



THE COLONG BULLETIN

Registered by Australia Post. Publication No. NBH 0318 Category B. Annual Subscription \$5.

THE COLONG FOUNDATION FOR WILDERNESS LTD. 18 ARGYLE ST, SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES, AUSTRALIA 2000. TELEPHONE: (02) 27 4714

No. 115

July, 1989

CONTENTS

Chairman's Address to AGM.....	1
Financial Report.....	2
Blue Mtns World Heritage Submission	3
Development in the Blue Mountains	4
Off-Road Vehicles on Crown Land.....	5
Donations.....	6
Meeting Dates.....	6

NEW DIRECTORS

Two new directors were appointed at the Annual General Meeting: Keith Muir, B. Nat. Res. (Hons) who wrote our Nattai National Park submission and has acted as research assistant to Dr Geoff Mosley for the purpose of the Blue Mountains World Heritage submission and Jeff Rigby the well known artist.

I don't know of a single major project which has been stopped on environmental grounds.

Adrian Jeffreys, Qld Conservation Council Project Officer, SMH 17/6/89

SIR: Your headline, "Hawke's \$100m aid for greenies" (Herald, June 23), is totally misleading. Any aid for our degraded countryside is aid for all Australians, black white or green.

Patricia Turnbull, SMH 24/6/89

Chairman's Address to the Annual General Meeting

While 1988 was the Bicentenary year it also saw a significant slow-down in the protection of our remaining natural heritage and wilderness with the March election of a National Party tail to wag the dog of a Liberal Party Government. The old ways of the Country Party still dominates the Nationals with the "if it moves shoot it, if it does not dig it up or chop it down for the maximum dollar profit made" policies. It is a pity for New South Wales that the more rational Liberals have such an albatross around their necks.

In the past year there have been few wins for wilderness protection, with the exception of the acquisition of the 30,000 hectare addition to the Apsley Wild Rivers National Park which eventually may develop into a real wilderness park if promises are kept, and the declaration of the Mann, Ettrema and Genoa Wildernesses. We still have a long way to go

before all of NSW wilderness areas are suitably protected. The most threatened of these at the moment must be Coolangubra with our State Government encouraging the Forestry Commission to make sure the wilderness areas are wrecked first before this small remnant of pristine forest can be protected by conservationists, or a Federal Government compromise. The Forestry Commission has no concept of wilderness within its senior management as its insistence that all State Forests must be "multiply used" shows. It is unable to consider the preservation of even its small Flora Reserves which have been logged by "accident" or can be by variation of the reserves management plan. The current list of Flora Reserves in the South East does nothing to protect wilderness.

Our main effort in the last year has been in promoting the Nattai National Park

Continued on p. 2

THE COLONG FOUNDATION FOR WILDERNESS

18 Argyle St., Sydney. Phone 27 4714

PATRON: The Hon. Neville K. Wran, A.C., Q.C.

DIRECTORS: Peter Maslen, B.Sc.(Eng), B.Sc.(Botany), (Chairman); Pat Thompson, L.C.P. (Vice-Chairman); Jeff Rigby (Vice-Chairman); Alex Colley, O.A.M., B.Ec., H.D.A. (Hon. Secretary); Albert Renshaw (Hon. Treasurer); Milo Dunphy, A.M., A.S.T.C.; Rodney Falconer, B.Sc., Ed.; Dennis Gittoes; Narelle Lovell, B.Sc.; Phil Millard, M.B., F.R.C.S.; Keith Muir, B. Nat. Res. (Hons); Peter Prineas, B.A., LL.B.; Jeff Rigby; John Sinclair; Jim Somerville, A.M., A.A.S.A.

HON. PHOTOGRAPHER: Henry Gold

HON. AUDITOR: Arthur Andersen & Co.

Cont'd from front page

proposal. This has general support from the conservation movement and the local community including politicians across the political spectrum. The Government's only known objection comes from the mining lobby on account of low grade, almost unwinable, probably uneconomic coal reserves under the proposed park. Similar objections along with some forestry ones hinder the Gardens of Stone additions to the Blue Mountains National Park. With these two additions the Greater Blue Mountains Park would almost be complete. There is little doubt that eventually Nattai will be added and with a little more promotion the Gardens of Stone additions may also be won.

In the last six months the media's attention to environmental issues has raised the public awareness of the need for increased protection of our environment, including our wilderness. It is hoped that this community concern will open some liberal politicians' eyes to the fact that we cannot continue to exploit every last corner of our world. While the concern was initiated through sewage pollution and the "Greenhouse" effect, both these issues affect our wilderness or are partially reduced by our wilderness. Sewage and the lack of suitable treatment spoils the waters of some of our potential wilderness especially in the Blue Mountains, while the forests of our wilderness can help to reduce pollution of our atmosphere.

In the coming year, the Colong Foundation for Wilderness will continue to press for the protection of our wilderness areas with the only suitable solution being in a declared wilderness area within a National Park. We will continue to nominate wilderness areas under the Wilderness Act and work toward having the Blue Mountains declared World Heritage. To achieve these aims, and all of the peripheral ones which need addressing in obtaining the main objectives, the Foundation needs continued moral and financial support and where possible assistance with the many tasks needed to be undertaken. I trust that your continued support and personal effort will help us achieve our ultimate aim of preservation of our wilderness areas.

Peter G. Maslen,
Chairman.

Colong Foundation Finances

Year ending 31/12/88

Income for the year was

Donations	
for investment	10355
general	3577
Subscriptions to Bulletin	309
Sale of publications, net	698
Sale of Wilderness Calendars	1097
Interest on bank account	128
Interest on investments	3373
Annual Membership fees	2720
Sundry Income	205
TOTAL INCOME	22462

Expenditure for the year was:

Stock write down	2090
Bulletin costs	1255
General expenses	996
Rent	1900
Depreciation	86
Stationery	599
Campaigns	
Blue Mountsins National Park	2237
Nattai River Proposal	5392
Kanangra Boyd Wilderness	378
Red List	135
Secretarial Expenses	1962
Bank charges	54
TOTAL EXPENSES	17084

Net assets at the end of the year were \$42,029. Of this \$35,023 (up \$10,355 during the year) constituted the Myles Dunphy Fund, consisting of funds specifically donated for the purpose of investment. The remainder is the Fighting Fund, much of which has gone towards the Blue Mountains World Heritage submission. Investment income is now making a substantial contribution to the Fighting Fund.

LOGGING ESSENTIAL TO RAINFOREST HARMONY

Selection logging has not destroyed the Mount Windsor Tableland rainforests. The difference in viewpoint arises because members of the conservation movement perceive rainforests only as an assemblage of material entities whereas foresters see them as a web of relationships and processes. Although some material entities are removed, logging operations are in harmony with ecological processes which drive the ecosystem and the rainforest will therefore not be harmed.

The Hon. Geoff Muntz, Minister for Environment, Conservation and Forestry, Queensland in a letter to Milo Dunphy, AM.

Blue Mountains

World Heritage Submission

Dr Geoff Mosley has completed writing, on behalf of the Colong Foundation, a World Heritage submission for the Blue Mountains. It is presented in the form required by the World Heritage Convention and covers geology and land forms, native flora and fauna, natural scenery and integrity of the natural systems. It makes a strong case for World Heritage listing and concludes as follows:

The site is an extensive sedimentary highland of the Triassic period which over tens of millions of years has undergone deep dissection by its rivers revealing the full sequence of deposition in the Permo-Triassic rocks. Located on the trailing edge of a passive continental margin it is one of a series of uplands which developed in association with the breakup of Gondwana, but this is the only one with this particular lithological character. Its vegetation cover is distinguished by its high degree of xeromorphism with a characteristically Australian expression in terms of dominance by open forest.

It is the best example in the world of an upland of sedimentary rocks deeply dissected by rivers over tens of millions of years. All key elements are represented.

The major weathering forces which created the landforms are still at work and are providing new information about the evolution of the earth's surface.

The vegetation is a classic representation of the xeromorphic assemblages which developed as a result of Australia's isolation and changing environment following the separation from Gondwana.

Plant and animal life is extremely diverse and is closely correlated with variations in the physical environment. All the processes affecting its differentiation are present and the biota is in a state of dynamic evolution.

The sandstone soils are amongst the most nutrient deficient in the world and the adaptation of plant life to this factor and to water balance is of international scientific interest.

The scenery is a unique blend of dissected plateau and eucalypt dominated forest.

The Blue Mountains has the best wilderness of the open sclerophyll type in the world.

The area is a stronghold for 157 species of threatened plants and animals.

The site is of ample size to function as an ecologically self-contained unit. The greater part of the area is unmodified, enjoys the highest legislative protection available and is being managed effectively.

What World Heritage Listing Would Mean

The inscription of the Blue Mountains on the World Heritage list would not only give the area recognition it deserves but would establish the extent of the priority which needs to be given by the entire community to the conservation of the area's outstanding heritage. In particular, the Commonwealth Government representing the people of all Australia would have responsibilities to ensure that the world heritage values were protected and presented. As an example this could result in greater priority being given by both

State and Commonwealth Governments to the urgent improvement of sewage treatment and diversion in the Central Blue Mountains. If there were proposals for new incompatible land uses affecting world heritage qualities, such as the raising of the Warragamba Dam to provide extra storage, coal mining under the parks and tourist resort developments in inappropriate places, the decisions would be more likely to be in favour of nature conservation.

Management would have to be of the highest standard possible and research would be increased both to provide a better basis for management and to take advantage of the unique opportunities offered by the landscapes of the region. If the nomination is made to cover the Gardens of Stone and Nattai proposals, action would most likely be taken at an earlier date to proclaim them as national parks. Jenolan Caves Reserve would probably be added to the Kanangra-Boyd National Park. Perhaps, also all the national parks might be merged into one to form the Greater Blue Mountains National Park, the present parks being recognized only as management divisions as originally proposed by Myles Dunphy and the National Parks and Primitive Areas Council.

Above all ours and many future generations would benefit from the higher level of protection. The Mountains, which the first Europeans found so strange, would be well on their way to being understood and loved.

Plans for the publication of the submission are now under consideration. Resources available to the Foundation will not cover more than the printing of the text and a few black and white photographs, and would have limited sales. The subject matter lends itself to a publication well-illustrated with colour reproductions. In order to cover at least part of the additional cost we applied, in 1937, for a National Estate Program grant, encouraged by the Department of Arts Heritage and Environment brochure which states that "As a principle the Commonwealth encourages publication and as wide dissemination of material as possible in order to further public information and awareness of the objectives of the program". Our application was unsuccessful, but we were encouraged to apply again in 1988. This application too was unsuccessful.

The 66 grants made in 1989 from the total available funds of \$550,000 were heavily weighted towards the built environment and localized projects. We have therefore written to Senator Richardson, asking for 0.015% of the \$100,000,000 the Federal Government is making available for conservation.

Development in the Blue Mountains

In view of the leading part we have taken in the protection of the natural environment of the Blue Mountains we were disappointed that we were not sent a copy of the Blue Mountains Environmental Management Plan. However we used one supplied to TEC.

The plan "recognizes the regional, national and environmental significance" of the Blue Mountains. Its first principle is to "ensure the protection of the unique natural and cultural environment". Areas of significant conservation are to be preserved, escarpment development is to be controlled to ensure minimum visual impact. Buffer zones will be established to and within national parks and between towns. Bush fire hazard areas will not be chosen for urban expansion, nor will new development be permitted except where a reticulated sewerage system is available, or where "all effluent can be disposed of on the site". Development and clearing of vegetation on all high erosion areas will be prohibited. The implementation of these good intentions will, however, be impossible because of the great increase in residential development which the plan will enable.

The Foundation's concerns with development in the Blue Mountains is mainly confined to its effect on the nearby parklands. These are threefold:

1. The pollution of all the streams emanating from the townships and their environs.
2. The substitution of "control burning" for fire hazard elimination urban planning.
3. Scenic degradation caused by development of lands overlooking the parklands.

Although each of the four categories of development in the plan are described as "conservation" zones and the words "conservation", "protection", "sensitive" and "fragile" recur in nearly every section, the principal feature of the plan is the promotion of development. The main parameters of planning – population, sewerage disposal and transport – are unspecified.

In 1973 Urban Systems Corporation was commissioned to prepare a Strategy Plan for the Blue Mountains. The plan described five "alternative futures" based on populations ranging from 47,000 (described as "Future 1 – the maximum conservation baseline") to 247,000 under "Future 5", a figure 72,000 above that of



the then extant Blue Mountains Planning Scheme. The considerably increased urban release areas included in the present draft plan might well accommodate over 300,000. Urban Systems' prediction for "Future 5" was for certain pollution of the Hawkesbury basin, inevitable ribbon development in the Lower Blue Mountains, increasing conflict between resident and visitor recreation, highest bushfire danger and constraints on control programmes, threats to all "environment areas" due to lack of urban infrastructure, the requirement of up to 12 lanes of highway and railway track quadruplication for commuters, economically exploitable water sources unavailable, capital cost of water supply and sewerage works as high as \$100m.

Population, then 37,000, now 68,000, is well on the way to "Future 5" and most of the threats are already reality. A new sewerage system to provide for a population much below "Future 5" is estimated to cost \$83 million.

The Blue Mountains exemplify the worst features of unplanned development. Dispersed and strip development in difficult terrain render servicing very expensive or impractical. Because of this, and their situation in the middle of one of the State's most scenic areas, the mountains are a most unsuitable site for urban expansion. Nevertheless each of the four conservation zones provide for further development. "Bushland Conservation" provides for development which "conserves the

natural bushland character of the landscape". Forty hectare lots will be subdivided into 1/4 to 1 ha lots. The other three zones allow substantial increases in density of development. "Rural Conservation" allows two 10 hectare lots to be taken out of the present minimum 120 ha holdings. Subdivision of lots on the Shipley Plateau and Mounts Irvine, Tomah and Wilson permit the number of dwellings to more than double. "Residential Bushland Conservation" allows 40 ha lots in rural zones to be reduced to a maximum of 5-8 lots per ha. "Development Conservation" (a contradiction in terms) allows 40 ha lots to be subdivided into 5 lots per ha for unsewered areas and up to 16 lots per ha in sewerage areas.

Because there are no large catchments on the Blue Mountains causeway, water has to be pumped up and will be taken down for treatment in an extended tunnel. All the ratepayers in the Water Board's area will contribute to this very expensive system. The proliferation of development, particularly large residential and small rural blocks, will greatly increase the number of unsewered houses and may well cancel the benefit of the tunnel plan for stream purification. It will necessitate a network of roads, many unsurfaced. Roading on the poor sandy soils is probably the major cause of bad stream siltation.

Dispersal of development in bushland, particularly on ridge tops, western facing slopes and other fire hazard areas, exposes many more homes to the disastrous fires which have destroyed up to 150 houses at a time. It is probable that this will mean pressure for burning firebreaks in parklands.

The third main concern of the Colong Foundation is scenic degradation caused by development of lands overlooking parks. The plan's objective of controlling development within 200 metres of the cliff line would go some way towards ensuring this, but this is offset by the bushland conservation zoning of lands on the edge of the escarpment. Nor is there any provision to prohibit developments such as the Fairmont Resort overlooking parklands.

Off-Road Vehicles on Crown Lands

In 1979 The State Pollution Control Commission held an inquiry into the off-road use of vehicles for recreational purposes. At the inquiry Mr Morgan of the Crown Lands Office said that one of the responsibilities of his department was to provide lands for recreational use and his department would be prepared to set aside such areas, having regard to environmental protection, particularly in fragile situations. After thinking this over for four years, the State Government introduced the Recreational Vehicles Act with the aim of regulating the use of these vehicles and providing a basis for minimizing the potential conflicts between off-road vehicles and other land uses. Following another five years of cogitation by the Department of Lands, during which ORVs ranged freely over most of the Crown landscape, the Department has published its Crown Lands Off-Road Vehicles Draft Policy. The Department's objective is to satisfy a range of recreational use demands, protect the environment and preserve safety and amenity for nearby communities, a task more difficult than mixing oil and water.

The Colong Committee, together with the NPA, the ACF, the National Trust, the NCC, TEC, the Federation of Australian Bushwalkers, FOE and the Bicycle Institute, made a joint submission, ably handled by Peter Prineas, to the 1979 inquiry. Its theme was that the "the use of ORVs can impinge on the welfare of others by spoiling their enjoyment of the natural environment and inflicting damage on that environment". The submission described the physical and auditory/visual/olfactory impact of ORVs, pointing out that the noise of a single vehicle could effectively destroy the very things that the passive recreationist sought. It was pointed out that the selling and servicing of vehicles (which now cost anything from about \$14,000 to \$69,000) was a lucrative business, supporting several glossy publications which emphasized not enjoyment of the bush but the brute strength of vehicles which, in their various expeditions, sorties and stunts, inflicted damage on vegetation, stream banks, lake beds, swamps, dunes, etc. The often used assertion that wildernesses are not "accessible" if you cannot drive into them was refuted by pointing out that closure of roads does not constitute a denial of public access. A person capable of coaxing an ORV along many such tracks could equally well walk, as could their small children.

Five members of the Colong Committee attended the Inquiry. Evidence was given by the principal authorities concerned with land management - The Forestry Commission, Local Government, the NPWS, the Soil Conservation Service and the Water Board. These authorities all emphasized the damage caused by ORVs

and wanted to exclude ORVs. Mr Morgan of the Lands Department said it was one of the responsibilities of his Department to provide land for recreational use and that it was prepared to set aside such areas, having regard to environmental protection. When asked where, in view of the evidence submitted by the above authorities, such land was to be found, he could nominate only quarries and gravel pits.

The findings of the SPCC Inquiry accepted the description of the objectionable features of ORV use, as described in the submission of the conservation societies. These were listed as noise, coastal damage, wilderness impairment, management track damage, other physical damage and impairment of managed lands. On wilderness impairment the Inquiry found that:

"The use of vehicles in areas with high wilderness value, jeopardizes wilderness qualities. The desire to explore and trail-blaze areas of virgin country can cause immeasurable damage to flora and fauna, cutting deep impressions as vehicles tyre-spin their way to gain traction over rough terrain."

On other physical damage the finding was that:

"Narrow trails are widened, hill-sides are rut-scarred, erosion is caused or initiated by off-road vehicles, reserves become and remain scarred, front-end winches ropescar and ruin vegetation, archaeological relics are damaged and the possibility of fire is increased from vehicles and the activities of the users of vehicles."

In our submission to the Lands Department on the ORV Draft Policy we have

stated that the inescapable conclusion of the inquiry is that ORVs cannot be used anywhere, except on maintained road, without adverse environmental impact. There are no areas so environmentally degraded that they will not be damaged, with the possible exception of areas where all the soil has been removed leaving only rock. Nor are there any public lands not used by people enjoying other forms of recreation. There is no necessity for the recreational use of ORVs, and allowing them beyond public roads on public lands is therefore a breach of the Department's charter of "protecting and managing the Crown Estate for the benefit of the people now and in the future". The fact that "demand" exists for this destructive activity is no justification for the Department to satisfy it. Perhaps the best example is the draft plan's statement that areas are required for four wheel drive exploration. There are no unexplored "trails" and damage is maximised on the most difficult routes.

Our submission then gives a number of examples of the Department's unsuccessful attempt to circumvent the above facts. In its quest for suitable "environmentally stable" sites it lists only areas which have been degraded, such as former quarries or rubbish tips, or areas destined for future development. Prospective management bodies must demonstrate their ability to effectively prevent adverse impacts. They couldn't.

Similarly, the stated objective of ensuring "that provision for recreation vehicles use is consistent with protecting the environment and preserving amenity for

Continued on p. 6

other forms of recreation and adjacent communities" is unrealizable.

Our submission to the Land's Department concludes as follows:

The impractical attempt to make ORV use consistent with environmental responsibility will necessitate a vast allocation of staff time by the authorities involved in the planning, signposting, delineation of areas of use and enforcement of the policy. The financial burden of this will be borne, not by the ORV users, but by rate and tax payers. This could be greatly reduced by a simple provision that ORVs cannot be used on public lands except on public roads or designated camping and parking areas.

The main concerns of the Colong Foundation are fourfold:

1. That ORVs be excluded from wilderness areas. We are pleased to see, in section 7(iv) that they will not be permitted in wilderness areas. Most wilderness areas are mainly on Crown Lands. Few of them have yet been designated as such, and we hope you will recognise that, whether designated or not, they are in fact wilderness areas. These areas, except some in the Western Division, are well known to the Foundation, and probably to the NPWS. We would be pleased to supply you with their location. They could be protected under the provision in section 7(iv) that ORV use will not be permitted on areas where future use will be prejudiced.
2. That vehicular use in national parks (i.e. those parts of the park which are not wilderness) be restricted to maintained public and park roads. This accords with the report of the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Environment and Conservation recom-

mendation that "At no time and under no circumstances should 4WD vehicles, or any other type of vehicles go off the road in ecologically sensitive fragile areas or in national parks". There is no provision in your draft policy for national parks. It seems probable that the control of ORVs in national parks would be left to the NPWS. However, potential or proposed national parks could be protected under section 7(iv).

3. Total exclusion from all beaches. There are no beaches which are not used by other recreational users such as bushwalkers, campers, fishermen and bathers and picnickers. "Demand" or "existing use" is no justification for imposing the noise, pollution and danger of ORV use on other users, or damaging sand structure. All beaches are readily accessible on foot. The planning and implementation of the policy outlined will impose a heavy burden on local authorities. The time and spatial restrictions will be confusing to tourists and the signs will often be destroyed by ORV users.
4. There is no need for provision for long distance touring on tracks on Crown Lands. Research by the Australian Conservation Foundation has proved that only a few minute areas of the State are more than three miles from a road. ORV users can enjoy any part of the State by using public roads or walking a short distance.

Prohibition of the off-road use of vehicles in all wilderness areas and existing or potential national parks and on peaches would satisfy the prime environmental concerns of this Foundation, though we are opposed to any avoidable damage to the natural environment.

Donations

We gratefully acknowledge donations from the following supporters during the half year ended 30/6/89:

V. Attenbrow, W.T. Bell, C.B. Benjamin, C.O. Boyd, P. Butt, E. Cadzow, H.H. Cameron, R.O. Chalmers, S. Cook, D.M.R. Coward, G. Cox, N. Douglass, C.L. Ferguson, H. Gold, L.A.J. Hamill, E. Hanvin, S. Harrison, P.B. Haydon, J. Holly, A.J. Keen, D. & J. Kelly, P.G. Kodela, G.W. Lawrence, J. McLellan, J.G. Marden, M. Mills, J.B. Palmer, J.H. Pratt, M. Rodd, J. Scarsbrook, I. Sefton, E. Smith, J. Stevens, P. Tafe, R. Toop, W.J. Turner, Upper Blue Mountains Conservation Society, E.A. Chapman Wade, M.J. White, I. Williamson, J.D. Wrigley.

In addition the following have made donations to the Australian Conservation Foundation, enabling the Foundation to make grants to our organisation:

J.S. Bentley, L. Berkeley, J.W. Blanche, D. Butler, I. Carder, B. Chick, A.G. Colley, Dr. P.J. Conaghan, R. Cooper, A.E. Dixon, Dr. R.A. Duncan, M. Ellwood, A. Emmerton, M.F. Flattely, M.J. Holmes, J. Howell, D.C. Johnson, M.M. Johnson, J. Kirkby, J. Lawler, Dr. A.K. Lethlean, M. Nordon, J. Offermans, J.L. Rentoul, A.J. Rigby, J. Simons, Dr. J.H. Stephenson, L. Sullivan, L.G. Sullivan.

WHO OWNS AUSTRALIA?

The environmentalists are unrelenting in their attack of private property, constantly asserting that property rights must be subject, more and more, to political discretion, in order to preserve and save the environment.

Hugh Morgan, Managing Director Western Mining Corporation, Financial Review 5/5/89

Such a comment from Mr Morgan ignores the fact that any exploration and mining permit granted to a mining company is also an expropriation of property rights from the wider community.

Peter Gill, Financial Review 5/5/89

During my period as Federal Minister for the Environment, I never ceased to be amazed by the naivety of many business executives in their lack of awareness of the environmental and political implications of the projects they were proposing. The sheer size of many of those projects and the executives' ignorance of the environmental movement led them to believe that no government would knock them back.

Barry Cohen, SMH 10/4/89

MEETING DATES

Meetings will be held
on August 3rd, 17th
and 31st and
September 14th and
28th

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS

To: The Treasurer
Colong Foundation for Wilderness Ltd
18 Argyle Street
SYDNEY NSW 2000

Dear Sir,

The enclosed remittance or advice covers the item(s) indicated by a tick in the box beside it.

- ☐ Membership application (see form below), (Note: The membership fee covers Bulletin subscription fee)
- ☐ Membership renewal (\$20)
- ☐ Subscription for all issues of Colong Bulletin to 31/12/89 (\$5) (Non-Members only)
- ☐ Donation of \$
- ☐ I have donated \$ to the Australian Conservation Foundation expressing a wish that my donation be spent for the purposes of the Colong Foundation for Wilderness Ltd (see form letter below). I would like this donation applied to:
- ☐ The Fighting Fund
- ☐ The Myles Dunphy Fund (investment only)
- ☐ The Blue Mountains World Heritage Book Fund
- ☐ Any of the above funds at the Foundation's discretion

NAME: (MR/MRS/MISS)

ADDRESS:

POST CODE

SIGNED: DATE

To: The Director
Australian Conservation Foundation
672B Glenferrie Road
HAWTHORN VIC 3122

I attach a donation to the Australian Conservation Foundation. I prefer that this donation should be spent for

the purposes of (insert name of your organization)

I understand that this donation is tax deductible and therefore look forward to your receipt.

NAME: (Block Letters) \$

ADDRESS:

POSTCODE

SIGNED: DATE:

MEMBERSHIP FORM

To: The Hon. Secretary
Colong Foundation for Wilderness Ltd
18 Argyle Street
SYDNEY NSW 2000

I hereby apply for membership of the Colong Foundation for Wilderness Ltd.

I am nominated by and seconded by
(Note: If you are not personally known to the Foundation, the Hon. Secretary will nominate you and ask one of the Directors to second your nomination. The signing of this application will be accepted as evidence of your support of the aims of the Foundation).

I subscribe to the Foundation's aim of preserving Australia's wilderness remnants.

I accept the liability provided in the Colong Foundation's Articles of Association to guarantee \$20 should it be needed in the event of the winding up of the Foundation.

Enclosed please find for \$20, being my membership subscription to 31/12/90. (Please note: membership fee covers Bulletin subscription).

Signed. DATE

FULL NAME: (MR/MRS/MISS)

ADDRESS

POST CODE

*Ann Henderson-Sellers
and Russell Blong*

GREENHOUSE EFFECT

"Just
what we need
to let Australians do
something positive."

Robyn Williams

Living in a
Warmer
Australia

The greenhouse effect concerns everybody. Since the preservation and restoration of vegetative groundcover is an important means of offsetting the buildup of CO₂, Ann Henderson-Sellers and Russell Blong's book is of vital interest to nature conservationists.

**Retail Price from the Colong Foundation is \$12.95
(no charge for postage).**