and geebung and the fourth a coachwood stand "which may take up to 300 years to reach maturity."

In fact the Commission has little or no knowledge of regeneration beyond the third stage, during which nothing but weeds and temporary growth has been produced, since its experiments only started in the early '60's. Baur's statement that "regeneration is no problem" might be right, provided we are willing to wait 300 years. But neither the Commission, nor anybody else, knows how long it will take for the regrowth of a forest comparable to the original.

The main body of the report described the rain forest system, the flora and the fauna. It is most informative, and would provide an excellent reference work for visitors to our rain forests.

Leonard Webb (C.S.I.R.O.) writes the concluding article "Rain Forests in the 21st Century". He writes that "The fate of the tropical rain forest ecosystems is interlinked with the future use and health of every other sizeable ecosystem on earth". After quoting The National Estate Report's plea for the preservation of rain forests, he writes: "Surely we can afford, without any sacrifice to our standard of living or the rate of employment, to exclude from further logging any of those rare areas of virgin rain forest which remain, such as Lever's Plateau, northern N.S.W. or Weymouth Holding, Cape York Peninsula. Remembering that 35 per cent of the total area of Australia lies in the geographical tropics, and conscious that the destruction of the renewability of resources is wrong, we are in a privileged position scientifically and technologically, to assist the conservation and development of the tropical countries north of ours. But first we had better come to terms with our own environmental management."

In a postscript Wendy Goldstein, Education Officer of the N.P. and W.S. says "The concern of the conservationists is

to take stock of the present resources before further commitment is made. In other words they are seeking a policy of land-use planning. That is land-use which is in harmony with natural processes and which ensures the existence of a mosaic of man-use along with viable natural areas. Such a land-use system would ensure satisfaction of the full needs of humans which include aesthetic needs as well as space." In another statement she defines the "principal concern of the National Parks and Wildlife Service" as being to "sample all the ecosystems of N.S.W." This is an important aim, but if the parks system stops at "samples" there will be very little land available for recreation. Surely adequate areas for recreation is a principal aim of the Service?

*("Rain Forests" available from N.P. & W.S.
or Colong Committee - price \$3)*

BORDER RANGES NOW PART OF NATIONAL ESTATE

The Colong Committee's application to the Heritage Commission for the listing of the Border Ranges on the register of the National Estate has been granted. We understand that the Commission will be making a submission to the S.P.C.C. Inquiry. We await with interest the decision of the Forestry Commission on the issue of licenses to Munro and Lever for the logging of the trees in Roseberry and Wiangarie State Forests since the trees are now part of the National Estate.

REPORT OF THE S.P.C.C. ON THE CULOUL RANGE EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRY

Following a round-table discussion, chaired by Mr. J.J. Wright, at which the Colong Committee together with 9 other conservation societies and the N.P. and W.S. were represented, the Commission recommended that, in view of Autobric's limited exploration for alternative sources of shale, and the existence of extensive areas identified by the Department of Mines as having a high potential for producing light-burning materials, mining leases should not be granted on the Culoul Range. It also recommended that the Colo Shire Council refuse any further development applications in that part of the Shire within the proposed national park.

The Commission's finding was based on assessments that

The Culoul Range is an integral part of an area which has outstanding environmental significance and... has considerable potential as a national park.

The proposed industry would have a deleterious long-term effect on what is at present a largely undisturbed environment.

That the area has high scenic value associated with wilderness qualities.

That the noise arising from the proposed industry would intrude upon the natural serenity of the area.

That the area contains relatively rare plant and animal communities.

This decision may be regarded as the first fruits of the U.N.E. wilderness study, which was submitted in evidence

by the N.P. and W.S. It has a significance far beyond the Culoul Range, because much the same criteria could be applied to most of the other threats to the Colo wilderness.

SUBSCRIPTIONS TO THE SAVE COLONG BULLETIN

In this, the 47th issue of the Bulletin we once again appeal to our supporters to renew their annual subscription. The amount is \$5 for the calendar year 1978 (up \$1 on the rate for 1966 and 1977, to cover increased costs). We are also calling for donations.

Subscriptions are budgetted to cover the cost of publishing the Bulletin. Donations are our main source of funds.

Experience has proved that the best way to raise funds is to do something effective and let everybody know what we are doing. By simply asking people to give outright, rather than organising dinners, outings, raffles or what have you, we retain the whole value of your donation.

Should you wish to make a tax deductible donation to the A.C.F., please use the attached form. Such a donation would be quite satisfactory to the Colong Committee.

Most of the work of the Committee is done by volunteers and the value of their services far outweighs our cash outlay. Money donated during the year has been devoted to the following projects:

The Border Ranges: Main item of expenditure was \$2,000 advance for the making of a film for Television - \$1,000 from Committee funds and \$1,000 advanced by a Committee member. Hire of hall, recoupment of fares of speakers and other expenses of the supporters meeting, described in this issue cost \$300. We have been successful in stopping the proposed road to Lever's Plateau and hope for a breakthrough on the Border Ranges following the coming S.P.C.C. inquiry.

The Blue Mountains: Total outlay was \$1,970. This included the professional preparation of photographic volumes for "selling" the Blue Mountains to the decision makers and the cost of the week-end in the Blue Mountains with Mr. Wran and other parliamentarians and officials. Results to date, addition of 98,000 hectares to the Blue Mountains National Park.

Kakadu: Production of coloured poster, cost \$587.

Secretarial Expenses: These totalled \$1,025. Main item was payment to the T.E.C. for office facilities. These include our meeting room, filing space and phone answering service which enables quick responses to situations as they arise.

Other: We made a submission to the S.P.C.C. inquiry on shale mining on the Culoul Range and the inquiry found in our favour. We also made a submission to the Planning and Environment Commission Inquiry on woodchipping in the five forests. This was partially successful. We made representations on many other wilderness issues.

We believe that a donation to the Colong Committee is one of the most effective means of conserving some of our wilderness remnants. Please use the attached form for your renewal.

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

Dear Sir,

I enclose \$5.00 being my subscription to the Save Colong Bulletin for the calendar year 1978.

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: