



SECOND SOUTH PACIFIC CONFERENCE ON NATIONAL PARKS AND RESERVES

Proceedings - Volume 2 Verbatim Transcript

333.78099
SOU
vol. II

SYDNEY AUSTRALIA 1979

LIBRARY
SOUTH PACIFIC REGIONAL
SECOND SOUTH PACIFIC CONFERENCE ON NATIONAL
PARKS AND RESERVES - SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA, 1979
ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT

VOLUME II

CONTENTS

(1) TUESDAY, 24TH APRIL, 1979

FIRST SESSION	2
SECOND SESSION	15
THIRD SESSION	28
FOURTH SESSION	36

(2) THURSDAY, 26TH APRIL, 1979

FIRST SESSION	42
SECOND SESSION	61
THIRD SESSION	74
FOURTH SESSION	79

(3) FRIDAY, 27TH APRIL, 1979

FIRST SESSION	89
SECOND SESSION	102
THIRD SESSION	114

SECOND SOUTH PACIFIC CONFERENCE

on

NATIONAL PARKS AND RESERVES

held at

SYDNEY OPERA HOUSE, RECEPTION HALL

on

TUESDAY, 24TH APRIL. 1979.

SECOND SOUTH PACIFIC CONFERENCE
ON
NATIONAL PARKS AND RESERVES

I am privileged to welcome all of you to the Second South Pacific Conference on National Parks and Nature Reserves. On behalf of the New South Wales Government, I would like to extend to you all a very warm welcome to Sydney and express my hope that this conference will be a beneficial one for each of you individually and for the nations you represent here today.

The New Zealand Government took a bold initiative in convening the Inaugural Conference in Wellington, New Zealand four years ago in 1975. The enthusiasm of that inaugural conference was carried back by the participants to their home countries. The impetus that was generated in 1975 is now producing results throughout the South Pacific Region, and no doubt we will hear some details of this progress later when the situation reports are presented. Let us strive at this second conference in Sydney to foster and develop the regional spirit of co-operation engendered at Wellington.

The New South Wales Government is grateful for the support it has received in arranging this conference. The South Pacific Commission, the South Pacific Bureau for Economic Co-operation, and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources have all associated themselves with sponsorship of the Conference and each of these bodies is represented here today. Additionally we have been favoured with generous assistance from the Governments of Queensland and Victoria, the Australian Government and the United Nations Environment Programme.

This week Royal National Park near Sydney will be one hundred years old. It is Australia's oldest national park, and the second oldest in the world after the famous Yellowstone National Park in the United States. The hosting of this Conference in 1979 by the New South Wales Government is particularly appropriate in view of the Royal National Park centenary.

It is useful for us to briefly look at the colony of New South Wales as it was a century ago and to examine the reasons proffered then for the establishment of Australia's first national park. Arriving in this country with their European technology and traditions, the new settlers were certain to attempt drastic innovations. Their assault on the environment took a variety of forms and ways, the results of which were not always foreseen and intended. Pastures were stripped, trees removed and the native wildlife decimated. The European invader in a new land feared the strange environment, and this alienation from his setting encouraged the spoiling of the land. The poet A.D. Hope in his "Toast for a Golden Age" expressed well an indictment of such an approach:

"For the earth, our mother, at last has found a master;
She was slow and kindly, she laughed and lay in the sun -
Time strapped to his wrist, he made the old girl work faster,
Stripping her naked and shouting to make her run.
He cracked his stock-whip; that characteristic gesture
Made dust of the plains and the hurricane bore it away
A thousand years had gone to make the pasture
Which the wind or the flood destroyed in a single day."

Sydney in 1879 was a bustling, squalid settlement of some 300,000 people.

While most of the denizens of Sydney may have lived in crowded, unsanitary conditions at the shores of Sydney Cove, and doubtless would have benefited from provision of more urban parks, few would have seen the need to set aside in perpetuity a large area of the Australian bush. Although a set of resolutions was submitted to the Legislative Assembly early in 1879, affirming "that the health of the people should be the primary consideration of all good governments, and to ensure the sound health and vigour of the community, it was necessary that all cities, towns and villages to be possessed of parks and pleasure grounds as places of recreation", at least one man saw the need of a permanent reserve. He was Sir John Robertson, thrice Premier of New South Wales, who pushed through the dedication of the National Park and actively served as President of the Park's Board of Trustees until his death in 1892.

For some years now, the Park has had more than one million visitors a year. Could there be more compelling proof of public need and, equally important, of the inherent attractions of the area selected for preservation?

What have those events, which took place one hundred years ago, to do with us now? A good deal, I think. Pre-eminently, it shows three things:-

Firstly, that the conservation of landscape and wildlife is increasingly a matter of public concern;

Secondly, that successful action to conserve nature depends very much on the willingness and determination to take a long term view of affairs; and

Thirdly, that the justification for the reservation of land areas can alter radically as environmental conditions and public needs develop over the years.

That brings us to the question of the role of this Conference. The South Pacific Region is one of great biological diversity with many unique plants and animals that places on us a special obligation to see that this resource is not lost or severely depleted. At the same time, we belong to a region that is made up of many nations and peoples each of whom face different sorts of problems. Essentially the problem which confronts us is to secure the conservation of the plants, animals and seas of the region while at the same time to protect the immediate needs of our peoples. It is no simple matter.

Changing political environments of developing nations, the problems of differing land use systems and ownership and even the establishment of a working definition of the term 'national parks', are some of the problems faced by countries represented here today. Again, no doubt all regions are threatened by domestic and industrial exploitation of land and sea resources and the immense problem of co-ordinating efforts related to the protection and conservation of the environment. In the more highly developed countries where cities are expanding rapidly and pollution of the land, sea and air is more complicated, we are acutely aware of the need to retain in as pure a state as possible, the remaining unspoilt areas. The establishment of national parks or reserves is rarely without debate and controversy over use of the land or resources contained therein, or without conflicts of interests and differences of opinion regarding use and management of the area. The designation of a national park also implies an obligation on a government to honour its commitment to the purposes for which the land was reserved and to withstand pressure to compromise this purpose. The support, by legislation, of moves towards the protection and conservation of our natural resources, is an encouraging sign and a necessary guard for these irreplaceable areas. Our responsibilities are thus immense as are our tasks of education, information and enforcement.

We will be privileged to hear, at a later stage during the conference, addresses by some of the delegates as to particular problems

faced by individual countries and the means they have embarked upon to approach and solve them.

Topics covering such fields as "The Development and Maintenance of Marine Parks and Reserves" and "National Parks, Reserves and Traditional Communities" will be introducing Australia and no doubt other countries to problems peculiar to only some of us. Yet approaches to management, conservation and education of the community are issues universal in application to all concerned with preservation of our environment.

Conservation is a commonly used word today, but its meaning is quite different from that of thirty or more years ago. At that time conservation of our natural resources was interpreted to mean preservation. Today, it also means the proper understanding of our resources and how they can be used and managed to provide not only what the community needs now but also what it will need in the future. In 1879, Sydney required land to be set aside for recreation parks and reserves whereas today, we are prompted by the knowledge that, if concerted action is not taken now to conserve our wilderness areas, eco-systems and habitats and other areas of particular geographic significance, they will be lost forever to the encroaching urbanisation and expansion of our communities. Many endangered species owe their existence to this planet today to the establishment of national parks and equivalent reserves.

The irrevocability of species extinction is an emotive issue which must be carefully examined so that the facts and principles governing our actions are clearly understood. Realistic assessment of future needs and values must be made by our governments as the establishment of national parks has traditionally been dependent upon action by these bodies.

We have reached the important stage now where the concept of designating an area for its historic, cultural, geographical or biological heritage, to be protected in perpetuity for the enjoyment and benefit of all people, has become a world-recognised institution. Thus international awareness and responsibility has sprung from national development. We must ensure that experience gained does not remain inaccessible and untraceable.

The centenary of the creation of Australia's first national park provides an occasion to reaffirm the foresight of those citizens who 100 years ago pressed for the reservation of Royal National Park. I am pleased to announce today to celebrate the centenary of Royal National Park, the creation of the State's 50th national park, the Wollemi National Park. The Wollemi National Park, the creation of which I am announcing today, covers an area of 502,000 hectares, and incorporates the Colo-Hunter Wilderness Area in the northern Blue Mountains region of the State, the largest remaining wilderness area in New South Wales. Yet this new park is a mere 80 kilometres from where we sit today. With the creation of Wollemi, the area of national parks in New South Wales is increased by twenty-five percent to a total area of 2.6 million hectares, equivalent to 3.3 percent of the land area of the State. In size Wollemi is second only to the State's largest park, Kosciusko National Park.

This new park offers some of the most spectacular unspoilt gorge, cliff and wilderness scenery to be found anywhere in Australia and includes the magnificent Colo Gorge.

I am sure you will agree that the centenary of Royal National Park could be celebrated in no better way. The creation of Wollemi National Park will rank with the dedication of Royal National Park in 1879, the dedication of the Kosciusko National Park in 1944 and the creation of the National Parks and Wildlife Service in 1967 as one of the four great milestones in nature conservation in this State.

The centenary provides a useful point not only to reflect on past achievements but also to look to the future to ensure that goals and policies of nature conservation remain relevant in the nineteen eighties and

capable of meeting the challenges of the next 100 years. The New South Wales Government is preparing to meet these challenges: Firstly, by seeking to cater for the interests of nature conservation over the broad range of land uses other than reserves set aside specifically for nature conservation purposes through a system of environmental planning; and secondly, by reviewing the goals, objectives and management practices of the National Parks and Wildlife Service to develop a clear and explicit policy framework for nature conservation and recreation.

Last week the Government introduced into Parliament the Environmental Planning Assessment Bill, 1979 to institute a new system of environmental planning in New South Wales. The nature and scope of environmental planning are broader and more comprehensive than land use or town and country planning as undertaken during the past thirty years in accordance with existing New South Wales legislation.

The new environmental planning system provides a greater opportunity for the identification of areas and issues of importance to nature conservation and their protection or development in harmony, or at least with minimal harm, with other uses of land.

So far as the development of a clear and explicit policy framework for nature conservation is concerned, I have recently requested the National Parks and Wildlife Service to prepare a draft policy statement on nature conservation for consideration by the Government. I believe that the development of a clear policy framework for nature conservation will be of significant benefit to the Service in its corporate planning to the community in understanding and appreciating more readily the role and objectives of the Service. Complementary to the development of a nature conservation policy for New South Wales, I have requested the Service in consultation with appropriate authorities to prepare an outdoor recreation policy for the State. The development of these policy statements will take the form of the preparation of green papers on each matter and then the preparation of a white paper expressing Government policies and objectives directed at future objectives, needs and requirements.

In the interim however we are able to identify, pending the outcome of the abovementioned review, a number of areas requiring the attention of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. These are:

Firstly, the upgrading of the scientific research capacity of the Service;

Secondly, the completion of a number of outstanding investigations and reservations on the North Coast and Northern Tablelands of the State;

Thirdly, the development of a more sophisticated approach to the management planning of the Service estate; and

Fourthly, the undertaking of a major resource inventory of the Far Western Plains and Western Plains, two areas identified in the Special Report where greater than fifty per cent of the plant alliances are not conserved at the present time.

Sir Otto Frankel, the Chairman of the Australian National Committee for the International Biological Programme, has stated:

"The period in which we live is more destructive of the diversity of life than any in the past, not mainly because of the high rate of lost or endangered species, but because of the destruction of habitats for potential recovery and evolutionary regeneration. Life in our existing reserves was widely different 10,000 years ago, and presumably it will be different again

10,000 years hence. But without reserves the continuity of life and of evolution would be restricted to organisms which man finds useful, or is unable to destroy.

It is a formidable decision falling to a mere generation or two. It is a heavy responsibility, especially for Australia, where there still are opportunities, more than in most other continents, for safeguarding an evolutionary future for the genetic heritage of the past. Future generations will make their own decisions which we cannot foresee. But in this period of unprecedented change, should we not keep some options open for them?

No longer can we claim innocence or ignorance. We have acquired evolutionary responsibility. The time for decision and action is now."

Man must be a balanced part of nature if he is to survive on earth. Each of the ways of life experienced by man constitutes a way of interacting with the physical environment to satisfy basic requirements. Underlying the most esoteric of cultural needs are the basic requirements of the individual to protect himself, to nourish himself, and to reproduce himself if the species is to survive. No matter how ingenious man's cultural methods of utilising the physical environment to satisfy his needs, he cannot be successful in the end if they lead to the disruption and disappearance of the ecological community of which he is the dominant animal member. It is therefore alarming that the ways of life of industrial man show an ecological imbalance between man and nature.

Gatherings such as this bear a great responsibility to ensure such warnings are not ignored and that our trust for this earth's resources is not abused.

We must keep in the foreground the knowledge that the success of this conference will be dependent on an active response by the countries here represented to the recommendations which will be developed over the next four days.

It is vitally important that we keep alive within our own countries the knowledge gained and the recommendations nominated here.

With this in mind, I wish you every success in this conference. I earnestly hope that it will be a rewarding and beneficial experience. I now have great pleasure in declaring the conference officially open.

Do I have any apologies?

SAUNDERS: I would like to apologise for the unavoidable absence from today's session of the Honourable Tom Newbery, M.L.A., Minister for Culture, National Parks and Recreation, Queensland.

LANDA: Thank you. Any further apologies?

PRAITT: Mr. Chairman, could I offer apologies for the Honourable Mr. Bob Ellicott, the Minister for the Capital Territory who is unavoidably detained on other Parliamentary duties for today.

LANDA: Thank you.

HARE: For the Northern Territory Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Paul Everingham, Chief Minister.

LANDA: Thank you.

BOWEN: For Western Australia, the Honourable the Minister for Environment, Honourable R.J. O'Connor.

SAUNDERS: Mr. Chairman, for Victoria, I'd like to tender an apology on behalf of the Honourable W.A. Borthwick, Minister for Conservation, Victoria. With a State Election imminent he is not able to be present.

LANDA: Thank you.

MWEMWENIKEAKI: From the Gilbert Islands an apology from my Minister, the Minister for Natural Resources. He's unable to attend this important conference because of the sitting of the House of Assembly over there.

LANDA: Thank you. No further apologies. I'm sorry Tonga.

TONGAILAVA: Thank you Mr. Chairman. On behalf of the Minister of Lands from Tonga, who is unable to attend this conference.

LANDA: Thank you. No further apologies. Ladies and gentlemen, it's my pleasure to introduce the delegates and observers to this conference and starting on my right from Australia is Senator, the Honourable Jim Webster. Thank you Senator for attending.

From the Australian Capital Territory, Dr. Pratt, thank you. From the Northern Territory, Mr. T. Hare. From the Cook Islands, the Honourable T. Tangaroa. From Fiji, the Honourable I. Bajpai. From French Polynesia, Mr. M. Tevane. From the Gilbert Islands, Mr. Mwemwenikeaki, thank you. From Nauru, His Excellency, Mr. W. Star. From New Caledonia, Mr. J. Cherrier. From New Hebrides, the Honourable T.R. Seru. From New Zealand, the Honourable V. Young. From Papua, New Guinea, the Honourable P. Kakarya. From Queensland, Dr. G. Saunders, deputising for the Honourable T. Newbery, who is expected, I understand to join us on Thursday, is that right? South Australia, Dr. J. Cornwall. From Tasmania, the Honourable A.B. Lohrey. From Tonga, Mr. S.L. Tongailava. From Victoria, Mr. D. Saunders. From Western Australia, Mr. B. Bower. From Canada, Mr. A.T. Davidson. From Malaysia, Mr. Ahmad Bin Harun. From Thailand, Mr. S. Nicharat. From the United States of America, Mr. J. Brown.

From the International Council for Bird Preservation, Mr. J. Disney. From the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, Dr. R. Dasmari. From the South Pacific Bureau for Economic Co-operation, Mr. W. Paia. From the South Pacific Commission, Dr. A. Dahl.

Welcome Delegates and observers all and we're honoured, of course, to have your attendance and from so many places.

Ladies and Gentlemen, unfortunately, due to the sittings of Parliament this morning, this being our last day of sitting and the usual pace of legislation coming through the Chamber, it is my melancholy duty to have to return to the Chamber, to the House and we are singularly fortunate in having Dr. Cornwall, our colleague from South Australia, who has volunteered his services to chair in my stead this morning's session. And I'd ask your indulgence and Dr. Cornwall's attendance now, so that I could depart now to Parliament and I will be joining you when the session finishes which is expected some time later today and also I'll be seeing you at the various functions to be held in the course of the conference.

Again, thank you for your courtesy this morning and I, of course, on behalf of New South Wales, wish the conference well and ask Dr. Cornwall if he could come forward to chair the first session.

CORNWALL: Delegates, copies of the Agenda have been distributed to all delegates and observers. I would ask for agreement that we adopt the Agenda as supplied. Is there agreement on the adoption of the Agenda as supplied?

DELEGATES: Agreed.

CORNWALL: Draft rules of procedures have been prepared and distributed. I'd invite the attention of the meeting to the rules of procedure on page 3. I would ask the meeting to agree to adopt these rules of procedure, unless there is any objection. Are the delegates happy to adopt the rules of procedure?

DELEGATES: Agreed.

CORNWALL: I would now ask you to consider the appointment of a recommendations committee. Is it agreed that the recommendations committee be appointed as suggested?

SPEAKER: Aye.

CORNWALL: I would suggest that the number be limited to no more than three persons and I would call for your agreement on that. Those in favour?

DELEGATES: Aye.

CORNWALL: It has been brought to my attention that Mr. G. Martin from New South Wales has been made available to act as secretary of the committee. I would now call for nominations for membership of the committee.

YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, I would like to nominate Mr. Coad from New Zealand as a member of the committee.

CORNWALL: Mr. Coad from New Zealand has been nominated by the Honourable Venn Young.

WEBSTER: T. Richmond.

CORNWALL: T. Richmond has been nominated by Senator Webster.

LOHREY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to nominate the Honourable Tangaroa from Cook Islands.

CORNWALL: Mr. Tangaroa has been nominated by the Honourable Mr. Lohrey.

SAUNDERS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to nominate the Honourable I. Bajpai of Fiji to be a member of this committee.

CORNWALL: The Honourable Mr. Bajpai of Fiji has been nominated by Dr. Saunders representing Queensland. We do have, therefore, four nominations. Have we any further nominations? We do have four. It was recommended that three persons might be sufficient, but I don't see any great difficulty in accepting four nominations and I think we can proceed on that basis unless there is any objection from the Conference. Agreed?

DELEGATES: Agreed.

CORNWALL: I would now like to draw your attention to paragraph 4 on page 4, Conference Recommendations of the Procedural Arrangements paper and ask delegates and observers to note the time deadline.

It should be mentioned that observers may only submit recommendations through a delegate and I would ask you to observe that procedure. I would also like to draw the attention of the meeting to the note on page 6 of the Procedural Paper about the suggested arrangements for media releases and ask the meeting to adopt the proposal outlined. I trust that there is no disagreement with those suggestions.

The secretariat will arrange for the keynote addresses to be made available to media outlets as they are delivered.

The next item concerns situation reports. The situation reports will be presented by delegates as scheduled on the timetable on page 5 of

the Procedural Paper. It was intended that the situation reports would have been distributed to delegates and observers prior to the appointed time for their presentation. However, some situation reports have not yet been received or were received only a short time ago and shortage of time has not permitted their reproduction and prior distribution. Delegates who find themselves in this situation should be invited to present their report, without the re-print, as per the timetable. However, if they prefer not to do this they might be given the opportunity of changing the appointed times for their presentations. Delegates will be given five minutes to present and speak to their reports following which a period of five minutes will be allocated for questions and discussion. I must point out to you that I will be careful in view of the rather tight time schedule to see that the ten minute time provision is adhered to. I think we will move directly into the presentation of situation reports and I would call upon the Senator the Honourable Jim Webster to present the situation report on Australia.

WEBSTER: Mr. Chairman, Excellency, Honourable delegates, officers and members of the organising committee, it gives me pleasure to be with you and to have the opportunity to present this first report.

Australia as you know is a very fortunate country. We firstly are fortunate to have delegates from so many countries with us today. There is perhaps a fortune for a Minister involved in the hurly burly of political life to come amongst people who are involved in National Parks and Wildlife and have perhaps a more serene existence than some of us who are involved in politics but perhaps to set a tone for the meeting and to recognise the quality of that which - in which we work there's one poem that has always reminded me of the very pleasant aspects of environment and I think perhaps it's worth quoting one verse of that which Longfellow wrote about Hiawatha and I suppose the words were more associated with Canada than they were with Australia but they are very applicable to our session today and each one of you can take heart when the words go along this line:

"Ye who love the haunts of nature,
Love the sunshine in the meadow,
Love the shadow of the forest,
Love the wind amongst the branches
And the rain shower and the snow storm
And the rushing of great waters
Through their palisades of pine trees,
And the thunder in the mountains
And its great reverberations flap like
eagles in their eyries..."

... and I think the general quality that is covered in those few lines draws us on the thought that we're dealing over the next few days with matters that concern us very much that are expressed in that poem of all the natural aspects of our life.

You have a situation paper from Australia and Mr. Chairman I can assure you that time will not be lost in running through it. Ladies and gentlemen, Australia is an extremely large country, there is no larger country represented here, I would imagine, and as you see comprises somewhere in the vicinity of 7,600 square kilometres. We are organised politically in a Federation. Some of the States such as that represented by the Minister who spoke before me being the first to be established in Australia but at the beginning of this century the various States decided to form a Federation and so I have representation here today as being from a Federal Government. We have the various States as you note represented around the table from Tasmania in our unique inheritance is an island situated at the south of Australia, running through our various States of Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia, Queensland. The Northern Territory has recently been granted a form of self government and they will be proceeding to Statehood over the ensuing years and perhaps the interests that we have in National Parks will find that particular area most rich for this country. We have Queensland - I believe some of you have visited some

of the parks there and in New South Wales we today celebrate that which Minister Landa mentioned to us, the new park which has been designated. Certainly it honours the function that we are attending today, the new park of Wollemi.

Whilst each State is involved in some park organisation of its own and nature conservation, you would be interested to note that within this country the federation brings a Council of Nature Conservation Ministers together, once annually, perhaps more regularly than that, but it is supposed to be an annual meeting and that committee is known in Australia as C.O.N.C.O.M., the Council of Nature Conservation Ministers, and it represents the commonwealth, the state, and the various territory Ministers with responsibility for National Parks and Wildlife as members of it. And it may be of interest to you that the main objective of the Council is to develop co-ordinated policies for nature conservation and especially for the reservation and management of adequate areas of land within Australia for Australian wildlife. That meeting incidentally was held yesterday to coincide with this meeting today and with New South Wales' celebration of its 100 years of national parks in this State.

The Australian Government, that is the commonwealth, the state and territories, are protecting examples of Australia's unique flora and fauna in a fairly comprehensive system of national parks and equivalent reserves. The parks are seen as an important matter for recreation and for other purposes such as research for education and one finds that many of the parks here are based upon the water catchments which uniquely are economic in the responsibility they have for the population.

Australia is the world's or said to be the world's driest continent. You will note that nearly 60% of the country receives an average rainfall of less than 380 millimetres; South Australia has the lowest rainfall of only 105 millimetres a year. The rain tends to be extremely variable and varies not only from year to year, but certainly across our continent, which gives us a great variety of the parks which are established in various areas.

Our population now exceeds 14½ million people and is expected to be about 18 million by the turn of the century. Our population is very centralised, some 85% of the people living in the urban areas. The largest city is the one in which you are in, with Melbourne being the second largest.

The geography of the country I think can be read by you but in the international sphere, Australia is actively co-operating with the United Nations, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources. Inter-governmental conventions relating to nature conservation, cultural and environmental protection are also seen as an important method of fostering comprehensive environmental policies and practices, and Australia has signed a number of international agreements for nature conservation.

Federally, and that is my own particular area of responsibility, the responsibility generally for nature conservation has devolved upon the Department of Science and the Environment, and that has been a recent change in December of 1978. We believe from the present government's point of view that the arrangement for science and the environment to be closely associated, brings about a very sound arrangement so far as government operation is concerned.

You will note that over 26½ million hectares of land have been set aside in this country for parks, reserves and other types of refuges and sanctuaries under both state and commonwealth legislation and the figure represents somewhere about 3.5% of Australia's total land area. You have the position paper in front of you and perhaps, Mr. Chairman, it may be appropriate for any questions to be invited.

I thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to outline to you something of the Australian Commonwealth situation.

CORNWALL: Thank you very much, Senator Webster. I may have been remiss in introducing Senator Webster not to point out to our international delegates that the Senator, of course, is the Federal Minister for Science and the Environment. I apologise for that, Senator. We know the Senator so well in Australia, it was a natural oversight.

I would at this stage invite questions from delegates.

YOUNG: Mr. Chairman ...

CORNWALL: Hon. Mr. Young, New Zealand.

YOUNG: It mentions in the paper the Australian Heritage Commission which probably extends beyond the direct interest of this meeting but I would be interested to know from the Minister what sort of progress is being made in establishing or setting up the National estate and how it covers matters to do with conservation and areas of conservation?

WEBSTER: The Australian Heritage Commission in the Australian scene was established and is under the auspices of a portfolio removed from myself. The Minister for the Australian Capital Territory is responsible in Australia for the National Heritage Commission. I speak without direct responsibility for it.

The Australian Heritage Commission is basically established so that it may advise the Government and have declared various areas which are significant within the continent, within all States relating to Australia's heritage. There is no great strength to enforce any particular action by the public or by the Government in relation to the declaration of various areas that may be declared as being of national importance but there is a requirement by those who are associated with any activity which may be harmful or destructive to the area that the Minister or the particular authority give an assurance that all avenues whether it be in mining or perhaps some agricultural feature within the particular area - it may perhaps be in the building of a building on a particular area which has been declared as of national importance - that that authority has taken a review that the proposal that is in hand is the only one that can be taken with the least damage to the environmental aspects of the declaration.

Could I note one particular one with which I'm associated. In Tasmania of interest to you Australia is seeking with the balance of the world to set up baseline air pollution stations in an attempt to establish what is the baseline constituents of the atmosphere on a worldwide basis and we are establishing - we have established various caravans on a point in the north-west corner of Tasmania at a place called Cape Grim. It was said to be one of the areas in which aborigines were most interested and the Heritage Commission have declared a 35 kilometre by 2 kilometre depth of that coastline as being of national importance.

The response from my Department makes it mandatory that we must make an evaluation of the building that we propose, of the site that we propose to see that there is no other area that would be as suitable or could not interfere with that particular area that has been declared. In short, the Heritage Commission is declaring to the Governments and the people of Australia those areas which it believes should be preserved in the national interest.

CORNWALL: We have time, I think, for one more question. Any further questions from delegates.

Thank you very much, Senator Webster.

The next item on your programme is the paper to be presented by the Australian Capital Territory.

This is not to hand at this time and has been deferred to Thursday. So I will move on to the Cook Islands and I have pleasure in introducing the Minister of Conservation from the Cook Islands, the Honourable Tangaroa Tangaroa.

TANGAROA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. Gentlemen and ladies, very happy to see you this morning with this conference. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my Government, may I congratulate the Government of New South Wales and the Government of Australia for hosting the Second South Pacific Conference on National Parks and Reserves.

My Premier and Government appreciates the invitation from the Government of New South Wales and the Prime Minister of Australia for representation by our Government at this conference.

Mr. Chairman, we recall that on the 5th June, 1972 the United Nation Conference on the Human Environment was held in Stockholm. That day in 1972 was an important landmark in the development of the increasing concern all over the world for the need to protect and manage our environment. Many developed countries while becoming very rich had destroyed and poisoned much of the very earth needed for the continued well being of their people.

The traditional ways of the Pacific Islands are being replaced by new ideas and methods. The rate of exchange and the changes themselves need to be analysed fully, from a social and cultural viewpoint as well as an economic viewpoint. At present, however, little is done to control the impact of the western society and its technology.

With economic independence and self reliance as stated aims for my country it is important that the environmental resources of the Cook Islands are properly cared for. The biological balance of the Cook Islands environment will determine the success or otherwise of the economic independence and self reliance aims.

To ensure a healthy environment is available to the Cook Islands people, key resources have to be protected. These resources include land area and the soil, water catchments, vegetation, the reef and lagoon systems which have in the past and in some cases still provide a basis of life for Cook Islanders.

Without protection these resources will disappear, the basis of self reliance destroyed, our past mistakes include:-

- (a) The uncontrolled use of the bulldozer has caused loss of valuable topsoil and agricultural land needed for the development of my country.
- (b) Uncontrolled removal of sand from beaches and creek mouths is a major contributor to the widespread foreshore erosion. Loss of land and vegetation here reduces natural protective barriers to inland agricultural lands. Fire, building, removal of tree cover, roads, all pose threats to the stability of critically important water catchment. Clean and available water is critical for survival.
- (c) Soil erosion, siltation, chemical pollutant, poor marine management are threatening the marine resources of my country.
- (d) Uncontrolled construction is reducing the value of coastal areas as a tourist attraction.

Mr. Chairman, the theme of this conference, "Man, Land and Sea" is very appropriate to the needs of the Cook Islands. My country is gradually learning from the mistakes of developed countries in their endeavour to become rich. We the people of the Cook Islands, live in the most beautiful group of islands in the world.

My government will endeavour not to make the same mistakes made by those developed countries for example like Australia and New Zealand and other countries. It fully recognises the importance of a healthy environment as a means to achieving a healthy society. Therefore, my government will ensure that any activity which result in damage to our land, our lagoons, our reefs and our ocean will be prohibited. My government will institute a programme of conservation and environmental education at all levels. A programme of regular inspection of any polluting or potential environmentally harmful activities will be instituted immediately. In addition to this, our people will be encouraged to preserve the beauty of our islands and to plant new and useful trees whenever any tree has to be removed for planting and building.

My government will financially assist in the provision of parks, for example Suwarrow Island, and will encourage landowners to provide family reserves. Our Marae and historical sites will be restored and preserved for our children.

The government will ensure that our lagoons are protected as an essential source of food for our people.

Lastly, may I thank you and your government for providing us with the services of two conservation environmental advisers in the persons of Mr. Neville C. Gare and Mr. Stephen N. Shaw. They have assisted our government considerably in its efforts relating to the creation of an awareness amongst our people of the need to conserve our natural resources and to maintain the attractive physical attributes of our islands. Their conscientious efforts have, therefore been of great assistance to us and have already shown visible results.

Mr. President, it is an honour for me to present a small gift to this conference. I tell you the use of this, you've probably seen it - they use it for entertainment, for dancing, or some other purposes. They use it for dancing and they use it for calling meeting. In the old days if you want to call a meeting, you don't have the bell - we haven't got any bell, so we use these, and call "Now the meeting will be so and so in Sydney, meeting in Sydney", and other use of it.

In the old days if myself and Mrs. Tangaroa, we were not married, and were found talking, the leader of the village would come and take us on the road and call everyone together and say, these two people have been talking and it looks like they're going to be husband and wife. It's a shameful thing - but the reason for presenting this is not of that kind but to control the meeting of this conference. So I want you to have it for the use of this conference for ever when anything out of control you just say - Second South Pacific Conservation Conference. Kia orana means 'greetings' from the Cook Islands government in 1979. It is my pleasure to present you with this on behalf of the government of the Cook Islands and the people.

I don't think Mr. Chairman - I don't think anybody will ask questions unless they ask questions about the boy and the girl - well - shall I wait or?

CORNWALL: Thank you very much for that interesting address and more particularly for the presentation Mr. Tangaroa. Have any delegates got any questions for Mr. Tangaroa?

SAUNDERS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the Honourable Minister what is meant by a 'family reserve' which he referred to in his talk.

TANGAROA: What I mean a 'family reserve' because we have many problems with land - you know in the Cook Islands. Once the government touch a piece of land - that government will be finished in power. They very strong on land so we say look you have the - could you reserve your historical place as a place for people to have a look you know like maraes and other - we don't mind the government to push it. So we say if this is good for national

park and - just take it away. It's dangerous - those people in Cook Islands. Probably they are still uncivilised yet but it's coming along. That's what I mean there. We have to encourage them to do their own - preserve or reserve their own piece of land for public - that's what I mean over there.

CORNWALL: Thank you very much Mr. Tangaroa. That has not only been informative but very interesting indeed. I'm sorry we haven't more time but it is necessary for the conference to move along. It is now my pleasure to call upon the delegate from Fiji, the Honourable Mr. Bajpai to present the situation report for Fiji.

BAJPAI: Mr. Chairman, delegates, ladies and gentlemen. First of all on behalf of my government I wish to pay tribute and congratulate the state government of New South Wales for hosting this South Pacific Conference on National Parks and Reserves. The situation report as you know has already been circulated and I feel every one of you must have read so I do not wish to go into details but I will give you a very brief report on what it consists. Fiji consists of 844 islands and islets with a total land area of 1.83 million hectares compared to 81 million hectares of the land that you have in New South Wales. You will note and notice the smallness of our country. The largest islands are Viti Levu which is 1 million hectare in area and Vanua Levu which is .06 million hectare in area. The population of Fiji totals and it stands at approximately 630,000 today of which 37% is concentrated in the urban centres.

Most islands are surrounded by fringing and barrier reefs. The climate of Fiji is warm throughout the year, with a mean temperature of 25° with a very little variation of 5.5°. There is a definite division of wet and dry zones as characterized by the vegetation, that is dry grassland and wet sub-tropical forests which are good. As yet, no national parks have been declared. There are eight native reserves totalling an area of approximately 5,700 hectares. There are over 32,000 hectares forest reserves, on some of which forest parks and recreation areas have been developed. Mangrove areas were de-reserved in 1975 to ensure access to natives, to exercise their fishing rights in mangrove areas. The National Trust Act of 1970 made provisions for the establishment of parks and reserves. There is no National Parks Act legislated as yet. In other words, there is no clear policy as national park reserves.

The current forest parks are administered by the forest department and the National Trust is currently pushing forward for the establishment of national parks and reserves but the administrative structure will still have to be sorted out when the time comes for this to be effective. A major problem is that no single government agency has been created for the running of environmental environments, and the national parks and reserves. Several government departments have powers under their legislation to control pollution of the environment, for example, mines, fishing and forestry.

Our government today realises and sees the need to pursue the venues for the establishment of national parks and reserves in some of the areas in Fiji, but the main problem that we have is the finance. The government will have to find these activities and we go and do things according to the priorities that have the first and second choice. It depends where this national park and reserve will stand insofar as the priorities are concerned. Land is - the land belongs mostly to these native owners, which is called tribal lands, and we have this land acquisition problem in Fiji because the Crown has only about 7% of the total land and 83 - roughly 83% of the land belongs to the native owners and the rest is all freehold, so you can see that we have three kinds of land in Fiji which is Crown, native and freehold. We also have to look for the finance to have enough manpower to look after the national parks and reserves that will have to be created in the near future.

The conference that we are having today is very important and useful to the developing countries like Fiji and other small countries, because by having this kind of conference we learn so much and then we try to implement that comes to the outcome of the conference. After having attended to this kind of conference, then only we try to implement and bring about the legislation which we don't have in Fiji at the moment.

There was a conference on National Parks and Reserves in 1975 in New Zealand and emanating out of that we had implemented few useful things. One was that we have a man in New Zealand who is doing a diploma course in National Parks and Reserves. Once he is qualified, he will come back and he will be fully responsible to organise the National Parks and Reserves in Fiji. The other one is we have got a person, the name of Richard Dunlop, under the aid of I.U.C.N., who is presently doing work on National Parks and Reserves and once his recommendation is put forward to the Government, some of this will be implemented and this is the result of the conference that we had back in 1975. Thank you, gentlemen.

CORNWALL: Thank you, Mr. Bajpai. We are trying to stay as close as we can to the timetable. I must tell delegates that morning tea will be available in the foyer adjacent to the conference room very shortly. In the meantime, I think I can permit one brief question to Mr. Bajpai. Mr. Bajpai, you have obviously made a very competent address. There are no questions. However, I am sure if delegates have things to take up with you, they can do it over morning tea and I would suggest, at this stage, that we do adjourn. I would ask delegates to reassemble promptly at 11 o'clock.

ADJOURNMENT

CORNWALL: Delegates, ladies and gentlemen, the session is now resumed and it's my very great pleasure to call upon the Minister for Planning and Environment in New South Wales, the Honourable Paul Landa, to address us on the situation report from New South Wales.

LANDA: Thank you ladies and gentlemen. With all this speechmaking you're getting from me, I think we'll have to put you before the Industrial Commission this morning of New South Wales to get penalty rates.

New South Wales now possesses 50 National Parks and 126 Nature Reserves, a century since the establishment of the Royal National Park. In the 12 years since the establishment of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, it has had the continuing aim of establishing National Parks and Reserves in the full range of the many habitats to be found in New South Wales. These include arid, coastal, alpine, rainforests and varying types of subtropical forests and in each of these there are reserves of all shapes and sizes.

Kosciusko National Park in the New South Wales alpine area is an enormous 27,218 hectares and is one of the largest national parks in the Southern Hemisphere.

Sturt National Park in the arid north west corner of the state is also comparatively large at 295,189 hectares. But on the other end of the scale the state has smaller national parks.

Nature reserves also vary in size. In the case of island reserves, some are extremely small, such as Moon Island which is only one hectare in area. Despite their size, such reserves are vital. In some cases they may be the last known habitat of certain sea birds such as the endangered Gould Petrel.

Other areas managed by the Service are aboriginal areas which are sites of significance to aboriginal culture. There are five of these and areas of special historic significance, known as historic sites. The Service manages nine of these.

In my opening address to this Conference, I indicated some of the broad approaches proposed to be adopted by the National Parks and Wildlife Service to meet the challenges of the future. Within that framework there are, however, a number of matters worthy of comment which indicate approaches and trends in National Park policies.

Firstly, the important relationship between land use planning and the system and management of National Parks. The recent administrative re-arrangements in New South Wales emphasise the close nexus between planning and national parks by bringing both the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the New South Wales Planning and Environment Commission under the one Minister.

Examples of the supportive role played by planning in this state are the seven north coast National Parks Extension Programme and the review of the Kosciusko National Park Plan of Management in the context of the development of a subregional planning strategy for that segment of the south east region of New South Wales.

In the north coast programme, investigation areas were identified by the National Parks and Wildlife Service within which optimum boundaries for parks could be drawn. These areas were then made the subject of direct planning control by the Planning and Environment Commission to ensure that developments were not permitted within the area which would prejudice the final decisions.

The announcement of the investigation areas was followed by a programme of public consultation and discussion, a detailed assessment of alternative land uses and further investigation of nature conservation aspects by a joint Planning and Environment Commission and National Parks and Wildlife Service working group to arrive at the most appropriate boundaries for nature conservation and management purposes having regard to the evaluation of any alternative uses.

Implementation is achieved by way of zoning to create National Park Extension Zones within which lands will be publicly acquired over a period of time and the Park Buffer Zones within which lands continue in private ownership, but strict planning controls are applied to ensure that development is in harmony with and does not detract from the adjoining park.

Kosciusko National Park contains Australia's primary ski fields and within the park are the major developed ski villages. As part of the review of the plan of management of the Kosciusko National Park I've instituted an examination by the Planning and Environment Commission of the relationship between development within the park, and development strategies within the surrounding sub-region to ensure that planning decisions in respect of the park are not taken in isolation and that advantage is taken of the interest of both the park and the surrounding region to maximise the primary objectives of the park in protecting and managing its diversity of environment.

Secondly, there is a need to re-assess the role of governments in national parks to more closely align such works with the unobtrusive use of areas for recreation, rather than promote intensive developmental works distracting from the park values. In this regard, I'd like to cite the draft general management plan of the Yosemite National Park in the United States, of August, 1978, which said:-

"This is the plan for the beginning of a new era at Yosemite. The goal is not to change the kind of activities people have been enjoying there, but rather to improve the quality of their experiences by rectifying an over-zealous attempt to civilize the park. The major concepts of the plan are to reduce automobile traffic. As this State's natural lands diminish, so do its opportunities to reserve

lands for nature conservation. Such an outcome is inevitable in a developing country, and we can only be grateful that the acquisition of land for such purposes and the evolution of the nature conservation idea began one hundred years ago."

Thank you.

CORNWALL: Thank you Mr. Landa. Because of the fact that we had some difficulty with the transcription service and are a little behind the time and because Mr. Landa has to return to the Parliament, I think we might dispense with questions at this time.

LANDA: Excellent.

CORNWALL: I thought that might please Mr. Landa. There will certainly be many opportunities during the course of the conference to further question Mr. Landa or his officers who are present. Thank you. I would now like to call upon the delegate from French Polynesia, Mr. Tevane, to present the situation report.

TEVANE: Mr. Chairman, distinguished colleagues and guests, ladies and gentlemen. On behalf of my government, I would like to very much thank the New South Wales government, all the people who have organised this conference, and say how much I have enjoyed the outings that have taken place in Queensland and I thank you very warmly.

The discussion that will take place today will allow us to deal with the problems, not only for today, but also concerning future generations. You probably know that French Polynesia is known as the pearl of the Pacific, and it is with great pride that I say so.

Some of you have most probably visited our Islands and you have probably succumbed to its charm. If you haven't we look forward to greeting you warmly, and to show you about and extend hospitality to you.

Among you here today, there are probably a number of delegates who will take part in the 19th South Pacific Commission that will be held in Tahiti, and I do hope that we will renew friendship, and once again I will be only too happy to extend a warm welcome to you. The Island of Tahiti is in French Polynesia and has a total land area of 4,000 square kilometres, and a population of 130,000 inhabitants. One must take into account that this Island of Tahiti is the largest of the French Polynesian Islands, where the population is extremely localized on a slight coastal strip of land. We therefore have very high mountains that are most interesting from a point of view of Ecosystems. Three types of environment stand out:-

1. The lagoon.
2. The coastal plains and the base of the slopes, which represent 10 to 20% of the area of the Islands, which are being transformed in urbanism, agricultural and other human activities.
3. The mountains, which are almost impenetrable, due to their vegetation, and land relief; they are protected naturally.

The aggressions against the natural environment are therefore concentrated on the borders of places inhabited, and the - our pollution of the lagoon, the destruction of the vegetation, and fire and erosion, and they are localized in a small limited part of the territory.

Under these conditions, the policy pertaining to parks and reserves did not seem up to date to have priority in French Polynesia and we preferred to put the accent to the protection of in general of the environment with elaboration on an arsenal of legislation concerning forest, the hunting, exploitation and resources of the lagoons, the organization

and development of human activity throughout the urbanism, the extraction of materials for building in the lagoon and on the river.

However, with the development of tourism and the recent concentration of the population towards the centre of Tahiti, the necessity of open spaces to the public seemed to be only just recently of some importance and therefore we have set our minds to the study of two natural parks on the island of Tahiti, one on the coast - (the eastern coast), that is the Pari Park, situated in the last zone on the coastal area which is not inhabited on this island. The other is in the mountains of Tahiti and that is the Park of Mt. Marau which should be set up as a park probably towards the end of the year.

The main difficulty that we are meeting in the setting up of these projects is linked to the privately owned land and the particular Statute which deals with dividing up these lands in our own territory.

Ultimately we envisage also to bring about a Statute concerning the natural parks of the total domain of Opunohu on the island of Moorea which is partially open to the public. In a similar way some integral reserves for the protection of the flora and the fauna have been created during the last eight years but we cannot say that they are actually of great significance except concerning the atoll of Scilly because these are islands which are partially inhabited.

To end up this paper I would like to also point out and say a few words on the sea upon which as you know the French Polynesians are largely dependent. French Polynesia has more than a hundred atolls which is half of the atolls in the world and that all these high islands with the exclusion of the Marquesas and Rapa are surrounded by lagoons. Two atolls, Scilly and Taiaro are actually completely protected and the policy of Government is to create new reserves and intensify the control of exploitation which has already started and especially as concerns the pearl oyster.

In regard to the lagoon and the high islands our principal problem is against the pollution. Urban pollution, physical pollution and due to erosion and reservations of plans dealing with urbanism in zones that are protected. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would also like to thank Mrs. McLean who has assisted me in translating my address.

CORNWALL: Thank you very much M. Tevane. Again I must point out that we are having some difficulty in keeping to our time schedule. I think because of that it would be desirable that delegates take any matters up which they wish to discuss with M. Tevane during the luncheon break.

I would now like to call upon the delegate from the Gilbert Islands, Mr. Mwemwenikeaki to present the situation report.

MWEMWENIKEAKI: Mr. Chairman, Honourable Ministers, delegates, ladies and gentlemen, it is my pleasure to participate in this Second National Parks and Reserve Conference and I assure you it is the wish of the Gilbert Islands Government to preserve its islands' flora and fauna as they are really parts of our heritage.

I did not give a long speech at this time as I'm sure you have already got a brief picture of the Gilbert Islands as stated in my situation report which I'm sure it has already been distributed to you all. However, I would like to elaborate on our wildlife conservation unit activities and the general attitude of the Gilbert Islands people towards conservation, but before doing so I would like again to give my Minister's apology, Minister for Natural Resources, the Hon. Thomas Uta, for not being able to join you in this important conference. It is his very wish to participate in this conference but because of the sitting of the House of Assembly is unable to do so.

10

The Gilbert Islands Wildlife Conservation Unit was set up in May, 1977 - a very young one. It is based on Christmas Island in the Line group and its main objective is of preserving the rich seabird life of the Line Island. There are 19 species of seabirds and for some of them the largest colonies in the world are found here.

At present, feral cats are our problem. I am glad to say that we have the upper hand in eradicating them. I am glad to say, also, that the response of our people in preserving birds has been good. As stated in my Situation Report, National Parks as such don't exist. Nor any areas reserved in the full sense of the word. However, Bird Sanctuaries have been declared on Christmas Island and some of the Line and Phoenix Islands.

We have no rainforest parks as in Australia nor wild mammals. The main vegetation apart from introduced plants are the coconut palms, breadfruit, pandanus and a root food crop known locally as tobobie, the same family as daro in the Fiji and other Pacific Islands.

Finally, the Gilbert Islands Government is now self-governing and will achieve independence on July 17th this year. Our present Chief Minister is the Honourable Yerrameethabbi, a young and energetic man.

Thank you very much.

CORNWALL: Thank you, Mr. Mwemwenikeaki. There is, I am pleased to say, some time for questions following that report if any delegate would like to direct a question.

No questions, delegates. Thank you very much, Mr. Mwemwenikeaki.

Delegates and ladies and gentlemen, His Excellency Mr. Star from Nauru, has requested that he present the situation report on behalf of Nauru on Thursday so we will now proceed to the delegate from New Caledonia, Mr. Cherrier.

CHERRIER: Mr. President, distinguished delegates, ladies and gentlemen, to begin with, I would like to thank the Australian Government for this invitation, and the National Parks and Wildlife Service of New South Wales for the organised tours.

As far as the Environment is concerned I would like to state precisely that, although New Caledonia has a small population (135,000) its impact on nature is very important.

On the one hand, New Caledonia has:-

- 1. a very varied climate, very varied grounds and undergrounds, very distinctly contoured, this, combined with her isolation, explains the wealth of the nature.
 - (a) A rich flora with more than 3,500 species already listed and several sub-groups not yet studied, 80% endemic and with very particular species. It is tropical but contains many living fossils.
 - (b) A relatively poor fauna but endemic and scientifically very interesting.
- 2. On the other hand, an economical activity based on the exploitation of the open-cut mines (essentially of nickel), located at certain altitudes, in steeply inclined areas. As a consequence, the destruction of the vegetation, the pollution of the waters and of the soil are important.

Besides the numerous bush fires and the introduction of ubiquitous exotic species increases very much the destructive pressure exerted on the indigenous species.

(1)

Therefore, to protect the otherwise very delicate local species, and to overcome the damages, New Caledonia has, since 1950, undertaken a series of new measures:

1. There are few national parks in New Caledonia, in the broad sense of the word, meaning places set aside for recreation.
2. There are, otherwise, numerous reserved areas, as it shows on the document which you received.
3. To overcome the effect of mining exploitation, some selected areas for mining activities were prohibited, and other areas for mining activities were controlled.
4. To this I add, a marine reserve, and classified sites.

For the future, New Caledonia which has already 16% of its territory under protection:

1. Will harmonise the Status of its Reserves with the International Status.
2. Will increase the number of its reserves, particularly by putting extra efforts on the ecosystems, not yet protected.

Mr. President, distinguished delegates, ladies and gentlemen, I thank you for your attention and I thank also my interpreter for her help.

CORNWALL: Thank you very much Monsieur Cherrier. We do have one or two minutes left available to us if any delegate has a question he might wish to address to the New Caledonian delegate.

SAUNDERS: Mr. Chairman - Queensland - in this report here it says at least one quarter of the territory, I presume that means the whole country, burns each year. You know, I was just wondering, is that grassland or forest land?

CHERRIER: I am sorry, I didn't follow.

SAUNDERS: On page 2.

CHERRIER: Yes.

SAUNDERS: Bush fires - at least one quarter of the territory burns each year; is that grassland or forest or ...

CHERRIER: They are essentially vegetation areas, but this goes only to the limit of the forest and it gains some ground all the time.

SAUNDERS: Thank you.

CORNWALL: Have any delegates any further questions? I'd remind delegates that when they ask questions it would be appreciated if they would identify themselves.

DISCUSSION

CORNWALL: In that case I will call on the delegate from the New Hebrides, the Honourable T.R. Seru to present the situation report from New Hebrides.

SERU: Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, first of all I would like to say on behalf of my government, I would like to say thank you very much to the government of New South Wales who organised this conference. And as far

as my country is concerned, this is our country's first representation to this conference of National Parks and Reserves.

As you will see on top of my report, the New Hebrides will, after independence, be known as Vanuaaku. The word Vanuaaku means 'our people and our land'.

Geography and Geology. Situated between latitude 13° and 21° south. The New Hebrides or Vanuaaku consists of a chain of 70 islands lying in the north-south direction. The Solomon Islands lie 800 kilometres to the north-west. Fiji lies 800 kilometres to the east and New Caledonia 400 kilometres to the south-west. It is approximately 1,200 kilometres to the north-east of New South Wales. The total land area is 11,880 square kilometres.

Most of the islands are generally hilly and only about 6,000 kilometres of the surface area is potentially cultivatable. Of the 6,000 square kilometres, 27% are on coastal plains with coral and alluvial soils and 73% are plateaux with deeper soils. The islands have two main geological regions; coral formation and volcanic activity. They are geologically very young and continue to be subject to earthquakes. There are three active volcanoes, namely the Yasur on the island of Tanna (south), the Lopevi (central) and the Benboo on the island of Ambrym (north).

The climate varies from tropical in the north to sub-tropical in the south, with a mean annual rainfall of 2,360 millimetres per year. The December to April period tends to be hot and wet and May to November period is cooler and drier. Temperatures and rainfall tend to be higher in the north and lower in the southern parts of the group. Like other south Pacific islands the New Hebrides or Vanuaaku is subject to cyclones and tropical depressions. On an average, one every two years in the north and one a year in the south. The high winds and heavy rainfall usually associated with cyclones can cause considerable damage. Various population census are being carried out at present. However, according to the last population census conducted in 1967 the total population was said to be 78,000 persons. The growth rate was thought to be 2.5% giving an estimated population at the end of 1978 of around 100,000.

The two main towns are estimated to have about 18% of the total population; 14,500 in Port Vila the capital and 4,100 in Luganville. The rural population is very unevenly distributed. Large islands usually have relatively small population while small islands are often very densely populated.

The New Hebrides is governed jointly by France and Britain for the last 70 years. The colonial powers have never established a policy on "national" parks and reserves, in the New Hebrides or Vanuaaku. Although the present government is transitional pending proper democratic election later this year it is our intention to explore the possibilities of establishing national parks and reserves in certain parts of the country.

Because of the present problems on land, priority is based on finding solutions to them before independence in 1980. It is only then that a clear policy on national parks and reserves can be taken. However, the present government places great importance on conferences such as this one to promote ideas and present solutions to these south Pacific countries such as ours who are far behind in establishing national parks and reserves.

It is hoped that our country will benefit greatly from conferences such as this one as we prepare for our future nationhood. It is the intention of the Ministry of National Resources to seek advice from international organisations such as U.N.D.P. for the recruitment of an environment expert to be attached to the Ministry within the next 24 months. The work of this expert is to advise the government on environmental problems and draft legislation for the protection of the country's environment. This is only a small beginning. However, it is very likely that one of the expert's

major tasks will be to advise the government on the creation of national parks and reserves in certain parts of the New Hebrides or Vanuaaku. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

CORNWALL: Thank you very much Mr. Seru. We have time for one very quick question if any delegate would like to raise a matter.

YOUNG: Could I ask you - is there much land in public ownership or is it owned by the families almost entirely as in many of the other island countries.

RUBEN SERU: Thank you Mr. Chairman. In my country land is owned by the people and usually owned by families or tribes. Not by the government.

CORNWALL: Thank you very much Mr. Seru. The order of delegates if you would note has been changed slightly here. I would now call on the delegate from the Northern Territory, Mr. Hare to present the situation report.

HARE: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, the Chief Minister for the Northern Territory has asked me to express regret that he wasn't here to be able to deliver this address. We have issued a Situation Report, I think it is appropriate to mention several things which may make the Northern Territory a little different to other places or other states within Australia.

Firstly, it is difficult to talk of the Northern Territory as an entity. It commences at the border with South Australia with a five inch rainfall and it stretches almost 1900 kilometres to Darwin where there is from a 60 to a 90 inch rainfall. So we are dealing with a country which is arid at one end and tropical in the other.

Secondly, whilst it does constitute about a sixth of the Australian land mass, it contains only about 1 percent or less than 1 percent of the Australian population.

Thirdly, of that 1 percent, twenty percent of the population are aborigines, who through recognition of their land rights are now gaining their rightful place in the community. This is a situation which has changed very rapidly in recent years and there are going to be a lot further changes in the immediate future.

Fourthly, whilst there are very large areas of unoccupied country in the Northern Territory which has the status of vacant Crown land, much of this is of very poor quality and whilst one might look at all these open spaces, I don't think it is ever likely that they will be occupied. There are huge areas of desert and I think that it is inevitable that they should be left alone, because in terms of occupation as we who have exploited the land so much is concerned, there is no place for man in those areas.

Fifthly, in terms of our own organisation in the Northern Territory, there is a certain amount of experimentation going on. The Northern Territory has recently been given a form of self government which ultimately is expected to lead to statehood. The organisation of our national parks has been combined with other activities such as forestry, land conservation and environment. The forestry part may not be as strange as it seems, because it is not an exploitative function in the Northern Territory; it is more conservation of the natural forests which ultimately of course may be exploited, but at this stage, there is very little exploitation going on.

Sixthly, I think that we have a situation in terms of Kakadu where mining is taking place, a national park has just been declared there, and in parallel with that, uranium mining is proceeding. Where we are normally looking at a national park where you are going to try to keep it in as natural a state as possible, here we have a township being built

within the national park area and so that that is going to be another problem which will be peculiar to this area. I think it is interesting to the degree that history is going to record whether this sort of activity is compatible. There will naturally be quite a lot of problems associated with it.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

CORNWALL: Thank you, Mr. Hare. Has any delegate a question which he would like to direct to Mr. Hare? We are now running into a situation where we have plenty of time for questions. I have been too efficient as a chairman, perhaps. Well, if not I am sure there will be much informal discussion in the course of the conference. Thank you very much for your contribution, Mr. Hare.

Delegates, there has been some difficulty in getting the New Zealand report printed, but it is at present being distributed. I would now like to call on the New Zealand delegate, the Honourable Mr. Young, to address the conference. Thank you, Mr. Young.

YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, delegates, first of all may I express the thanks of my government to the Government and people of New South Wales and Australia for hosting this very important conference. As you know, it was our privilege to host the first conference some four years ago. I want to summarize the contents of the New Zealand situation report, which is now being distributed. It contains sections on geography, climate and population. It describes New Zealand environmental legislation, the land that has been set aside for public use, the administration of these areas, and a note on conservation and environmental agencies. It might be useful to point out at this stage that in New Zealand, as in Australia, and probably unlike many of the Island nations represented here, it is a considerable area of land that is in public ownership, as against private or family ownership.

New Zealanders would largely speak in glowing terms of their natural heritage, and justifiably so. We have a higher percentage of land in parks and reserves, about 10% of the total land area, a higher percentage than any other country in the world. There are nearly three million hectares of public land available for recreation, that is just under one hectare or two acres at least for every man, woman and child in the country. The quality of the land is even more impressive.

A notable thing about the New Zealand open space system is the variety of reserve classification. There are ten national parks, which comprise the bulk of the reserved areas. There is a wide range of public reserves, including nature, scientific, historic and scenic reserves. There are farm parks which is a relatively new concept and I might say as an urbanised former farmer, a concept I thoroughly support. The aim of the farm parks is to provide rural recreational opportunities for the urban public, in conjunction with an economic farming activity. In an increasingly urbanised world, farm parks offer an excellent opportunity to bring closer together town and country, by allowing city people to see farming operations at first hand. Maritime parks are another comparatively recent development. These parks provide for the co-ordinated management of existing and proposed reserves, including appropriate Island reserves, with the coastal region, and I will have more to say about that in my keynote address.

Another category of reserve in New Zealand, is the forest park. The forest park incorporates the principles of multiple use, often combining forestry activities. Farming and mining with recreation and conservation. There are 15 forest parks in New Zealand now, embracing an area of over one million hectares; as well as this, there are 126 forests throughout the country. These are indigenous forests that have been recently selected as open forests, with unrestricted access. There are also forest wilderness areas and forest sanctuaries.

131

Another integral part of the New Zealand open space system, is the New Zealand walkways. The Walkways Act aims at the establishment of walking tracks over publicly owned and privately owned land so that the people of New Zealand and visitors I might add, have safe unimpeded foot access across the countryside. It is intended that eventually there will be a network of walking tracks from one end of the country to another.

A further recent development associated with the provision of open space is what we call the conservation covenant. I suppose it's our attempt to approach the family reserve concept mentioned by Mr. Tangaroa of the Cook Islands, where private land has specific reserve values but the owner wishes to retain ownership - there is provision for the land to be administered as a protected private reserve. Another related development was the establishment in 1977 of the Queen Elizabeth II National Trust. The Trust was set up to fill a growing need for an independent body to foster the development of an overall open space plan and policy. The Trust has the authority to negotiate open space covenants to acquire open space land in its own name.

Ladies and gentlemen from these brief descriptions, you can see as I indicated earlier that there is a great variety of reserves in the New Zealand open space system. However, each reserve and each administering authority is a part of a total recreational and conservation network. Each has its own function. New Zealand's internal aim is to pursue energetically the policy of preservation and conservation of the environment. This provides for a variety of outdoor pursuits in a natural unspoilt environment through a complex of reserves and national parks set aside for the proper use, benefit and enjoyment of the public today and set aside in perpetuity. Internationally, our policy is to engender co-operation in the field of conservation of outstanding natural and historic areas as a part of the world heritage and we will continue to pursue this goal calling upon our experience and with some financial aid with special emphasis in the South Pacific region. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

LANDA: Thank you very much Mr. Young for that very interesting address. I'm sure the delegates might well wish to question Mr. Young further on that situation report. Would delegates please identify themselves as they ask their questions. I'll take them in order - Dr. Saunders.

SAUNLERS: Queensland. Mr. Chairman, I'm very interested in this concept of farm parks and I'd like to ask the gentleman from New Zealand, what incentive does the Government offer to the landholder for setting up a farm park and is there some sort of agreement or covenant entered into between the Government and the land owner?

YOUNG: Well, the farm parks I mentioned, Doctor, are land that is publicly owned and - the Lands and Survey Department in New Zealand which also farms land for development and settlement has incorporated that farming activity with a reserve responsibility, so the farm parks I've mentioned - there's one in the far north of the North Island, one in the Sounds in north of the South Island, two on the Coromandel Peninsula and we are just developing one on the outskirts of Wellington city - they are on publicly owned land. The sort of covenant you have in mind is something that will develop outside of that concept, and we are hoping that where private individuals wish to retain land, we might be able to encourage a restricted public use of that farm land by conservation covenants.

PRATT: Mr. Chairman, Australian Capital Territory. Could I ask Mr. Young a little more about these farm parks. Are they administered for example by the Nature Conservation Authorities, or by the Agricultural Authorities on behalf of Nature Conservation groups?

YOUNG: No. They are administered by the Lands and Survey Department which is responsible for the administration of National Parks and Reserves and it is a combined farming and public reservation responsibility. The

aim is not so much nature conservation or provision of recreational opportunities for people living in urban areas, being able to get out and see farming activity at first hand, to be able to walk on walkways we are - and will develop - across the farms.

SAUNDERS: Victoria. I'd like to ask a question about the walkways concept. I notice that they can be established over public and private land. I'm wondering to what extent those in existence do include private land and, if so, what sort of compensation is made to the owner of that private land for the public right to walk across.

YOUNG: Most of the walkways that have been developed so far are on land of some type of public tenure. The Act provides for, and we are negotiating with the private land owners, through the covenant system - protection for the farm land owner in relation to the use of a part of his land for a walkway. There is no specific compensation for other than damage. There is a great responsibility with the Walkways Commission, in building up the confidence of land owners to this concept and we do have Federated Farmers, the major farming organisation in New Zealand, represented - on the National Walkways Commission and on the district committees.

BOWEN: Bowen, Western Australia. Sir, the nature reserves, I have noted that they all have the restriction on entry 'by permit only'. You have 87 of them. Is this generally accepted by the community or is it common practice for people to attempt to enter the reserves without a permit?

YOUNG: Generally, accepted. I am bound to say that I think most of the nature reserves would be islands, so in fact they do have an inbuilt form of protection there. But, by and large, the public accept that there are areas that merit special protection and are prepared to go along and obtain a permit.

CORNWALL: There are no further questions. I thank you very much.

YOUNG: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

CORNWALL: Because two of the delegations have deferred their situation reports until Thursday, we are now left in a situation where we have a little time to spare. Because we will have to make it up on Thursday morning the Minister for National Parks and Wildlife in Tasmania, the Honourable A.B. Lohrey has kindly agreed to go on a little early. I'm sorry to do this to you Mr. Minister, but I'm sure you are quite competent to handle the situation at short notice.

LJELLINE: Mr. Chairman, delegates. Tasmania is the smallest state in Australia which I suppose most delegates would realise. The southern most state. We are on the forty-second parallel and I would say, I'm sure without contradiction, that we are certainly the most beautiful state in Australia and we have a population of around 400,000 people and we have about that number of tourists every year to Tasmania. One of the reasons that we have that many tourists is because of our National Parks. The area of Tasmania under national parks is approximately ten percent of the state. In Tasmania we don't like to publicise that very much because there is a great deal of opposition to acquiring any more land for national parks from development interests but in a situation like this we're very happy to talk about it.

The policy of the service is in fact to acquire and manage land for conservation and ecological purposes, as well as to protect all forms of wildlife in Tasmania. The legislation which controls conservation in Tasmania rests basically with three Acts. The first one is the National Parks and Wildlife Act which was created in 1970 and that created the National Parks and Wildlife Service and then we have the Aboriginal Relics Act which came into force in 1975. The purpose of this Act was to ensure that aboriginal relics and aboriginal sites throughout the State would be protected. Not very much work has been done in that area at the moment

mainly because of lack of funds. But we are hoping that in the future a great deal more work will be carried out and a lot more research will be carried out in that particular area.

The third piece of legislation is the Environmental Protection Act which was established in 1973, and that established the Environment Department.

In Tasmania I'm the Minister for the National Parks and Wildlife and also Minister for the Environment, so I administer both those Acts. The Environmental Protection Act in fact, is more an industrial police Act rather than anything else, and we are involved in reducing pollution from industry generally.

There are two other departments that have some effect on reserves and conservation in Tasmania, and they are the Lands Department and the Forestry Department, and both these Departments are involved in some way in reserving land in the State.

The kinds of areas that we do reserve are national parks, and these are large areas, larger than 4,000 hectares. Then there are nature reserves containing unusual natural areas. There are historic sites which are monuments or sites which have some historical significance. At the moment we don't have any heritage legislation in Tasmania as some of the other States do, but we're looking at that, and hope to introduce legislation later on this year to reinforce the preservation of historic sites. We also have State reserves. Areas less than 4,000 hectares, and as I've said Aboriginal sites.

We are also going to be setting up game reserves which will be protected areas where protected species will be managed. In the game reserves there will be shooting allowed under licence, and we have yet to see how that is going to work out, and finally we have conservation areas. Conservation areas are areas which don't have the same status as national parks where mainly the object is to protect wildlife, but where development can take place. We just recently proclaimed a large area of the south-west of Tasmania as a conservation area, where development will take place. This has been a very controversial subject in Tasmania for many years. A committee was set up to look at the whole of the south-west of Tasmania. There is a national park in the bottom end of the State, in the south-west, and the committee was looking at the possibility of extending that national park to incorporate all of the south-west, about 25% of the State. The Government decided not to go ahead with the proposal to establish a national park in the south-west, but to make it a conservation area, and to set up an authority to determine developmental projects to determine whether or not development should go ahead. If it does go ahead under what conditions. As I say this has been a most controversial matter in the State, not least of which is because we have the Hydro-electric Commission which has been established in Tasmania for many years, to develop our hydro resources, and most of the hydro resources in Tasmania unfortunately happen to be found in the south west of Tasmania. Although to other States it may seem strange that conservationists in Tasmania are opposed to hydro development, it is a fact that hydro development in Tasmania would mean the loss of great tracts of land, wilderness areas which conservation minded people are very much opposed to. So we are at present looking at a proposal to dam or not to dam a very large area of the south west of Tasmania, and as I say this is an extremely controversial area in the State.

We have approximately 683,000 hectares in Tasmania under some kind of reserve. As I said that approximates 10% of the State.

The situation report gives a description of the different parts of the State and what they're like. Perhaps the only other thing I need to say about Tasmania is that we have two Biosphere reserves which the

United Nations - U.N.E.S.C.O. has proclaimed. These are - one is the south-west of Tasmania, which covers that area which is proposed by the conservation area, which is 25% of the State and the other Biosphere reserve which is Macquarie Island Nature Reserve. Macquarie Island - the whole island is a nature reserve and that of course is approximately 900 miles south of Tasmania. Also the south-west of Tasmania has been nominated as an area to be included in the world heritage list by U.N.E.S.C.O. This matter has not yet been formalised by the State government and has to run the gauntlet I would say, before it is. But you will gather from my remarks that we have some special areas in Tasmania which we're very proud of, some special wilderness areas which have a uniqueness in the whole of Australia, we believe, which should not be developed under any circumstances, and of course, that is the controversy which we're faced with. Mr. Chairman, I'd be happy to answer any questions.

CORNWALL: Thank you very much, Mr. Lohrey. Are there any questions which any delegates would like to direct to Mr. Lohrey?

YOUNG: Could I ask a question with regards to the various demands that are made on waterways these days. Do you have any legislation to protect or aimed at protecting wild water in its original state, in other words whole rivers or stretches of rivers?

LOHREY: Not at all. This is the problem in fact in the south-west where there are several wild rivers which are very, very isolated. It has no development around them at all, and they will be flooded if the hydro development goes ahead, and we have no legislation in fact to say that they are particularly unique or to afford them any protection. This is one of the bones of contention in fact.

CORNWALL: Are there any further questions?

YOUNG: Could I ask one more question Mr. Chairman?

CORNWALL: Certainly.

YOUNG: Minister, the game reserves that you mention for hunting; is that indigenous game or introduced animals?

LOHREY: No, that will be indigenous game, mainly the kangaroo. We do have, however, introduced deer in Tasmania, they were introduced last century by the early settlers. They are fallow deer. There is usually an open season each year that goes for about 4 weeks, and they are shot throughout the State where they occur in limited numbers, but the game reserve is a separate area, and they'd be for kangaroos which are of course, indigenous.

CORNWALL: Yes? Delegate from Tonga?

TONGAILAVA: Mr. Chairman, would Mr. Lohrey care to comment on what status class your reserves are now? Have you made legislation for your forestry reserves?

LOHREY: Have we made legislation for ...

TONGAILAVA: For your biosphere reserves?

LOHREY: Parks or reserves, yes the national ...

CORNWALL: Biosphere reserves.

LOHREY: Biospheres, oh I'm sorry - no we haven't made legislation in conjunction with that. We were presented with certificates from U.N.E.S.C.O. which the government received but we haven't made any legislation in conjunction with that. As I say in Tasmania there are a great deal of controversial problems in relation to locking away reserved land in the

.38

State from development. I think it would be right to say that our attitude in national parks is that there would be no development of mining or power stations or the like, and of course when somebody finds some precious minerals in your parks then you've got a real problem.

CORNWALL: No further questions? Thank you very much, Mr. Lohrey for both your very interesting address and for going on at short notice. There are two announcements which I would like to make. The first is that Mr. Lohrey will be the Chairman for the two sessions this afternoon.

The second very important announcement that I would like to make is that lunch will be served in the North Foyer of the Opera Theatre and that staff will be on hand to direct delegates to that location.

That now concludes the morning sessions and I thank delegates very much for their co-operation, for their contributions and for their attendance.

ADJOURNMENT

LOHREY: I'll call delegates together for the afternoon conference.

Delegates, as Dr. Cornwall said, I'll be taking the afternoon session. I'd like to thank Dr. Cornwall for taking this morning's session. Before I call on Senator Webster to give the first of five key note addresses perhaps I should remind delegates of the suggestion which was made this morning about recommendations. I'd remind delegates that they could put forward recommendations to the Recommendations Committee but that the recommendations that you would like to put forward have to be in before Friday morning at 9.15 so it is perfectly legitimate to put forward recommendations to the Recommendations Committee this afternoon and the Secretary of that Committee is over here, Mr. Geoff Martin.

Well delegates, ladies and gentlemen, the first of five key note addresses will be given by Senator James Webster. Senator Webster was elected as Senator in Victoria in 1964 and has been Australian Minister for Science and Environment since 1975. His areas of responsibility in his portfolio cover the C.S.I.R.O., the largest research organisation in Australia, financing for research in universities and scientific agreements of international importance. Two areas which his portfolio covers which would be of interest to delegates is the Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service and the Australian Antarctic programme. I should say that Senator Webster has visited the Antarctic Continent on two occasions and is the only Australian member of Parliament to be at the South Pole on two occasions and his government's concern on environmental issues is reflected in its recent proclamation of the Kakadu National Park in the Northern Territory and the decision to prohibit whaling in Australian waters, which was hailed as a - perhaps we shouldn't say, a great leap forward but certainly a significant step forward by the Ministers of National Parks yesterday. Certainly in Tasmania our relationship with him and his Department has been a very good one over the years and we were very pleased to have a special survey team in the south-west of Tasmania which has been carrying out survey work down there and our relationships with the Commonwealth have been excellent.

Without any more to do I would like to call upon Senator Webster to give his key note address.

Senator Webster then presented his paper, "Man in the South Pacific, Past and Present", the text of which appears in Section 2 of these proceedings.

LOHREY: Thank you very much Senator Webster. I forgot to remind delegates before Senator Webster began that there would be question time from delegates concerning Senator Webster's key note address.

I think perhaps we could extend the invitation to observers if they wish to participate in question time so that I would ask that if any delegates or observers had a question to put your hand up and say where you come from.

We have quite a bit of time up our sleeve for questions. According to the agenda we have afternoon tea at three fifteen so I'm hopeful that the points that Senator Webster raised in his address would engender a certain amount of questions from the conference. I'll throw the conference now open to questions to Senator Webster.

YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, Senator Webster laid a lot of emphasis on the need for the development of a type of multiple land use regime in National Parks - if I could put it that way - to provide for tourism, for mining and I guess although he didn't say - maybe forestry as well. Is there not some danger that if we approach these principles so widely that we would tend to dilute the protection that specific areas require notably the conservation of the nature and the natural resources in that area.

I know there's great conflict going on and I have the same sort of problem in my own country when deciding to set aside an area for a national park or as an addition to a national park. According to our legislation when you reserve it, it can be developed in a limited way for tourism but certainly not for mining except under very unusual circumstances and not for forestry activities. The question I'm really asking is if we try to accommodate all, don't we finish in some danger of not accommodating any sufficiently?

WEBSTER: Sir, your comment is undoubtedly correct. I speak certainly not as a qualified man in the knowledge of national parks that others would have here but let me as a representative of the people perhaps give the ideas that would appeal to me in this matter.

I could fully agree with you that whatever action is taken in an area which is considered of importance in the national park field may be harmful to that particular area and that can be readily agreed. I quoted in my address that Australia has now some eight million square kilometres, I think was the figure of parks and reserves in this country and much as we are a very big and fortunate country that is a considerable area which in my view should not be locked up and confined for any one particular use. How that statement would not necessarily be agreed by perhaps others around the table and it's a matter worth arguing but it does appeal to me that to fully understand and have knowledge of what our future may hold for us and Australia again I say is more fortunate in that it has area and perhaps may not be as confined as some others who are represented at the table today, we must find multiple use for much of our lands.

You know it always appeals to me and it must be obvious to all of those who sit here that the greatest polluters and the most harmful thing that goes on in our national park regrettably is the advent of public access in any particular area and provided you have people that will go round and clean up after the public have been through, well, so be it, there's no detriment but it can become an expensive business and comment was made earlier, not in the remarks that I made but I think, one other speaker made the comment earlier in his address that there is very little use in conserving areas unless you're willing to back that conservation with funds - so that you are able to adequately manage it. The Chairman, from Tasmania, has an enormous problem - one of the most unique areas in Australia is in the south-west corner of that State. Conservationists are demanding that it be locked up purely for conservation purposes. We should all be influenced today with the fact that hydro-electric power is perhaps

the purest energy form that we could find. We could do away with coal that is polluting well to my knowledge, the atmosphere; we could do away with the problems of uranium mining if we had the good fortune that Tasmania has. Regrettably his Government is posed with a problem that conservationists do not want any type of development including hydro-electric power coming out of that particular territory. And so there is a problem and there is conflicting interests. My view would be, sir, that I would hold to the fact that scientific research is not so far advanced in any particular area that we can indicate concisely the result either of access by stock, access by foresters or by those who may be using timber resources, vehicles running through forest in relation to development such as I've mentioned for power purposes to understand what will be the activity or what will be the effect on any conserved area by having access of any other area whatsoever. But I'm of the view that access must be given for the proper utilisation for the people of the various interests that they may have. And reiterated again those of scientific interests, those perhaps of industrial interest, mining interests, those perhaps of recreational interests, sporting interests, they must after careful survey and rational decision be given access.

LOHREY: Further questions of Mr. Webster. Mr. Tongailava.

TONGAILAVA: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I wonder whether the Honourable Minister, Mr. Webster would care to comment if it comes about that there will be a conflict of interest between science and the national park. Say if you come to find or discover a valuable mineral resource within a gazetted national park, how would you decide it? About this eventuality. Have you made provisions to cater for the conflict Senator from the Federal Government's point of view and the State Government's point of view? I would be very much interested to learn Senator Webster what would you do in such circumstances. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

WEBSTER: Thank you for your question. I think it's very appropriate that it complements the previous question and it is a problem which will beset all countries as the conflicting interests within governments decide whether areas large or small should be set aside which have the potential for the use in our time for the population that may be dependent upon that area. We in Australia have the very latest in conflict of interests in that regard. And you ask a question "how would I or my government perhaps decide on an issue" comes forward in relation to the park which I mentioned in my address - the Kakadu National Park. Kakadu is an area which we proclaimed quite recently. An area of in excess of 6,000 square kilometres of land some 180 kilometres west of Darwin in the Northern Territory. If you got a map and see where that is, it is based on an enormous river system - a most unique park area of outstanding quality. In the middle of that park we are said to have the richest uranium deposits in the world and the income to Australia from uranium mining - I don't know whether my memory will be correct in recalling it - I could call on my secretary to prompt me - but I think it's somewhere in the vicinity of \$5,000,000,000 in uranium sales that are likely to occur to this country within a very short time. Now there is conflict in the country as to whether you should even mine uranium. But it would be an attitude of at least the government that I support that there will be no cleaner fuel ever provided, no cleaner energy source ever provided for the population of the world. And if one - I don't doubt there are many conflicting interests around the table but if one can look at the activity over the past eight or ten years in this particular field it is reasonable that we should pursue that a government having the responsibility should pursue this problem. I for instance have very grave doubts about our use of fossil fuels in the future because in a small way I have been connected with what are the results of the burning of coal and other fossil fuels in our community. But that is not likely to come upon our community for some years I shouldn't think. However, we in the declaration of the Kakadu National Park have set about to make provisions through our Director basically, Professor Ovington, who is in charge of that particular park; ways in which this mining will be developed. It becomes an expensive proposition for Government. We have set up an area of

responsibility for a supervising scientist who must take an interest in not only the results of mining in the area, the effect on the people, the indigenous people, the effect on the ecosystems that may be there, waste disposal, all that type of thing. I'm confident that it will be conducted in a proper way within the National Park and if there is a problem which undoubtedly many of those in areas represented here who would be seeking economic gains from the resources of their country for their people today, they will be posed with just such problems.

I believe they are able to be coped with. I would suggest the type of regulations and the type of acts of Parliament that are put down to proclaim the particular areas need to take account of what may be required by the people of the particular area in the future.

LOHREY: More questions, delegates?

DASMAN: Dasman, I.U.C.N. I'd like to ask the Senator if in the provisions for the Kakadu National Park or other similar areas in Australia, there is allowance for the continuation of traditional aboriginal uses of the park, for example, traditional hunting practices or other activities that have gone on for many years among the aborigines.

WEBSTER: Various laws within the country do permit this. Sometimes there are particular problems. We would seek in this country not to have a recognition either of aborigines or of Australians. We perhaps would seek to be one nation but that is not necessarily carried out and for instance, where we may be wishing to say we will protect the crocodile as an endangered species in this country, it is necessary to see that those who may either live off the flesh or may wish to live off the income from the hides or skins of the particular animal whatever it may be, are allowed their traditional role and certainly within the area of the Kakadu Park where there are traditional hunting grounds and they are required by the people, where those continued traditional rights perhaps persist, they would be allowed to continue.

LOHREY: South Australia.

CORNWALL: Mr. Chairman, Senator Webster has taken us into some fairly controversial areas and, as he said, there would be many differences of opinion around the table. Park use and uranium mining are but two. However, it's not my intention to canvass the controversial areas as far as the Federal and State Governments in Australia are concerned at this moment. I think it would be appropriate, certainly, to compliment Senator Webster on the initiatives which he and his Government have taken to prevent whaling in Australian waters. That is an area in which we are all in agreement in Australia. I would like to test the feeling of the conference delegates regarding the production of a recommendation or statement on whale protection in the South Pacific region in general. I believe that this conference presents us with a unique opportunity to set an example for the rest of the world and I would urge delegates to consider the possibility of endorsing and issuing such a statement. It is not my intention at this time to move that as a formal resolution but I would certainly like to see it discussed.

WEBSTER: I think that's a very fine proposal, sir.

LOHREY: I would suggest that if there is a recommendation at all on whaling that it should be referred to the Secretary of the Recommendations Committee for formalisation so it can then be put to the conference on Friday to be agreed to or not.

Questions, delegates or observers?

WEBSTER: Right, well I'll begin on the - do you have someone else?

LOHREY: Yes.

DAHL: Dahl, S.P.C. With respect to the Kakadu Park area, you mention this is created on aboriginal-owned land and many countries in the Pacific have the problem of land still in customary ownership. What kind of legal provisions or arrangements are made to make such an area into a national park? I presume this remains in aboriginal ownership? And what are the respective residual rights that the original owners may still have over this land?

WEBSTER: Successive governments in Australia have sought to perhaps bring about that which throughout the world is spoken of as disadvantage that may be inherent in the originating peoples in a country with Europeans coming in and perhaps taking over the area and claiming it as their own. We face great problems in Australia relating to that, and it is necessary to bring about some type of system whereby claims can be established if that happens to be over traditional lands. It could be well said that much of Australia, of course, once you commence following that path, is within that particular area of claim. I don't know any areas of Australia myself that could not be put in that context. The way in which successive governments in Australia have managed this is to have an appeal by the aboriginal traditional owners who believe they are traditional owners, claim land when it happens to be unalienated land, and that is land which is held under a particular title. The land in the Kakadu Park was held in the title of the Commonwealth. It was not recognised as traditional aboriginal land, but we had an enquiry - this country set up an enquiry into uranium mining and an independent enquiry taking evidence, finally reported to the government of the day, and it was decided that, if mining were to go ahead in a particular area, it would be as well to consider whether the traditional lands that were there should be made available for claim by the aborigines. And indeed, the government allowed this to be done. Agreement was then entered into with the aborigines that, if the land was available for them, they - I think it was their own free act - that they decided it would be best in a National Park.

The title to the land does not now lie with the aborigines, nor does it lie with the Commonwealth. The land is in the title of the Director of National Parks and Wildlife in this country, and so that becomes - I think that's correct Professor?

OVINGTON: No, the aborigines have the land rights - the land is leased by the aborigines to the Director.

WEBSTER: It's leased to the Director? Well, Professor Ovington has prompted me on one thing. The general proposition that I've given you is the one that I understood it to be, the Director prompts that the title to the land is still held with the aborigines and that they have leased their land. Professor, I think that I am correct in saying, much as I said, that all the land is aboriginal - it is not all aboriginal land.

Some of it in actual fact, remains Commonwealth land, yet perhaps to be challenged and claimed by aborigines, and some will be held in that particular title. I think the thumb sketch that I gave in my paper, generally concedes the overall view of it, but there are some details associated with it.

LOHREY: Thank you, Senator.

DAVIDSON: What I was going to ask, following up on the discussion on mining in national parks was this, Senator. Obviously, conditions of the licence to mine would include restitution. How do you guarantee that that will take place, to the satisfaction of the administering authority. Do you require a bond?

WEBSTER: The way in which we have gone about this, and in actual fact Professor Ovington may prompt me as I go - we have taken a variety of assurances. First, following an enquiry, there is necessarily in this country an environment impact statement, and the results of that statement

perhaps throw up the fact that we do not know as yet what may be the effect of certain activities within the area, on some of the species in the area, on the population perhaps, on the waters of the area if mining is to continue. And so, associated with the mining lease are placed very stringent restrictions which will be supervised personally within this country. It would be by the various Mines Ministers in the States - in this instance that is conducted by the Department of Northern Territory Department of Mines have we? Mines and Energy. So there is the restriction in the lease that is given - a breach of the lease will find that the lease is void so the restrictions are placed on the mining lease. We then require bond money to see that the land is restored in line with the lease document and so we have as not my detailed understanding is but subject to prompting again by Professor Ovington I think they are the two main holds on the lessee. That's correct.

LOHREY: Mr. Bowen?

BOWEN: Thank you sir. I wasn't going to ask a question actually, Senator, but simply make a general comment. I think, following the comment that was first made this afternoon and my name is Bowen from Western Australia - that I am often concerned when one is talking of National Parks. in the broad sense of establishing National Parks throughout Australia or throughout any other country, that one tends to see as the priority and it certainly is one of the priorities, but one tends to list and see as the priority areas which have unique beauty or areas which are of specific value to the community, in terms of a ski field or areas which are of particular attraction to the community in terms of the general people usage of the area and that then when one looks at the possible multiple use of such areas these are seen as the overriding uses of the park which need to be maintained. Others tend to be compromised and allowed if it doesn't happen to be dramatically deleterious to these two particular things which to my mind often loses the point of one of the other major uses of National Parks or Nature Reserves, whichever terminology one is using, of the unique web of life which one requires to ensure persistence of the whole array of plant and animal fauna and flora in parts of Australia. Assemblages of plants and animals which are in such danger of breaking that web of life and thus ending up by affecting some of the unique plants and animals of the particular country. I just wanted to make the point that I'm always a little concerned that sometimes we do not place enough emphasis on the intricacies of our population systems whether they be plants and animals when we are saying that we are setting aside areas to represent those assemblages and that the dominating influence of a national park in terms of its beauty or in terms of its particular place for the people gets consideration out of weight with the other considerations required to maintain the unique populations of plants and animals.

WEBSTER: It's not for comment. Perhaps it would be better for comment around the room and perhaps around the room there may be more agreement with your comment than may come from myself. I believe that it can be argued that that setting aside of parks and leaving them in a locked up state for the preservation of the flora and fauna, as you say, may be a very good thing and to keep people out of the parks may be something that we should attempt to do. I don't think that will follow in years, I think it will be necessary for the management of parks to be such that as populations grow, as areas diminish that are available to us that they will become multiple use areas. And, again, in setting aside of parks, State and Federal Governments, of course, must look to the cost that is applicable. It is all very well to say there is a unique area which many of us may be familiar with and to say that it should be locked up and no access. I see great danger in many of the parks and park areas of which I know over many years, I see the uncontrolled devastation of fires. Someone mentioned here a quarter of their whole area is ravaged by fire every year, without proper management I don't know where your comment about conservation of the flora and fauna is going to come in. Whether it is as I hear it from some conservationists who say, well of course that is a natural happening and so let it happen, it should happen. It appears to

me that we've got to act in such a way that we should attempt perhaps more carefully to preserve that which is there and may be lost by uncontrolled fire which is certainly a great problem in your state as well as in many other areas of Australia.

So the fact is, whether in these days, as we see the introduction of horrid things such as blackberry, which in some parts in Australia are ravaging the parks at the present time, so that very very few of the native animals can get through those areas and again a point of argument today is the use of certain chemicals in being able to control those particular plants, those noxious weeds, I would believe will probably run fairly wild in Australia in the next few years because of the fact that we are not willing to accept the comments that have been made about the possible harmful effect; or we are willing to believe the comment that is made about the possible harmful effect of certain sprays that are used commonly today.

I think at the next meeting that this council has, we will probably be debating that particular point at length. Because, in this country it is going to be a very very great danger, and so it is funds for management, and perhaps that is something which is the responsibility of Ministers for Conservation and is the responsibility of the officers whom I acclaimed for the dedication of their work, that they must seek that if a country sets aside a park area, it must have sufficient funds to manage it properly. Whether it then becomes locked up or whether it then becomes one which can be used for a variety of purposes is perhaps for the advice of officers to give to their Government. I think we will find mainly multi use in the future.

LOHREY: The gentleman at the back.

CHADWICK: Mr. Chairman, Bill Chadwick from Queensland. Senator, I don't mean to cause you any embarrassment but I'm interested in your statement, 'multi land use', to hear your ideas and philosophies on the removal of sand mining from Fraser Island, and it is not meant to embarrass you, I'm just interested in your ideas or philosophies on the multi use of land. And possibly why in the Kakadu situation you can condone mining whereas on Fraser Island, it was excluded from an area which was legally able to be mined.

WEBSTER: Well now Minister Lohrey will agree with me that whenever everybody stands up at question time in the Senate and says, I am going to ask you something that won't embarrass you, you know it jolly well will, I suppose.

Well sir, I can only give you a Government attitude so far as that particular question is concerned and I don't know that it really comes under the auspices of the thing that we are discussing today. The Federal Government instituted a report; the report made particular recommendations, it is then for a Government either to accept them or reject them as they see wise, in this instance the Government through its external affairs powers and its export powers decided that mining would be discontinued. I am impressed by the fact of the restitution that has occurred on the Island, my understanding, although I have not been there, from other Members of Parliament who have been there, they have reported very favourably on that.

My understanding is that there would be no possibility of any re-occurrence of mining on that particular Island.

LOHREY: Thank you sir. I think we have got time for one more quick question before afternoon tea. Perhaps I put you off. One more long question. The gentleman over there.

BODEN: Boden, from the Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service. I will take the opportunity to mark the opening of this meeting to look at traditional hunting and the use of traditional methods affecting fauna. I know Mr. Hare, in the Northern Territory, and I have had long discussions

on this, whether in fact it's the method by which the animal is taken or the fact that the animal is taken at all, and it may be possible during the next two days to discuss this and get the experience which other countries have had in this matter. In my mind it doesn't matter how the animal is killed, it's the fact that the animal is killed, whether it's used with a traditional weapon or a more - a modern weapon. But I think we'll be interested to hear the views of some other countries in this of the absolute numbers of animals taken rather than perhaps the methods used.

WEBSTER: Doctor Boden introduces a very interesting matter of course which we all face and that is whilst perhaps the traditional owners a hundred years ago went about their killing in a very conservative way. He puts the point that today the killing of any endangered species of course is outlawed, and I made the point earlier in saying that we did not wish to have two classes of citizen in this country, but we're all posed with this problem, and of course the problem is today that the traditional owner whoever he may be is probably in possession of weapons other than those which he traditionally had a hundred years ago, and his method and ability to kill becomes much greater. There is a great deal of concern I would feel and certainly Doctor Boden presents a problem to you which will become greater as years go by. He deals with an area wider than perhaps the Federal Government's interests in national parks at the moment. Doctor Boden expresses an interest I suppose on behalf of all areas for conservation, but it is a major problem. I would feel that governments will not take action to exclude the taking of traditional food by those who may consider themselves to be traditional owners, but that is often a mixture of people claiming to be at times something which they are not. I think it's a very good question for discussion.

LOHREY: Certainly in Tasmania we have a programme of wildlife management which involves the shooting of kangaroos under licence, under controlled conditions, and it's part of the management of the wildlife that that happens. I presume this is what happens in other states as well as in Australia. I know that the minister from Western Australia yesterday raised the problem of the multitude of kangaroos that are in Western Australia and how Western - sorry, Queensland rather, is facing that problem.

Well delegates, are there any more questions? I think perhaps then we should round off this segment of the conference by thanking Senator Webster for the stimulating address. Certainly Senator Webster raised some issues I think which are of great interest to anybody who is in government who are faced with the problems of national parks and the problems that national parks raise; the problems of land use, whether to have a single purpose land use policy or whether to have a multi-use land use policy. It's a problem which I think faces every government today, and certainly in an industrialised country like Australia it is quite a difficult question to answer, and I think we should be thankful for Senator Webster for raising these points and giving the Australian Government's point of view, and putting them forward to the delegates of conference. Certainly it's a question that as I say exercises my mind as minister in Tasmania, I'm sure exercises the minds of people in government throughout this region. When you're in government, I find that it's much more difficult to answer complex questions, and when you're out of government you tend to put forward an idea that seems reasonable enough, but when you're actually in government and have to take account of different values from the community, then it's very much more difficult, and if you ignore certain values in the community and override them, then you can be accused of misrepresentation I believe.

I believe Senator Webster has covered the area of land use very adequately and I'd like to thank you sir very much for your address - the first address of five, keynote addresses in this Second South Pacific Conference, thanks very much.

Now delegates I think we break for afternoon tea where it will be exactly the same place as it was held this morning and we resume again at 3.45 sharp.

ADJOURNMENT

LOHREY: Conference, the second keynote address this afternoon is entitled "National Parks, Reserves and Traditional Communities". For this paper we have to thank the Honourable Kakarya, the Minister for Environment and Conservation from Papua New Guinea. Mr. Kakarya took over the portfolio of Environment and Conservation in January 1979. Prior to this he held the Home Affairs portfolio following Papua New Guinea's last election in June 1977. Mr. Kakarya is a traditional leader in the community as well as a political leader. He was first elected to parliament in 1972. I understand that the introduction to this keynote address will be done by Mr. Kakarya and after that he will hand over to Mr. Genia who is the Secretary to the Department of Lands, carry on.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have much pleasure in introducing Mr. Kakarya.

KAKARYA: Thank you Chairman, honourable ministers, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen. On behalf of my government of Papua New Guinea I am most delighted to convey the gratitude of being invited to attend this conference and I now would like to proceed with giving an account or address - the keynote address on behalf of the government of Papua New Guinea.

The Honourable P. Kakarya, assisted by Mr. J. Genia - Under Secretary for Lands for Papua New Guinea - then presented his paper "National Parks, Reserves and Traditional Communities", the text of which appears in Volume 1 of these proceedings.

Mr. Chairman, my apology for not thanking the Government of New South Wales, and the people of Australia in sponsoring these - or hosting the Conference here in Sydney, and I shall remain here for about 1 or 2 minutes, for conference delegates to raise any questions, and I would like to ask if those people asking questions to say - call their names and say where they are from, and we should be able to answer hopefully some of your questions.

LOHREY: I thank you very much Mr. Kakarya. Are there any questions? From delegates or observers? Australian Capital Territory?

PRATT: Firstly, I'd like to congratulate Mr. Kakarya on what I think is a delightful paper. It explains to me something more clearly than I've been able to get for some time about other people's problems with national parks, and I think all I'd like to do is simply register a comment with Mr. Kakarya, and perhaps seek a little reaction.

I wonder if the situation is that in Australia we've already had much of our development phase with land, and are now trying to come to grips with the aesthetic values of that land, we are trying to learn to appreciate and commune with wildlife, after an early exploitative phase, Papua New Guinea has already gone through the more important of those phases, in that they, I assume from the sort of comments made by Mr. Kakarya have a very much greater appreciation of the natural values, the wildlife values, the plant and animal systems.

They already are much closer to communing with it and therefore have those long term values in balance. They now, as I understand it, see the development phase as their major challenge, their greater danger. It seems that we in Australia are probably at different and possibly opposing ends of a system of land use and I really found the paper interesting and most stimulating.

KAKARYA: Honourable member of Australian Capital Territory, I very much appreciated your kind comment on my address. As outlined in the paper or the address, our Papuan-New Guinea society has always been very much aware of its environment and the animal life and I wonder if after one hundred years whether we will be in the same situation as here in Australia as far as environment conservation is concerned, or wildlife.

LOHREY: I'd like to add my comments to those of the Australian Capital Territory also. What an excellent paper it was. It certainly raised some very interesting and controversial questions I'd say.

Any delegates like to pursue any of those points that Mr. Kakarya raised? We have half an hour gentlemen and ladies. Queensland.

SAUNDERS: Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to congratulate Mr. Kakarya on his excellent paper. He followed the theme we were getting on to before afternoon tea; this question of multi-purpose - the multi-purpose use of national parks. I'm making more of a comment than asking a question and I feel that perhaps this conference at some stage should consider just what we mean by 'National Park'. Perhaps a recommendation or resolution could be considered. I would rather hope that this forum might reaffirm the sacrosanctness of the National Park term if we're going to use it that way and at the same time recognising that a National Park is not the only way in which nature is conserved. There is a place for multi-purpose land use which involves compatible uses - other uses compatible with nature conservation.

But you know if we're going to adopt the I.U.C.N. and United Nations definition of a national park well quite obviously it brings into question whether activities such as uranium mining to mention one aspect, are in fact compatible with that concept. I'd hate the delegates from our visiting South Pacific areas to get the impression that the management plan espoused for Kakadu National Park sort of sets the pattern for national park management in Australia at the present time because it certainly doesn't.

KAKARYA: Thank you, Honourable Member for Queensland. I'm most delighted in your encouraging comments there. In Papua New Guinea we have very strong policies on environment conservation, and any kind of major development that has to now proceed must first be preceded by careful feasibility studies in making sure that peoples lives are not affected, and the environment and wildlife too must be protected.

YOUNG: A question here Mr. Chairman.

P. R. i.s.

YOUNG: The Minister emphasises the need to negotiate with landowners a leasehold to obtain land for a national park. In view of the fact that there would need to be a reasonable tenure if a park was to be established, what are the general terms of the leases that he negotiates?

KAKARYA: Your comment there about the, well, I'd say land tenure systems would have three forms of land tenure system. Well, one is Government leasehold land, this is land alienated from the customary owners, and most of these are acquisitions taken place during the colonial era, and another form is the freehold land, and the third and the most important that constitutes, as I said over 97% of the total land mass in Papua New Guinea, is the customary owned land. Now it is a bit of a problem at the moment in trying to acquire such customary land to be developed into national parks, and we see the need for close liaison, consultation and educating the people to let them see the necessity and the benefit that can be gained out of declaring certain areas of land as national parks, emphasis being placed on the maximum involvement of the customary owners of such land. This is a subject of the present land law reform in the country in that we are attempting or endeavouring to introduce a customary land registration legislation that would empower the Government to at least have some control and regulate the utilisation of customary

owned land, emphasis again placed on the protection of the customary land rights of the people concerned. Now if I may also call upon the Executive Director of the National Parks Board to expand on the administrative procedures involved in negotiating with the customary owners of such land in attempting to declare this land national parks and reserves.

LOHREY: Mr. Gorio, would you like to speak into the microphone please?

GORIO: Mr. Chairman, with your permission, from National Parks Service in Papua New Guinea. This is quite a problem of getting areas as Minister stated in his paper but as I think an indication shown in the paper that we are looking for ways and means of tackling this problem of land tenure.

We in National Parks came up with a decision that we should come up with some form of agreement between the land owners and the Government, in this case National Parks Service, to come up with some sort of limit within, well in Government leasehold businesses taken about, what, 99 years. Now we are coming up with something that a Papua New Guinean and the average Papua New Guinean will live to it be saying within a limit of 40 to 50 years and then signing an agreement in front of the lawyer or whatever the case may be both parties agreed, well this will take about more than five or ten negotiations between the land owners - thrash it out, involve every one of them and if and when in later days they wanted a certain area or a zone of the National Park area to be converted in a rural form of development, because that's the only ideal place in their own province, then in turn the Government, well National Parks in this case, turn around and ask for an extension or additional land of similar size if possible, if not the bigger size, to be included as a sort of a payback to the land they're getting and these tend to work out on some areas and probably in order not to go on in detail I will probably mention this one through our situation reports if that is available by Chairman. They're in probably tomorrow according to the programme. I will go in detail at that time and also I take it that I was given a sort of opportunity to talk in a panel, I will probably cover this one in more detail but this is to try and be brief with the time factor here. But the other approaches we are looking into are sort of a direct Government type of approach but this depends, remembering, not forgetting, over 700 different beliefs and language groups we have in Papua New Guinea. We tend to suit where the type of group requires the type of approach and I'm saying that we are not static. We bend it where it's possible and the practicalities of it remains to be seen. We came with some sort of pros and cons we are facing but it's working out with the pace of development.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

LOHREY: Thank you, Mr. Gorio.

Perhaps I might ask Dr. Dasman who has been quoted in the paper whether he would like to add anything to the comment that Mr. Kakarya made about the concept of National Parks?

DASMAN: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Dasman from I.U.C.N. I would like to congratulate the Minister, Honourable Mr. Kakarya, for what I believe was a very excellent and illuminating talk. I have long been concerned that this question of creation of national parks not be used as a way of destroying or overriding the culture, the beliefs of local people and it seems to me that Papua New Guinea is now moving in the direction of creating effective nature conservation with the agreement of the local people and not against their wishes as has happened so often in the past with national parks. I do think however the term 'National Park' creates difficulties in people's minds because the definition tends to vary from country to country and I.U.C.N. has attempted to standardise the definition at least for the purposes of the U.N. list of National Parks. But it should be noted that none of England's National Parks qualify for the U.N. list. There's not a single English park that I know of that does qualify although

some of them contain nature reserves which do qualify but the English use of the term 'National Park' is quite different from the use of the term 'National Park' in, say, the United States and there is certainly nothing to prevent any country from using the term 'National Park' in any way that suits its purpose and the purpose after all is conservation. It is protection of nature and of the environment. It doesn't matter what label you give it; it doesn't matter how you accomplish it; what matters is that you do accomplish it and I just feel very pleased to hear that Papua New Guinea is taking a new approach which seems to be very effective and may, like the family reserves of the Cook Islands and similar ideas being considered by other countries in the Pacific, prove to set a pattern which fits this area and the type of land ownership that is customary in this area.

Again I simply want to congratulate the Minister on the splendid contribution he's made.

KAKARYA: Honourable Member, your supporting comments are very much appreciated and the purpose of bringing these - an account on the United Nations list of National Parks and Reserves was brought purposely to this conference to gather views and opinions of the conference delegates as the concept of National Parks, although we have traditional concept of nature conservation dating as far back as the first man ever landed in Papua New Guinea in its modern and western concept is relatively new to us.

LOHREY: Any more comments or questions delegates? Well delegates I think we will finish off there and I'd like to, on behalf of the conference, say to Mr. Kakarya, thank you very much for your very excellent address. You had a great deal of acclamation by the speeches - the comments put forward by some of the delegates this afternoon. Certainly, on my own behalf I found it extremely interesting and illuminating the interrelationship of western concepts of parks with traditional societies and the kinds of problems which Papua New Guinea is facing today. I think also the problem of terminology is a very interesting one and the term 'National Park' and what it means in different countries is a fascinating subject for discussion. I think perhaps the terminology of some of your language is very interesting also. I know that Members of Parliament are always accused of buggering up all sorts of things around the State and I think that perhaps that concept is a very useful one in terms of pressure groups.

But once again I say thank you very much for your very good address and I am quite sure all the delegates at the conference are enjoying it.

KAKARYA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

LOHREY: Delegates before we finish there is just a couple of announcements. The publication I think for Australia's 100 years of national parks has just been handed out. This is a publication put out by the New South Wales National Parks & Wildlife Service to commemorate 100 years of national parks in Australia. I think it is being given out now, is it? If it hasn't already been given out. It is a very excellent publication and I commend it to you.

The conference will recommence on Thursday, 26th April, at 9 o'clock. You would all realise that tomorrow is a holiday, being Anzac Day. We commemorate our great defeats in this country and we do that tomorrow. And on Thursday we will be gathering here in the same conference room at 9 o'clock and in the chair will be Mr. Newbery, Minister for Culture and National Parks and Recreation from Queensland.

Any other announcements? Mr. Tom Fox, the Organising Secretary has some announcements I think to make about recreation.

FOX: Yes, thank you Mr. Chairman. Just a couple of things that we would like to re-acquaint you with. As set out in your handbook we have arranged for this evening a dinner for you and for your spouses at the

Argyle Tavern in Sydney's historic Rocks area. The dinner commences at 8 p.m. and coaches will be available to take you from the Wentworth Hotel to the restaurant. If you will please assemble in the hotel lobby at 7.15 p.m. in order to meet up with the coaches.

The other thing I should mention is that as the Chairman stated, tomorrow is a public holiday and the conference will not be sitting. We have arranged one outing for you. That will commence at 11.45 when coaches will leave the Wentworth Hotel to take you to the Opera House wharf and from there you will board the John Cadman Cruising Restaurant and there will be a luncheon cruise of Sydney Harbour terminating about 4 p.m., following which coaches will be available to take you back to the hotel. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

LOHREY: Thank you Mr. Fox. I think that is about all delegates. The only function left to do is to officially close this session and I will do that by knocking on the knock top. Thank you very much.

ADJOURNED

SECOND SOUTH PACIFIC CONFERENCE
on
NATIONAL PARKS AND RESERVES
held at
SYDNEY OPERA HOUSE, RECEPTION HALL
on
THURSDAY, 26TH APRIL, 1979.

1

SECOND SOUTH PACIFIC CONFERENCE

ON

NATIONAL PARKS AND RESERVES

NEWBERRY: Ladies and gentlemen, Session Five is now open. This session is allocated to the balance of the situation reports. Delegates are reminded that those presenting reports are asked to speak to the report for five minutes, following which five minutes will be available for questions or discussion.

Because of the printing difficulties on Tuesday last, and the consequent re-scheduling of some report presentation times that day, today's sequence of situation reports varies from the published list and the amended times, are - Australian Capital Territory, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, Queensland, South Australia, Tonga, Victoria, Western Australia and Western Samoa. They are the order of the day, ladies and gentlemen.

Now, before proceeding with the business, I'd just like to say how happy I am to be given the privilege of chairing this conference this morning. I do regret that I was unable to be with you last Tuesday for the opening of the conference. I think you would all know by now, the reason why I was recalled to Brisbane and I regret too, that I was unable to be with you yesterday at what appears to me by reports, was a very wonderful day. Everyone enjoyed themselves on their boat trip and luncheon and festivities throughout the afternoon. I believe there was a wonderful spirit there and that everyone enjoyed themselves. I would hope now that that spirit of togetherness, having got to know each other, will continue today as we proceed with this very, very important conference. Once again, my sincere regrets, but I am glad to be with you today, to be with you again tonight and all day tomorrow. Thanks very much. We have an announcement or two from the Secretary.

FOX: Thank you Mr. Chairman. A couple of things I would like to mention. We would urge early presentation of recommendation drafts to the Recommendations Committee from delegates to facilitate compilation of the report of the Recommendations Committee in good time. So if you could make sure that, if you in fact propose to bring forward any draft recommendations, that you give them to the Committee very shortly. And, incidentally, I'd mention that, you might have noticed that some delegates are in fact absent this morning - that in the main is because the Recommendations Committee is having a short sitting this morning. Those delegates will rejoin us very shortly.

One other matter I wanted to mention is in relation to the transcription service. We distributed to you this morning, and to some of you yesterday, a copy of the transcript of the first day's proceedings. Now, doubtless there will be some corrections needed to that transcript. In such case, if you want any adjustments made would you please see Mr. Glenn Reid on the Secretariat table either during the break or at some other convenient time.

The other matter in relation to the transcription service is that, and I think I may have mentioned this yesterday, - on Tuesday - is that, if you are seated at the main table, then there is no need to move the microphones - they are positioned in such a way that they will pick up voices from the front table. Should you - a person who is not at the front table be speaking, then it is desirable for you to move some way towards the front table, to give the microphones a better chance of picking up what you're saying. Thank you very much. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

NEWBERRY: Thank you Mr. Secretary. The first business of the day is a situation report by the Australian Capital Territory, and I now call on Dr. Pratt, to present that report.

PRATT: Mr. Chairman, delegates and ladies and gentlemen. I represent that part of the Australian Commonwealth Government which is responsible for the Australian Capital Territory and the Jervis Bay territory, both of which are situated in New South Wales - the Australian Capital Territory is the seat of the Federal Government and the Jervis Bay territory provides the sea access for that Territory. We have a fairly small area of land in which to carry out nature conservation programmes. It's approximately 255,000 hectares. However, the record of nature conservation in those territories is very good. The main thing to realise and the main difference between the Australian Capital Territory and the rest of Australia is that the land is almost entirely government owned. Only very small amounts are privately owned and in the long term all of the land will be federally owned. We have a small but efficient nature conservation service which is responsible only to operations within those two territories. We have several declared nature reserves which amount to about 10,000 hectares of land which is especially set aside for conservation purposes. Those three reserves are the Jervis Bay Nature Reserve which is a coastal marine and terrestrial area, the Tidbinbilla Nature Reserve and the small Black Mountain Reserve which is immediately adjacent to Canberra City.

As of today there will be a major addition to the nature reserve network in the territory by the creation of the Gudgenby Nature Reserve which is, despite it's name, a national park but which will be referred to as a nature reserve. This very important park is approximately 51,000 hectares in size and this comprises about 20% of the area of the Australian Capital Territory. We expect that to form the focus of our future nature conservation programmes in the territory.

The other concept which is important to know about in the A.C.T. is that whilst much of the land is not declared as nature reserve it is in fact managed in sympathy with the declared reserves. Thus we have a whole series of buffer lands which grade from the heavily developed urban area into the formal nature reserves. One of the most significant aspects of the A.C.T. is its tourism and we at present take an estimated 2.5 million tourists per year and at the rate this is growing we expect this to increase to something exceeding 4 million tourists annually by about 1985. Now that is a very important source of revenue and activity in the territory and we would be hoping to channel a lot of that activity into nature reserves in the future.

We have our own separate nature conservation legislation which is somewhat dated at the moment but is being brought up to standard commensurate with the rest of Australia in the near future.

Thank you Chairman.

NEWBERRY: Thank you very much doctor. Now after that excellent report I'm sure that there would be some questions you would like to ask Dr. Pratt before he takes his seat. Any questions ladies and gentlemen? Saunders, Victoria. Mr. Saunders.

SAUNDERS: I'd like to ask Dr. Pratt why in fact this area is going to be called a nature reserve when he said that in fact it will be managed as a national park. Are there legislative reasons that it could not be called a national park?

PRATT: No, I think like many other groups around the world we are still struggling with the proper terminology and at the moment to avoid creating any further confusion we prefer to call all of our conservation areas nature reserves. We are working on the basis that people are more aware at this stage of what a nature reserve is than some of the other names that we could have used. But there is no particular legislative reason for it.

NEWBERY: Thank you Doctor. Any further questions of Dr. Pratt please? No further questions? Lohrey, Tasmania.

LOHREY: Dr. Pratt could you elaborate more on the buffer zone administration around the nature reserve?

PRATT: Yes Minister. One of the fortunate things in the territory is that because it's so small we're able to integrate the management of all types of land so that all of the commercial forests, nature reserves, agricultural land, in fact all of this type of open land in the territory is administered by the one organisation which is the Department of the Capital Territory.

NEWBERY: Thank you, Doctor. Any further questions of Doctor Pratt, please, if not I'd like to thank you Doctor very, very much for your presentation here this morning. It was very informative of course, and especially for me also being an Australian there is always something more you can learn, and I've no doubt that to all of you that there would have been quite a lot of information, good information to take home with you. Thank you, Doctor. Now I did mention Nauru would be next to speak, but the Nauruan leader is still not here, so I have asked Papua New Guinea. Would you please come forward sir. Mr. Kakarya from New Guinea - Mr. Gorio I understand now is going to do it. Thank you, Mr. Gorio.

GORIO: Mr. Chairman, Honourable Members, delegates, ladies and gentlemen. You've got a Situation Report in front of you and I suppose I will not go into details, but I will try and cover what areas that are I think important in P.N.G. plus the South Pacific islands.

As you can see where we are located if you keep on going up in Queensland towards northern direction you will come up to rugged country. In the national park system it's a new concept to us. Minister Kakarya did mention in his keynote address of the problems in broad that we're facing with the land tenure system. The population up to February this year was about 3,000,000. We are having a lot of difficulty in trying to get areas for national parks. If you have a Situation Report in front of you, turn to page 3 please and see the environmental legislation. I think that was a great improvement, and a step towards establishing national parks system, that we got our Lands Act, 1962 as amended, Fauna Protection Act and since last year we got an Environmental Contaminants Act of 1978 plus Environmental Planning Act, 1978, and Conservation Areas Act 1978, which enabled National Parks Service, with Wildlife Division with Lands Department, to carry out its task in the field of conservation.

The last one, Conservation Areas Act covers in broad, areas what you term may be in Australia, national landmarks, or United States or countries who might have a different terminology. Most of these areas as you're well aware sketched by J. Genia, Secretary for the Lands Department, that we - the Government got about 3% of the whole total area of land; 97% rests with the traditional customary landowners.

Now I think it is of great benefit that we're trying to arrive at this last Act, the Conservation Areas Act, and I'll be talking mostly on that one, trying to point out some of the things that we are trying to do, and the channels of approach about getting areas, potential areas or some of the approved areas gazetted areas for national parks purpose which we term them as Government owned land, but because of the situation, the present Government of the day we tend our programme in ex gratia payments or asking for more money on what is known as Government-owned land because during colonial government days, government tend to get lot of areas with payment of such things as ornamental beads, bush knives, axes and whatever and people come to realise that if we in a Government sector go in through areas - when I say we, I mean Government departments like Agriculture, Forestry, Lands, National Parks, - we then are faced with a

programme of people confronting us asking for more payment towards the areas because Government cunningly took over some of the land they say. Now this created programme of a type of approach that Government of Papua New Guinea should take in getting areas for its National Parks purpose in this case. We've got few areas of National Parks - if you turn to page 4 you will see some of them mentioned there and when I say National Parks, we have an understanding in Papua New Guinea contacts that if one talks about National Parks then to the village people it comes under historical park or nature reserve or whatever it is, they all term them as National Parks. Now that enables us the service to proceed with some of the areas we think of historical significance, pre-war, of traditional historical sites and various other areas which we will get to come under National Parks Service. The Government is well aware - and when I say Government it's national Government - about conserving its nature or natural resources and it was mentioned in Minister's speech, the keynote address, about the national goals we term them, the fourth goal states about natural resources and environment and we have a provincial government system in Papua New Guinea and national government got number four goal is natural resources and environment and these enable both provincial government areas plus national government to be aware of the environmental damages and what benefit it will derive to future Papua New Guineans and present ones. Now I think that's a wonderful move by the national Government to try and remind the members of the Parliament and those who are in decision making circle about the environment and the degradation of the environment likely to happen due to mining activities plus powerful and other various development projects going through and from there I will try and answer any questions, it's no use going through all the paper Mr. Chairman thank you very much.

NEWBERRY: Well thank you Mr. Gorio who presented the paper on behalf of Mr. Kakarya, an excellent report ladies and gentlemen. Mr. Gorio has suggested now that we have questions and I'm sure that there would be many questions you would like to ask of the Papua New Guinea delegation. A young country growing up in our midst. Any questions please?

We have a question from Western Australia.

BOWEN: Bowen, Western Australia, Sir. Sir I have not been to New Guinea, but I am aware of some very precious birds that you have in New Guinea. Do you use your National Park concept as a means of setting aside areas specifically to protect such animals as some of your more spectacular birds or do you have no protection for these or do you set aside other type areas for that purpose?

GORIO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, we have wildlife division of the Natural Resources and Lands Department but not together with National Parks and Wildlife Service like you have in New South Wales or Queensland but in P.N.G. wildlife officers or field officers go through to villages and some of these birds are a means of protein to the local people so they decide the areas themselves. Some of the areas with a joint venture of wildlife and national parks officers go and remind them about certain rare species of birds and they come up with what is known as "wildlife management areas". They make the rules themselves. Government acts as technical advisers to them and they don't make policies. So these people make their own rules and set these areas aside. But even when some of the birds that are found in national park areas, potential areas, then that would come under national parks and so as the wildlife people. Now if among this wildlife management areas that they've found these birds, then the whole objective there is that people don't tend to interfere with a species of bird but if they are getting some sort of protein with the other birds then they manage to kill the other birds with traditional weapons. I must stress here the traditional weapons, the uses of it, is that they make their own rules and if one goes in there hunting and using modern weapons then because each one made their own rules and they catch one of the families doing that then they cast the family out completely. There is lot of shame in that area and they would

have no say whatsoever because the majority will say "all right, you didn't follow the rules. You made them, it's not Government made them" so that controls the uses of modern equipment like shotguns. So people tend to use traditional type of weapons, bows and arrows or some other means. So you see, it's not Government that concerns it, the people themselves, they made the rule and they follow it. Now it's their concern to get up to the policeman or law and order or whatever it is if the matter gets to an excess. But yes, we have areas for these birds and we have a group, Papua New Guinea Bird Society, go around and do service for us in various areas or in our wildlife management areas and national park areas or other areas around the urban areas.

NEWBERY: Thank you, Mr. Gorio. Any further questions of Mr. Gorio, ladies and gentlemen?

YOUNG: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Young, New Zealand.

NEWBERY: Mr. Young from New Zealand.

YOUNG: Mr. Gorio, just following on that previous question. In areas where the rainforest is being removed or converted into mono-culture, does the Government or the companies involved or the landowners insist on areas of indigenous forest being kept for wildlife reserves in those areas - in those districts?

GORIO: There are no such areas of that nature in practice at the moment but forestry people - both forestry and national parks and wildlife division works very closely together and we have a group in Government National Planning Unit that if certain area with recommendations from the Department of Forest that they could get the mining or the timber saw-milling to go through and exploit the timber then we must say from the word go in national headquarters before they go to an area in a province.

Now, this gives us some chance of pressing their claim before going through. But some of the areas that are potential areas for timber exploitation, well forestry people tend to remind national parks that if we have this one we'll try and re-vegetate it but this means that we don't go for rainforest only, three storey type of rainforest or two storey but we tend to get some disturbed areas and if it's an ideal area with recommendations from the village people themselves which something that the Prime Minister stated clearly and every Government officer bore that one in mind, that whatever you want to do in a province or in any one district the originator should be a village man or a group of village people that they should go through there and this gives an opportunity that we don't come up with some conflicting ideas with the Government departments.

NEWBERY: Mr. Young, there's a good answer for you. Any further questions, ladies and gentlemen to Mr. Gorio? If not, I would like to thank Mr. Kakarya for his excellent report and to you, Mr. Gorio, for your presentation, and congratulations on the way you have answered the varied questions put to you today. Congratulations and thanks very much New Guinea.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, being Queensland's turn next, I am going to ask Mr. Johnstone to take over the chair while I present my report. Over to you, Mr. Johnstone.

JOHNSTONE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Many of the delegates and observers will remember that last week Mr. Newbery welcomed them to Queensland on Wednesday night and, subsequently, delegates and observers were able to visit a number of National Parks in Queensland and to talk with rangers and officers from the National Parks and Wildlife Service in Queensland.

Mr. Newbery, I am quite sure that delegates and observers welcomed that opportunity and I am quite sure that they are anxious to hear what you have to say in speaking now to your Situation Report which has already been distributed. So I would ask you now to speak to your Situation Report.

NEWBERY: Thank you, Mr. Acting Chairman. Mr. Chairman, Ministers, distinguished delegates and observers. I would like to add the congratulations of the Queensland Government to those bestowed by previous speakers for the way in which New South Wales has handled the planning of this important conference.

We were honoured, ladies and gentlemen, to help with the pre-conference excursions and we appreciate the generous hospitality that has been afforded to us here in Sydney.

Copies of the Queensland Situation Report have been distributed to all delegates. With your permission, Mr. Chairman I would like to take the contents of that report as read and move on to expand on some of the points raised in the report and add some new ones.

In December, 1975, my Government established a National Parks and Wildlife Service to administer former nature conservation activities that dated back in legislation to 1877. Responsibility for the Service is included in my portfolio of Culture National Parks and Recreation. At the present time, Queensland laws relating to the nature and wildlife conservation and management are contained in a number of different acts in our Statute books. We are now working to amend this situation by drafting consolidating legislation that will bring relevant parts of all these acts together in a single piece of legislation governing the whole of nature conservation in Queensland.

The Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service has adopted the policy of land acquisition to preserve important and representative samples of the States national heritage. Our National Park estate has more than doubled since the establishment of the Service and we'll be adding substantially to that estate in the months ahead. You will see in your report printed that the total area of the National Parks and Reserves in Queensland stood at more than 2.2 million hectares at the end of last year. It will not be long before that figure passes the 3 million hectare mark which will represent a trebling of our National Park estate in the short time since the Service has been established. The major acquisition which will boost that figure is the huge Lakefield aggregation in the Cape York region. When gazetted it will become Queensland's largest National Park with an area of 531,000 hectares. Its acquisition is part of my Government's wilderness concept for the Cape York area, a concept that is attracting worldwide attention.

Incidentally, the concept had a major influence on the selection of Cairns in our far north as the venue for the second World Wilderness Conference to be staged in the middle of next year. Organisers are expecting two thousand delegates from every corner of the globe and I look forward to renewing my friendship with many of you at that event.

The Cape York wilderness concept already includes almost the whole of the large Jardine River Catchment area. This area will lend itself to a wide range of park activities, however I should warn delegates, following on what Mr. Landa had to say yesterday, that those activities will not include the new sport of kiloing due to a number of crocodiles in residence in that area.

To further add to our National Park estate, ladies and gentlemen, we are presently negotiating the acquisition of some 250,000 hectares on the Bulloo River in Queensland's south west arid zone. In addition, we have recently acquired 63,000 hectares at Mount Moffatt in Queensland's central highlands. When gazetted, this will become one of Queensland's

most important and spectacular inland parks. It contains abundant wildlife, magnificent scenery and outstanding examples of aboriginal art.

I understand that on Tuesday, the New South Wales Minister outlined his intention to upgrade scientific research as a major area of development in the New South Wales service. I am pleased to report that Queensland was able to establish a comprehensive scientific research programme from the outset of the service.

Our research projects cover a wide range of activities. For example, there are studies in kangaroo population dynamics, exhaustive inventories have been prepared covering more than 90 percent of the extensive diversity of species which occur in Queensland. A long term regional resources mapping programme has been implemented to describe and justify regional and state priorities for remaining natural land, and management research on the main agencies of disturbance has commenced on representative sites.

In addition, ladies and gentlemen, multi purpose land use is being studied in collaboration with other organisations on particular land selected for that purpose. These activities are, of course, related to an enormous increase in management duties.

The annual visitation to Queensland's 323 national parks, now exceeds 2 million people per year. To meet this demand, we are expanding picnic and camping facilities in a number of parks as funds permit. Other facilities and equipment, such as large boats to service our 173 island national parks are also being purchased. Management plans for the Parks and their wildlife are being devised, tested and implemented. Despite its relative youth, the service in Queensland has been able to set standards for others to follow and the provision of information and education resources. A range of brochures, posters and publications have been produced, based on a photographic library, which now holds in excess of 150,000 colour transparencies.

The Service has developed a popular Junior Ranger programme which is considered possibly the most advanced of its type and progressively plans to establish information centres for visitors in each of the State's more popular Parks. The service is reaching out to the people at all levels to make its work better known and to promote nature conservation principles. An example is this book, and written by Service Officers, which gives a most interesting insight into Queensland Nature Resources. It is on sale in bookshops throughout the world and was produced in association with a television series made by the A.B.C. which screened throughout the nation for several weeks in prime viewing time.

The Service's latest initiative is this record on nature songs, again produced by our officers and on sale to the general public. The record is designed for children as part of our continuing environmental education programme. Mr. Chairman, I would like you to accept the book and the record and present them to your Mr. Landa your Minister here, as a token of Queensland's appreciation for the manner in which New South Wales has planned and hosted this most important conference. Thank you very much ladies and gentlemen.

JOHNSTONE: Thank you Mr. Newbery. Delegates and observers I would invite your questions and comments.

NEWBERY: Any questions, ladies and gentlemen? I have many experts here from Queensland with me, who no doubt would be able to help me in answering any questions you have, on the research side, the information side, general side. We are only too glad to help you and to give you information that we have accumulated.

JOHNSTONE: Yes, Western Australia.

BOWEN: Sir, this is perhaps a technical question, and certainly pass it on if necessary. It's a question of entry fees to national parks, and it's a question that perhaps has got some philosophical overtones and I'm just interested in your State, sir, which I do know has got an extremely competent group of National Park and Wildlife people and some very, very good national parks. I congratulate Queensland on that. What is your philosophy in terms of entry by the public, fees, and whether they are designed at all to cover the costs of administration of those parks, and so on.

NEWBERY: I'm glad Mr. Bowen that you have asked this question because at this very moment, we have a problem in our national parks with the great demand from people wanting to use them. As an example I might quote the case of the Girraween National Park outside of Stanthorpe. We threw the applications for camping permits open and they closed in two and a half hours. We had our camping in the area full, in two and a half hours, and then we expected three thousand people on top of that again. I feel I know just what has engendered your question because there is a problem here and we have to look at this kind of thing, just what we are going to do in the future. Maybe if I just hand over to Dr. Saunders for a moment, I'm running out of time. Doctor if you might just give us your opinion on this, because this is something that will be worrying all, quite frequently for sure. Our parks are being loved to death.

SAUNDERS: Well Mr. Chairman, as my Minister has said, it is something that does worry us and at the present time we don't charge an entry fee or a permit fee for an entry fee to any national park in Queensland or a camping permit fee. The camping permits are issued free and I know that most of the Australian States do charge, make a charge for some of their national parks, for entrance or camping. But we have, as the Minister said, we have been looking at it over the last few years, but we haven't satisfied ourselves that the cost of administering it is warranted at this stage. Now I guess in places like Bunya Mountains National Park, where it gets fairly cold in winter, we do provide hot water there free. You know, I mean the taxpayers are providing this out of general revenue, so a place like that might be the first place where we look at making a charge. But at the present time as the Minister said, the policy of the government is not to make a charge.

JOHNSTONE: Thank you Dr. Saunders. Mr. Davidson from Canada, did have his hand up.

DAVIDSON: Davidson, Canada. Mr. Newbery I notice on page 4 of your paper there is a statement:

"The aim of management of our national parks is to cater for legitimate usage."

Could you comment on what is meant by legitimate usage, what kind of usage you do allow?

NEWBERY: Well maybe I could pass that over to Dr. Saunders also.

SAUNDERS: Mr. Chairman, unfortunately our Chief Management Officer who Mr. Newbery hoped to have at the Conference because of illness, his wife, he wasn't able to come, and he would have been the best person to handle this. Of course we could argue over this all day couldn't we? What is legitimate ...

JOHNSTONE: We don't have time Dr. Saunders.

SAUNDERS: ... legitimate usage, and we haven't got time, but you know ...

DAVIDSON: I did not mean for exploitative ...

SAUNDERS: Oh no, passive use of the park by people. Bushwalking, camping, etc.

JOHNSTONE: Thank you Dr. Saunders. I'm afraid we have no time for any further questions. Mr. Newbery would you please accept the thanks of the meeting for your presentation and also the thanks of those delegates who were fortunate enough to have inspections in Queensland of your national parks and to have discussions with your officers in Queensland. Thank you very much, and I now pass the chair back to you.

NEWBERY: Thank you very much, Mr. Johnstone, and I can assure you that we in Queensland were delighted to have you with us, and we look forward to your coming back very, very soon.

Now the next speaker, ladies and gentlemen, is the representative of Nauru, Consul General, Mr. Star. Over to you, Mr. Star.

STAR: Mr. Chairman, Honourable Ministers, other delegates, ladies and gentlemen. Before my report is read I would like to extend my President's greetings to the delegates of the conference and he asked also to convey his fervent wish for the success of the conference. I shall begin with the Preamble -

"The Republic of Nauru has never been able to develop national parks and reserves, yet it does have an interest in achieving a balance between man and his natural environment.

The island of Nauru is an elevated coral platform in the Western Pacific close to the equator with a total area of 21.2 square kilometres, on which 60% is phosphate bearing land on the central plateau. The population of 6,000 occupies the lower coastal platform. There are periods of drought when water must be imported from Australia.

Since phosphate is the only significant resource on Nauru, the commercial development of the phosphate mining industry was the only possible avenue for economic development and had to take priority over the conservation of the natural environment. Although subject to yearly negotiations which review phosphate prices, Nauru is committed to supply fertilizer to Australia and New Zealand farmers. It is therefore not possible to consider conservation of the remaining phosphate-bearing areas on the island. Of the total area with phosphate, 66% has already been mined, and at present rate of extraction, the remaining reserves will be exhausted in about 15 years. This presents the Government of Nauru with two problems:

1. The restoration of the mined areas to some natural or productive use; and
2. the future economic and social sustenance of the people of the island once the phosphate runs out.

People cannot live divorced from the environment around them. The challenge for Nauru is to meet the needs of its people for food, water, recreation opportunities and a high quality environment in which to live. It will be necessary in the long term to restore the balance between man and nature which has been disrupted in the phosphate-mined areas.

Before phosphate is mined, the trees are cut down and the vegetation cover removed. The thin layer of fertile topsoil (8-18 inches deep) is not used for phosphate extraction in its present form and is also removed, and used for fillings and gardening, and surplus ore is stock piled for future use in restoration. The phosphate is mined using mechanical shovels and grabs down to depths of 6 - 20 feet (2 - 6 metres). The worked out areas remaining after consist of gaping holes with frequent outcrops of pillars of limestone, the barren surface of which supports little life. It has proven uneconomic even to level these areas, and the government has therefore continued to investigate viable means and ways to solve the problem of restoration. Hopefully, the expertise now being gained in other areas and that which delegates will be exchanging at this conference will suggest new approaches which will be of use to the authorities responsible for restoration on Nauru.

Two kinds of information are particularly required: techniques or material which might permit the viable restoration of those severely disturbed areas, and the time when such activities should begin to achieve usable areas when they will be needed. In 1967, when Nauru began receiving the world national market price for phosphate, a rehabilitation fund was established. However, its resources are insufficient to restore the roughly 30 or 40% of the area that was mined prior to 1967.

The establishment of natural or productive biological communities on degraded land may be a new direction for conservation efforts, but one which will be increasingly needed all around the world. Nauru would welcome the co-operation of countries such as Australia and New Zealand with greater technical expertise in this area."

Not only the Government but also the people are very concerned about the extent of the damage caused by phosphate mining. Therefore we are very grateful that through the South Pacific Commission, Nauru has been invited to participate in this conference. Here I have found personally very valuable information on National Parks and Reserves received and heard through exchanges of opinions and expertise advice I had. Thank you very much.

NEWBERY: And thank you too your Excellency for a very fine report and now I'm sure there would be some questions to ask Mr. Star of the interests in his area. Any questions please? No questions? Everyone seems to be terribly satisfied Your Excellency.

STAR: Thank you very much.

NEWBERY: Thank you very much for a very very fine report. Thank you very much. Now next is South Australia and I would ask Doctor Cornwall to come forward and present his paper please. Ladies and gentlemen Doctor Cornwall.

CORNWALL: Mr. Chairman and delegates, the situation report before you outlines significant matters concerning the National Parks structure in South Australia. I would like this morning to expand on one or two items and to give you a little other information which I believe may be of interest.

South Australia as has been said before has the unenviable reputation of being the driest state in the driest continent on earth. While the water supply to the urban areas of Adelaide, Whyalla and Port Augusta is adequately supplemented with piped water from the River Murray, the primary productivity for the rest of the state in both agricultural and natural areas is severely limited by the rainfall regime. 83% of the state receives less than 250 millimetres or 10 inches of rain. While

the South Australian Government has developed extensive softwood plantations, principally of *pinus radiata*, we have no tall native timber or rainforests, which can be used for commercial purposes.

South Australia has however considerable areas of woodlands, mallee scrub and shrublands.

The state has a population of 1.3 million of which some 900,000 are in the capital Adelaide. The National Parks and Wildlife Service attempts to meet the needs of this population by the provision of parks to cater for both active and passive recreation. An area at Belair dedicated in 1891 as "The National Park", was the second National Park in Australia. Its title still lingers on today even though it was reconstituted as the Belair Recreation Park in 1972.

The setting aside of land specifically for nature conservation purposes began with the Flinders Chase on Kangaroo Island in 1919. The history of the dedication of reserves can be pieced together from the area statement on the back of the maps supplied to you with our situation report.

The greatest period of land acquisition for parks was during the 1960's and early 1970's. Today our park holdings cover almost 4 million hectares or about 4% of the total area of the state.

The land tenure system in the countries represented at this conference differs very widely. South Australia is quite different from many of our South Pacific neighbours. 86% of the total area of the state is Crown Lands, and a further breakdown shows that 51% is pastoral lease in the north of the state, 9% is perpetual lease in the southern areas, 18% is currently unallocated land, some of which is leased on an annual term, and about 8% is reserved for other purposes including Aboriginal use and defence. We have in South Australia of course the Woomera Rocket Range which is Commonwealth controlled.

Further land is designated as lakes or is held by local councils. Only 7% of the state is freehold. This is almost the direct reverse of some of the figures quoted here on Tuesday.

Many of our larger parks were originally set aside by the government while land was being alienated for agricultural development and this applies particularly to areas on Eyre Peninsula and in the south east. Nevertheless, other land acquisition for parks and reserves has involved purchases of freehold land and payment of compensation for loss of production and improvements on leasehold land. Needless to say, this has been a costly exercise. Our land acquisition programme is by no means complete. There are further areas in the north and the south which should be reserved for historical or recreational purposes as well for their natural history.

However, the main concern for the present is to manage those areas which we now hold. The four park categories listed in our situation paper can be misleading to the public. Consequently, at the present time we are reconsidering our parks classification to increase the number of categories allowing a better description of what they in fact mean to the general public. This is being done with due regard to both I.U.C.N. classifications and proposals by C.O.N.C.O.M.

Like most park authorities, South Australia has problems with feral animals, particularly cats, wild dogs, goats, donkeys, brumbies and, on Kangaroo Island, pigs and, of course, rabbits. The proper management of some native species, which are increasing in numbers, notably, kangaroos, wombats and certain of our parrot species, particularly rosellas, lorikeets and corellas has also to be resolved.

In conclusion, I would draw your attention to the two biosphere reserves which have been recognised by U.N.E.S.C.O. One is a conservation park of just over 2 million hectares in the northwest of the state adjoining the Western Australian border. This is part of a large area currently under scrutiny by a Parliamentary Select Committee considering land rights of the Pitjatjinjara aboriginal people. We in the department, while not wanting to pre-empt any findings that might come from that select committee, nor any direction which might come from the parliament, certainly do hope that any change of control will not alter the status of this area as a biosphere reserve. The second such reserve is Danggali conservation park of some 250,000 hectares north of the River Murray and adjoining the New South Wales border. These areas are both within the 83 percent of South Australia which has less than 10 inches of rain and is regarded as arid land. However, it is my ambition that a new large area in a higher rainfall area of the state may at some stage achieve biosphere reserve status. The area I refer to is 230,000 hectares of the so-called Ninety-Mile desert adjoining the Victorian border. This proposed park will link three existing conservation parks in South Australia, Mount Rescue, Scorpion Springs and Mount Shaugh and will abut the proposed Victorian Big Desert Wilderness area. Together, these areas will comprise one of the largest protected areas in the higher rainfall region of south eastern Australia. And in their entirety should be worthy of biosphere reserve status.

Delegates, I'd like to conclude by congratulating New South Wales on the excellent way in which they have organised this conference and thanking them on behalf of South Australia for their gracious and generous hospitality. Thank you.

NEWBERRY: Thank you Dr. Cornwall. Any questions of the Doctor, please? An excellent report from South Australia. Any questions please? Everyone seems to be happy down your way. Thank you very much, doctor, for a very excellent report.

Next, ladies and gentlemen, is Tonga, and I'm going to call on Mr. Tongailava to present the report on Tonga. Mr. Tongailava.

TONGAILAVA: Mr. Chairman, Honourable Ministers, distinguished delegates, ladies and gentlemen, I consider this a most singular honour to participate in this Second South Pacific Conference on National Parks and Reserves, with the most distinguished delegates from many parts of the world. With great pleasure, Mr. Chairman, may I take this opportunity to express on behalf of the government of the Kingdom of Tonga deep gratitude to the Right Honourable the Prime Minister of Australia for extending the invitation to the Prime Minister of Tonga which enabled our government to send a delegation to this conference. I also take this opportunity to express our deep gratitude to the state government and the National Parks and Wildlife Services of Queensland for hosting these excellent pre-conference tours which not only provided the opportunity for us to tour some of their great national parks of Queensland it also enabled us to exchange ideas with other national parks people and to become acquainted with them on both professional and personal levels.

I would like to extend here a special and a very sincere thanks to the government of the state of New South Wales and to the Honourable Minister and staff of the National Parks and Wildlife Services for the excellent efforts in preparation and hosting of this conference in this beautiful facility.

The hospitality we have already earned in Queensland and here in New South Wales is beyond words to express our deep gratitude. We are looking forward with great expectation for the post-conference tour of Victoria. Now Mr. Chairman I call upon by old friend Mr. Tom Hubbard who is our National Parks Supervisor to come forward and present our Situation Report. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

NEWBERY: Well thank you Mr. Tongailava for your introductory remarks. Now we are going to ask Mr. Hubbard to come forward to give the balance of the Tongan Report.

HUBBARD: Mr. Chairman, distinguished delegates, it's a great honour and privilege to represent the Kingdom of Tonga at this conference. First I'd like to say that like most Pacific islanders Tongans have always lived close to the land and the sea. The rich soil of Tonga and the numerous reefs which surround the islands have provided abundant food for its people. The plants, the animals, the scenery have provided inspiration for poetry, legends and love songs. The natural environment is the source of the "fiemalie", which is the feeling of contentment and relaxation which all Tongans treasure above everything else.

Tonga is now involved in extensive agricultural, fisheries and economic development. These projects must follow a rational and organized programme where environmental effects are considered. The establishment of marine and terrestrial parks is timely and essential before irretrievable damage occurs and priceless natural resources are lost forever. Since the first South Pacific Conference on National Parks and Reserves in 1975, Tonga has made considerable progress in environmental legislation and in the establishment of national parks and reserves.

Firstly I'd like to say that Tonga is a very tiny nation. It only has 269 square miles which comprises 150 widely scattered islands. Of these islands only 45 are inhabited. The population of Tonga is 92,000 people - it's growing at a rate of 2% a year. 15% of the population is under four years old. 45% of the population is under 14 years old. Tonga presently has a family planning programme which is beginning to show progress.

In the field of environmental legislation Tonga has enacted four Acts in particular to preserve the natural, historic and cultural resources of the Kingdom. The first is the Bird and Fish Preservation Act which limits and protects the catching or injuring certain species of fish, birds and turtles and establishes the legal authority to fine, imprison and confiscate equipment used in the catching of protected animals. Certain animals that are - most of the birds of Tonga are protected under this Act and so are the turtles, especially the Leather-back Turtle is prohibited all seasons. The Green Turtle which is commonly eaten is protected in the three months of the year when it has its breeding season. Also recently included under this Act is something that is I know of interest to several delegates at this convention. Tonga is one of the few countries I think represented here that is engaged in subsistence level whaling. Tonga has declared a moratorium on whaling this year. There will be no whales taken this year - humpbacked whales taken this year in Tonga. We have under New Zealand aid, we will have in the month of August a population survey of the whales, to determine the breeding population, population dynamics and exactly where are they living and what resources they're using in Tonga, in Tongan waters.

We also have the Preservation of Objects of Archaeological Interest Act of 1969 which protects the archaeological, cultural and historic resources of Tonga. All excavations and investigations must be approved by the Tonga Traditions Committee and no object of archaeological interest may be removed from the kingdom temporarily or permanently without a permit from the Committee. Within two years all investigations must produce a published scientific report.

The Tourist Act of 1976 established the Tourist Board to manage and control the tourist industry in Tonga, and of primary interest to this conference is the Parks and Reserves Act of 1976 which established the Parks and Reserves Authority to protect, manage and develop natural areas in the kingdom.

There are four reasons why we have national parks in Tonga. They're conservation, recreation, education and scientific research. By establishing national parks and reserves Tonga will be conserving valuable natural resources. Along with its fertile soils, the coral reefs of Tonga are the national heritage of the kingdom.

The parks will preserve areas with the minimum of human interference. These will be references against which human effects of fishing, shell collecting, dynamiting, sand removal, agricultural development and forestry can be measured. The reefs will provide a suitable habitat for breeding population of fish and shell fish, and some of their progeny will migrate out of the parks and become part of the commercial catch of Tongan fishermen, and end up on Tongan dinner tables.

The establishment of parks will preserve populations of plants and animals which are rare and endangered, and some of the original representatives of the original forests of Tonga will be preserved.

The second purpose of the national parks is recreation. Parks supply a place for people to relax and enjoy the natural environment. There are several beaches on Tongatapu. They are very crowded on Saturday afternoons which attest to the need for recreation in the kingdom.

Another aspect of recreation is tourism. Parks become tourist attractions as we all know. Snorkellers and scuba divers from around the world will come to experience reefs of unparalleled beauty where the shell fish and fish are abundant and tame because they're not hunted or fished.

Only recreation activities consistent with the goals of the park will be allowed. We will also give an incentive to the tourist industry which already provides four million dollars a year to the economy.

The third purpose is education. We're hoping to include environmental education in the curriculums of the high schools, and primary schools of Tonga. We're also embarking on a radio programme over Radio Tonga, and we plan to include articles in the Tonga Chronicle which is the newspaper of the kingdom.

The fourth reason for the national parks is the establishment of preserves where scientists from Tonga and from around the world can conduct scientific research.

The Fisheries Department is already doing growth studies on the giant triadeck and the clam within the park. The concept of parks and reserves is not new to Tonga. In 1940 the Minister of Lands, 'Ata, declared the first park reserve in Tonga on the shores of Fang'uta Lagoon.

In 1972 the present King of Tonga, King Tauf'ahau Tupou, IV, declared a reserve at the Ha'amonga Trilithon. The Ha'amonga Trilithon is the Stonehenge of the South Pacific. It consists of two upright stones, 5 metres high with a lintel of about 6 metres in length. This is quite a considerable engineering feat when you consider that it was built in 1100 A.D. by the famous King of Tonga, Tu'itatui.

In 1968 Sione Tongailava who introduced myself did a survey of the Ha'amonga on the 22nd December, 1968, the sun rose at the exact point on the horizon by points predicted on the lintel, in other words it was used as a stellar observatory. I daresay that if Sione - if the sun had not risen at the exact site where, at the exact point on the horizon predicted by the points as Sione told the King that it would happen, he probably wouldn't have been here today.

But under the Parks and Reserves Act Tonga has gazetted two national parks which comprise the entire islands of Monuafe and Maliona and five marine reserves, and two of the reserves are reefs which surround the islands of Maliona and Monuafe, and the other three are reefs at Fangiomotu, Hakaumama'o and Ha'atafu.

Tonga will soon have a major terrestrial park on the island of 'Eua, which is 19 kilometres south of - south-south east of Nukualofa, the capital of Tonga.

'Eua is probably one of the oldest islands in Polynesia; it has a wide vertical diversity and being the most lightly settled and developed it possesses the most extensive and undisturbed habitats in the kingdom. The proposed national park on the east side of the island comprises 1,400 hectares and four of the major habitats of the kingdom. The park contains several indigenous species, several of which are only found in Tonga and Fiji or Tonga and Samoa.

The South Pacific has lost many species of birds, many of the species of birds are contained within the park, including the lufae, which is the Pacific pigeon which is specially important to Tongan culture and is used in all of the love songs.

We also are planning - well just briefly, we are going to have historical parks also to preserve the cultural resources of the kingdom. Thank you for your attention.

NEWBERRY: Thank you Mr. Hubbard and thank you Mr. Tongailava for the excellent presentation you have given us here today. It has been very very interesting; a very beautiful young country and it's nice to hear some of what is going on in the area. Congratulations to you. I ask you to carry it by acclamation.

The next to present their situation report, is Victoria and I'm going to call on Mr. Saunders, if he would please do so. Mr. Saunders, ladies and gentlemen.

SAUNDERS: Mr. Chairman, Honourable Ministers, distinguished delegates, ladies and gentlemen, I'll keep this as brief as I can because I realise we're running short of time.

The state of Victoria is quite small; it occupies less than three percent of the continent of Australia. However, it has a population of over 3.8 million, which is 27% of Australia's population. Obviously with 27% of the population in three percent of the total area, it is by far the most densely populated state. Of that population, 70% live in Melbourne and its environs, which brings special problems as you can well imagine; that's 2.7 million people in Melbourne.

Although small, Victoria has great diversity of natural areas, ranging from alpine to rainforest to semi-arid lands. However, I'd point out, in contrast with most states, or all other states on the mainland, we do not have any lands which are classified as arid. I'd like to briefly mention the land tenure, which is another way in which we differ from the other states of Australia. 60% of the land in Victoria is in fact free-hold, owned privately, which means that the other 40% is Crown Land. Of that 40%, 14% is in fact reserved Crown land under various tenures such as National Parks, Reserve Forest, Wildlife Reserves and so on.

Because of the large numbers of people and the relatively small area of Crown land, there is a great demand for the use of this Crown land, whether it be for mining, agriculture in the form of grazing, whether it be for forestry, whether it be for National Parks. This has led to a great number of conflicts within Victoria, with many competing claims for the use of this Crown land. Perhaps I could digress just for one second to say that we have established a somewhat unique way of trying to resolve these conflicts through the establishment of the Land Conservation Council which is systematically studying the Crown land right throughout the state, region by region and making recommendations in regard to its future use. And if anyone is interested in that particular concept it's something that they could talk to me afterwards about.

Turning now to our parks. The first parks that were established in 1892 with major ones such as Wilsons Promontory and Mount Buffalo being established in 1898. It wasn't until 1956 that legislation was passed to enable the establishment of a separate agency which we now call the National Parks Service. In saying that I would like to point out that we are not a wildlife service; that is a separate organisation within Victoria. The parks under our control are shown in the situation report. There is a great variety of them, 27 national parks and another 20 parks of other types such as State Parks and Coastal Parks. The Coastal Parks are particularly important and under the National Parks Act, we currently manage 30% of the total length of Victoria's coastline. So the National Parks Service has a very big involvement in the coast.

I should also point out that we do have of recent times some Marine Parks which have been established but these have been established under the Fisheries Act and not under the National Parks Act but it is still possible and will be done in the future to establish Marine Parks under our Act.

Victoria congratulates New South Wales on this centenary of National Parks. It is certainly a very very important occasion. Victoria recognised the importance of this occasion through making special provision for new parks to be created today, the 26th of April. Today in Victoria we have four new National Parks and nine new other parks established. These 13 new parks increased the area under our Act to 654,000 hectares which is two and a half times the total amount of parks we had yesterday so we have seen today as a very significant event for Australia in the way of National Parks. And to take it just one step further we have brought the spirit of interstate co-operation into it and four of these new national parks will, in fact, adjoin parks in other States, three on the New South Wales border and one on the South Australian border so that Dr. Cornwall can now refer to the big desert wilderness as a park not as a proposed park. It was established today.

That is all I would like to say now except just pass on Victoria's thanks to New South Wales for their hospitality and to say that we look forward to seeing as many of you as possible in Victoria for the post-conference tour. Thank you.

NEWBERY: Thank you, Mr. Saunders. Any questions for Mr. Saunders? French Polynesia?

TEVANE: Mr. Chairman, gentlemen. Since I have been in Australia I have been able to appreciate the effort made by the Government in different areas in Australia and especially I have been able to see what has been done in Queensland. I go from surprise to surprise and I am amazed at what has been done and is being done. A question that comes to mind regarding different parks that have been presented here today is the cost of these policies. Now I would like to ask this question - what is the average cost of park management and I would like to address to the Queensland government, the cost of maintaining the parks and management?

NEWBERY: Dr. Saunders, will you answer that, please?

G. SAUNDERS: Well, I think I've got the most difficult question that's been asked in three days. Well it varies enormously of course and you know you could look at it cost per park or the overall budget that's allocated for park management and this would vary from State to State but as far as Queensland is concerned the total budget this year which includes a land acquisition allocation of more than \$800,000 would be close on \$6,000,000 for the National Parks and Wildlife Service in Queensland and we've got, what, the Minister quoted the figure, it's over 350 national parks. I just haven't got the paper open in front of me. But, you know, that doesn't really help you very much, I'm afraid, because quite a lot of those national parks are islands and are not manned. A lot of them are new areas where we haven't established a management presence other than in a very limited way so I think we could get

11

detailed figures for you as I'm sure some of the other States could too on particular parks.

NEWBERY: We have a comment also from the other Mr. Saunders.

D. SAUNDERS: Thank you Mr. Chairman just the figures briefly for Victoria and this is not including land acquisition and it is not including wild-life components, so this is just for management of the parks. Last financial year it was six million dollars our budget, of that, one million dollars was collected in revenue, that's fees from camping and entrance fees. That catered for 3.4 million visitor days to those parks. So that gives you an idea of how much it is costing us to provide for visitors, it doesn't give you an idea though, that the great percentage of that - or a great percentage of that was actually aimed at protecting the natural resources through fire protection, weed control, vermin control, control of illegal activities, so the weakness in those figures is, there is no break-up between the amount spent on protecting the park as distinct from the amount providing for people. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

NEWBERY: Thank you Mr. Saunders. Does that satisfy you Mr. Tevane? Okay. I would ask you all to carry a vote of thanks by acclamation to Mr. Saunders for his presentation. Now it is a great pleasure to call on Western Australia and Mr. Bowen will present the report, thank you Mr. Bowen.

BOWEN: Mr. Chairman, Ministers, Ladies and gentlemen. Western Australia is a very long way away from the Pacific Ocean and I'll be extremely brief on that account. It is a third of Australia. It is the western third of Australia. It ranges in temperature from temperate to arid and through to the tropics. Western Australia has two major systems of parks and reserves; that of commonly called national parks the people park areas and that of nature reserves. Both are given equal status and they in fact are managed as separate entities similar to that in Victoria. The report by Western Australia - you do not have in front of you at the present time if you're looking for it, it is being typed at the moment. The national parks are for people, there are some forty-two of them in Western Australia that are large parks and there are nineteen smaller ones. National parks represent something of the order of two percent of Western Australia in total 4.5 million hectares. Nature reserves on the other hand represent something like 3.5 per cent of Western Australia - gives a total of parks and reserves of 5.1 per cent or a total hectares of 12.6 million. It is a large State and there are large areas set aside. That shouldn't be taken however, to suggest that we are completely satisfied with the parks set aside because many of them as you can well imagine, are very large areas in the desert conditions. The largest reserve that Western Australia has for instance is some 2.5 million hectares, the Victoria Deserts National Park. The method of consideration of land usage is undertaken by a system of committees which calls for public input into the requirement of national parks and nature reserves. This is documented, considered and put out to the public as a Green Book. They have further input possibilities, this then goes through to the Cabinet in its final form of recommendations so that when one has a review of parks and nature reserves one is having them finally determined as a group at Cabinet level. We have recently undertaken such a review called The Conservation Through Reserves Committee Review and as a result of that there has been a Red Book given by Cabinet which has set out a whole new series of national parks and nature reserves which are now being put into administrative practice. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

NEWBERY: Thank you, Mr. Bowen. Any questions of Mr. Bowen? No questions. I ask you to carry a vote of thanks by acclamation please.

Back to the other side of Australia again now, Western Samoa, and I'm going to ask Mr. Tioa to present the address, ladies and gentlemen. Mr. Tioa.

TIOA: Mr. Chairman, Ministers and delegates to this 2nd South Pacific Conference on National Parks and Reserves. I would like to present to you our situation report for Western Samoa and I hope it gives you an indication of areas in which we live and the problems we face. But before beginning I would like to thank Government of New South Wales for hosting the conference and express our appreciation for your hospitality in Australia.

Western Samoa is an independent state situated in the middle of the Pacific with a population of 152,000 people. In 1974 the Government passed a National Parks and Reserves Act and since that time has been active in its implementations with the setting aside of one national park and two reserves. A number of proposals are either in the early stages of implementation or are being evaluated at present. An active programme for training the small staff is under way both within the country and overseas.

Western Samoa consists of two large islands and several small ones. Total land area is approximately 2,934 square kilometres located between 13° and 15° south latitude and 168° and 173° west longitude. The two main islands are Upolu, which is the most heavily populated and Savaii. One with 1,100 square kilometres extending about 70 kilometres from east to west and up to 24 kilometres from north to south. Savaii is 1,820 kilometres square. It is also about 70 kilometres across, but is 35 kilometres wide.

The islands have numerous volcanic peaks, the highest being Mt. Sili Sili (1,850 metres) on Savaii and Mt. Fito (1,100 metres) on Upolu. Savaii has a central core of volcanic peaks surrounded by a ring of lava base plateaux, then lower hills and coastal plains. Upolu has a chain of volcanic peaks running from one end to the other, with hills and coastal plains on either side. Much of the coast is surrounded by coral reef and lagoons.

The climate produces a dense growth of luxuriant forest although soils are generally poor.

Western Samoa has a tropical climate. There is little seasonal variation in temperature, the mean daily temperature is about 26°C, temperatures rarely go outside the 18-32°C range. Humidity is high, the yearly average being 83%.

The south and southeast windward areas receive from 5,000 to 7,000 millimetres of rain annually; the leeward side of the island receive 2,500 to 3,000 millimetres of rain. There is a marked dry season between May and August. Although Samoa lies outside the main hurricane belt, occasional storms are experienced.

The Government of Western Samoa is currently considering a draft National Policy on Conservation of the Environment, these policies being aimed at preserving examples of the natural environment and the wise use of natural resources for economic betterment and welfare of present and future generations.

Initial policies are to work towards the implementation of the legislation by the early declaration of Parks and Reserves, initially on State controlled land, and to increase public awareness of environmental values through all available avenues.

In 1978, the Government set aside the first Friday in November as Arbor Day and proclaimed it a public holiday.

The National Parks and Reserves Act was passed in 1974. This Act is administered by the Agriculture and Forestry Department through the Forestry Division. It provides for the declaration of public land not less than 600 hectares in area (except for islands) as national park. Parks will be preserved in perpetuity for the benefit and enjoyment of the

people; will be administered to preserve them as far as possible in their natural state; will preserve the flora and fauna and maintain their value for soil, water, and forest conservation. Subject to any special conditions or regulations the public will have freedom of access to enjoy the benefits of parks including inspiration, aesthetic appreciation, enjoyment and recreation.

The Act also provides for the setting aside of nature reserves, recreation reserves, historic reserves and other reserves can be declared for specified purposes.

The Forests Act 1967 enables control over land use by declaration as protected land. The Water Act 1965 provides for the prohibition of the removal of protective vegetation within 60 metres of rivers.

Tusitala Historic and Nature Reserve. A 1968 ordinance set aside approximately 128 hectares on Mt. Vaea, which is subsequently being incorporated into the 1974 National Parks and Reserves Act. This area includes much of a small hill located in a commanding position immediately behind Apia. Robert Louis Stevenson as we name it Tusitala was buried on Mt. Vaea near the summit. Additional land has recently been added at the base of this area together with the adjacent slopes are to be developed as a botanical garden together with picnicking and walking areas.

O Le Pupu - Pu'e National Park. This area of 3,000 hectares was set aside by the Government as the country's first National Park in March 1978, although it has not yet been formally gazetted. This latter matter awaits the survey of the boundaries. The land was previously Government land and stretches from the southern coast to the dividing ridge at Mt. Fito on Upolu island, thus providing a range of ecotypes found on the island.

It is hoped that O Le Pupu - Pu'e will serve as a demonstration area and thereby foster wider public and political support for the concept of National Parks and Reserves.

Togitogiga Recreation Reserve. This reserve was set aside by the Government in 1978. It is a small riverside area containing 2 waterfalls and a very popular swimming hole. It has recently been surveyed to enable it to be formally gazetted as a Reserve. The area lies adjacent to the O Le Pupu - Pu'e National Park and the proposed Park Headquarters area.

There are a number of areas currently under consideration for reservation. Palolo Deep is a small area of coral reef close to Apia. It is proposed to improve public access to the area and develop an under-water nature trail. Work on the project is currently underway.

Lake Lanuto'o. This area is also on Upolu island and is situated on the main divide to the west of O Le Pupu - Pu'e National Park. The proposal is centred around Government land but includes Customary land, freehold and Government corporation land.

The area has significant recreation, soil and water catchment protection values.

The National Parks and Reserves System is administered and managed by the Forestry Division of the Department of Agriculture and Forests. On the following page you will find an organisation chart which indicates how our department operates. I hope this has given you an understanding of our situation in Western Samoa and an indication of the problems we face. Thank you for your kind attention.

NEWBERY: And thank you very very much Mr. Tioa for the very fine presentation of your report. Before taking a seat, maybe we have some questions of Mr. Gioa, Western Samoa. Any questions, please? If not, I ask you to carry a vote of thanks by acclamation to this young gentleman for putting

his report out. Now, ladies and gentlemen, we will adjourn for morning tea and resume at 11.10. Thank you very much.

ADJOURNMENT

NEWBERRY: Ladies and gentlemen, the next part of the morning's session is an address by the Honourable Venn Young from New Zealand, Minister for Lands, Minister for Forests, Minister for the Environment and Minister in charge of the Valuation Department.

Mr. Young was elected to Parliament in 1966 as a member for Egmont and his duties have included being a member of Select Committees on Island Affairs, Maoris Affairs and Social Services.

He has served as the Chairman of the Parliamentary Select Committee of Petitions, Racing and Wool Marketing Corporation. He was Junior Government Whip in 1972 and attained Cabinet ranking when the National Government returned to office in 1975.

I ask the Honourable Venn Young to come forward, please, and his topic is "The Importance of Islands as Reserves". I would like to also remind delegates that the agreed rules of procedure will provide for time to be available for questions and discussions following the presentation of Mr. Young's address.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Honourable Venn Young from New Zealand.

YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I intend to speak to the paper that is in your folder rather than just record word by word what is on it.

I think it would probably assist you and assist me if those of you who had the map still in your folder took the map out so I could describe at this stage the islands I will be speaking about in the course of my address. The islands I'll be referring to do not include Australia, although when I went to school we had it described to us as the island continent, but they will include the North Island and the South Island, the main islands of New Zealand. Immediately below is Stewart Island and in the north you will see the Kermadec sub-tropical islands, Raoul, Ihakauley, Curtis.

To the east of the main islands of New Zealand you will see the Chatham Islands, where farming takes place. You will see in the south the Bounties, the Snares, the Antipodes and the Auckland Islands, and they, of course, are very remote and very different from the main islands of New Zealand, and certainly from the islands in the Pacific that most of the delegates here either live on or have a responsibility for.

So you have the maps there. Let me, then, continue with my address.

Mr. Chairman, those of the delegates who have lived their lives on small islands or administer these islands, may consider that my experience does not equip me adequately to speak on the subject of the importance of islands as reserves. However, when I speak of islands as reserves of national or international importance, I speak of islands mainly without a significant human habitation or a human impact. Certainly I refer to islands where the flora and the fauna is no longer required to sustain even the casual visitation by man. Many of these islands are small, most are not attractive to human habitation. Others are in latitudes too extreme for even those early mariners from Polynesia and certainly to many of the mariners today. But, first of all, I want you to examine why I insist upon a minimal impact by man. It is because I believe man is a predator by habit and a dominator by instinct and virtually nowhere has he been content with

taking a passive role in his environment as just one part of a total balance. Man sought and he took the furs and the feathers and the flesh and the leaves and the roots of other living things across the world, not just to live but often to enhance his way of living. He has always sought to be master of many destinies. I believe that the subtleties of survival in the animal kingdoms bear little relationship to the drive for domination that has been part of the kingdoms of man. If we judge the latter to be merely the influences of westernisation or European colonisation, then I think we close our eyes to some of the events of history. Think of the species of whales that are at risk today, or those mighty moas, the largest of all recently known birds that once lived on the land in New Zealand. They were not exterminated by modern techniques. They were exterminated some four or five hundred years ago; exterminated by a people who sought to be master of the land which they occupy. I believe that it is not, then, unreasonable to set aside some places where the occasional man is to be there only to observe, to inquire, to assist or to study, and what better places than islands, with their shores as natural boundaries and natural defences. But we should think less of refuges and more of museums or laboratories; laboratories where old or sometimes new balances of nature struggle to reach an equilibrium.

I have been lucky enough to visit some of the places that I will speak about in my address. I well remember some 15 months ago, on the southern islands surrounding Stewart Island, joining in a small team from the Wildlife Service, searching for the kakapo, the most endangered bird in New Zealand at the present time. I said to the people who were with me that I am sure that when the Prime Minister asked me to accept the portfolios of Lands and Environment some two and a half years earlier, he didn't anticipate, or neither did I, that I would be on my hands and knees in some remote uninhabited island in the more remote parts of New Zealand looking for a bird that was extinct there and almost extinct on the main islands. And then, subsequently, I was able to travel to the Auckland Islands - you will see those in the Sub-Antarctic and there be able to witness the rehabilitation of some of those islands originally occupied by the early sealers and the whalers which led almost complete destruction of the seals and the driving away of the magnificent royal albatross. I went on to one island, Enderby Island, where there were some 17 or 20 pairs of royal albatross nesting. Fascinating. They sat up on top of the scrub proud of their nests. We walked right to these magnificent birds, but in defence of their egg they wouldn't move from them. We had with the group Sir Robert Falla whose name would be known to some of you as one of the world's leading ornithologists on sea birds, and Sir Robert was checking the banding of these magnificent animals, born on that island many of them, travelled the Southern Oceans for some seven or eight years, came back by a great system of navigation that no one understands, came back to those islands to breed. They mate for life - they do a bit better than the human race, - and live to the age of 50 or 60 years old and certainly as far as equal rights are concerned, the great royal albatross also shares equal responsibility because the male and the female alternate sitting on the egg for about five or six days each. They then go away to the Southern Oceans again and come back. Quite remarkable, - a laboratory or a museum, a place of tremendous international importance.

I have already made the point that New Zealand is simply not two main islands. In fact, New Zealand is much more accurately described as an island realm or a realm of hundreds of islands. On a map of the South Pacific, we appear simply as the two islands, but a closer inspection reveals a multitude of smaller islands and islets ranging over a broad expanse of ocean from the sub-tropics to the sub-antarctic. There are the Kermadecs, a volcanic group of four main islands dominated by Raoul Island, with a warm, humid, sub-tropical climate. There are the northern off-shore islands, extending from the north cape of New Zealand along the east coast, and they comprise mainly ancient or recent volcanoes. Then there are the

Cook Strait Islands in the strait between the north and south island. In the south, there are those southern off-shore islands mainly outlyers of Stewart Island.

The Chatham's group, 900 kilometres to the east of the south island, is another major group. The main Chatham Island (191,000 hectares) is the largest. Finally there are those intriguing sub-antarctic islands, and these consist of five groups. The largest are the Auckland Islands, about 240 square miles as I recall, quite a large lump of rock standing up on the sub-antarctic, with a long history of shipwrecks. It was described to us when we were there that the old sailing vessels from India or Australia, found the quickest way to Europe was to go down into those latitudes, turn east, and with the trade or "roaring forties" go across the sub-antarctic and up into the Atlantic Ocean. The only thing in their way, was the Auckland Islands, which they seemed to hit with a kind of monotonous regularity, to such an extent that some animals were liberated onto those islands, exotic animals, solely for the purpose of providing food for the shipwrecked sailors.

These islands to the south, which include the Bounty Islands, differ markedly from other islands because of their isolation, their climate, their geology and their scenery, but they are an integral component of the New Zealand environment and represent a unique and extremely valuable natural resource. In recognition of their national and international importance for nature conservation and recreation more than 100 islands around New Zealand have been set aside as various types of reserves. Almost all the classes of reserves that are described in our Situation Report are represented on islands around our coast. I have camped and tramped on those islands. I have inspected the Government's farming operations on the Chatham Islands and, as I said, I have been a member of an expedition to the Sub-Antarctic. I have visited, also, a number of Cook Strait Islands in the northern off-shore islands. Many of these latter are incorporated in maritime parks. As I said in the Situation paper the maritime parks concept is an extremely useful administrative strategy for co-ordinating the management of related groups of off-shore islands incorporating that with the adjacent mainland reserves.

We in New Zealand now have three of these parks established to provide for public use and enjoyment, particularly for water-based recreation, along with preservation of flora and fauna and the natural landscape. The New Zealand Island Reserves have the same statutory and administrative provisions as the mainland reserves. The principal act governing protected areas in New Zealand is the Reserves Act of 1977 which provides powers necessary to reserve islands for nature conservation and for recreation purposes.

Perhaps the most recent significant development in the stewardship of reserves in New Zealand has been the evolution of an elaborate management planning programme. It is now a requirement for administering authorities to prepare and to implement management plans.

In the New Zealand Reserve system, management planning ensures that immediate decision making is compatible with the long-term purposes and interests of a particular reserve. However, simply declaring an island to be a reserve does not in itself ensure the survival of its animal and plant life. Islands are often highly vulnerable to damage or destruction from human impact. As enclosed environments, they are too often ravaged by a sudden explosion of change. This impact may be direct or indirect and either purposeful or accidental. Whilst sometimes the object of management is to retain a pristine ecosystem in other cases the aim is to restore original natural conditions from the now man-modified state.

Elsewhere, it may be desirable to retain but control changes already set in train by man. All these opportunities are available in New Zealand Island Reserves. Examples of pristine or little modified island

environments are Meyer Island in the Kermadecs, Middle and Green Islands in the Mercury Group, that is north east of Auckland. Such islands are of extreme value biologically because they illustrate what all the islands have been in the past and, to some extent, what they could become. Islands can be precious museum pieces of our world's natural heritage. Thus, they have not just a national but also an international significance. It is of importance that such islands be guarded against the effects of man and his associated animals. Too often, the results are biologically explosive, catastrophic and frequently irreversible.

An illustration of such impacts is provided by the case of rodent introductions to islands, many of which are rodent free.

The invasion of the Big South Cape Islands - that's off Stewart Island - by ship rats was no doubt the most biologically costly event to have affected any island fauna in New Zealand this century.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, in summary then, I hope in the course of my address to have been able to show that islands are very special environments with much to offer as reserves for the protection and the study of the natural ecosystems and also for recreation. Thank you very much.

(The text of The Hon. V. Young's formal paper "The Importance of Islands as Reserves" appears in Volume 1 of these Proceedings).

NEWBERRY: Thanks very much Mr. Young. Now ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to invite questions or comments to Mr. Young on his excellent address. I'm sure there would be questions and Dr. Saunders of Queensland is putting up his hand. Dr. Saunders.

SAUNDERS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Mr. Young if he would be good enough to elaborate on the process of developing management plans for reserves. Now specific questions that I have in mind are, who finally approves the plan? Is the plan reviewed at fixed intervals? In other words, how secure is the plan once approved from arbitrary alteration and who has input into the plan? For example, do the general public, conservation groups, development groups, other government departments and authorities, local authorities, do they have an input and if so, how is this achieved?

YOUNG: Dr. Saunders, the first move is to have the reserve classified, could be a nature reserve, historic, scientific, recreational, local purpose reserve, government purpose. There's quite a range of them. According to existing legislation, that classification is notified publicly and then individuals or interest groups have the right to object or seek for an amendment to the classification. The responsibility for classification lies with the administering authority which is either the central government or a local body; that's where the responsibility lies for classification. So there's public involvement then. We will assume that an area has been classified a nature reserve, then within five years of the implementation of the Reserves Act, which I think was the 1st of April in 1978, the management plan must be submitted to the Minister. The Minister has the final decision on accepting the management plan. The management plan goes through the same process as classification. It is to be prepared and made public. The Minister mainly would have to be satisfied that the proper submissions made by interested individuals or groups were taken account of in the management plan, and then, being satisfied of that, the Minister confirms the management plan. These plans are required to be published in certain daily newspapers and a period of time given the public to make their submissions. I think the greatest difficulty comes where there are reserves that are of multiple use which could be a combination of recreation, local purpose, and scenic. We would expect there to be considerable input by the public. The plan finally being confirmed by the signature of the Minister stays then for five years and is reviewed.

It's quite a complicated administrative process and I'm bound to say this, that there has been some adverse reaction from local bodies who

accuse me of putting my sticky finger into their business of running their reserves and it's not the intention of the Act at all. The intention of the Act is to give the public the right to have its input and we might have to ease up on some of the requirements for publication of classification. But then we will continue to insist that the management plans, which are subsequent to the classification be made public.

SAUNDERS: Thank you.

YOUNG: I'm sorry the answer is so long to a very short question.

NEWBERY: Mr. Star. Thanks.

STAR: Star from Nauru. I wonder if you would be good enough Mr. Young to tell me about the off shore islands which have been consequently made in your report, as to whether they are inhabited or not and secondly, what titles are those islands called? Are they freehold, Crown lands or leaseholds?

YOUNG: Right. The second question first. The land is owned by the government; it is Crown land. They are nature reserves and reserves requiring special protection. That covers the major number of the islands; they are not inhabited except for special purposes. In the Kermadecs there are a group of people there who are employed by the Transport Department; they are employed by the government, for navigation and meteorological information. They are the only inhabitants there.

The Chatham Islands which are well to the east of New Zealand are inhabited by Maori people who moved over to the Chatham Islands in the early days of European colonisation - probably - between 1830 and 1850. And those people - represent mainly the community on the Chatham Islands and they are farmers or they are fishermen. I think that the population on the Chatham Islands - which is about 200 square miles, is about 1,000. It might be 900. The other islands are not occupied apart from Stewart Island which has a small occupancy in the north of the island. The Auckland Islands are occupied occasionally by rangers of the Lands and Survey Department but on an intermittent basis only and for research purposes.

Further south the Campbell Islands has a weather station. That is permanently occupied there but basically - even though some of them are quite substantial - apart from the Chatham Islands they are not attractive for human habitation particularly in the far south. But they are particularly interesting islands to visit in the middle of summer time.

NEWBERY: Any further questions or comments? Dr. Dasman from the I.U.C.N.

No sir.

DASMAN: I wonder if I might ask the Honourable Minister - at the time of the first meeting of this sort in New Zealand there was considerable discussion of the proposed I.U.C.N. draft of an Island for Science Conventions. Now New Zealand has gone a long way towards proclaiming Islands for science in its own territory but there was some talk at the time of the Apia meeting of New Zealand hosting an inter-governmental meeting to consider a Island for Science Convention. Has there been any progress towards such a meeting?

YOUNG: Not to my knowledge Doctor. But perhaps Mr. Coad may want to correct me.

COAD: No sir. I don't want to correct you I just want to add to what you said. It still would be our intention to call such a meeting ...

DASMAN: Yes.

COAD: ...when the time was ripe. But the time will not be ripe until further progress is made in the negotiation about the law of the sea.

NEWBERY: Any further questions...

YOUNG: Our intentions are good - our performance is not quite so good so far Doctor.

NEWBERY: Mr. Brown from the U.S. Yes Mr. Brown.

BROWN: Mr. Young I recognise what you are saying in relationship to the islands and a need to set them aside as laboratories and the such - I wonder if any consideration has been given though to the marine archaeological value that may be there as a result of shipwrecks. I realise they've brought havoc to the islands but I've never been - I'm just assuming that in the sea it may be rich in marine archaeology and has anything been done to protect that.

YOUNG: The main interest in the old shipwrecks at the Auckland Islands is - what's the name of that ship Noel?

COAD: General Grant.

YOUNG: General Grant went down there with about half a million dollars' worth of gold on it and - about every two years there are expeditions down there to try and get the gold rather than to study what has happened to the General Grant. But it did provide for me a fascinating history of that island knowing the number of shipwrecks that have taken place there - the traumatic circumstances that people met if they were lucky enough and sometimes unlucky enough to get ashore. It has been written of but there are no particular areas or relics that I know of that are set aside on the Auckland Islands specifically for historic purposes. But they are protected because - all the islands are islands for which a special permit is required for anyone to enter onto the land.

NEWBERY: Any further questions? From Tonga - yes sir?

TONGAILAVA: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I wonder whether Honourable Young would care to comment on - I understand that on Chatham Island rise, we have found off-shore phosphorite. Are you prepared to have this mined and how do you go about protecting marine life?

NEWBERY: Yes. Mr. Tongailava.

YOUNG: Mr. Tongailava, yes. There is a mining right that has been taken out over those phosphates on the Chatham rise by one of these New Zealand mining companies. We would allow it to be mined, but - the government would have to be satisfied of the mining method. But there is quite a bit of interest in these phosphates on the Chatham rise.

NEWBERY: South Australia?

CORNWALL: Mr. Chairman, Cornwall, South Australia.

NEWBERY: Mr. Cornwall?

CORNWALL: I wonder if Mr. Young could tell us whether, in actual fact, they have met the requirements for a management plan and a subsequent review in five years? It's the experience of the States in Australia, that, although we have very good intentions in this regard, we do have rather severe difficulties often in meeting the objective.

YOUNG: Doctor, no they haven't - the five years is not up yet. But there are a number of local authorities who have had discussions with the Lands and Survey Department, and although they stepped back from this imposition they saw, initially, of having to produce these management plans, we've tried to simplify the process for them, and the local authorities, mainly the larger city authorities are making considerable progress, but the five-year term won't be up until 1983, and I think that we will have to coax many of these smaller territorial local authorities to do what the larger ones are doing and what the government itself must be doing. But, I do see some difficulties.

NEWBERY: Any further questions for Mr. Young? Mr. Bowen from Western Australia.

BOWEN: Just two or three if I may, Sir. I was interested in the fact that on Enderby Island, initially, goats were introduced and later they were not there. Was that a natural occurrence? Do you know, or in fact was that a management decision to get rid of the goats?

YOUNG: That was a natural occurrence. The goats were liberated on several of the Auckland Islands, but they couldn't survive the elements, where the cattle could and the rabbits.

BOWEN: I see, so it was the elements.

YOUNG: Yes.

BOWEN: And the...

YOUNG: I might add, on the main island there are also wild pigs at the present time, so they have survived the elements.

BOWEN: I see. Thank you very much indeed. Can I then just move on to this question of the usage of islands as a research facility. It seems to me that as one moves to places like Australia, at least, to establish national parks and nature reserves, one of the major dilemmas always, is what size should a reserve be. Is there a minimum size that is of any use in terms of maintenance, the diversity of flora and fauna, taking into account the fire strategies required. The islands then, as you have rightly set out, provide an opportunity for obtaining information on diversity and abundance of fauna which is of relevance to the - what is now becoming island situations on the mainland surrounded by farmlands, and I'm wondering whether you have a researched - in your research institutes whether you are undertaking research on the diversity and abundance of flora and fauna, correlated with island size and other relevant factors to the island situations, and whether this - these - this research is adding to one's understanding of the general concept of reserves and national park size requirements.

YOUNG: I think the islands are special types of reserves. For instance the setting aside of an island as small as 1 hectare as a reserve requiring special protection, can be quite fully supported, so it bears no relevance to the size of reserve or park we require on the mainland. But in the research that would have gone on over many many years it would be the type and the balance and the amount of flora and fauna on an island that would be of more significance than the size of the island itself.

NEWBERY: Is that all you have Mr. Bowen?

YOUNG: Did I answer all those questions?

BOWEN: Well can I just continue. I don't know what your time limit is sir.

YOUNG: No, we are all right for time.

BOWEN: Just to say in Western Australia we have endeavoured to - or we have used to some extent the island situations in an attempt to gauge the minimum size of islands that is likely to support, for instance one, two or a number of species of marsupials and there is at least on the west coast of Australia, quite a significant correlation, not just tied to island size but in the multiple regression type arrangement. There is a very close correlation between the diversity of at least the larger animals that can be accommodated and this island size research has been able to provide some light as to the sorts of sizes of reserves which - nature reserves which perhaps should at least be - or is supportable in a debate in the political scene, if you like, as to the sorts of minimum sizes that are of value to support the total array of plants and animals that a mainland island is attempting to support.

One so often gets into the situation of having to defend the reason for having say a 5 million acre reserve or something of that nature and one needs to be able to look to experimental and to data which is available to give information as to why such size reserves are required. And it seems to me that island situations, because they have been in that particular - constrained to that particular size over a long period of time, provide an excellent opportunity for research in this type of work, and I would simply urge that there is a tremendous value, as you have listed here for islands as research tools in this way, not just for themselves, but for what they can do in terms of assisting the other concepts of mainland reserves.

YOUNG: Yes, I can only confirm what you say. In New Zealand now our situation is quite different because of the fact that we had originally an indigenous fauna, consisting only of birds except for, I think, the one mammal was a native bat, while the islands that I speak of have transient populations because they are coming and going, both the birds and the sea mammals.

I did have the interesting experience of being on another island called Dundas about 9 or 10 acres off the shores of Auckland Island and sharing that 9 or 10 acres with 3½ thousand sea lions, and I can tell you I didn't appreciate the sea lions personal habits, and they probably didn't appreciate my presence. But they came there to mate in these huge numbers and then travelled away around the rest of the island and the South Pacific for the balance of the time.

So in such islands we are unable to measure the carrying capacity of animals.

BOWEN: Yes, it is a different story.

YOUNG: Carrying capacity has not really come into our experience or our study as much as it would in Australia.

BOWEN: Sure, sure.

YOUNG: I do think Australia and New Zealand probably have some special responsibilities in the provision of island reserves because obviously with the demand for living space so important on the other islands of the Pacific, it would be more difficult for those island nations to set aside the type of island reserves that we can.

BOWEN: I see.

NEWBERY: Okay. Any further comments please? Or questions? To our guest speaker. Yes, Peter? Peter Ogilvie from Queensland.

OGILVIE: I'll yell. If you can't hear me, please say so.

NEWBERY: We can hear you.

OGILVIE: Are there any islands in New Zealand where you've restricted the number of people who are allowed on the island at any one time? And if so, how do you derive that human carrying capacity if you have such a figure?

YOUNG: Indeed now, Peter, these are people who reside there permanently or people who may visit?

OGILVIE: No, I'm talking more of visitors. I might give an example of Skomer Island off the coast of Wales in Great Britain where people go across to look at the sea bird colonies on the island and they only allow a hundred people on the island in any one day. I was wondering whether you had a similar situation and if you had, how did you derive the figure that you've put?

YOUNG: Yes. Well, the similar situation we have is an island called Kapiti which is very close to the city of Wellington, which is a bird sanctuary and is only some five or six miles off-shore. It is attractive to a large number of people to go there. We limit the number, I think, to about 50 a day. Those there for very special reasons, such as scientific study could stay overnight. The balance are day visitors. It is an offence to land on the island. So although the area is adjacent to a city and there are a number of pleasure boats that are near at hand we obtain great support from the city community who tend to police this provision themselves. It is recognised that there is a need to limit the number of visitors otherwise we destroy what we're trying to save.

NEWBERRY: Any further questions please? We have a gentleman here who is able to give you any information. Let's take advantage of it. Any other questions? French Polynesia? Mr. Tevane?

TEVANE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask this question. How does New Zealand control and police all these islands that you have just mentioned? What is the situation in this regard. In Polynesia, for instance, towards the north of the Marquesas Islands, there is a small island there, that is of great value but we find that they are almost devastated by visitors who go there and pillage this island. So what measures are taken for policing these islands?

YOUNG: The difficulty in policing the laws that restrict access to these islands is very real. I'm bound to say that we get the greatest assistance from nature through the types of shores many of the islands have and the very rough seas surrounding them.

Apart from that, however, in our surveillance of the new 200 mile fishery zone, we have the Navy that will assist us. Finally, it is a condition of fishing licenses in that 200 mile zone that the New Zealand laws must be adhered to and these relate to not landing on the islands except in the cases of emergency. But the physical policing of it is extremely difficult apart from what we can do with the Navy.

NEWBERRY: Okay, Mr. Tevane.

TEVANE: Mr. Chairman, yes, naturally we have rules also, not to allow people to go along to these islands without authorisation from the Government. Unfortunately, the steps that have been taken are very often overlooked, especially by small ships who go by and if the weather is calm, they disembark and a lot of damage is done.

YOUNG: Yes, I think the nature of your problem in your part of the Pacific regarding the landing of people from small vessels who may not even know the law, some may, would be different from ours in the southern Pacific. We do have longer distances, more difficult oceans and because of the relative remoteness of the islands, the problems would be not as severe as yours. But we would still have difficulty in policing it because for instance, we have the fourth largest economic zone, fishing zone, in

the world, and maybe one of the world's smallest Navies, and so the problems are very real. We must rely on nature and the Navy, in that order.

NEWBERY: Okay, Mr. Tevane?

TEVANE: Yes.

NEWBERY: Any other questions, please? Give us another one or two. Any comments? No other questions? Well, in that case, ladies and gentlemen, I'd just like to formally thank the Honourable Venn Young for his very excellent address here this morning. It was a stimulating and instructive address and it was very pleasing to see so many of you take advantage of the knowledge of this Minister from New Zealand and I believe too, Mr. Young, that addresses of this nature confirm the necessity for conferences such as the one that brings us here over this week. We are very indebted to the Honourable Venn Young for making his time available to give us this fine address here this morning. I can see that you have all been very interested in it and I would ask you to carry a vote by acclamation to the Honourable Venn Young from New Zealand.

Honourable Ministers, Your Excellency, ladies and gentlemen, I am now going to ask Mr. Joe Brown from the United States to speak about his situation report.

Of course, he represents the country that originated the National Park idea. So it is very nice to have you here with us, sir, from the United States, the country which had the initiative many years ago to originate National Parks in this world. We are looking forward to hearing from you and what you have to say today to us.

Mr. Joe Brown, ladies and gentlemen, from the United States. Glad to have you with us, sir.

BROWN: Mr. Chairman, delegates, ladies and gentlemen. On behalf of my government, I wish to take this opportunity to thank the government of New South Wales and the delegates of this conference for giving us the opportunity to be an observer here this week. You have copies of the situation report on the table, and therefore I'm not going into the details of what's in the copy. I think you will find definitions, goals and the likes are fairly well explained where we are today. I would however, like to point out to you that section of the report on page 4, titled "environmental legislation". We have an area in our country known as Alaska, it's a long way from the south pacific. It's an area that we have been looking and working with for many years, and we recognise it as probably being the last frontier as far as our country is concerned where you can still find land almost the way the Lord produced it.

Now in December of 1978 our President Carter used his authority under the antiquities Act of 1906. Now this antiquities Act of 1906 provides the authority for the President by proclamation, and that's the key, by proclamation to set aside as national monuments historic landmarks, historic and pre-historic structures and other objects of historic or scientific interest that are situated upon lands owned or controlled by the government of the United States. In this 1906 Act the fact that it had in it scientific interests as well as historic, gave us an opportunity to set aside lands that were being threatened, and threatened in this way. The congress of the United States last year had before them a bill to set aside many hectares for preservation and this bill was successfully worked through the house, however, when it went before the senate one senator was capable through parliamentary procedures to keep the bill from coming to the floor for a vote. As a result of it, it died in the last session. The importance of this land to the United States, and we feel to the world was such that

our Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture urged the President to take advantage of that 1906 Act and to designate monuments to give us the protection.

Now this significant resource management action designated, and he accepted the advice of the Secretaries, designated 22.7 million hectares of Alaska national interest lands as 17 new national monuments, two of which were to be managed by the United States Forest Service, two existing forest reserve areas to be managed by the Forest Service which is a unit of the Department of Agriculture, and 14 units to be managed by the National Park Service. Now this immediately put in my terms a lock or a hold on the lands which were being threatened by the mining interest, the lumber interest, sports hunters and the like to give us a chance to come back to the congress again to see if we could get legislation to create not monuments, but national parks. Now you're probably wondering, well, what's the advantage of a monument over a national park. There are two advantages; one, particularly, to us from management because we do have, in this real world, to go to the congress of the United States for funding to manage all of our areas, and they have a tendency to frown on new parks being set aside by proclamation, have been very few done in recent years. So we're interested in having the congress pass a law that we will manage, that we will meet our requirements. The second reason for going back, under the antiquities Act and the establishment of the monuments, we are not able to include all of the acreage that we felt should be included in that act. So we have two real reasons: 1. we're going to have to face them for funds in the future; 2. this gives us an opportunity to try to take in a little more land to give better protection to the areas possible. This legislation is now being drafted. We feel that it will pass, because if it does not; if again individual senators or congressmen want to hold it up for one reason or another, they are, while I'm speaking with you, monuments, they are under the protection of the Department of Interior.

But we have another issue along with this, and which has been raised many times here in the last two or three days and that is the consideration of the native people in an area, and we have a great number of native Alaskans in Alaska. The Eskimo population is high and there are other natives as well. The question of survival for these people is a concern and under the monument setup you cannot hunt, fish or do anything, it is the strictest sort of legislation that we can have and we do feel that the natives are entitled to subsistence, hunting and fishing. So through new legislation this would probably be included in it. But we feel it will pass because the importance of it, and the indications by the people. I believe there was almost close to 300 votes in the house, it was almost a total majority of the house in favour of it, most of the Senate was in favour of it, but it was just one of those things.

Now, the important thing and the reason I want the opportunity to speak with you today, is that we now are taking a hard look at our past history of managing 320 parks which amounts to about 31 million hectares. To be sure, and I re-emphasise to be sure, that our management plans for the future, for this new area will protect the scientific, cultural, historic and living resources, and one of my reasons for being here is to be able to share with you our successes as well as our failures, and we have failures. And I'm hoping and I have already seen it in my travelling this past week and next week, where you people are finding ways to manage your areas to enable you to give the protection and yet enable people to use in some cases these lands. So I would like to conclude by saying that we are proud to be here, we need your help, being the oldest and the largest not necessarily means the best, and we have a lot to learn from our experiences, and this is our last chance to take a set of lands as large as 22 million hectares, that is almost twice as large as the existing national park service, and protect them so that they'll be here for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you.

NEWBERY: Thank you Mr. Brown for your address. Now ladies and gentlemen. Mr. Brown no doubt would be only too glad to answer any questions. Any questions of Mr. Brown, please? The Honourable Venn Young from New Zealand.

YOUNG: What is the situation Mr. Brown, if further oil fields are thought to be under this land, or are you satisfied there aren't?

BROWN: At the present time, under the Monument Designation, mining in any form cannot take place. As I understand it, in the legislation that is being proposed it will also prohibit this type of activity, but this is an area, that as you well know when you get on the floor and start debating the pressure groups, the lobby groups are working on. But we feel that this can be set aside. There is other lands where oil, gas and minerals could be found.

NEWBERY: Okay, anything further. Peter, Peter Ogilvie from Queensland.

OGILVIE: Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service. Joe, I was wondering, there are situations in America I believe, and Navaho land is one that comes to mind, where the land is owned by the indigenous people, but they have established their, I think, Navaho Land National Monument or National Park. Could you explain exactly how that works. It is run, I believe. In conjunction with the National Park Service, but it is in fact the land of the people - indigenous people there. How does that function?

BROWN: Peter, I'll try. We have many examples in our park system similar to that where through some form of agreement or legal arrangement, we work together with the individuals, in this case the Navaho Indians, to assist them in the development and management of the areas. In some cases we merely provide money and technical assistance. I'm not thoroughly familiar with the specific one that you are bringing up, but it is not uncommon to work with other groups without actually becoming involved in the acquisition of land. I think that's what you were referring to. In fact we are encouraging our land policy - a new policy which was presented through our channels here about a month ago, stresses in there the means to acquire land other than fee purchase.

In other words, easements of one kind and another, special agreements and these sorts of things so that we do not interfere where we can with the local tax base or with individual's land. In some cases where we have to buy land then we buy it and lease it back in the case, I believe, New Zealand was referring to our farm parks. To achieve this we constantly will purchase the land from the individual, pay him for the land and there's a deduction for his continuing to live on the land and he - one of the conditions would be that the individual continues to farm. This way as we say in America, he has cake and eat it too. He gets money, we get the scene and go on from there. But there are many different kinds of arrangements to have parks without actually buying them.

NEWBERY: Any further questions of Mr. Brown please? Mr. Bowen.

BOWEN: Very quick one Sir just one of administration. You have on page 4 and 5 talked about national parks, national monuments. I think if I read your paper correctly - and could you just confirm - that the term national in America means that they are in fact run by the Federal Government, the central government with regions throughout the country as distinct from parks which might be run by one of the States. Is that true?

BROWN: Yes Sir, that's true. We actually have, I guess, four categories of parks in the United States. We have city parks or town parks, we have county parks, we have state parks, and we have national parks which are federal parks. Usually the national parks are larger in size when we talk about natural areas or recreation areas, we get into historic type parks, they can be as small as a portion of an acre or up and normally we try to separate the national parks from the other categories by saying that whatever the features are in the area that we have acquired and managing is

of national significance, one of a kind, if possible. Normally size of a national park is larger. But it's getting more confusing every day in America because the tax base in the cities, counties and states is becoming such that the money is having to be used for welfare and all the other things needed to keep a community going and parks and recreation organisations are finding it difficult to get funds. So we now are becoming involved in urban parks in large cities such as Sydney. Where in San Francisco, New York City, we're now in an area up and down the Kyhoga River near the Cleveland area, so it's getting more confusing by the day, but actually when we say national we're talking federal.

NEWBERRY: Any further questions. We have one here from Mr. Armstrong, New South Wales.

ARMSTRONG: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Brown, I would be interested to know if you have actually come to the stage of planning the management of these national parks in Alaska. What part will the native populations themselves play. Will they actually be directly involved or will they be represented by lobby groups who may not always represent the tender aspirations of the native community.

BROWN: Sir, that's a very fine question and the only thing I can say in answering it is that in our planning process they will be truly represented. We now have under the National Environmental Policy Act - will be effective July 1 - we're going to be required to do what they call scoping before we even start the planning process. In scoping, as I understand it, it means that you go into an area and deal with all of the people at all levels to try to come up with some idea or understanding on how to manage. You don't go before them with a prepared plan. You theoretically crank them in its initial stages. Now to answer your question, will they be represented by themselves or will they be represented by special interest groups. I think I'm safe in saying that we speak public, but we really speak special interest groups, in this case they could very well have people representing the mining industry or the timber industry, but there will also be our national conservation organisations who are strong throughout the country that will follow us step by step to make sure that whatever we do, will, in the end, protect the resource, and I think, that's the bottom line, but it's always a gamble when you talk in terms of the individual, I think that's what you said, will his voice be heard, yes, through various organisations, and I hope we'll have the balance between, if we put it, the white hats and the black hats in this particular case.

NEWBERRY: Yes. Any further questions? If there are no further questions I'd like to on your behalf thank Mr. Joe Brown for his very fine contribution here this morning, and to reiterate what I said regarding America being the founders of national parks, and that was of course with Yellowstone National Park in 1872. Ladies and Gentlemen I was privileged to have the opportunity to be in America about nine months ago, and visited Yosemite and Muir Park, outside San Francisco. I mentioned in my comments earlier, of loving a park to death, and I know that the Americans are having the very same problems there, that the people of the world are inclined to be loving Yosemite to death.

BROWN: That's quite right sir, and that's why I said we're taking a hard look at our past history to make sure that we do not make some of the mistakes in the future that we have in the past. Now we are changing and even Yosemite has changed. We've eliminated, as you noticed there, the automobiles on the floor of the valley and so forth. But those of you who are just starting, it's a lot easier to crank in in the beginning, what you want for the future, than to say, "well, we'll let them do it now and then we'll change it later", because once people get the habit of doing something it's extremely difficult to eliminate it, so, if I had a word of advice, is that take your lumps early because you will get criticism when you come up with some planning requirements that appear to be harsh. But it's a lot easier than trying to change it when you see the damage that might come from it later on.

NEWBERY: Thanks very much Mr. Brown. I ask you to carry a vote of thanks by acclamation, ladies and gentlemen.

Ladies and gentlemen that concludes the morning session. We will now adjourn for lunch. The afternoon session will be chaired by Mr. Paul Landa, the Minister for Planning and Environment in New South Wales.

I've been privileged to have the opportunity of chairing this meeting this morning, and thank you for your co-operation.

ADJOURNMENT

LANDA: Ladies and gentlemen can we take our seats and I would like to just formally announce that the Conference is now resumed.

Before we go into the more formal parts, some of you - or all of you - may have noticed, both visually and/or audibly (is that right), these very handsome gavels that we have been presented by two of our representative countries and the conference now has two gavels. One presented by the New Zealand Government during the first South Pacific Conference held in New Zealand in 1975 - that's this very fearsome one here. I try to elicit a sound out of it and I think it is something like that. But if that fails to bring the meeting to order, I think it can be directed at the particular speaker with some effect. And the second one is this very audible one here which I have shown a distinct preference for myself in using, called the conference sword, presented by the Honourable T. Tangaroa, the Minister for Cook Islands, to this conference on the opening day on 23rd April.

And the New South Wales Government has already taken some measures to ensure that the first gavel, the one from New Zealand will be ensured of a safe place for depositing it between conferences and we have had a box constructed of New South Wales timber - what sort of timber is it? It is New South Wales rosewood timber, a very handsome box. It used to contain cabinet secrets, I'm told, but there is no need to have them anymore because we can all read them in The Sydney Morning Herald and it can be - it houses the New Zealand gavel and I would like to present this to the conference to facilitate the carriage and protection of that gavel.

I've had suggested to me that to avoid embarrassment to either the New Zealand or Cook Island Governments or delegates, I am quite prepared to announce that the position would be, subject to conference approval, that we use the Cook Island's gavel during the morning session, and the New Zealand during the afternoon session.

I'm told that this has some basis in logic because the sun rises earlier in the Cook Islands than in New Zealand and the Cook Islands being located in a more easterly latitude than New Zealand. I then have to use, according to that dictate, the New Zealand gavel, so all lengthy contributions be warned. This is the instrument of order for the afternoon.

I'd like to certainly thank you for those - both those expressions of generosity to the conference and, of course, I've also been warned that that should serve notice on anyone else in relation to - that anyone else having the idea that we need a third gavel will only mean that we will have to have very late night sessions to ensure it gets some use.

The fourth keynote address, the Coastal Ecosystem and Man's Impact, will deal with, as it says, on man's impact on the coastal ecosystem and it will be presented by the Honourable I. Bajapi, Minister of State for Social Development and Welfare in Fiji. Mr. Bajpai has held this portfolio since his election to parliament some eighteen months ago. Mr. Bajpai's portfolio includes responsibility for the National Trust of Fiji and it is through this body that Mr. Bajpai is involved with nature conservation. He also works closely with his colleagues, the Minister for

Forest and the Minister for Lands, whose departments manage a number of reserves.

Ladies and gentlemen, delegates, I have great pleasure in calling upon the Honourable I. Bajpai to address the conference.

BAJPAI: Mr. Chairman, His Excellency, Honourable Minister, delegates, ladies and gentlemen. My keynote address this afternoon is going to be on the coastal ecosystem and man's impact. I must thank the organisers of this conference for inviting me and allowing me to render this address on the coastal system and man's impact.

(Hon. I. Bajpai then presented his paper, "Coastal Ecosystem and Man's Impact", the text of which appears in Volume 1 of these Proceedings).

LANDA: Thank you Mr. Bajpai. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm sure that paper gives rise to a lot of interest and I'd call for any questions or comments on the paper. Dr. Pratt.

PRATT: Chairman, Pratt from the Australian Capital Territory. I wonder if I could ask Mr. Bajpai about your figures there for fish, Minister. The catch of fish seems surprisingly small, both for what I assume are your dietary requirements in Fiji and also for the number of commercial fishermen. Do I take it that many people therefore catch their own fish and don't buy from commercial fishermen and if that's such an important issue, do you intend to consider the issue of setting up marine national parks or nature reserves to protect those fish stocks?

BAJPAI: Well, this is right. In fact the figure given here in this paper is only for those fishermen who do commercial fishing. But according to the Fijian custom and rights they obtained from the Fijian Affairs Board they are free to fish any part of the sea and they do their own fishing which is not regarded as commercial fishing. And as you have said, in future I think our government is trying to look into this and create a bit more of this commercial fishing wherever possible.

PRATT: And would that include setting up nature reserves or national parks and would the intention be of conserving those stocks?

BAJAPI: We have in fact at the moment some nature reserves and the idea is to create more nature reserves insofar as reefs are concerned and coastal areas are concerned, the beaches, etc. etc.

PRATT: Thank you.

LANDA: Any further questions or comments on the paper?

YOUNG: Young, New Zealand. I would like to commend Mr. Bajpai on a very comprehensive paper outlining the Fijian situation. I wanted to ask him a matter related to paragraph 2 on page 8 where it refers to ensuring public access to the foreshore under the expressed Development Plan. Now in what circumstances can that access for recreation and other matters be provided, is that where there is a mining development, a hotel development, or how could it apply to privately owned or customary occupied land?

BAJPAI: These are mostly customary occupied lands. But as I have said, the considerations are being given to the applicants who would like to put up hotels, etc., and I think to give you more answers I would ask my adviser to give you.

YABAKI: Mr. Chairman, these reserves are essentially to ensure public access into the coastal beaches. This has been customary in the past. People have had the opportunity to go into the beaches at all times, but most of the developers tend to close these rights to people as soon as they have developed these areas.

At the moment there is no plan to develop these coastal strips further, particularly for recreational purposes. It has been used customarily for recreational purposes, but without building facilities for people, to cater for people coming into the coastal areas. Most of this land is customary land, tribally owned, and when negotiations for the development to be done is made, these rights for public access is also included into the negotiations with native landowners. There are very few freehold lands that have been - that we have come across where there is a place, but this sort of specification is made by the town and country planning, who eventually approves the plans for each involvement within the rural areas.

LANDA: Thank you Mr. Yabaki. Thank you.

YABAKI: Thank you.

LANDA: Yes, Tonga. Mr. Tongailava?

TONGAILAVA: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I would like to congratulate Mr. Bajpai on a very concise presentation of his keynote address. At the same time I'd like to raise a few queries with Mr. Bajapi. Did you make any study of the ecosystem, say, upsoil before mining sand and - I meant for regeneration and recycling? That's one question Mr. Bajpai. Another question - what's the impact of the tourist industry on the human environment of the indigenous population of Fiji? Thank you Mr. Bajpai.

BAJPAI: The answer to the first question is that we have got a body or organisation or machinery within the government itself which does these studies first before the licence is being given to the sand mining. We have got experts who look into this, and on their advice only, this is being done. It's not that anybody or somebody goes and does it. We already do the study first, we have got experts who advise when the licences are being issued, or the mining is being done.

The answer to the second question is - so far we don't have any real impact from the tourism, as far as our country is concerned, but we are going to take enough precaution for the future so that any detrimental impact is not effected in our country through tourism. Thank you.

LANDA: Are there any further questions? I'd just like to raise on behalf of New South Wales - recently we passed through parliament a bill known as the Coastal Protection Bill, which has some bearing I'm sure, on all of us, so far as protection of coastal ecosystems, and it establishes two things, it establishes one a coastal council as an independent body reporting to parliament, and to advise the Minister for Planning and Environment, myself, on policies and directions that should be followed in management of the coastal area. Coastal area has been defined very widely by maps attached to the bill which will be amended later. It follows river systems and areas up to 60 miles from the coast but undertakings have been given in parliament to later bring it to an area specifically relevant to the coast but we drafted it very wide at the start because of the second part of the bill which also operates from the same Acts which statutorily requires all developments to be - that are likely to have a detrimental effect upon the coastal system to be subject of specific approval by the Department of Public Works. And that bill is available to any delegate who sees the officers here and we will obtain copies from Parliament House. I've just really abbreviated it to almost the indecent level by that short summary of it but the full bill can be obtained by anyone seeing any of the officers. Another question I would like to ask to the conference generally and not necessarily through Mr. Bajpai is do any states or governments here have any legislative system requiring compulsory environmental impact statements, assessments or public hearings.

That being the case, that there are none we have introduced in the bill I referred to in my opening address to the conference, the Environmental Planning and Assessment Bill which is laying on the table at Parliament House for three months to allow public discussion and debate. Within that bill is contained procedures for compulsory environmental impact statements, assessments and public hearings where appropriate. And if members would like a copy of those bills we would be only too happy to supply - if not immediately because there has been a fairly heavy demand on it to ensure that people get a copy sent to their particular governments.

It also establishes a Land and Environment Court for the hearing of environmental actions and other matters related to land of course but specifically referable to today's discussion and that bill is also laying on the table of the parliament at the same time. So if members would like copies of those and - we'd be delighted on behalf of the state of New South Wales to hear subsequently within that three month period any comments that you may wish to give us for the better implementation of that legislation. Any further questions?

SAUNDERS: The questions actually arise out of your comments Mr. Chairman. I'm wondering whether the legislation - the coastal legislation which you referred to is in fact binding upon the parks service in situations where you have national parks along the coast.

LANDA: It's binding against the Crown entirely - in its entirety. As is the planning legislation.

SAUNDERS: As by way of comment there was a proposal to do that in Victoria which we - as managers of 30% of the coastline - we fortunately avoided.

LANDA: Well I suppose of all the departments that possibly has the least to fear from it I would have thought the National Parks and Wildlife Services would have had the least to fear of it and indeed I think the mechanism set up by such a bill certainly preserve options for National Parks and Wildlife Services in relation to particular areas that otherwise could be despoiled by developments that are unsympathetic to the coastal system. So I think in terms of their own management plans I certainly have not received any worries about it from my own department but for future lands that we wish to acquire we certainly see it as a very important procedure to prevent - to close off options for natural preservation of the area. So we're not as sensitive in New South Wales to oversight on development. Also the National Parks and Wildlife Service, I might add, is represented officially on the coastal council.

CORNWALL: Mr. Chairman, I think it's all relevant to the debate but you have opened up Pandora's box there, so to speak. What level of jurisdiction will your proposed court operate at? Is it proposed in the bill that it will be conducted by a magistrate, by magistrates, or up to Supreme Court level?

LANDA: It contains a new concept in the determining of these disputes. It will be presided over by a Supreme Court judge and it will have attached to it, lay assessors of varying expertise depending on the field that's required for the determination of a merit appeal. So it will use both the legal and the non-legal process. It will not be bound by the rules of evidence. It will be duty bound to deliver thorough but expeditious determination of the disputes. And at the same time, any legal matters formally heard in the Supreme Court or the Land and Valuation Court can be heard, if not concurrently, which would be the better way, certainly immediately following the determination of the merit appeal by the judge that will be exercising control of the court itself and the lay assessors. All of whom will be under his control.

CORNWALL: And it will set its own precedents, will it?

LANDA: And it will set, for the first time in New South Wales, its own precedents. Previously before planning decisions were done a local government appeals tribunal not bound by precedent and consequently causing a great deal of uncertainty to potential claimants. I would have expected at least someone to wish me luck.

DISCUSSION

YOUNG: I wonder if I could ask another question of the Minister, Mr. Chairman? It's in relation to the solid waste disposal from some of these big hotel complexes that are there or being planned for Fiji. I note that you're giving much greater emphasis to the protection of your mangrove areas. What sort of safeguards do you have against leaking from your solid waste disposal areas into your coastal waters?

BAJPAI: As I've said earlier, so far we have had no such hazard or no such problem and for future we are trying to take enough precautions so that this sewerage are not disposed into the nearby coastal areas.

LANDA: Yes, I'm sorry. Gilbert - New Caledonia - Gilbert Islands - Nauru, I'm sorry. Please Mr. Star.

STAR: Apparently this is a matter too complex for me but one thing I did not find here in your paper, Minister, is the concept of setting aside a place or places solely for national parks. In the same way as we have seen in Queensland and here in New South Wales. Now, in Queensland we are very amused about the extensive lands that have been set aside solely for that purpose. Now, we were told also that the - by commentary from our friend, he's not here this morning - this afternoon, that the people are not allowed to build a house in the designated area only allowed to build outside at the boundary of these places. Now those people allowed there are two kinds of people. One who take advantage over the parks and those who are contributing to the park. Now excuse me for a moment Mr. Minister Bajpai, of Fiji, but is there particular land or lands in the big islands or outside the - I mean offshore of the main islands are set aside solely for the national parks, based on those concepts?

BAJPAI: The answer to that would be Mr. Star that Fiji is quite different from the States of Australia like as you've mentioned Queensland or New South Wales or Victoria. Here I believe all the land belongs to the Crown, and they're quite - Crown and may be freehold.

In Fiji we have got three different kinds of lands. We have Crown land which is only 7% of the total land mass, then we have 83% of the traditional customary land which belongs to the tribes, the natives, and the rest is the freehold which is in the hands of rich people like the hoteliers or people who are holding a few thousand acres of land.

I think during my situation report I did make it very clear that the total land mass of Fiji is only 1.83 million hectares. So imagine 83% of that land belongs to the natives and we cannot interfere with their land in any way unless we have the consent of the Fijian Affairs Board, or the native owners. This is why we cannot have a land set aside for this kind of national park.

LANDA: There are no further questions or comments. There being no further questions or comments, I'd like to on behalf of all delegates I'm sure Mr. Bajpai, thank you for what is a very interesting and certainly useful document and paper given with great authority, and on behalf of all delegates thank you for your contribution to the conference. Thank you.

BAJPAI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

LANDA: We have ten minutes before afternoon tea and Mr. Tom Hubbard of Tonga has kindly prepared some slides of Tonga to illustrate some of the remarks he made in this morning's presentation on the Tongan situation paper, and I'm sure all delegates would be delighted to see them if that can be arranged now. Is that possible? Thank you.

Gentlemen I will announce that afternoon tea is now being served in the usual place and I would like to make one further announcement. Subject to the weather tomorrow being favourable - Saturday, I beg your pardon, Saturday, that is Saturday subject to the weather being favourable, an aerial inspection of the Wollemi National Park, the new park that I announced on Tuesday, will be available on Saturday morning for delegates and observers. A light helicopter and two fixed wing light aircraft will be used, there are only 11 places available, the flights will depart Sydney Airport with transport arrangements from the hotel at 8.30 a.m. It is proposed that participants will return to the hotel by 11.45 a.m. and I might say - that is, that in the shortage of spaces, if there is more than 11 places sought that of course we will be forced to give preference to those delegates that come from outside Australia naturally enough. So I would ask you to contact Mr. Tom Fox, he's the Organising Secretary today and I can assure you, it is a most spectacular tour.

Unfortunately ladies and gentlemen I won't be able to chair this afternoons proceedings. There is another ministerial meeting scheduled for tomorrow, unfortunately that I have to be briefed on this afternoon which - and I with pleasure notice that the Honourable Venn Young from New Zealand has kindly consented to chair this afternoons session. I thank you Venn for that courtesy and kindness to me and to the conference. Thank you. Afternoon tea ladies and gentlemen.

ADJOURNMENT

YOUNG: During the course of the day we have moved from island to the coastline, now we are going to hear something of marine reserves and it is going to give me the greatest pleasure to chair this part of the conference and to introduce Mr. Tongailava who has already addressed the conference and his curriculum vitae has been described to the conference. The fifth Keynote Address is entitled "Development and Management of Marine Parks and Reserves in the Kingdom of Tonga", and will be presented by Mr. Sione Tongailava. Mr. Tongailava is the Superintendent of Lands, Survey and Natural Resources for the Kingdom of Tonga, a position he has held since 1971. He has travelled widely over the past 13 years, representing his government in numerous international meetings, conferences and seminars. I have much pleasure in introducing Mr. Tongailava to address the conference.

TONGAILAVA: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, honoured guests, ladies and gentlemen, I have expressed my gratitude and sentiments to our hosts this morning, but I will still thank the organisers for the honour of giving Tonga one of the Keynote Addresses in this conference, which I must confess I am at a loss as to know the reason, because I stand here and looking at most distinguished delegates I feel very small, because I understand some of you know more about marine parks than myself. However, I suppose the die is cast, and here goes. Before I speak to my paper, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that you refer to the little map which is attached to my paper of Tongatapu Island, that will help you more to understand as we go along. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I would like - I am glad to report to the Second South Pacific Conference on National Parks and Reserves that as a direct result of the first conference in Wellington, New Zealand, Tonga has been able to set aside terrestrial park

and especially marine parks, and have it legislated upon, and have it gazetted which is, as I mentioned a direct result of the first conference in New Zealand.

(Mr. Tongailava then presented his paper "Development and Management of Marine Parks in the Kingdom of Tonga", the text of which appears in Volume 1 of these Proceedings.)

Now, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I would like to refer to a quote by one of the great American statesmen, Abraham Lincoln, who said "my major task in life when I come upon rugged places, I want to smooth them over and over and when I come across thorn bushes, I want to pluck the thorns and plant roses". My interpretation here of these words, perhaps not verbatim - it just came to memory last night, Mr. Chairman in the context of this conference of National Parks and Reserves is that by smoothing over the rough places, we are repairing the human environment, by building friendship, co-operation and understanding within and between the nations of the world. And by planting roses, we are referring to National Parks and Reserves which we are saving for our posterity.

It is my sincere hope and desire that the roses we are now planting will perfume the air for generations to come and that man, land and sea will exist and thrive in harmony with each other in the future. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

YOUNG: Thank you Mr. Tongailava. I know delegates will agree with me that in the very colourful way and explicit way you've taken us into the reefs around Tonga, you have demonstrated how public participation is operated in Tonga. You have mentioned the administrative difficulties and you have reminded us of our international responsibilities. I think that following such an interesting address there would be a number of questions or comments that would come from delegates or observers. So I now open the meeting up to questions or comments based on that very fine address from Mr. Tongailava. Yes.

OGILVIE: Mr. Chairman, Peter Ogilvie from Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service. I would just like to make a comment - did anyone have any information on boundaries or comments on boundaries and I wonder if I could make a short comment on how to draw your boundary lines around a marine park.

There is no very quick answer to this, but there are different ways depending on the sort of marine area you're dealing with. First of all you can use navigational markers, if you are in shallow enough water to use navigation markers they are one of the best ways of doing it. But if you are dealing with deep water, well that's not quite so easy unless you use marker buoys. You can also use a technique of extending your marine park boundaries a little further than you really needed to for the resource you are trying to protect. In other words your boundary is beyond and covers an area that you're not too worried about, so that people can infringe a little bit if the boundary line isn't readily marked, because you have got that area almost like a buffer zone if you like and a buffer is another idea. You can have a distinct marine park boundary and around it an area you can have a buffer zone which may have limited exploitation, and then phasing in to the marine park where you are trying to keep all force of exploitation out. So the buffer zone itself is a technique and I have seen that applied in Kenya - Kenya Marine National Park...

Another way that is coming into vogue at the moment is using depths, now this may not be applicable in Tonga but certainly in Australian waters where most commercial fishing boats have sonar, boats can pick up what depth of water they're in and if you've got a shelf of water that is slowly rising up to a coral reef or a reef crest or you have a slow bulk from the crest itself, a boat can readily determine whether it's in 'X' metres of water and you can say that your boundary line follows the 30 metre line or something of that order.

The other way, if you've got a park that's associated with the shoreline, is to use markers on the shore itself. These could be lights or some other form of marker that someone can get a bearing on and know that they're certainly within the marine park boundary on two sides at least. Maybe the other side is a little more difficult. But no-one in the world has solved how to mark marine park boundaries. Those are a few of the different techniques that are worth looking at, but depend very much on the location of the marine park itself.

But I might sum up with a question, Mr. Tongailava can you give us some idea of what sort of education programme you're thinking of towards tourists to Tonga? You mentioned you were going to include something in the pamphlets you were giving out to them, are you intending to extend that to provide more information over a period of time and if so do you see any way of getting something, like money for instance, back from the tourist when they visit your marine park to help you feed back into the park management?

TONGAILAVA: Yes Peter, this very thing Mr. Hubbard is working on it now and perhaps, Tom, you could comment on this.

HUBBARD: Yes, thank you Sione. The answer to your question here - most of our visitor access to the marine parks is through one boat operator and we are hoping to have a ranger work with this one boat operator. Also with this one man who owns three boats, two of which are going to - he's planning to have two glass-bottomed boats, so we'd not only have snorkellers we'd have people that are unable to snorkel or to scuba dive to enjoy the marine parks also. We're hoping to charge a nominal fee of about half a dollar for visiting the parks and we estimate that this will cover some but not all of our budget.

YOUNG: Thank you. Are there further comments or questions?

MURRELL: Mr. Chairman, through you I'd like to ask a couple of questions if I may.

YOUNG: Yes.

MURRELL: The relationship between the fisheries officer and the national parks officers; do the fisheries officers have any jurisdiction over the marine parks?

TONGAILAVA: I'm afraid the - we have a little bit of the same situation in Tonga. The Act, the National Parks and Reserves Act comes directly under the control of the Minister of Lands. At the same time we are working very closely with the Fisheries Department and after this we'll be taking with us more experiences from other situations in this conference and they should be helpful indeed for us when we go back. But to answer your question, they have no jurisdiction at all except to help us in the maintenance of the marine parks. As a matter of fact the Fisheries Department have given us the means i.e. Tom and myself, a new boat for the maintenance of the park, just before we came. What size boat, Tom?

HUBBARD: It's an eighteen foot fibreglass boat.

YOUNG: Thank you. Satisfied, Mr. Murrell?

MURRELL: Thank you, Your Worship.

YOUNG: I think there's a question from Mr. Bowen.

BOWEN: Just a comment, please Sir.

YOUNG: Comment. Western Australia.

BOWEN: Bowen, Western Australia. My judgement is that we will have over the next decade a lot of learning to do in relation to marine parks and reserves insofar as traditionally, and the gentleman from Tasmania raised this question really, traditionally there has been a long history of commercial involvement in the marine sphere and certainly in Western Australia one moves from the terrestrial situation where it is; really, all animals are protected except those that are unprotected. One moves then, into the aquatic situation where in effect all animals are unprotected unless those that are protected by other means. That's in generally true and so one has had a commercial involvement in fishing and one has grown up from the 1800's and into the 1900's Fisheries Departments and in that sort of involvement with closed areas for breeding seasons and the whole array and one will find them probably, or those people, probably slightly wondering what this new concept of marine parks is going to do in the general administrative arrangement between those who have responsibilities for marine parks and those who have responsibility for managing fish populations and so, I just comment that I think in the next decade there will need to be a lot of co-operative discussion to ensure that what the community is endeavouring to do, is done in a meaningful way, taking into account the responsibilities of various instrumentalities.

YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Bowen. I'm sure that is right. Now - yes. Comments, yes, Mr. Johnstone.

JOHNSTONE: Mr. Chairman, Johnstone from New South Wales. I'd like to congratulate Tonga very sincerely on the progress that that country has made in establishing marine parks and particularly since the first South Pacific Conference in Wellington, New Zealand and I have the hope that the deliberations of that conference may have had some influence in the Tongan Government taking these steps.

I think that the delegates from the South Pacific countries outside of Australia could well be interested in the peculiar situation we have in Australia in the establishment of marine parks in this country.

We are singularly different in the administration of this country, the Government of this country, from other South Pacific countries inasmuch as Australia is a federation of states, each state having its own government, and so the Australian Government and the State Governments each have separate areas of responsibility.

Recently, in the High Court of Australia it was decided or it was ruled that the sovereign rights to the seas around Australia rested with the Australian Government, and as all the States of Australia border the ocean, the question arises which government is going to be responsible for the establishment of marine parks around the Australian coast. That question is currently being examined at the level of the Premiers' Conferences of Australia. The Premiers of all States meeting with the Prime Minister, a meeting which happens each year, and at the meeting last year, the Prime Minister referred to the Attorney-General, the question of how marine parks could be established around Australia, and the principles which would be adopted.

The conference of Attorneys-General of Australia referred that matter to the Council of Nature Conservation Ministers, and that Council comprises the ministers of all governments in Australia responsible for national parks and wildlife matters, and of course, the ministers from Australia who have been around this conference table have been involved in those discussions earlier this week at the meeting of the Council of Nature Conservation Ministers on Monday, and on Monday of this week those Ministers gave consideration to the principles of establishing marine national parks around Australia.

The Ministers have made recommendations to the Attorney-General, and the Attorneys-General will make recommendations to the Premiers' Conference in June of this year, and it is hoped that after that meeting a

decision will be made on the methods for establishing marine national parks around Australia.

It is expected that a decision will be made that a - with the coast line around Australia will be - sorry, a width of the sea around Australia will be transferred to the States, and at this stage that width is expected to be 3 miles. It is expected then that the territorial sea will be transferred to the States, and the States then will have power to establish marine national parks alongside their borders.

I think, Mr. Chairman, I hope that that explanation has been understood. I think it's an unusual situation, and I feel sure that the delegates from the South Pacific countries will be rather interested in how a federation works by that small example.

YOUNG: Thanks Mr. Johnstone. I'm sure that the administrative process required would probably dissuade these small island states from setting up their own federal system, but we do, as with a common objective, we do wish the States and the Commonwealth well in resolving this difficult issue. Right, now do we have some more questions or comments. Mr. Tangaroa from the Cook Islands.

TANGAROA: I just ask about this marine park you are setting up in the sea over there. What happen with the fish, do you allow the local people to use the fish or not just limit for tourists to have a look at it?

TONGAILAVA: Not at all, see the idea is to, oh, Minister the fishes are just like human beings, they have to have a home to breed and stay there undisturbed. This is the whole idea of marine parks, not only the fish but the whole marine ecosystem because human beings intrusion into the fish habitats are quite tremendous and this is the idea sir. Inside the park no one can fish there neither can anybody travel along the corals.

And it is rather - we haven't made legislation on this and nobody is allowed inside the park except on special occasions because the parks are for four or five purposes, including educational and tourism. And these are the very things - we'll try to keep an eye on this to protect the parks and don't allow human beings to interfere with the fish.

Outside the park when the fish, you know, becoming more naughty, they could be caught outside the parks and it's a fair game to all fishermen. Not inside. Thank you.

YOUNG: Ah, yes. Thank you Mr. Tongailava. Now Mr. Tioa from Western Samoa.

TIOA: By reading through your Kingdom report it is said here, fish need to be allowed to grow to maturity and reproduce and it is very true and I would like to put you back to the slides we had and Mr. Tom Hubbard just told us that there is an important plant for poisoning fish in your slides. Is that plant - will that plant still be important when you have your marine parks? Very soon or are you going to get rid of it. Because I hope the people are still using the poisoning plant for killing fish in your areas.

TONGAILAVA: Thank you. I'll let Tom answer you.

HUBBARD: I forgot to mention when I showed the masikona - it's not - it's illegal now to use the fish poisoning as well as it is illegal to use reef dynamiting. We occasionally hear reports of using it but it is not a common experience - I mean it's not used now. The fish poisoning or reef dynamiting to collect fish.

YOUNG: Right. A question, I think, from Dr. Pratt. Do you have a question?

PRATT: No. No thanks.

YOUNG: Just must have been stretching your arm, were you? Perhaps I can ask you a question, Mr. Tongailava. In the public participation of the proposal, the Minister quelled the fears of the fishermen by saying "Well, you want to preserve the breeding grounds and therefore they could anticipate larger catches of fish in the future". If that in fact does not happen, is the principle of marine reserves so well established that it doesn't rely on increases of fish to have the continued support of the fishermen?

TONGAILAVA: Mr. Chairman, one thing we have proved since we stopped people from fishing inside the lagoon in Nuku'alofa in 1974, we have noted that the grey mullet has increased in numbers. That's for one thing and other development. But perhaps delegates here think it is a bit strange that a minister of lands just talked to the fishermen and they seemed satisfied. Or perhaps but for one thing they didn't talk back to us but they understood the situation now. But perhaps they still can poach inside the reef, no-one knows.

YOUNG: Yes. Now, we have a question from French Polynesia. Mr. Tevane.

TEVANE: I would like to congratulate our friend on his most interesting and enlightening paper and as he said, certain folk, - but as I see things, certain folks in Polynesia who are here today know quite well that most people in those islands seek and find food containing proteins and this is a question which is most important. Now do we prohibit this type of food by creating marine parks? In Polynesia we are looking at this problem and we are beginning to understand it. Do we find satisfaction from fishing? It is quite true that little by little not only the fishing, but the collection of shells from all these reefs do not allow them time to reproduce. For instance the - the prickly one, the urchin, yes - and other shells do pose this question, and we cannot leave the people continue to do this or do we bring about regulations and suppress all actions in this regard.

We know that a lot of fish are mobile and - 70 and they are nomads. In these parks will the problem be that the fish will only be there, will they have sufficient time to reproduce, will these zones that will be classified by man prevent development in marine life and will limit the type of fish that lives there and other such elements?

What I see is this. Will these parks allow for a great reproduction of the species?

YOUNG: Mr. Tongailava.

TONGAILAVA: Thank you. As a matter of fact what we do, we just try to give the fish a home. At the same time we can't stop them going outside the park. They can reproduce inside the part or outside the park but Monsieur I'm afraid I can't stop them, it is not like a prison - it is not really a prison, they can please themselves whether they stay inside the park or go outside the park. Which I'm afraid Monsieur it is beyond me to tell you the characteristics of fish. But the best thing we can do is to give them an area, purposefully to breed in and stay there in their own environment without disturbance from human beings. Perhaps that could answer your question for reproduction but I am afraid I am not a marine biologist, perhaps Tom Hubbard could answer you that question.

YOUNG: I think that was a very good answer Mr. Tongailava but Mr. Hubbard.

HUBBARD: I can't improve on his answer.

YOUNG: You can't?

HUBBARD: No.

YOUNG: That's right. If you keep the fishermen out, you can't keep them away from the boundary. Yes Mr. Tevane.

TEVANE: We know that a certain variety of fish are sedentary. We know that in certain species, these fish will remain within the park and will reproduce. It seems to me that the operation that exists in Tonga is that the fish will be able to reproduce and also serve the population, that is in their food. The question that I want to pose is, do - has it been seen that these fish go out of the park and that the people are able to fish outside the park or do they stay within the park where the - they can also be caught for the food of the population.

YOUNG: Thank you. Mr. Tongailava.

TONGAILAVA: Yes, Monsieur, I think this was written in my paper, that once a fish goes outside a park for reproduction Monsieur, I think this is intended only for smaller fish but I don't think that sharks are - I don't really know Tom whether the sharks are breeding inside reefs or outside the reef. Outside the reef, not inside the reef. Yes but the idea sir is to - when they go out of the reef they are fair catch to any fisherman but it comes to, what you call a - something like, the babies are born within a home, then we start from there you see. When they come of age, you can't hold them at home. I think it is more or less like the fish themselves. you know you can't hold them inside.

YOUNG: Right. Thank you, Mr. Tongailava. A question from Doctor Dahl.

DAHL: S.P.C., I would like to add perhaps a short comment to what has been said in answer to Mr. Tevane's question. The series of marine reserves in Tonga has been selected in part, with the needs of different kinds of fish in mind, so that for instance, you have the protected lagoon which is an important breeding area for some of the more migratory of fish, those that are coming and going, and they have a safe place to go and breed and for the young to grow and then come out where they can be caught.

The reserves - some have been chosen because they're areas of considerable tourist impact and they may only protect the more sedentary species. Others such as the large reef area further away are quite discreet reef units in themselves, and should be large enough to protect not only the sedentary species but also some of those that move within the same reef system. So within the different reserves that have been created you will find different kinds of protection adapted to the needs of different fish populations and I think this is the kind of planning that needs to go into any system of reserves, that no one reserve can do everything, but by an appropriately selected system of reserves you can get protection for all the different major elements, or at least most of those that you wish to protect.

With the sedentary species, what we find on a reef is that where an adult is removed from the reef, either caught by a fisherman or in other way lost, the recruitment is by small baby fish coming in and filling the space that was left, so that as long as you have within the area a few places where those fish are reproducing there will always be juvenile fish available to repopulate any areas where the adults were taken, and I think there is a sort of a combination of strategies behind the Tongan reserves that should cover most of the requirements of the fish population, at least to some extent. Thank you.

YOUNG: Thank you Doctor Dahl. Time is moving on. Are there any more questions, I think we can take one more question. Well, we'll take two more questions. There's one from Mr. Yabaki from Fiji, then Mr. Tongailava and then you.

YABAKI: In Fiji we have certain rights for the local people from their traditional fishing rights over certain reefs, and this could extend a fair way..... excuse me. Mr. Chairman, in Fiji we have certain

rights for natives which is called the Traditional Fishing Rights to the people and this could extend the distance from the coast, from the land to the sea, could extend a fair way into the sea. I note that most of the reserves are maybe within this range and the question I would like to ask you is that are some of these reserves - do you have this system of traditional rights to the locals, and if so what sort of compensation if any, do you pay to the owners to - for them to give up this area or their rights of fishing on those grounds. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Yabaki.

TONGAILAVA: Mr. Chairman, if I attempt to answer Mr. Yabaki - it's just, Mr. Yabaki, Tonga is fortunate in this respect because we don't have - we don't kill people - that's not traditional fishing rights at all offshore in Tonga, and now we have made legislation upon quickly because we just happen to escape the situation which you'll find yourself in. I understand the Fiji traditional rights over the reefs for fishing, and I'm afraid I can't come up with any solution to your problem.

YOUNG: Thank you Mr. Tongailava. Now, I think the last question from Mr. Tangaroa from Cook Islands.

TANGAROA: Chairman, no question, I just want to make a comment because I'm interested in fishing, talk about fishing. I came from fish place. The Cook Islands from Rarotonga to one island called Penrhyn is the biggest lagoon in the whole of the Pacific. Is Penrhyn Island. Is a big lagoon now with three harbours going out and over there the government owned the lagoon. It is Crown, you know. Every sea side, I don't know how many feet above sea-level owned by the Crown. And the local government made a legislation that says for three months they open the lagoon for mother-of-pearl shell for commercial. And we dive, but the local government is in charge of the opening and the closing of this mother-of-pearl shell. But we found the longer you close the lagoon with this mother-of-pearl shell you don't have more shell. Once you take it out then they spawn again and grow. The same thing with clams. We'll call it the clam, in New Zealand they call it the 'paru'. We call it the 'paru' too. We got thousands of them. We can export some to Tonga if you want some, because we can't eat them. Too many of them. And because we can't sell them out and just the people use it, is full on the rocks. What we want, we want to take it up and find a way of selling it out so they grow more and they grow about that big and getting old and so this is something we were just talking about, the marine thing. And the fish, when they spawn too, when they come to lay their eggs, they come to the harbour, not inside the lagoon. There is a certain time of day that they go right inside the harbour, millions of them inside the harbour and they lay their eggs there. Inside there. So, you're probably talking about a small lagoon and I think there is only a small lagoon around Rarotonga and the people fish all over the places. I just wanted to make those comments, Chairman. Thank you.

YOUNG: Thank you Mr. Tangaroa. Perhaps on that note we should conclude this session but before doing so, it's obvious from the amount of questioning and comments made following this very very interesting address by Mr. Tongailava, that there has been a great deal of interest engendered in the contents of his paper and a great deal of interest in the progress that Tonga has made in the sphere of marine reserves. So I'll ask the delegates to join with me in thanking Mr. Tongailava for a very interesting paper. Just before the meeting does conclude I am to remind you - to remind the delegates that you should submit any recommendations you have to be presented to the conference to the Secretary of the Recommendations Committee. I'm also to remind delegates of the inspection of the new Wollemi national park, remembering that I think there are only thirteen seats available and indication should be made early to Mr. Fox by those who would wish to make that aerial inspection on the Saturday morning. I would also like to give notice that in the Canberra Times today it's reported that the Gudgenby Reserve has been opened so while we are constantly moving quite proper

votes of thanks to the Australian Government and particularly the New South Wales Government, for this conference, I'm sure the people of Australia can move a vote of thanks to this conference to the way in which it has enabled various states and the Australian Capital Territory to announce the opening of new reserves and parks. Now finally I have to remind you that tomorrow, Friday the 27th April at 9 a.m. the conference will resume. The Chairman will be Dr. Cornwall of South Australia and just before I conclude this session, would you advise Mr. Fox of any special arrangements for tonight for the social evening.

FOX: Thank you Mr. Chairman. A couple of things that I wanted to mention were that as shown in your handbook, there is this evening the Royal National Park Centenary Dinner at the Sebel Town House at Elizabeth Bay. Coaches will be available to take delegates from the Wentworth Hotel and their spouses to the Sebel Town House and the coaches will leave the hotel at 7 o'clock. Would you please therefore assemble in the hotel lobby at, say, ten to seven. The other thing that needs mentioning is that contrary to what is shown in the handbook, the coaches to return you to the Wentworth Hotel will leave the Sebel Town House at 11 p.m. not 12 midnight.

YOUNG: On that note, I'll declare this session of the conference adjourned and we'll resume again at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

ADJOURNED

SECOND SOUTH PACIFIC CONFERENCE

on

NATIONAL PARKS AND RESERVES

Held at

SYDNEY OPERA HOUSE, RECEPTION HALL

on

FRIDAY, 27TH APRIL, 1979

21

SECOND SOUTH PACIFIC CONFERENCE

on

NATIONAL PARKS AND RESERVES

CORNWALL: Delegates, could I have your attention please? The conference is now reconvened. I would like to begin by announcing to delegates and observers that they should submit topics for conference recommendation to the Secretary of the Recommendations Committee prior to 10.15 this morning. The Recommendations Committee will bring forward this afternoon a number of recommendations for consideration by the Conference. This is a major opportunity for us as the official collective voice for nature conservation in the South Pacific to publicly express views in an effort to advise and influence governments in the region to act with wisdom and foresight to preserve the natural heritage in this part of the world. So I would urge you to make sure that any recommendations which you have are with the Committee prior to 10.15.

This session is a panel session dealing with the problems of creating public awareness and I'm sure, gentlemen, that we're all too consciously aware of the fact that no matter how honourable or well founded are the intentions and actions of governments in implementing nature conservation programmes, unless we have the confidence of the people in our countries, our efforts could be totally in vain. Indeed at the 14th General Assembly of I.U.C.N. held in the Soviet Union last year, the need for the creation of greater public awareness about nature conservation was highlighted time and time again as one of the most pressing tasks of the Union.

The conference organisers have recognised this as a matter of vital importance in the South Pacific region by listing it as a special item for discussion. A panel discussion has been arranged, and we were fortunate to have on the panel to head our discussion this morning Dr. Arthur Dahl. Dr. Dahl will be the convenor representing the South Pacific Commission; also the Honourable Venr Young, Minister for Lands, New Zealand; Mr. Joe Brown from the United States National Parks Service; and Mr. Gorio, the Executive Director of the National Parks Board of Papua New Guinea.

At this stage I would invite Dr. Dahl to outline the manner in which he proposes to conduct the session.

DAHL: I think we could invite the members of the panel to come forward now. Each will give a short initial presentation of perhaps ten minutes on the particular aspects of his country's experience and then we would like to open this to more general discussion and the sharing of experience on what is an extremely important topic. So if the members of the panel could come forward I'll make a few brief introductory remarks.

I think it has been apparent to everyone in our discussions this week how important public awareness is to successful park and conservation programmes. This seems to be particularly true in areas in which land ownership is traditionally held where the problems of even public acquisition of land are very great and where in the island areas the land resources are extremely limited and the demands on those resources are often great and conflicting.

We of course have a fundamental problem in creating public awareness of the need for conservation and that is that for most people conservation is not as obvious a need for government to provide as for instance providing safe water or police protection or even such economic activities as forestry or transportation resources. For most people water or transportation are fundamental requirements; but when it comes to something like conservation, it's often a very vague area and it's

hard for them to see why governments should be working in this area.

Why should they be giving up perhaps certain development options or the possibility of using some areas of land for something they do not really understand? And yet we can see that at every step in our activities and conservation, support from the public is extremely important. In creating parks and reserves we have to deal with the owners of the area that needs protection, with those who live in the neighbourhood and who may suddenly find that there would be changing activities, or in the area where they are living.

For those people who may have some traditional, cultural or spiritual attachment to the area, that we want to set aside. For the economic interests who see these areas as essential to their future or as possibilities for making money or increasing the economic development of their area. There are also, sometimes, public groups on the side of conservation. The conservation groups and those interested in natural history who may be pushing for more conservation activities.

Another dimension of public awareness is in the using of parks and conservation areas. If people are not aware of the parks, they won't visit them. So, awareness becomes important to visiting the park areas. If people understand the need for parks, the purpose of parks, they are more apt to take care of the resources in those parks. And they will - if they have sufficient awareness, they will become to see the ways in which they can learn from parks and which the parks can become educational for them.

Public awareness is also important in the need to enforce the protection of those Reserve areas which are not set aside for the public to use, though they are set aside for the protection of particularly fragile resources. And also, very important in the protection of rare and endangered species, which may be subject to hunting or other effects from the public if they are not aware of the importance of leaving them alone.

We have seen many examples, some referred to here, of which the lack of sufficient public awareness has blocked the development of a park area. It has just not been possible to go ahead because the public would not support the idea. We also have heard examples on which the lack of sufficient public awareness has led to the degradation or destruction of a park area. In fact, there are a couple of horror stories in the Pacific Islands of parks that may have been created 20 or 30 years ago, and because the public was not aware, even of the existence of the park in some cases, gradually the area has been cleared for farms and agriculture, and today, little or nothing is left, and the park has essentially been forgotten.

But another aspect of public awareness that is very important in the light of one or two of the questions that has been raised here, is the fact that public awareness can greatly reduce the expenses of managing park and reserve areas. An aware public will observe the rules in the park; it will require fewer controls on their activities in terms of barriers and signs and so on. An aware public is less apt to leave its garbage in a park, which has then to be cleaned up.

In fact, if there is very strong awareness on the part of a local public for a reserve area, much of the enforcement of the conservation status of that area can be done by the local people themselves, thus reducing the staff requirements of a park for conservation service.

I think we will be hearing from our panel participants on some of the many ways in which we can help to create public awareness. These can include extension activities, officers who work in the rural areas, and areas where parks are proposed or created, educating the adults, the villagers and so on, in those areas to the importance of conservation. This can include formal school curriculum of material studied by the

children in the schools because the children can both have a very good influence on their parents now and also become the adults, the park user of future generations.

It can include activities through the mass media, through radio, through films, television where it exists, newspapers, publications and brochures.

Certain of the islands of the Pacific have worked to create public awareness by creating samples of different types of park and reserve areas, so the people in their country can see for the first time, what a national park is, and what it can mean to them.

Another dimension of awareness that is extremely important, is awareness among the leaders in our society, whether it be the political leaders, who often have to make the final decisions, or the community leaders in each community, or even the church leaders, and while we don't often talk about the role of the churches in a subject like conservation, I know of areas in the Pacific in which the people don't care about their resources, because they say "God will take care of that". That is no responsibility of theirs, that is for God to take care of, and this is where, in working with the churches and church groups, we may be able to create a new awareness that God may have produced the creation, but that man is responsible for ensuring its survival and for passing on that heritage to the future. So there are dimensions of public awareness that touch every aspect of our society.

We'll also be hearing about the role of formal government action, such as public hearings, in creating a better awareness and support among the public.

On our panel today, we have, I think, a very good balance of experience in different aspects of public awareness. The first of our panel members, the Honourable Venn Young, Minister of Lands for New Zealand, is a political leader, and it is of course, at the level of our political leaders, that everything comes to a focus, all the demands from the parks service, from the scientific groups, from the public, from the special interest groups, and economic interests - everything focuses on the political leader who must make the final decision, and I can't think of a better expert to talk about public awareness than such a leader. We also have Mr. Joe Brown, with extensive experience in working with what is perhaps the largest and most experienced national park system in the world, but he also has particular experience in bringing the concept of national parks to small island areas in the Caribbean, such as the Virgin Islands, in which the local population had had no previous experience of national parks, and in which most of the visitors to those parks are overseas tourists. And I think that those problems will be common to many of the Pacific islands as well. And we have Mr. Sylvanus Gorio, who is probably the world's most experienced person in the problems of creating public awareness in rural village areas and among traditional peoples, and I think in the brief comments that our panel will have time for this morning, we'll be able to cover some very essential aspects of this important subject, and if I could now ask the Honourable Venn Young to present the first of the short comments ?

YOUNG: Thank you Doctor, other members of the panel, delegates and observers. I want to deal, in the ten minutes I've got at my disposal, with the politics of conservation, the administration as I have experienced it as Minister of Lands, (which is essentially Minister of Conservation and Minister for the Environment, and Minister of Forests as well, in a country where we are adopting new forestry management policies, and the conflict there), then I want to conclude with some items on the experiences and practices of introducing young people to parks and to conservation.

The politics of conservation frankly, are these, that - to take our message to political levels and beyond that and receive it from the people at political levels, does mean that conservation has got to be

seen as a part of our way of life. I think we all belong to countries in which we expect and want growth and development, and we've got to be able to project to those with whom we work, the principles of conservation as being beneficial, and working along with those programmes of development and growth, whether it is the conservation of water, the conservation of soil, or the conservation of the other living things. That's a very important role that we have, as administrators responsible for conservation.

When we talk about public awareness, I think what we have to be sure of is that, when a park proposal or a management proposal for an existing park is discussed in public, it is properly understood. We can, as administrators, suffer sometimes from the eloquence of those who support our cause, because if there is a debate about whether or not there should be a new national park or an addition to a national park, I think in many cases we find that the eloquent are on our side, and the people who are affected and are not so eloquent, feel threatened by those who can argue their causes much more persuasively in public. Certainly, as Minister for the portfolios I've just outlined, I find myself at times in public, having to put forward all sides of an argument where an addition to a park is concerned. I find myself - perhaps more than some people to whom I'm responsible would like - having to put forward the point of view of those who are adversely affected. So that in public we can build up a fair picture, a balanced picture, on what additions there should be to a national park, or how the management of an area of land should be altered. Those are the politics of conservation as I seem them from where I sit.

We have the administrative practices in New Zealand of trying to involve the public in the management plans and the classification of reserves, in the selection and appointment of park board members, who are appointed by the minister, but for whom the public may make nominations. It has been a new - reasonably new - venture as far as national park boards are concerned, to have the boards or the national parks authority in New Zealand advertise for nomination to the nine positions, where members are appointed every 3 years. Previously, the public knew little of these appointments, and in fact, park boards tended to comprise members who sat on for many years until they retired, then the boards themselves would look around for a suitable new appointment.

Now we've opened up the nomination of park boards to the public and it has been quite amazing the amount of interest that there is in the nomination of members to park boards, and people who are prepared to offer their services to park boards - far more, far more, than we ever anticipated. And so that in itself helps create a public awareness in the sort of responsibilities there are in the national park administration with parks and with reserves. We have, as I mentioned yesterday, involved the public, which of course must imply public awareness in the management plans of those reserves. So administratively, that is what we are trying to do, and we're getting quite satisfactory results in most areas.

Now finally, in a practical sense away from the administration and the politics, how can we make the public more aware of what is in the parks, what they are for, and how they should be preserved? We have been following a policy that aims at involving young people through the educative or education process. There has been quite a move in New Zealand towards outdoor recreational camps, residential camps where a greater and greater proportion of our young people are now going away from their home for a period of 4 or 5 days, staying at an outdoor recreation centre, being introduced to experiences they wouldn't have otherwise had, living in the mountains, in the forests, by the lakes.

That involves, of course, not only these children, and I'm quite sure will affect and influence in a very satisfactory way their attitude to parks in the future, but it also involves their parents. It involves their teachers, the parents, the children, and by doing that, then I believe we are quite effectively introducing people to the parks and reserves who would not otherwise either have the opportunity or take opportunities that are there.

Mr. Chairman, I've spoken from a point of view of my experience as a Minister of Lands and the manner in which we in New Zealand have tried to involve the public, more aimed, of course, at getting a greater public awareness. But then I get back to my introductory remarks. Finally, the success or failure of what we are trying to do will be measured by how we can persuade those with whom we live, that the principles of conservation are ones we live by, not ones with which we compete.

DAHL: Thank you very much Honourable Minister. I think we'll hear next from Mr. Joe Brown, American National Parks Service.

BROWN: Dr. Dahl, members of the panel and delegates: I, of course, concur with the Honourable Mr. Young. What I'm about to give you this morning is more or less a case study. I would like to preface it by saying that today we are approaching our whole park development and acquisition concept in quite a different way than we did twenty three years ago in the Virgin Islands. But I want you to know what we have done in the past and what we feel, or what I feel, should be done to improve our public relations. Then, I think when we get to questions-and-answers, we can go into depth.

Yesterday I told you that I was here to share our successes and failures with you and I hope this morning I can do just that. My subject was "creating public awareness" of the value of a national park in a specific area. To bring this out I'm going to speak to you this morning on the Virgin Islands National Park, located on the island of St. John which is one of three U.S. Virgin Islands. The other two are St. Croix and St. Thomas, located in the Caribbean Sea about seventy miles east of Puerto Rico. This particular Park was authorised in 1956. That's twenty three years ago - keep this figure in mind.

The Park covers about three fourths of the island. It covers approximately twelve thousand acres. We do not own all these acres. In our system, once the Congress of the United States passes a Bill and the President of the United States signs it and it becomes law, we then proceed to establish the park and acquire the lands, or to accept donations. So the lands that we are referring to here as I go on, were either privately owned or lands which were eventually donated to us.

This island includes quiet coves, blue-green waters and white sandy beaches ringed by lush green hills; that is, when it rains down there, they're lush and green. Sometimes many months pass without any rain. Also, here are located early Caribbean relics and the remains of the Danish colonial sugar plantations. The island is about five miles wide and seven miles long. The permanent population is about twenty five hundred people, of which most are native St. Johnians.

Laurence Rockefeller, one American who has been very interested in the conservation movement, and the Jackson Hole Preserve Corporation, which is a non-profit corporation, began acquiring land in the Virgin Islands back at this time. Here's where part of our problem started. It was referred to by Mr. Young when he discussed how you start a park. When they were assembling the land they did not tell the people they were assembling it to develop a National Park. Some had the idea it was going to be a big fish camp, some had the idea it was going to be another Caneel Bay which is a resort there, and various things like that. And then it was made public that it was being assembled with the idea of donating it to the federal government for the creation of a National Park. In order, of course, to donate it for that purpose, a law had to be passed. There were public hearings, but I don't think at that time - twenty three years ago - that any great effort was made to explain in the public meetings exactly what a National Park was and what effect it might have on the area. And going through this process, starting a Park in this manner, left the feeling there, or set up an atmosphere of mistrust as far as the people on the island were concerned.

Now following that, we immediately did the normal thing we were doing in those days. We assembled a cadre of individuals in the States, sent them to the Islands and began developing a National Park, which brought in the usual things: visitor centre, parking lot, trails, park roads, marine capabilities, and this sort of development - all foreign to the people at that time.

Now after six years - after legislation - the development programme that was going on was designed 100 percent for the national visitor, that is, people coming from outside the island. Within six years, visitation increased from almost nothing to 200,000 people. When we arrived, as far as I know, there were no vehicles on the Island. We brought in the first jeep. So St. John went, in six years, from a few visitors to 200,000 visitors, and from probably 50 donkeys, which were used for transportation, to one taxi, then to 200 taxis.

Things were beginning to prosper. People wanted to get on the bandwagon. New ferry boats and sight-seeing boats were put into operation. The taxis, which were little vehicles at first, today are huge vehicles. I wonder sometimes how they make it around the curves, they are so large. And prosperity was there and everybody was happy, and the main interest at that time was money. They didn't see anything else except that all that was happening was bringing in money, and the Park, as far as they were concerned, was not doing this. They didn't realise that the Park was the thing that was actually attracting the people. Of course, then other headaches came along with this. There was an increase in solid waste. The problem was: how do we dispose of it? We started experiencing a lack of potable water, a lack of electricity, pollution in various forms, then traffic problems that are pretty difficult to imagine on a tiny little island.

Today, this small island is still being developed at a rate that far exceeds the island's capability to provide potable water, electricity, sewerage, schools, police, etc.

Today the Park is being considered by many of the people - I won't say many - by some of the people on the island, as being in the way of progress, rather than the goose that has laid the golden egg. I feel this sort of attitude developed because we actually failed to make the people aware of the values of the Park in their area. I'm painting a pretty poor picture. It's not as bad as it sounds. The relations with the island people are improving. We have made progress over the last twenty three years. People are becoming aware of some of the values in protecting their natural resources through various means, and one example of this is the price of land, which has skyrocketed - double, tripled. It's almost beyond the reach of most people to acquire, yet it is continuing to sell. And one of the main reasons that it is selling is that the usable beaches and the usable natural areas are under the protection of the National Park Service. So if you buy a piece of property, you are assured that you will have a place to swim. You're assured of a place where you can enjoy the out-of-doors without worrying about it disappearing in the future.

We are now hiring, and have a staff that is almost entirely local. This is important because they're making a living from the Park Service. They're becoming familiar with our literature, our Stateside people and the national visitor, who in almost every case talks about how wonderful it is that "you have a national park". I think our visitors actually do more to sell to the local people the value of the Park than we do ourselves.

We have established a very strong environmental education programme aimed at the young people - and it's a very successful programme. It is almost entirely run by local people. We lean heavily on living history demonstrations, weaving, native cookery, pottery, and that sort of thing. We have published posters and brochures to make not only the national visitor aware of what's there, but also to make local people aware. (Doctor Dahl, if you would, please pass these brochures around.

They are on the Virgin Islands and other seashore areas that I'm responsible for. If you see anything you want, give me your card or mailing address and I'd be happy to send you one.)

A third thing that has been done to bring awareness (again, some of these things you look into) is the National Geographic magazine. There is a complete series on the Virgin Islands featuring some of our native interpreters. They're seeing their pictures in this famous magazine and receiving fan mail, so to speak. This helps make them aware that maybe there is something to this National Park after all.

Yet, with all of this, there are still those who want the Park to stop buying inholdings. If you recall, I told you that we do not own all of the 12,000 acres. There are privately owned tracts inside the official boundaries that we acquire on a willing seller basis. The legislation for this Park did not provide for our acquiring land by eminent domain. So we can only acquire when an individual is willing to sell.

But some of the people on the island, and this is current - as current as two weeks ago, are interested in trying to see if they can find ways and means to keep us from completing the acquisition of the Park. They believe that the parkland should be open to development such as condominiums and recreational facilities.

They say that this will create jobs for our young people who are coming along. Most of us who have been involved in this business over the years, know that there is a surge of work in producing the structure, and then after development is completed, it usually tails off, or the owners import people, and you're still back to almost the same employment situation that you had before.

But this is what they say. You are in the way of progress. You're keeping job opportunities away from our young people.

Now if I could turn the clock back twenty three years, I would like to do this, and this is more Joe Brown telling you what he would like to do, because I was Superintendent in this Park for almost three years. I came in at a time when you had to be careful where you went, and what you did, because you were not really welcome then. And I can honestly say I'm welcome today when I go back. But if I could turn the clock back twenty three years, I would first spend a long time searching for the employees to make up the cadre to go in to establish the park. I would look to see that they were, or had the capability for being, very sensitive to the island's values, and the way of life of the people. I think this is important. It was one of the areas we failed in because we didn't understand the people. And our progress to date has been slower than it should have been because of that. So I'd go out of my way, and I would spend a lot of time selecting personnel. I wouldn't rush in to picking anybody.

Secondly, I would spend my time trying to develop a regional plan for the whole island so we could look ahead to see what the impacts might be on the island after the Park came into being.

Today we are required under the National Environmental Policy Act to explore all the alternatives and impacts. We no longer just look at the acreage inside the Park. We look at the entire region, and even go beyond a region in some cases, to see what the impacts are on your area and the local area. So, today I would develop some kind of a regional plan to take care of the impacts like these creating problems today.

Then I would start a training programme for all - that would be the people coming in from the States - (we refer to them down there as 'continentals'), and those island residents who are hired. And the training programme would not be just in the skills, but a training programme in the values that we are trying to teach in conservation and resources management.

Then the third thing I would do would be to locate housing for our employees in the community itself, or better still, I would not build houses, but have the incoming employees build or move into the community. We did not do that the first time. We built a little settlement in this Park - it more or less was an island to the side. Until we started dispersing our people throughout the island, we did not have the close relationship with the people that we have today. So if you have to provide housing, try to provide it in the communities rather than setting up your own housing area. There is just something about people - they do not mix when you do it that way.

Then I would - if I were doing it over again - encourage the continentals to join the local churches, schools, register to vote, and do all the other things that I feel an employee ought to do when they're residents of an area. This shows interest on your part (or their part) for the community, and it also helps to do away with that atmosphere of mistrust. We do this now. I was a registered voter in the Virgin Islands. My sons were registered in the military - one went to Vietnam from there.

The other thing I would do if I were to do it over again, would be to work very closely with the local officials. We worked with them, but not as closely as we should have. We had the feeling we knew best, and of course, looking back now, there was a lot they could offer as well.

And then I would try to establish a local advisory board. At the present time, legally, we cannot do that, but there is nothing stopping you from getting an organisation of some sort established, to assist you in the development and management of the Park. And this, of course, is public involvement. I think it would have been very helpful if we had had a six or seven-member local advisory board at the time we were starting out.

Again, I would start the environmental education programme about the day I arrived, because through that programme you are reaching children, and through children I think, is the easy and best way to eventually get the message of conservation across. Now you can start from the adult and come down, but my preference is to start with the young and go up. Children like to come home, tell their parents what they did that day, and that seems to bring it on.

The seventh one you will probably be surprised at. I don't know whether you have this problem in the South Pacific, but I would begin immediately teaching people how to swim. We went on this island with the assumption that since they were surrounded by water, everybody could swim. Believe it or not, when we started to look to hire lifeguards for our public beaches they weren't there. They used the sea to bathe in, they used it for fishing, they sailed on it, did all kinds of things, but only a handful could actually swim. We started swimming lessons - using one of the local people who could swim - teaching the children. I suspect today there is not a child on the island of St. John old enough to learn how to swim who can't swim. But twenty three years ago that wasn't true. Can all of your island residents swim? It might fool you. Check into it and see. But what the value of it was - when they learned to swim then they could learn to snorkel. And when they learned to snorkel they could see what was in the sea around them. So through the swimming lessons we got to the children and through the children, again, we were able to start making some of the adults aware of the value of the park.

And then - I would learn more about participating in local customs. In that part of the world they have a carnival once a year. It originated during slave periods after the harvest of sugar cane was over. They were allowed to have a week off to do whatever they wanted. They're still doing it today - there's a lot of song, drink and fun and floats.

Today, we prepare a float and are part of the planning of the carnival. Then I would gradually start turning the management over to the local qualified park employees who have been trained so that they can eventually carry on. What better way to communicate with local people than to have a local speaking for you?

And then lastly - and again it's a planning process - I would try to encourage local zoning. It's zoning that is about as misunderstood as, I guess, as the word national parks. But local zoning not only protects local interests, but also park interests. And, in conclusion, tourism is really the main source of income for this island. Now, to destroy the waters, the vegetation, pollute the airs and foul up the beautiful views would indeed in my opinion, be the thing that would kill the goose that lays the golden eggs. Thank you

DAHL: Thank you very much, Mr. Brown. And now I think we'll have some very interesting comments from Sylvanus Gorio of Papua New Guinea.

GORIO: Mr. Chairman, Convenor and members of the panel, delegates, ladies and gentlemen. Being a South Pacific Islander, it gives me a pleasure to stand here, as commonsense will tell you that we are trying to learn from the most developed countries about this whole concept of conservation. And yet we've been practising it all our lifetime in much smaller scale. I don't know, this might apply to some of the other islands in the South Pacific, or not, but to P.N.G., yes. Papua New Guinea is too long, and I will be saying P.N.G. Before I start we got a deputy Prime Minister in last house in his opening address to the International Training Course. Joint International Training Course with the Australian and New Zealand Government in administration of Parks and Reserves. It's a three months' course of the administrators and policy makers. When he was giving a speech and he said 'Before I will proceed I will remind the delegates here that you are in a country known as Papua New Guinea and God made this country on Saturday night. And that means all the remnants and rubbish of all sorts were dumped here. Please bear that as we go through the paper.' he says. So I would like to bring your attention to this point that whatever Mr. Brown and Minister Young were saying, you can well imagine that we have them up there, in the way of pros and cons. The general outline given by Dr. Dahl, in his opening speech, that we have various ways and means of tackling all of this awareness about the conservation on the whole. But we in South Pacific, especially in P.N.G., we have different terms of getting areas for conservation purposes. We give different names because of the type of understanding that our people have. We don't have visitors' information centres, we have welcome houses. English being our second language, people do understand welcome, and a house where you go in and rest and you're welcome to see what you would like to see inside. And this is some of the things that I would press upon during my little talk. We have a new media, form of school curriculum right down from the kindergarten and the primary up to secondary, even tertiary and university level. Extension work by the officers, by person to person contact, talking, sitting round with village community leaders, talking to them about the national parks concept and bearing in mind that English being our second language, when you say national parks, historic sites, nature reserves, marine parks - whatever it is, they are known as national parks. So we are glad to have this term 'national park' And it's getting through to the people's heads.

We have traditional tribal areas where certain parts are bush, it may be rain forest, lowland or high mountain forest where certain tribes are allowed to enter to get special medicines, like they have them in India or certain sort of magic for love, for dream or whatever it is, or to cure people. They call them national parks. They recommend them to us to try and get the areas reserved. They get the areas reserved, what you would term in Australian context as nature reserves or, you know, a patch of bush, state forestry reserves or whatever you call them. But this type of approach is just because the Prime Minister in P.N.G. made it clear by pursuing the National goal number 4 which the Minister stressed in his opening address and in the situation report I made mention of it. And because of that, the demand for such reserve or anything to do with environment must originate from a community in a village level, a group in a provincial area before any national officer will go through and do the investigation which also investigates into anything whatever in view of getting an area reserved for parks or for conservation purposes.

We have problems in - if we are trying to pursue the normal channel of Government form of approach, e.g. we have a very interesting park just outside of Port Moresby City. It is a Crown Land, determined, in other words, Government bought that land area, and when I say Government i.e., in good old colonial days, where if a patrol officer goes to representing the Government in trying to negotiate with land officer or surveyor, they discuss, but because of the communication problem, language barrier, they tend to get interpreters to interpret to the local people. So the Government officer talks to the interpreter, and in turn the interpreter tells the village people of the story. If it so happened that the interpreter is being unhappy with any tribe or some family then I bet you can well imagine what is the next step; he is not going to interpret exactly what the Government is saying but in turn he will tell the Government, no problems mate, you carry on, you can have this area for your purpose. And that is exactly what had happened in the case of Varirata National Park.

It is just on the Astrolabe face of Port Moresby Range. This area, since we got development going - since 1970 - there were about three approaches made with the view of slicing the area. People realised that Government dealt it unfairly in the past, and because of that situation they wanted sawmillers to go in there, and they made various approaches to private sectors or developers to go in and exploit the area, in means of getting timber out, putting cattle grazing business in and whatever it is, and we always fight a losing battle. Why? because the area negotiated through the normal Government channels where you do the normal thing in the Government in Papua New Guinea.

So, because of that, we decided to try and adopt different means of approaches in various provinces. We have 21 provinces in all Papua New Guinea, and we are trying to help 21 provincial Government areas. Before the provincial Government get their planners and designers in line, or provincial secretaries or administrators, where, (inaudible), one called planner, we go through and remind/discuss with this planner. We already went to some of the areas where they are just talking about getting provincial Government and reminded them of this, and this area in your province we are interested in, and when it comes to development of that area, would you kindly ask us to be involved. And at the same time, in each province we have a provincial body looking after national parks, made up of agricultural officer in the province, forester, lands officer, one councillor, city councillor or town councillor, and one prominent village figure. And in this way we tend to get the message across to our people. This is not a static approach for all the provinces at all. We approach them in whatever manner we think suitable. By sitting around with village people, certain tribes are very touchy, like Negroes in U.S.A., we have "Lolais" and like those who are very quiet and say 'yes' only; we have that type too. So we approach them in whatever is convenient for their understanding. Now, when I say we approach them, we don't go once and once only. We go for even ten times, in trying to get the negotiation done. And this, you can well imagine, is time-consuming, and the pace of development is much, much slower than in most developed countries as it's a 'pacific' way. But that's the way we get things done. If we get an area, then it's going to last for 99 years or so. So we thought from the word 'go' if we get this concept quite clear in their little heads, then there won't be any hindrance during the developmental process.

We have over 700 different dialects and languages, and you can well imagine that each tribe has its own manner of approach to the Government, and because of the leaders or the managers in a Government, their form of approach and the type of approach to the village people created certain suspicion in the minds of traditional leaders and therefore, when they get up to the parliament level it's pretty hard to get an Act passed, e.g., Conservation Areas Act or whatever it is - Environmental Planning Act - to get it passed. They thrash it and tear it into bits and make sure that we are talking sense. And this means a lot of education to the politicians. When you talk about education in a country like Australia and New Zealand, it's good, but not in South Pacific countries. I'm pretty sure we have different dialects and it's pretty hard for the members to grasp exactly what the Act states. Now, in turn,

my Service turned around in the name of Minister for Environment and Conservation and got it organised with the Cabinet Secretariat that we would like every other Minister at one time or another, going overseas anywhere at all, to visit on their way through, a sample of a park, and if not, on their way back to visit a park. This was organised through Foreign Affairs, and the Minister for Foreign Affairs is also a Deputy Prime Minister and well agreed with the idea, so the politician's level is being looked after on the concept of conservation, or the need for it, and in the Minister's opening speech he said "Why worry about national parks when the whole P.N.G. Island is your national park", but if you tried to go through it I bet you'd be trespassing over a native land. They will tell you to "Get out of here or else we're going to kill you".

In Papua New Guinea, each village has got its own area of fishing rights, and whatever it is, that area is not for one family only. Everybody in that particular home village is allowed to go fishing, to get coral and whatever marine life, and by doing that they know each area or zone in that shoreline, and when certain fish is getting scarce, then it is just a matter of leaders coming together and saying "Okay, let's fish over there for two years and leave this one alone". And they do it consciously or unconsciously, and whoever disobeys that ruling then, I'm afraid, is cast out from the community and brings a lot of shame to the young educated ones and the elders or brothers and sisters, grandparents back in the village level, and this is the same approach or same thinking that applies in wildlife management areas. When village people make their own rulings and it comes to policing them, Government don't put policemen in there or councillors in there, they nominate their own man to become a sort of law and order man and when he catches someone using shotgun or rifle, then it's a big shame or disgrace to a family who has that type of attitude, and I'm pretty sure those of you who have been in Papua New Guinea can support me here, that they will be cast out completely, so they may go to a certain city or town in Papua New Guinea. To live in town and not to go back to the village because they are not the ideal people to live in rural areas. When it comes to birds of paradise reserves, they're protected legally under the Parliament Act, and so are dugong, turtle and other fauna; but they move around anywhere at all from village to village, and if someone happens to see these fauna - protected ones - then they know that although they pass through their own land they're not going to harm them because each government field officer from forestry to agriculture to local government is empowered to carry out this task - and that does not mean that National Park officers only will police that Act, but every field officer in all government sectors.

Finally, I think we are glad that, because we are learning from the mistakes made by countries like United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand in the field of conservation, we are trying to steer the way we think it will benefit us greatly in South Pacific Islands. Developmental process is very slow, but what we're doing at the moment is getting areas - potential areas - marked out and under our care so we will prevent the other exploiters from getting the areas. Public awareness in interpretive education is one of the things that we emphasise, and in fact, is the most important thing in Papua New Guinea government circles.

I think I should stop there, Mr. Chairman, and I'm pretty sure that no one will bother to turn the clock back to - what, ten, twenty years back. We're not like prawns that we go backwards. In other words what I'm saying is that we all lead in the same direction. Thank you.

DAHL: Thank you very much, Sylvanus. It's unfortunate that our time is so short; it will not be possible to go into some of the other kinds of public awareness activities, particularly in the smaller Pacific Islands that we haven't been able to represent on the panel, because there has been an interesting diversity of conservation campaigns over the last few years in areas such as the Cook Islands where it became a campaign lodged by the traditional leaders to return to their traditional conservation practices, and in one case, a traditional council of elders met for the first time in a hundred years to take part in a conservation campaign; or the situation in New Caledonia where the two week conservation campaign is organised

entirely by a private conservation association. It's not a government activity at all, but organised by a private association that holds big exhibitions and tree plantings and collections of the giant African snail and other activities to alert the public to the need for conservation. (in Western Samoa where it has been a directly government activity They had a recent three week campaign of (concluding with an arbour day) the declaration of a new botanical garden by the Head of the State, and many activities in the schools and in the village areas

But I think at this point it's probably more worthwhile to open up what few minutes we may have remaining since we started a little bit late, to some general discussion on this very important issue. If there are any questions from members of the panel to the conference ...

PRATT: Pratt from Capital Territory, if you'd like me to lead. I was struck by the diversity of comments of the four speakers I presume they were chosen with that in mind, but I was impressed by their coverage of this immense topic. Mr Brown was talking about build-up of people on an island - a build-up in population out of all proportion to the sorts of things that we would normally expect in some of these South Pacific countries and even in Australia. Mr. Young was talking about the fact that they've been able to home in on specific aspects of public awareness in New Zealand with young people. Sylvanus, I think, gets down to more of the core of the problem for many people attending this conference. He's talking about a situation which has a very long history to it. I think I'm correct Sylvanus, in that when you say that your people say, "Get out of here or I kill you" - they mean it! Now, in Australia that might be an idle threat; in Papua New Guinea I take it that these fellows really mean what they say, and the strength of that reaction must give you immense problems in Papua New Guinea. In Australia we don't have anywhere near that complexity of direct human emotion. I think what we have, though, is an equally powerful force of the economic value of the land. You, I think, are facing a very big moral and ethical problem, and I presume some other countries are also facing that. In Australia we still face a very strong barrier of finance. People know that there is much more money to be made out of - or they feel that there is money to be made out of, forms of development other than national parks, and I see that still as our biggest barrier in Australia. We are a very long way from the problems that some other countries have.

DAHL: Thank you very much. Other questions or comments? Tonga?

TONGAILAVA: Thank you, Doctor. I was very interested when Sylvanus commented on the way they start from the crossroad level in trying to acquire land for parks. It's very interesting, Doctor Dahl, because it seems to me that in other situations in the Pacific, it's from top to bottom instead of from bottom upwards. I'll be very interested for Sylvanus to try to elaborate on this acquisition of land for parks, because he suddenly said he started from crossroad level to community life and so on. That's a very interesting aspect - because in our situation in Tonga it was from top to bottom.

DAHL: I think the situation in each country is different in the sense that in Tonga all land belongs ultimately to the Crown, even though there are tax allotments and responsibilities over the land in law; the perspective is very different from a situation like Papua New Guinea that I'm sure Sylvanus can explain more about, in which the land is - you know, ultimately belongs to, the people.

TONGAILAVA: No, not really, Doctor Dahl; one thing - may I correct you? - is that in Tonga not all the land belongs to the Crown. It is the approach which I do really mean here which is the most suitable - I think this is a very relevant point for discussion that this - I think this is the idea of the whole national park to get across the message of sense of responsibility to the public to be aware - a sense of awareness and responsibility, but at the same time it so happened in our situation that that particular area did belong to the government, which is in that respect, with the Crown. I think it is the same thing as here in Australia it's - that legacy of Crown land, the terminology of Crown land in Tonga,

it doesn't really mean it belongs to the King, it's a governmental area isn't it? Yes. But I'll be very interested to learn how it is done. Is it very hard to get across the message to the people?

GORIO: It's very hard. The government attempted it when in the last house of assembly and only sort of. The Prime Minister was well aware of the problem of killing each other, tribal fighting, and when it comes to finding out the cause of it - it's because of the land. People - some other group or one or two, would agree because they want compensation out of it and the others don't, so there's this land thing. The Prime Minister decided that rather than working from the top downwards, from the government downwards, it's from village level up to the Government. So, - if and when any department that deals with the rural development will submit a cabinet submission, with the attachment of the originator's signature plus the request and which tribe requested it. Is it true? - or has some other office or someone in headquarters created the whole thing to suite their own ends; the criteria, solve the problem in this way. They agree with it; they don't get a full amount of money. Government look after the savings for them so rental goes in there to help the village development and they sign for and they can withdraw it, but they don't get a big lump sum. The other sons and daughters in schools, they don't have any benefit at all, so in this case they will benefit everyone. But if and when government thinks of an outright purchase because of the situation then they will see that they're negotiated properly. But in this case they don't; they come up with agreement between both parties, government, and National Parks Office and the village people for about a term of 30 to 40 years to try and do a national park development, and we work very closely with them. They benefit; if any traditional dancing is performed inside a park where tourists go through, then about 50% of the gate takings go to them. We don't care how they spend it, but we give them the other half if used for improvement of the facilities. In some other parks, we do not charge entry fees to go into a park where village people get involved - they've got a right to go through there. But if they had to do a garden, then this is where zoning is very important - Minister Young mentioned something about zoning in New Zealand.

Many a time the 99 year lease system, that Minister's keynote address stated it, where people are against the idea as nobody in P.N.G. lives to 99 years and they wanted a more reasonable period of say 30-50 years for national parks development. That means we work very closely with the village people; we make them become trustees of the particular park, and when it comes to development, one sits in a panel, and if he's talking about something which we know will bear an adverse effect on the park development we tell him no; we get one of the pictures from a developed country like Australia, New Zealand or United States, and show it to him, and this satisfies his little mind, and answers him. Government, many a time, ignores a lot of the requests and complaints from the village people and we are trying to go through a barrier, so we are taking this form of approach as a remedial measure.

When it comes to government land or Crown land, then there is no difficulty as government has got its laid down systems. But when it comes to the traditional customary land, then that's the form of approach we pursue. But, for Bird of Paradise and other birds, some people/tribes live on those as form of protection, and they tend to say that they would preserve this zone and then do hunting traditionally over the other areas of the park land.

But some of them appreciated the fact that they haven't seen Birds of Paradise nearly or wallabies, and now they tend to see them in national parks; even they come into their home village areas.

DAHL: Thank you very much. Are there other questions or comments for member of the panel? You have just one or two minutes left. Yes ... French Polynesia.

111

TERRASSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have spoken a lot about the protection of parks by the public. But I think that this type of education can cause some inconvenience. And the main thing, I think, is to educate the people on the general problems of parks - on the conservation of nature. When the public is educated too quickly on parks, there can be created in the public mind, two kinds of areas in the country; on the one hand, the parks in which nature must be preserved, and then the remainder of the land in which anything can be done. This can be quite dangerous in that parks can be utilised contrary to what the aim was.

DAHL: The focus of the park becomes an excuse for not doing any nature protection anywhere else.

TERRASSON: That's right, yes. Relating to the South Pacific, we have been lucky in that the natives of the land live closer to nature, but this does not say that the whole of this area has been protected, because there have been fires, but people have kept the awareness of what protection actually means, and the next steps we have to take are simply to get them altogether, to make them understand the implementation of the laws and the need for conservation.

DAHL: Thank you very much. I think this is an extremely important point that, because the island peoples are much closer to nature, and observe what is going on, it is much easier to lead them to see the importance of taking action to protect nature from the effects they are now observing around them. Thank you very much. I'm afraid that our time is up. We appreciate your attention and your participation. I thank all of the members of the panel for sharing some most interesting observations this morning. Thank you very much.

CORNWALL: I would point out to delegates that we would like to re-assemble again at ten minutes to eleven. We are being joined at morning tea by Sir Peter Scott, and he will address us over lunch. We are very keen to finish the next session by 12.15, so that we will have a little extra time over lunch for Sir Peter Scott's address. Please co-operate and reassemble as close as possible to ten to eleven.

ADJOURNMENT

CORNWALL: Delegates, I wonder if you could resume your seats please so that we can press on with the business of the conference.

Before I open this session formally, I would like to extend a very warm welcome to Sir Peter Scott who is with us on my right. We will have more to say about Sir Peter, and we will hear from him during the luncheon, but in the meantime we are privileged to have the opportunity of listening to a world authority on nature conservation - a person who has for many years devoted his life working in the international scene, telling peoples and governments throughout the world about the urgent need to stop and think of the consequences of actions which affect our natural environment.

In this section Dr. Dasman will attempt to draw together some of the ideas which have emerged during this conference supplemented by his own thoughts under the title 'Man In The South Pacific - The Future'. Dr. Ray Dasman is the official representative at this conference of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources. We are indebted to the Union and its Director-General, David Munro, not only for supporting this conference and thus acknowledging its importance in international nature conservation terms, but also for making it possible for such a distinguished figure to attend as its representative. Dr. Dasman is currently teaching at the University of California at Santa Cruz. His field is environmental conservation, and indeed his book bearing that title is now a classic. He was for quite a few years I.U.C.N.'s senior ecologist and has long been interested in the particular problems of the inter-action of man and nature in the Pacific islands. It may be that his interest in this part of the world can be in part

attributed to the fact that his wife is an Australian.

He attended the first South Pacific Conference on National Parks and Reserves in Wellington in 1974 where he presented a memorable paper on the problems confronting the Pacific island peoples arising from economic and technological pressures of the modern world.

Delegates, it gives me great pleasure to invite Dr. Dasman to address the conference.

DASMAN: Mr. Chairman, Honourable Ministers, and delegates. It's an honour and a privilege to be asked to speak to you today on this second meeting of the South Pacific Conference on National Parks and Reserves. I know that I can speak on behalf of the entire International Union for Conservation of Nature extending their greetings to you and in particular those of the Director-General, Dr. David Munro, who is unfortunately not able to be with us here. I know that we all feel that this conference will lead towards a much brighter future for those nations that lie within or on the shores of the Pacific and for the natural world from which those nations have obtained their basis for existence.

I also wish to express my personal thanks to our hosts, the government and people of New South Wales who have been so kind and gracious to us on the occasion of this second conference. I did have the privilege of speaking to many of you at the first conference in Wellington four years ago. Today however, my responsibilities seem more overwhelming for I've been asked to summarise your deliberations and then go on to discuss the future of man in the South Pacific. It seems to me that the conference has just barely started and it's premature to summarise it, but I'll try. I do feel uniquely unqualified.

I have examined crystal balls and watched the flight of birds, the behaviour of schools of fish but I can't forecast the future with any confidence. The best I can do is perhaps like the Polynesian navigators of centuries past, say that I believe there are safe shores ahead but I don't know if we will reach them.

Four years ago we made a beginning - much has happened since then. The number of fully independent nations in the South Pacific has increased - the Solomon Islands Tuvalu joining the ranks, and soon the Gilbert Islands and Vanuatu will also become independent. But independence leads to interdependence. And around the Pacific we are all interdependent. That is an ecological reality with which political realities must eventually conform. We live on an imperilled planet. It is imperilled primarily because the activities of those who have taken up the ways of what is called 'western civilisation' are out of phase with the realities of the biosphere on which we all depend.

Now I've been brooding for the past few days over the word 'western'. What is 'western' and what is 'the west' - where is 'the west'? It's always somewhere out beyond wherever you are toward the setting sun and it's been a characteristic of western civilisation to be discontented with wherever it is - that you always strive to be somewhere else - to be moving on. That was a useful trait perhaps in the days of Captain Cook when the earth seemed infinitely large and the numbers of people were few. It is probably not useful in this day of Concorde and orbiting satellites - in fact it is dangerous. Now set against that concept is the concept that some of us have called 'living in place' - learning to be a part of the ecological chain of being - the reality of land, sea, sky and living beings wherever you are. Learning to nurture and cherish your own living place on the earth/sea.

I think the future of man in the Pacific lies in that direction and not in the forever unreachable 'west'.

We've been struggling ever since the first conference with the concept of national park. Trying to define what it is or what it should be in relation to the facts of life in the South Pacific. In my view we

are worrying too much over labels and perhaps not thinking enough about our purposes and goals. There are areas of the earth that are still wild and beautiful and many of them are out here and there are native species of plants and animals. These are the things we are talking about protecting. We need to ask why are there still areas like that in the Pacific. In places where people have lived for a thousand or twenty-five thousand years. They're not on another planet where people have never been - they're here. They're wild and beautiful because the people who lived in those places - ecosystem people I've called them - have not destroyed them. They have not behaved in the ways that are now becoming far too familiar throughout the world. Not because they're better people necessarily - individually - but because their culture, traditions, beliefs, religions would not permit such destruction. Well, is it right then in the effort to conform with the definition of a national park written for countries where land is treated as a commodity to be bought and sold to tell those people they must give up their land and move out or sell their land? - because to them land is not a commodity to be bought and sold. It is often a part of their physical and spiritual being.

No, I think what has been described as the Papua New Guinea way, although I suspect it is the South Pacific way, is better. What is important is that nature be protected, because everywhere on earth, the wild world is in retreat - it's threatened, and we here are determined to see that at least some of it is saved. How it is to be protected depends on the circumstances. If the people who occupy the wild areas have been taking care of them, that's all to the good. If they begin to destroy them, then perhaps government must re-negotiate and seek other means to accomplish the goal of conservation. But as long as people agree to protect the wild values, who should interfere? Admittedly, this is not an easy question to be dismissed in a sentence or two. The question of customary rights and traditional uses requires critical evaluation, particularly in view of the rapid spread of western technology among formerly traditional people.

Well, definitions can be changed to fit specific realities, but I'd say the goal of nature conservation cannot be set aside. Nations can still do what they please within their own boundaries - they can call a pig a goat if they choose to, but they shouldn't be upset if the international community still insists it's a pig and pretends not to hear.

I believe that the international concept of national park will not be stretched, now or in the future, to include areas where mining, commercial timber harvesting, other direct forms of exploitation, take precedence over nature conservation. Rather, it must continue to be used for areas where nature conservation is a primary purpose. I don't believe that any of us are willing to accept as true national parks, those migratory areas that some nations have proclaimed. I call them migratory because they seem to move on, whenever an exploitable resource is discovered within their former boundaries.

There are many things that go under the name of national park within countries, that are not acceptable as national parks, because they do not have that primary goal of conservation.

The question of multiple use of national parks has also been raised in this conference. I think it's worth noting for the record, that all national parks provide multiple uses and values, from cleaning the air and providing clean water, serving as genetic reservoirs for the future, acting as breeding grounds for wildlife, fish, providing recreational, educational, scientific uses - values, for the people.

The uses that are restricted are prevented by those who would damage or lead to the deterioration of the resources that the park was established to protect.

We've been told in this conference, of great progress towards the goals we set forth four years ago. On the centenary of its first national park, New South Wales has proclaimed a new national park, an

area larger than some nations, in its wild Blue Mountains. The overall record of Australia, in creating new national parks in this centenary year, in fact in this centenary week, is remarkable indeed, and I'm sure it will establish some sort of world record.

The news of equally spectacular moves yet to come, is even more heartening. New parks, reserves, sanctuaries have come into being throughout the region in many other countries. Western Samoa, Tonga, Gilbert Islands, Cook Island, Papua New Guinea, New Zealand - and I hope I haven't overlooked some. I probably have.

But again, what is likely to occur, what we've heard about in this conference, is likely to occur in the near future, is even more encouraging. And it is obvious that since the first conference four years ago, the South Pacific nations are off and away in their efforts to protect the national environment.

The conference has taken a valuable step in the amount of attention it is giving - it has given to the conservation of coastal marine resources. Presentation by Minister Bajpai of Fiji yesterday, suggests that marked attention is now being given to coastal and marine protection in that country. Whereas, Mr. Tongailava has reported on the major step his country has taken by the creation of five new marine reserves along with measures to protect the endangered humpbacked whale.

The recent New South Wales Coastal Act gives further support to measures throughout the region which is intended to maintain that area, that highly productive coastal area which is of such great importance to maintenance of the total productivity of the oceans.

Minister Young has called our attention once again to the great values of protecting those remaining unpopulated islands. And has talked of the measures which New Zealand has taken to accomplish that. I think we all look forward to the day when the islands for science convention becomes a reality and international protection is provided for those natural museums and research areas that such islands can provide for the future.

I have been impressed with the variety of new kinds of protected areas that have been mentioned in this conference. Farm parks, maritime parks, family reserves, all of these affirm the point that many different approaches can be used to meet the goals of conservation. No one approach is better than another - each must be tailored to fit the human situation and the natural environment.

We've seen progress toward creating that network of biosphere reserves, which was called for in the U.N.E.S.C.O. map programme. And in Tonga and Australia, particularly, we've seen advancement of areas to be included for protection under the world heritage convention. During this four year period also, we've seen another major step toward regional co-operation in the South Pacific, through the preparation by the South Pacific Bureau of Economic Co-operation and the South Pacific Commission, of a South Pacific regional environment programme. I hope that during the next four years that programme will receive the support of nations within the region. But we can't afford to be too self-congratulatory, though there's been all of this progress. But there's still too much which remains undone. You'll forgive me if I call attention to international conventions which have not been widely ratified in this region. I would mention, particularly, the South Pacific Convention on the conservation of nature which many of us helped launch with great enthusiasm at Apia in 1976, and it has still not taken effect.

May I also mention the Convention on Trade and Endangered Species and the Convention for the Protection of the World Natural and Cultural Heritage, both of which can be of great value, I think, in achieving more effective conservation in this region.

Of course I look forward to the day, and I think we all do, when such conventions are no longer needed, because conservation of nature will have once again become a way of life. But I'm afraid we have a way to sail before we reach that shore.

There are two things that no nation can live without, - nature and culture. We all depend on nature - cannot escape that dependence. We destroy the natural world within our own boundaries; then we must depend on the natural world that still survives in other lands, and that can be a very uncertain existence for others who control our destiny. If we destroy nature too widely across the planet, then none of us may survive, and that is certainly a threat we live with in this nuclear age. None of us can have a guarantee that other nations will protect their natural resources while we use up our own. That is a lesson some industrialised countries have yet to learn, but they will learn it. All that any of us can do is to try and protect our own homeland, and then perhaps try to persuade others to do the same.

Without our own culture we lose the ties with our own people and our own spiritual world. We can become camp-followers of other cultural groups, squatters on the edges of their cities, but we belong nowhere. The traditional people, the Indians of my own home state of California, had one severe punishment that they inflicted on only the most grave offenders, the worst criminals, and that was not death. Death was too easy. It was banishment. Cut off from his own people the person is nobody. In time such people died, since nobody can live alone. But it was the days or years before death that were most painful.

We hear a lot about genocide in the news. Destruction of whole peoples. It's happened in some places over the past few centuries. More common, however, has been ethnocide. The destruction of cultures. This is sometimes done deliberately, but more often it comes as an accidental by-product of cultural confrontation where military power or material wealth of one group greatly exceeds that of the other. Values are then lost, beliefs disappear, social customs crack, and people can be left as outcasts in their own homeland.

If I can divert from my script, which you don't have in front of you anyway, I'd like to say that I'm particularly conscious of this cultural problem in my own country. We seem to be going through an identity crisis in America, with a great confusion of cultures. There is culture and counter-culture, and alternative cultures, and people trying desperately to figure out who they are. Our most successful television programme in recent years has been called "Roots", and everyone is scurrying to find out what their roots are, who they are, where they come from. We've lost so much of that identity, and now we're trying to get it back. It's not easy to rebuild a culture once it has gone.

Of course, cultures evolve and change on their own, and evolution may come faster if there are other cultural groups for comparison, but change that comes from within a culture is more often organic and healthy. Change imposed from outside is seldom healthy.

Nature also evolves slowly at its own pace, or more rapidly in the agro-ecosystems that people nurture to meet their own needs. But nature can also be forced too rapidly - as we may be seeing today with the so-called green revolution. There are signs of stress, strain and collapse in the effort to force nature too quickly to produce too much.

Well, I believe the future of man in the Pacific can be bright, but only if we dedicate ourselves to maintaining our own cultural values, and to protecting our share of the natural world.

Development and changes must occur, but it must be based on the cultural values of each group of people, and it must lead to an enduring inter-relationship, symbiosis with the natural world, and symbiosis which benefits all sentient beings, all living things.

This form of development, eco-development as it is now called, can lead to a healthy self reliance of people occupying a healthy eco-system. But need I mention that we must all beware of those who come selling any form of development. Ecodevelopment can be used as another kind of sheepskin to conceal the same old wolf.

The appropriate technology that you buy today, may prove to be appropriate only to its manufacturer in America, Europe or Japan. But you Pacific people have been burned often enough - you don't need to be warned about fire.

I cannot foretell your future, but I hope we all reach safer shores. I have one wish for your future. May you always live surrounded by a national park - call it what you may.

CORNWALL: Delegates, the matters raised by Dr. Dasman are now open for discussion and I would invite both questions and comments from the floor. Dr. Dasman, I think if you could resume your place at the podium

OGILVIE: Mr. Ogilvie from Queensland National Park and Wildlife Service. Ray, I would like to ask you if you would like to make a comment on the relevance of your remarks about culture and the conservation of culture to the Pacific area - a comment about the relationship between tourism and culture. I see tourism producing a sameness around the world. Quite often it can be a major factor in changing culture and community standards by raising the aspirations of the local people who seek the same facilities and attention as the international visitor. This can be damaging to traditional practices, particularly in small communities such as those throughout the Pacific. I was wondering if you would like to comment on this matter and how the Pacific nations might look at handling tourism in such a way that it supports or complements their culture rather than destroying it. As I said, the tourist industry seems to be cloning throughout the world, and producing a frightening sameness.

DASMAN: Thank you. I think you've touched on a very serious issue for all of the Pacific region and for the entire world for that matter. Tourism in itself can be of benefit but I think only if it is controlled by the country involved and tailored to meet the needs of that people and that culture for the people. If it is brought in on a massive scale and with the tourist industry dictating the terms to the country, then you have the effects that you've mentioned, of really serious cultural impact which can be destructive, totally destructive.

I also get concerned of course with what is the future of tourism. We had a discussion over ... (inaudible) ... with the people around the Pacific on this issue and of course the tourist industry is maintaining a very optimistic point of view, that it is just going to go on and on and on, but if you look at the energy picture a little carefully, and availability of petroleum, jet fuel for the future, you begin to wonder what you are going to use all those old Hilton Hotels for, 25 years from now - or 30 years from now. Admittedly, some new fuel may come along, things may go on, but it is certainly not something I would want to bank on if I were planning the long term future of my particular place.

So you not only have this cultural impact, you have a possibility of a real dangerous economic trap in this tourist game. At least, this is the way it seems from where I stand.

CORNWALL: Mr. Lohrey, the Minister from Tasmania.

LOHREY: Dr. Dasman, I am interested in your concept of culture. I may be wrong in my interpretation of the way you talk about it, but you seem to me to talk about culture as a static concept that is not dynamic, and when you talk about conservation of culture, the cultural value seems to imply a staticness that dismisses the fact that I personally believe the culture of any nation or any race of people is a dynamic thing that does change, and the values of a culture change all the time - and that those values that do change are values that no longer work in a community. I

find some difficulty with the implications of the way you use the word "culture" with what you're saying about ecodevelopment, that culture should have a ... the values of ecodevelopment. There seems to be a contradiction there.

DASMAN: I hope I didn't create that impression because I didn't intend to. Cultures do change. They must. They do evolve but there's a great difference between an evolution that comes from within the culture. The culture reaches out and borrows things that it sees outside, adapts them, moves along, changes, but at its own pace as compared to the type of cultural change which is shattering and destructive to the culture. I haven't wanted to give any idea of a static type of culture. You do have relatively static cultures in parts of the world that have stayed virtually the same for long periods of time but in most places you have cultural evolution going on, just as you have natural evolution going on in the rest of the world outside of human society. So I agree with you; I have not tried to present the idea of cultures as static. If cultures were static, then the idea of ecodevelopment would not make sense because the idea of ecodevelopment is - you take the values, traditions, techniques, materials, familiar to people of a particular culture; they take them - they use their own knowledge, background to develop in a way that is suited to them. They determine the pace, they determine the direction and what the goal should be. This involves cultural change, but change at a pace and at a rate that suits the people who are doing the developing - not something that's laid down on them from somewhere else. All right?

CORNWALL: Mr. Tongailava from Tonga.

TONGAILAVA: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to congratulate Professor Dasman on his presentation, trying to look at the cost and message of conservation by way of contribution, and there's still very, very much uncertainty with regard to culture. As the Minister from Tasmania just said very relevant to island countries culture, the impact of tourism in certain island cultures is tremendous. Perhaps some of our Australian hosts here have come to the islands one time or another for holidays, but for the information of this Second South Pacific Conference, they are conflicting in cultures - that's for sure. In certain small countries they are a bit modest with regard to attire - like in Tonga it's not allowed for anybody to go on public road with no shirt on, but you could well imagine big tourist ships arriving at Nukualofa on a very hot day; they would like to go without shirts on public roads, but certainly they have been told before. At the same time, tourism is becoming a very big money earner for the small countries of the Pacific, and this is an area, Professor Dasman, where we don't really know where to go. We would like tourists to come with money to the islands. At the same time, we would like to preserve our traditional way of lives. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this is almost an insoluble problem.

We have learned from other countries - Hawaii and other countries, the impact of tourism perhaps, and disappearance of certain cultures, and this is the very thing, Mr. Chairman, we are trying very hard to hang on to, but I'm afraid we are already in the race - perhaps in the western race. How can we go back to ecodevelopment? I don't know. Can we bring back the clock? I don't know. It will be a very major step forward in this Conference to make it one of the recommendations to each government, especially the smaller countries in the Pacific. The impact of tourism is a major issue. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

CORNWALL: Thank you, Mr. Tongailava. Would you like to respond to those comments, Dr. Dasman?

DASMAN: Well, just that I agree with them. I'm much better at identifying problems than solving them. I'm not going to come up with the answer to the question of how you handle that situation. Once it is out of hand it's very difficult to control it. If you're starting in all over again, would you do it differently? I think probably you would, in relation to the scale of tourism that you permit, and the degree of control over it. But when you already have planes coming, cruise ships coming, hotels built and people there, it's more difficult to turn it off.

MARTIN: Dr. Dasman, we're all aware that the South Pacific is very much dependent on the Pacific Ocean for its bounty and its stability. We're also very aware of the disastrous effects that wastes have caused in polluting enclosed waters. There have also been a lot of theories that the wastes of our developed society are carried by gravity into the waters of this world, and traditionally we have relied on the sea accommodating this and indeed cleansing itself. But there have been a number of theories that the chemical balances of the oceans are in fact very fine, and unless there was substantial change in society's way of controlling its deleterious effects, the oceans would be unable to accommodate the rate of change that we were contributing to them. Can you give us any progress report on just how the oceans of the world are accommodating man's pollution and impact?

DASMAN: Thank you, I could try, although there are people here, I'm sure, who are more expert than I at this.

The problem is, of course, it's not the carrying capacity of the entire ocean or the ability of the ocean to assimilate waste, speaking of, say the entire Pacific - it's the ability of those areas on which the productivity of the Pacific depends, that we need worry about. And that is the coastal zone around the islands, lagoons, coastal edges of the continents, and those areas of upwelling where bottom waters are brought to the top and nutrients returned to the cycle.

It's the productivity of those areas we need to be concerned about; if we destroy the productivity of those areas, then it doesn't matter about the middle of the Pacific; the fact that it's pure and clean is not going to be much help, or the living resources of the ocean. And so the areas that are getting the biggest input of human waste are the areas that are most vital to the survival of the entire Pacific.

I think that you can say that the amount of waste put in the entire Pacific is just a drop in the bucket. It's not very much, but the amount of waste that we put into the productive areas of the Pacific is causing problems. How severe, is something we can probably argue about for a long time. When do you pass the critical limit? When you have too much D.D.T., too much P.C.B., too much various other kinds of pollutants? It's like, when do you have too much radioactivity? We can argue about that for a long time.

We don't know the real extent of the danger because we are not sure how much harm we have done already. All we know is that we have done harm, and we had better start thinking very seriously about recycling waste and re-using those materials, instead of trying to dump them. The Pacific isn't a dump.

COINWALL: I've noted Dr. Dahl. Don Johnstone has indicated that he would like to ask a question. The Director of the New South Wales National Parks and Wildlife Service ... and Dr. Dahl, if you could follow Mr. Johnstone.

JOHNSTOLE: Thanks Mr. Chairman. Dr. Dasman, I appreciate that the thrust of your remarks is very much directed to the South Pacific island communities and that we, in Australia, possibly regard it as a large island and more of a terrestrial mainland community. But, it seems to me too, that messages have come out of this conference that should be useful to us, and I would like your comment on some of those. Now, particularly in Australia, in the establishment of National Parks and the protection of our environment, we are faced with the proponents of the multiple use concept. The multiple use concept for natural areas and indeed, we heard this expressed quite forcibly by an eminent speaker at this conference earlier this week, and that concerned me, and I am quite sure that it concerned many people assembled at this conference around this table.

Now it seems to me that it is all very well to talk about the multiple use concept and to talk about the fact that too many people are looking to preserve wilderness areas, and that we should allow everybody to enter our wilderness areas, and to have roads through them. It's all

very well to say that, but it seems to me that we can't, in this country of Australia, set ourselves aside from the rest of the world's community and say that our people should be more privileged than anybody else. If you, and we, are going to encourage the South Pacific people to preserve their environments and to preserve their cultures, surely it's good enough for us to say that we, in Australia, should do so too.

I wonder if you have any message for us, and particularly in the context that continually, I'm told, and I'm sure my colleagues are told, that people who have traditionally used land in Australia - the farmers, the timbergetters and the miners, have a higher use for land than we have when we are looking for land for nature conservation purposes, when those people continually tell us that the farmers are true conservationists, and I believe myself sincerely, that many farmers are conservationists but they are not nature conservationists. We are the nature conservationists and yet we are being faced with the challenge that firstly these other uses, the exploitation of timber resources, mineral resources and the use of the land for grazing are higher purposes than the use of the land for nature conservation and, secondly, that we must therefore look to a multiple use concept for natural areas. Dr. Dasman, what message do you have for us?

DASMAN: Well Australia has been doing such an outstanding job of establishing parks and reserves that my principal message is one of congratulations, but getting to your more serious question, the point has been made by various speakers here, that maybe you'll have as much as ten percent of your State, or all of Australia, protected in nature reserves. That sounds very good, but ninety percent of Australia is then going to be not in nature reserves. You have to have areas for timber production. You have to have areas for grazing of livestock. You have to have areas for agriculture. You have to have areas for cities. Ninety per cent of Australia is available for that. Without the protection of nature in the other ten per cent, the likelihood that that ninety per cent will break down eventually because we don't know how to take care of it, is very great. I mentioned the tendency of agricultural soils to break down under heavy applications of fertiliser, pesticides - the like, loss of soils through intensive machine cultivation, dust bowls. All of the things that we don't know how to do properly, we can learn from parks and reserves where an observed natural process is at work; where we have base line stations for showing what the productivity of the land could be, what healthy soils look like - all these points. The value of the reserves is so great for the many uses that are suited to them that the thought of extending these other extractive destructive uses to these relatively small protected areas is, to me, just unthinkable.

I don't know that that's going to help you any in arguing the point in front of your legislature, but that's, I think, about all I could say on it right now.

CORNWALL: Dr. Dahl of the South Pacific Commission.

DAHL: I think Dr. Dasman has this morning, emphasised the very important link between the conservation of nature and the conservation of culture in many parts of the Pacific, and referred to the importance of an integrated view in ecodevelopment as bringing these aspects of man and his environment together. This may also suggest some answer or partial answer at least, to the question raised by Mr. Tongailava about the destruction of cultural heritage that is taking place very much as we see the natural heritage being destroyed, and I think some of the points raised in our discussion earlier this morning on public awareness and public education, may apply equally well to some of these problems of the cultural impact of tourism and many other outside influences because it is not only the tourists who visit our countries that cause the young people to question their values, their life styles and rules and so on, that they have inherited from the past. It is also the expatriate teachers in the schools - the text books that are brought in from overseas - the mass media - the films - the radio. In our colonial heritage it was the colonial administrators who came also, setting the example of the superiority of one kind

! ; ;

culture over another. And I think we have the same kind of inheritance of cultural erosion that we have in inheritance of natural erosion, so to speak, in natural areas and it may well be in the smaller islands that the solution also needs to be a combined programme of education - education not only to appreciate the values of the natural areas, but also to appreciate the values of the cultural heritage. The values - the wisdom incorporated in the traditional ways of managing the natural environment and the traditional ways of managing social interactions. And I think, if, in the process of the educational approaches that are used, it is possible to give people in the islands a pride in their heritage - a respect for what they have received from the past in their own society, it will be easier for them to choose to go through a healthy cultural evolution and not through a cultural erosion and destruction.

Too often what has happened is that young people - and I have met many of them - say "our old ways are bad - that is poverty and suffering. We want to escape from that and go and live in Los Angeles where the good life can be found." Now when they get to Los Angeles, I think sometimes they've been deceived because you don't necessarily find the good life in the over-materialism of many large cities today. But I think it is symptomatic of what has happened in the Pacific, and I would hope in the programmes of public awareness that are developed to work towards nature conservation goals, this can be linked whenever possible to programmes of public awareness in creating a healthy cultural evolution towards the future. In creating a better balance between the different cultural influences - those from the past from traditional society and those from western society and helping each country to choose for the future the balance of all these factors that best suits their own particular requirements. Thank you.

DASMAN: I agree with much of what Dr. Dahl has had to say. I don't think I can add to it.

CORNWALL: Dr. Pratt. A.C.T.

PRATT: This morning when Dr. Dahl was speaking, he threw in what I thought was an interesting bait to do with the major influences which we should consider in relation to nature conservation, and now as Dr. Dasman is suggesting, to cultural conservation and noting that the two are closely linked. And Dr. Dahl I thought, tossed in the bait when he referred to the impact of the churches. I take it he meant religion generally. I'm just a little curious now that no one in this room has picked up that bait to this time. I wonder - would it be in order to ask Dr. Dasman if he would like to make any sort of a general comment on either the manner in which religion has impacted upon nature conservation and cultural conservation and whether you see that as another useful avenue for us to explore in getting educational access to people. I presume that - without wanting to be too specific - I was thinking of western religions rather than those of preceding periods.

DASMAN: I quite agree with what Dr. Dahl said earlier today, that if you could get the churches into the act, reading the appropriate passages in the Bible and bringing messages across to their parishes and congregations, on conservation, you would probably move this process ahead much farther - particularly in rural communities where religious values are held very deeply. And you've seen that certainly in the United States there has been quite a movement of the churches into the environment field, and you'll have sermons on cherishing the earth as well as sermons on advancing your soul to a higher stage, and these reach people who would not be reached by public schools or political speeches, even television which would hit them at a time when they're a little more vulnerable to such messages.

I've often thought that one of the greatest things one could do for world conservation would be to find the Islamic religious leaders who would be willing to put this message across in the Islamic world, because I'm sure the message is there in Islam as it is in the Christian documents, but it isn't taught by the religious leaders.

CORNWALL: Tim Richmond, representing the Federal Minister?

RICHMOND: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I wonder if I could just follow up a point made by - in the question by, Mr. Johnstone, concerning activities which I think Dr. Dasman indicated he believed also were inconsistent with the concept of areas being set aside for - basically for conservation purposes, and I wonder if his view is in any way modified or moderated by the consideration perhaps, of setting aside rather larger areas than might have been set aside purely if we were concerned about the strict conservation issue in an attempt perhaps to moderate the adverse effects of this less desirable activity through the processes open to us as park managers. I wonder if you would like to comment on that?

DASMAN: I think you know, this is certainly a way to go. In thinking of my own home State, 50% of the land in California - California has a population greater than Australia, New Zealand, New Guinea and all the Pacific - South Pacific that is - but 50% of the land is in federal reserves of one kind or another. They're not all national parks by a long way - national forests where commercial harvesting of timber is allowed, as well as grazing of livestock and other uses - all under control, controlled use, but nevertheless extractive, exploitive use. Our Bureau of Land Management lands where similar activities including mining, can go on. These areas, which are kept in a semi-wild condition, serve as buffer areas for the national parks, the national monuments, the state parks, the totally protected parks of the total protected region, so I think it is always useful to have a much larger area set aside around the area that must be protected as a national park. But that doesn't mean that we can get by with little bits and pieces of totally protected areas. I think we need much larger ones, and the conversation yesterday on relation of island size to number of species that can survive is, I think, a very appropriate one for considering the size of reserves. The size of reserves for the protection of species may - it may be that we're grossly underestimating the amount of land that we need for the maintenance of the full variety of species, plants and animals.

CORNWALL: Mr. Tevane, French Polynesia?

TEVANE: Mr. Chairman, I know that the theme that has been discussed here this morning is a most interesting one, and its relationship between conservation and culture is something that we must look at and study, and I'm sure that all my friends here, and other delegates from Polynesia, Tonga, Cook Islands, etc. etc., are in agreement with me. Our traditions have taught us many interesting relations between man and nature. In a few words, I would like to explain myself on this point.

When our God, Taaroa, created Polynesian people, he gave a lot of himself, and this is where our traditions are so precious to us. The trees from which the Polynesian lives are issued from the body of man. There are two trees which mean a lot - and two among the many species are significant as being the trees of life, and here I must mention the coconut tree and the breadfruit tree. When the first man Taaroa died, his head came back to earth in the form of a coconut. That's why, by looking at a coconut you can see two eyes and a mouth. From the body of man has come the breadfruit tree and in this fruit you will find all the components of man, beginning from the head down to the extremity. To tell you, Mr. Chairman, the importance that is meant to the man of Polynesia, of these objects. Unfortunately, today we see the aggression that is brought by the western people to our culture. If we look back 200 years, we can see that the first aggression has already taken place on our culture, and what is left has been badly manhandled, unfortunately. Should one renounce these cultures and should we let it continue? We resist this with vigour, and I must say that the government has taken measures so that the Polynesian man can now live with the two cultures and be able to live in a reasonable and intelligent way. Another modern aggression is the one that is imposed on us by tourism. Some four weeks ago a meeting was held in Papeete in which was discussed these matters concerning Polynesian man and his environment. We have come to the conclusion that we do not agree to having two cultures - one for tourism and one for the inhabitant of the Islands. We want to retain our own culture.

Mr. Chairman and delegates present here, this is what I wanted to say and express my point of view, especially concerning the culture that can be brought in by tourists, and I am very happy to see that I am not the only one to emphasise the importance of the inhabitants of the different islands to maintain their culture. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DASMAN: I don't think I could add anything to that. It's a fine statement.

CORNWALL: Delegates, we have to go to lunch at 12.15 so I think at this stage that I should wind up this session. I would thank you all for your participation and for helping us to draw together the threads which have been emerging throughout the conference. I would particularly like to thank Dr. Dasman for his lucid presentation, which, it seems to me, has so aptly encompassed the work of the conference, and pointed clearly to some of the things that remain to be done, or the many things that remain to be done, and the ways in which we might proceed.

Before I do adjourn the session, I have been informed that the Honourable Venn Young from New Zealand and the Honourable Andrew Lohrey from Tasmania will be leaving after lunch and will therefore not be able to attend this afternoon's sessions. On behalf of the organisers I would like to express the appreciation of the conference to them for their attendance and participation. We wish them a safe journey to their homes and we certainly wish them success in their continuing efforts for nature conservation.

The session now stands adjourned.

JOHNSTONE: Mr. Chairman, may I have something to say before we do adjourn? Just this - that you yourself will be joining the other Ministers leaving after lunch, and on behalf of my Minister, the Honourable Paul Landa, I would like to add to the thanks that you have expressed to the Honourable Tom Newbery and the Honourable Andrew Lohrey, but also to add this expression of gratitude to yourself. You three Ministers have helped us tremendously in chairing individual sessions of this conference, and your presence here has been very, very much appreciated by New South Wales, and I know, by my Minister. I regret very much that the three of you will not be here this afternoon. I do thank you indeed sincerely. I think French Polynesia wants to say something.

DISCUSSION

CORNWALL: I think it might be appropriate nonetheless, while thanks are going around the table, to thank Mr. Newbery for his attendance from Queensland, for the way in which he has helped our deliberations, and to wish him Godspeed, safe journey, and we look forward to seeing you again, sir, on a future occasion.

The delegate from French Polynesia, Mr. Tevane, I believe, wants to

TEVANE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CORNWALL: say something to us.

TEVANE: Mr. Chairman and delegates, all good things come to an end unfortunately. I myself have to leave you this afternoon. I was hoping to remain here till the end of the session, but I have just been recalled.

Before I go, I would again like to renew my most sincere and warmest thanks to the government and the delegations and the organisers of this conference - park and wildlife conference and my special thanks to Mr. Landa and to all the people who have been responsible for the organisation of such a useful and interesting conference. I do renew my message to you all that I do hope that we shall all meet in a future - a nearby future, and you will always be welcome to Tahiti if and when you do come.

I must tell you that my colleague, Mr. Terrasson will be replacing me and will be taking part in the visits and whatever outings that figure on the programme. I am sure that he will do this with great efficacy, and will replace me indeed in a manner which I will approve of.

Mr. Chairman and all, thank you very much, and 'au revoir' - not goodbye.

CORNWALL: Thank you very much, Mr. Tevane. We all believe that the South Pacific is a very pleasant region indeed. One of the most pleasant in the world. But there are very few people who don't know that Frenchmen believe there is nothing like Paris in the spring. So we wish you a safe and happy journey. The conference stands adjourned until 2.30 p.m.

ADJOURNED

NEWBERRY: Ladies and gentlemen, the conference is resumed; that is, the resumption of Session 11, and the business this afternoon is general business and the report of Recommendations Committee. I now hand over to Mr. Bajpai who will present the recommendations. I will call for a mover and a seconder, and we'll go on and deal with each individually, so over to you, sir, for the first recommendation.

(The recommendations as adopted, appear in Volume 1 of these Proceedings).

BAJPAI: Mr. Chairman, His Excellency, Ministers, delegates, ladies and gentlemen. I feel very honoured and privileged to have been appointed as Chairman of this Recommendation Committee of this second South Pacific Conference on National Parks and Reserves, and as Chairman now, on behalf of the Recommendation Committee, I have pleasure in presenting the 15 recommendations which comprise the report.

I wish to thank my Committee - the Honourable Mr. Tangaroa of Cook Island, Mr. Coad of New Zealand, Mr. Richmond of Australia, and Mr. Martin of New South Wales, who acted as Secretary for the deliberations and efforts to cover the important points discussed during this Conference in this short period.

At the first conference held in 1975 at Wellington, New Zealand, I am advised that the Recommendations Committee Chairman ruled with an iron hand. He obviated dissension by imposing two rules: Rule No. 1 was that there should be no debate on the context of the recommendations. His rule No. 2 was that delegates may raise matters that make the text clearer, or amend it to give more emphasis to the recommendations. All this Committee's recommendations were adopted unanimously.

I'm not so tough, and I wish that I could hear your detailed views on each of the recommendations. However, please remember the limited time available. I seek your co-operation in voluntarily applying the wisdom of the two simple rules, recognising the stringent time constraint upon us. Therefore, in this spirit of mutual co-operation, I present recommendation 1 and call for delegates to move, second, and sparingly discuss and refine it if necessary.

So delegates, our recommendation No. 1 is process in the establishment of national parks and reserves. I think you have got the recommendation circulated and I feel I need not read the whole context of the recommendation - I'll only go through the title of the heading.

NEWBERRY: Well, someone - can I get a mover and seconder please? Moved, seconded.

TONGAILAVA: Sorry, Mr. Chairman ... (inaudible) ... for that matter Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't want to debate it again, but since the last four years, I wonder whether in the first conference there was any definition

of the national park to include marine park? Was it? I have asked two experts on the back there, Dr. Dasman and Dr. Dahl. They thought there was no definition. My point is this, Mr. Chairman, whether a proclamation of petitioning national parks and reserves included marine parks?

NEWBERY: Including Marine parks?

TONGAILAVA: Including Marine parks.

TANGAROA: This is - I'm moving this, Mr. Chairman, whether it would be better if you get it on recommendation 7, on the marine ...

TONGAILAVA: I know, but since the last four years since it was resolved at the first meeting, Tonga has been able to set aside five marine parks.

NEWBERY: I would ask the Chairman of the Recommendations Committee, the Honourable Bajpai, just what he would think about it?

BAJPAI: Well, as Chairman of this Recommendations Committee, I think we'll accept what he is saying as an amendment.

TONGAILAVA: Including marine parks?

BAJPAI: Including marine parks.

TONGAILAVA: Thank you very much.

NEWBERY: It's been moved and seconded - moved by the Honourable Tangaroa, seconded by Mr. Tongailava - all in favour?

SPEAKERS: Aye.

NEWBERY: Carried. On to the second?

BAJPAI: Recommendation No. 2 National park release.

NEWBERY: Someone move the recommendation No. 2 please?

MURRELL: Mr. Chairman, could I suggest a slight amendment there if it's not out of order?

NEWBERY: Just a minute, will you second that? Oh well, you want to suggest a ...

MURRELL: I was going to suggest that, instead of the term water harvesting, water production be used.

NEWBERY: Instead of water harvesting, the suggestion has been water production. What does the Chairman think about that?

BAJPAI: Yes, I think we'll accept that.

NEWBERY: I'm going to call for the mover and seconder again, and please give your name and your country.

COAD: Coad, New Zealand.

NEWBERY: New Zealand, Mr. Coad, New Zealand, and who is seconder of that please?

MURRELL: I'll second it.

NEWBERY: Well, Tasmania seconded it in view of their suggestion. Name please?

MURRELL: Murrell, Tasmania - sorry.

NEWBERY: Been moved and seconded with the alterations from harvesting to production. All in favour?

SAUNDERS: Sorry, is this open to discussion?

NEWBERRY: Yes.

SAUNDERS: Moved, seconded and open ..

NEWBERRY: Okay.

SAUNDERS: Oh, just one word in the last line ...

NEWBERRY: Note your name again.

SAUNDERS: Saunders, Victoria.

NEWBERRY: Yes, go ahead.

SAUNDERS: Providing intangible aesthetic and inspirational values ... I don't like the word 'intangible' in there.

NEWBERRY: And what are you suggesting as a ...

SAUNDERS: Just delete that, is my suggestion - "providing aesthetic and inspirational values".

NEWBERRY: What does the Chairman think about that? Firstly, what do the mover and seconder think about that suggestion?

COAD: I'm happy to have the word 'intangible' removed, Mr. Chairman.

NEWBERRY: Now the Chairman's thoughts on that.

BAJPAI: As Chairman, I agree to the deletion of that word 'intangible'.

NEWBERRY: It has been agreed by the Chairman, by the mover and seconder. All in favour say "aye", to the contrary "no". On to the next recommendations please. Over to you, Mr. Bajpai.

BAJPAI: Recommendation to me reads:-

"Review of I.U.C.N. definitions of national parks
and other protected areas."

NEWBERRY: The recommendation is at the bottom of the sheet - Recommendation 3. Would someone move please, giving your name and country.

TANGAROA: Tangaroa, Cook Islands.

NEWBERRY: Tangaroa from Cook Islands. Seconder please?

RICHMOND: Richmond, Australia.

NEWBERRY: Richmond, Australia. Any discussion? No discussions. All in favour?.

SPEAKERS: Aye.

NEWBERRY: I think the 'ayes' have it. Recommendation 4.

BAJPAI: Recommendation 4 reads:-

"Protection and importation of cultural heritage."

NEWBERRY: Would someone move please?

TANGAROA: I move. Tangaroa, Cook Islands.

NEWBERRY: The Honourable Tangaroa of the Cook Islands moves. Seconder please?

CORNISH: Cornish, South Australia.

NEWBERY: From South Australia. Any discussion? No discussion. All in favour say 'aye'.

SPEAKERS: Aye.

NEWBERY: I think the 'ayes' have it. Recommendation 5. Over to the Chairman of the Committee.

BAJPAI: Recommendation 5, gentlemen, reads:-

"Social and cultural areas on tribal and customary lands."

NEWBERY: Will someone move please?

TANGAROA: Tangaroa of Cook Islands - move.

NEWBERY: Seconder please?

KAKARYA: Kakarya of Papua New Guinea.

NEWBERY: Yes, of New Guinea. Any discussions? No discussions. All in favour?

SPEAKERS: Aye.

NEWBERY: I think the 'ayes' have it. Recommendation 6. Over to you, Honourable Bajpai.

BAJPAI: Recommendation 6 reads:-

"Island national parks and reserves".

NEWBERY: Someone move please.

TANGAROA: Tangaroa, Cook Islands move.

NEWBERY: Tangaroa, Cook Islands moves - seconder please?

TIOA: Tioa, Samoa.

NEWBERY: Samoa seconds. Any discussions please? If not, all those in favour say 'aye' - to the contrary 'no'.

SPEAKERS: Aye.

NEWBERY: I think the 'ayes' have it. Recommendation 7.

BAJPAI: Recommendation 7, gentlemen, reads 'Marine Parks and Reserves'.

NEWBERY: Will someone move, please?

COAD: Coad, New Zealand.

NEWBERY: Coad, New Zealand. Seconder, please?

TANGAROA: Tangaroa, Cook Islands.

NEWBERY: Tangaroa, Cook Islands. Any discussions? All in favour? The 'ayes' have it. No. 8 Recommendation.

BAJPAI: Recommendation No. 8 reads:-

"Conservation of Oceanic Ecosystems".

NEWBERY: Will someone move please to Recommendation No. 8.

KAKARYA: Kakarya - moved.

NEWBERY: Papua New Guinea. Seconder please?

TANGAROA: Tangaroa, Cook Islands.

NEWBERY: Tangaroa, Cook Islands. All in favour? Aye, again carried. Recommendation 9.

BAJPAI: Recommendation 9 reads:- "Protection of Whales and Other".

NEWBERY: Someone move Recommendation No. 9 please?

CORNISH: I'll move. Cornish, South Australia.

NEWBERY: Thank you.

JOHNSTONE: Mr. Chairman, if I could remind the conference that during his address at luncheon, Sir Peter Scott noted that this recommendation was coming forward, and he suggested that the conference may wish to be somewhat more specific in terms of this recommendation. I just bring it to your attention.

NEWBERY: Now who moved that? South Australia. ... And seconder please?

TANGAROA: Tangaroa, Cook Islands.

NEWBERY: The Honourable Tangaroa, Cook Islands. All in favour? Aye. Against? Carried. Recommendation 10.

BAJPAI: Recommendation 10.

"Convention on Conservation of Nature in the South Pacific Region".

NEWBERY: Someone move, please.

TANGAROA: Tangaroa, Cook Islands. Moved.

NEWBERY: The Honourable Tangaroa, Cook Islands. Moved. Someone second, please? A seconder, please?

COAD: Coad, New Zealand.

NEWBERY: Mr. Coad, New Zealand. Any discussion?

SAUNDERS: Saunders, Victoria. I'm wondering if someone could tell us what the problem has been with the convention. Why in fact it has been ..

BAJPAI: I think Mr. Coad will like to say something to Recommendation 10.

COAD: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can only speak for New Zealand. We have a slight legal problem which we are in the process of resolving, and we hope to sign this treaty later this year. It hasn't been through a lack of willingness to sign; it simply has been that we have had a slight problem, which we've had to overcome.

NEWBERY: How is that?

RICHMOND: I was wondering from an Australian position - I was wondering if we could be invited, in light of ...

COAD: I'd be happy to.

NEWBERY: Would you tell your names, please?

RICHMOND: Richmond.

111
NEWBERY: Mr. Saunders of Victoria has enquired. Mr. Richmond, representing Australia, replies.

RICHMOND: As a matter of Government policy now, the means by which conventions of this sort are entered into by the Commonwealth is through negotiation with the States and, if possible, through the use of State legislation to give effect to conventions of this kind. There is, naturally, as a result of this, the requirements are quite extensive. Discussions with the States and consideration of whether or not State legislation is adequate, and this process is, as I say, a long one, but it is proceeding, and we hope it will proceed to a satisfactory conclusion.

NEWBERY: You have to get agreement with all States and have legislation?

RICHMOND: It may possibly be necessary for State legislation to be amended in order ...

NEWBERY: It may not be necessary?

RICHMOND: It may be necessary.

NEWBERY: It may be necessary, yes. Yes, sir?

TONGAILAVA: Mr. Chairman, I just want to elaborate on this convention because I happen to represent Tonga in this convention. I wonder whether Dr. Dahl could tell us here that how is the twelve months period. Is this applicable or not? No **ratification** by our Government. I understand it was twelve months.

DAHL: Let me clarify this point for the benefit of the Conference. The Convention provided that it would be open for signature only, until the end of 1978, and that period for signature has now passed but ... (inaudible) ... in 1977. There was some discussion whether or not the period could be extended, but since any government can accede directly to the convention without first signing and ratifying it, it's not necessary to make a change in the signature term. It is possible for any government simply to deposit an instrument of accession with the depositor government which is the government of Western Samoa.

It may be necessary, however, to make a couple of minor changes in wording in this recommendation in the second paragraph; the second line, I think, should be "accession" rather than "accessories" would be the correct term, and in the final paragraph since only a few governments have signed the convention, mainly Western Samoa, Papua New Guinea and France, to my knowledge, other governments who wish to become part of this convention will have to accede to it, and therefore in the final paragraph it should probably be necessary to say "urges that the signatory countries ratify the convention and that other eligible countries consider acceding to the convention so that it may come into force as soon as possible". Since there are two different processes involved, those three countries which signed it during the eligible period, can ratify that signature. Other governments will need to accede to the convention.

NEWBERY: Does that satisfy

TONGAILAVA: Well, I'm all right. I wonder what the Chairman thinks about the - anything.

DAHL: I think we'll agree to the amendments put by Dr. Dahl.

DAHL: Could we request that the amendments be made?

NEWBERY: Yes. I think we should have - Dr. Dahl, would you repeat that amendment? Just before we take the vote

DAHL: Yes. The second paragraph, the second line - the correct word should be "accessions" rather than "accessories". It's simply - I think it's probably a mis-spelling. The significant amendment is in the last paragraph which should read "urges that the signatory countries ratify the

convention and that other eligible countries consider acceding to the convention so that it may come into force as soon as possible".

NEWBERRY: Okay. Satisfied, the mover and seconder? Satisfied, the gentleman who had made enquiry? Well, I now put the vote. All those in favour?

DELEGATES: Aye.

NEWBERRY: To the contrary - no? I think the 'ayes' have it. Recommendation No. 11, ladies and gentlemen.

BAJPAI: Recommendation 11, "Environmental Management".

NEWBERRY: Will someone move please?

TANGAROA: Tangaroa move - Cook Islands.

NEWBERRY: Nauru and Cook Islands. Seconder, please?

MURRELL: Murrell, Tasmania.

NEWBERRY: Murrell, Tasmania.

JOHNSTONE: Mr. Chairman, Johnstone, New South Wales. I wonder if the Chairman or somebody delegated by him could explain to us how this matter comes before the Conference, and the significance of the South Pacific Regional Environmental Programme.

BAJPAI: Would you explain this to the delegates - the Recommendation 11 - Environmental Management?

RICHMOND: I don't want to be awkward, Mr. Chairman. This wasn't one that emanated with me. I think there might be somebody perhaps a bit more appropriate.

MARTIN: I think that you could perhaps ask Dr. Dahl. The matter has - is, rather a broad motion. Martin, New South Wales sector. The Environmental Management does cover a big field that has been in the process of much discussion, and Dr. Dahl, I think of him as - can talk well to this Pacific programme which is of ...

NEWBERRY: Dr. Dahl, would you care to speak on this, please?

DAHL: The South Pacific Regional Environment Programme is a regional programme encompassing all of the area of the South Pacific Commission that has been developed over the last two and a half years in consultation with all the governments within that region and was - the first phase of which was approved at the last South Pacific Conference and I.U.C.N. has been working very closely with the organisations in the region on developing a conservation component over this regional programme, which is a programme intended to provide assistance to all the smaller Island Governments in various environmental areas where they cannot undertake everything by themselves, assistance and providing information, technical experts, and in other ways helping them with their responsibilities for the environment. Since conservation is an element of environmental management, and I think there were several references made today to the fact that we cannot consider parks and reserves in isolation, we must consider them within the context of the total environment of the country if they are to achieve their conservation objectives. I think a recommendation that urges Governments to include conservation within such a programme would be appropriate from this conference. I don't know if that gives enough detail on the programme itself. If there are further technical questions, I can answer them.

The programme is expected to begin within the next two or three months, as soon as the final funding comes through from the United Nations.

CORNISH: Mr. Chairman, Cornish, South Australia. In view of that, would it be more appropriate, as we don't understand all the implications of the environment programme, to include the words, "participate actively in the conservation component of the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme".

NEWBERY: That may be one other way of overcoming the problem.

JOHNSTONE: Johnstone, New South Wales. I only sought enlightenment about the programme, Mr. Chairman, and I've been fully enlightened by Dr. Dahl. I think Mr. Cornish's concern is more specific.

CORNISH: I don't want to pursue the matter, Mr. Chairman. I gathered it was of some concern and I was trying to find a way around it, but if it's of no concern I will withdraw the comment.

NEWBERY: All happy about it now, prepared to vote on it - any other queries? If not, all in favour?

SPEAKERS: Aye.

NEWBERY: I think the 'ayes' have it. Recommendation No. 12.

BAJPAI: Recommendation 12. "Planning for National Parks and Reserves".

NEWBERY: Will someone move please.

TANGAROA: Tangaroa move, Cook Islands.

NEWBERY: Honourable Tangaroa, Cook Islands moves. The seconder please.

RICHMOND: Richmond, Australia.

NEWBERY: Richmond, Australia.

JOHNSTONE: Mr. Chairman, Johnstone, New South Wales. A question. Are we looking at planning for the establishment of national parks and reserves, first query?

NEWBERY: Over to you, Mr. Chairman of the Committees.

BAJPAI: I think that Dr. Dahl again would be a likely person to give that answer.

NEWBERY: Dr. Dahl, can you answer that, please?

DAHL: I think as the resolution stands now, it seems to imply planning in a more general sense, and the incorporation of national parks and reserves within the general context of planning as I understand it.

MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, if I might draw attention to the two first factors, the recognising ...

NEWBERY: Mr. Martin.

MARTIN: Recognising and noting aspects and then also the second part of the action is to urge that plans be given to - in fact to recommend and urge, I think referred to potential conservation areas, and to institute proclamation of those areas. Certainly the motion also does embody the aspects of integrated planning within the surrounding areas of a national park to give greater effect to the benefit of the park and indeed a park to the community. And so I think it covers both the identification, proclamation and then subsequent wise integration of the park into the community.

JOHNSTONE: Mr. Chairman, Johnstone, New South Wales. I take it from what has been said that we are talking about land use planning and the statutory planning system as used in the Australian states. I would like clarification of that please.

NEWBERRY: Mr. Martin, can you clarify that rule?

MARTIN: Sure, we are talking about aspects of land use planning and whether the term environmental planning has become rather synonymous, I suppose, is a matter for debate.

SAUNDERS: I'm at a complete loss to understand the last paragraph where he talks about and encourages the expanded use and refinement of the integrated environmental planning systems currently legislated in practice. He goes on - and finishes up in an ungrammatical manner. I can't work out what this: "are often both complex and expensive to reconcile" relates to. The whole thing is full of jargon, and I don't really understand what it means.

NEWBERRY: Can you explain it any further to overcome that problem?

MARTIN: There have been a number of references to in fact land use, planning systems which I understand are now being corporated into environmental planning systems. Certainly in New South Wales and Victoria there are planning systems that are legislated and which are in operation, and the advice that has come to this conference is that they're working very satisfactorily. The motion is an attempt to introduce this - to record this concept and record the value that it has been seen to achieve. I'm sure that any improved wording to improve the understanding and comprehension of the motion would be welcome.

NEWBERRY: Any further suggestions? Mr. Coad, New Zealand.

COAD: Two comments, Mr. Chairman. I think perhaps it may be clearer to members if they will look again at the paragraph which begins: "Being advised" -

"Being advised of integrated environmental planning systems now legislated by some governments and the success of these processes in identifying important nature conservation areas and establishing development control within adjoining areas to create beneficial transition zones."

I think that is the heart of it. And the second comment I'd like to make is that there's a word missed out in the final paragraph - the second last line:

"Which may present the future with conflicts"

(Add the word "which" and then carry on.)

NEWBERRY: Oh "which if not".

SAUNDERS: Saunders, Victoria. I think the problem that I have is this terminology - "integrated environmental planning systems". I believe Mr. Johnstone was getting close to it when he was asking whether we're really talking about land use planning as distinct from environmental planning. Environmental planning covers a much wider range of issues than land use planning, I believe, and the type of regional planning that we've been talking about at this conference has related to land use planning on a regional basis. So my suggestion is that that phrase "integrated environmental planning systems" should probably be "regional land use planning systems" or something along those lines.

NEWBERRY: Whereabouts is that?

SAUNDERS: In paragraph 3 and in the final paragraph.

NEWBERRY: Oh yes.

SAUNDERS: "Integrated environmental planning systems".

NEWBERRY: Mr. Johnstone, how do you feel about that then?

JOHNSTONE: Mr. Chairman, my feeling is that that would interpret the thrust of the recommendation much more effectively, and make it much more easily understood by all those who have reason to read the proceedings of this conference, and to seek to understand the views of the delegates at this conference.

NEWBERRY: Now where is that amended?

SPEAKER: Regional land use planning systems.

NEWBERRY: Now can we have the amended paragraph read please?

MARTIN: Third paragraph in the preamble will now read:

"Being advised of the regional land use planning systems now legislated by some governments and the apparent success of these regional planning processes to identify important nature conservation areas and to establish development controls in adjoining areas to create beneficial transition zones."

And also in the last paragraph:

"And encourages the expanded use and refinement of the regional land use planning systems currently legislated and practised."

NEWBERRY: And following conflicts which.

MARTIN: Yes

"To increase the viability and value of nature conservation areas and to avoid incompatible development which may present the future with conflicts which if not irreconcileable are often both complex and expensive to reconcile."

NEWBERRY: Now, any further discussion? That seems to have been much improved. Now would the mover and seconder agree with those amendments for a start?

TANGAROA: Agreed.

NEWBERRY: Do you agree, Mr. Tangaroa?

TANGAROA: Yes.

NEWBERRY: And Mr. Richmond.

RICHMOND: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

NEWBERRY: Okay? Now it's been agreed to by the mover and seconder. Now I'll put it to the vote. All in favour say 'aye' - to the contrary 'no'.

SPEAKER: Aye.

NEWBERRY: I think the 'ayes' have it. On to Recommendation 13. Over to you, Mr. Chairman of the Committee.

BAJPAI: Recommendation 13. "Community Awareness and Education."

NEWBERRY: Now would someone move Recommendation 13 please?

TANGAROA: Tangaroa, Cook Islands.

NEWBERRY: Tangaroa, Cook Islands moves.

SAUNDERS: Saunders, Victoria.

NEWBERRY: Mr. Saunders, Victoria, seconds. Tongailava from Tonga ...

TONGAILAVA: Mr. Chairman ...

NEWBERRY: Questions?

TONGAILAVA: Are we concerned with typographical error here or ...

NEWBERRY: Yes, we'll have a look at that. Which one, sir?

TONGAILAVA: It was in the very last paragraph "and recommends - investigate and evaluate the applicability."

NEWBERRY: Now it's been moved and seconded. Any discussion please? No discussion? All in favour say 'aye', to the contrary 'no'.

SPEAKERS: Aye.

NEWBERRY: I think the 'ayes' have it. Recommendation 14.

BAJPAI: Recommendation 14 says: "Training of staff to manage national parks and reserves".

NEWBERRY: Recommendation 14. Would someone move please?

TANGAROA: Tangaroa, Cook Islands.

NEWBERRY: Moved by New Guinea. Seconded by ...

TANGAROA: Tangaroa, Cook Islands.

NEWBERRY: Tangaroa, Cook Islands. Mr. Kakarya, New Guinea. And Mr. Tangaroa, Cook Islands. Any discussions please? This one seems to be okay. No further discussions? All in favour?

SPEAKERS: Aye.

NEWBERRY: I think the 'ayes' have it. Recommendation 15. Over to the Chairman of the Committee.

BAJPAI: Recommendation 15, delegates, I think is very important - which is - "Future Conference".

NEWBERRY: Would someone move please?

PRATT: Mr. Chairman.

NEWBERRY: Dr. Pratt moves. Australian Capital Territory, of course. A seconder please?

TANGAROA: Tangaroa, Cook Islands.

NEWBERRY: Mr. Tangaroa of Cook Islands. Any discussions? Would the Chairman like to say something here?

BAJPAI: Well, Mr. Chairman and delegates. I think we have gone through all the Recommendations from 1 to 15, and the Recommendation 15 says in the last paragraph:

"Recommend that further meeting in this series takes place and that the Third Conference be held in 1983 and recommend further that the Third Conference be held within a Pacific Islands country or group of countries and that developed countries of the Pacific and international organisations operating in the region be urged to assist financially and in any other way necessary to enable conference to be so located."

BAJPAI: (continued) I think this particular sentence should be changed: "Pacific island country or group of countries". I think we'll leave this to the conference to decide now in which country it will probably be better for us to have the next conference. Our initial idea was that this conference could be held in Fiji, but in here it says the finance will be - will have to be arranged by other countries, and by doing this we can have the pre-conference tours of Western Samoa, Tonga, and then eventually the conference held in Fiji.

NEWBERY: Sounds marvellous. Firstly I think, to complete the business of the recommendations. The motion has been moved and seconded. No further discussions? If not, all those in favour? I think the 'ayes' have it. Now, ladies and gentlemen, that concludes the discussions on the recommendations, and before vacating the Chair, I would like to thank the Chairman of the Recommendation Committee, the Honourable I. Bajpai, the Members of the Committee and the Secretary on my left here, Mr. Martin, for their work. You'd realise of course, from the fifteen recommendations that they must have spent much time in considering, developing and drafting the recommendations. The fact that they were accepted so readily, I believe, by the conference indicates, ladies and gentlemen, that the Committee has reflected the views of the delegates about the matters we have been discussing during this conference over the last three or four days. Those recommendations, ladies and gentlemen, will be included in the written record of the conference which will be produced by New South Wales and distributed to all delegates in Australia and overseas.

I would just like to move a vote of thanks, ladies and gentlemen, to the Committee for the reasons that I've just indicated, and I would like you to carry that vote of thanks by acclamation. Mr. Bajpai, ladies and gentlemen.

BAJPAI: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the delegates for having their confidence in this Recommendation Committee which they appointed only two days back. I feel that these fifteen recommendations that were put before the delegates had very few alterations, and this gives us a real happiness for the confidence that was placed in us. We feel we have achieved that for which the Committee was appointed. Thank you.

NEWBERY: Now, ladies and gentlemen, I'd just like to announce that the Honourable Paul Landa, the Minister for Planning and Environment in New South Wales, has re-joined the conference and will now proceed to the final session, and before vacating the Chair, I'd just like to take this opportunity, Honourable Ministers, ladies and gentlemen, of thanking the New South Wales Government through your Minister, Mr. Landa, for the wonderful conference that you've had here over the last few days, and the way that you've carried it out, and the way you've looked after the delegates. It is one of the best conferences that I've ever attended and this has been brought about of course, by the way that the New South Wales Government has organised the conference here in Sydney, and the way they have given attention to every detail right down to the accommodation and the transport. I think you'd all agree with me that attendance at a conference, which is always difficult, is made so very much easier when you're taken care of by the Minister and his Government as we have been here in Sydney over the last few days.

I'd just like to say also that we in Queensland were very, very privileged to have the delegates with us over a few days during the previous week and I can assure you that we were delighted to have the opportunity of taking a part in the second South Pacific Conference. We were absolutely pleased to have the opportunity of looking after you while you were in Queensland. And so with those few words, Mr. Minister, I'll now resume my seat and look forward to the next conference. It has been suggested it might be Fiji. So we'll be looking forward, of course, to a conference as successful as this one has been. Thanks very much.

LANDA: Thank you, Minister. I again have to apologise of course, to delegates for my inability to be here this morning, but there was a Commonwealth-State Ministers' meeting on emission control on motor vehicles

and, needless to say, if you watch your television tonight, you'll be able to see I was relatively engaged this morning on that matter.

Delegates, as you are aware, the organisation of this conference followed the pattern established in New Zealand for the first South Pacific Conference on National Parks and Reserves in 1975. The conference commenced with a pre-conference tour of Queensland, followed by the conference in Sydney, and a post-conference tour to be held in Victoria. The pre-and post-conference tours were organised to provide delegates with first hand experience of some types of areas which are being discussed at the conference, so that delegates would be aware of the problems associated with the care, control and management of those areas.

The organisation of the conference has therefore been a co-operative effort among the governments of New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria, as well as the Federal Government, which was responsible for extending invitations to overseas delegates and also in meeting some of the costs involved in the conduct of the conference in Sydney. Thanks should therefore be extended firstly to the Queensland Government, represented here by the Honourable Tom Newbery, and I would like Mr. Newbery to convey to his Government and to the staff of the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service, my thanks, and the thanks of my Government, for their co-operation and assistance in arranging the pre-conference tour.

In anticipation of a successful post-conference tour of Victoria's national parks and reserves, I also wish to extend thanks to the Victorian Government, and I would ask the Victorian delegate, Mr. Don Saunders, to pass on to his Minister, the Honourable Bill Borthwick, and to the officers of the National Parks Service, our sincere thanks for their involvement in the conference.

I also wish to acknowledge the financial assistance extended by the Federal Government and the co-operation of their officers in communicating with the governments from overseas represented here today.

The International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, the South Pacific Commission and the South Pacific Bureau for Economic Co-operation have all been co-sponsors of the conference and for their support and the attendance of their representatives, we are indeed grateful. I'm sure the delegates would agree that the conduct of a conference is only as successful as the Chairman of each individual session. In this regard, we've been indeed fortunate in the way the sessions have been conducted, and my thanks especially to the Honourable Venn Young of New Zealand, the Honourable Tom Newbery of Queensland, the Honourable Andrew Lohrey of Tasmania, Hon. John Cornwall of South Australia, for the very capable manner in which they conducted the sessions, and especially for their assistance to me in a personal way due to the unforeseen commitments that overtook my possibility of attendance at the sessions listed for me.

One of the most important aspects of any conference is the preparation of recommendations arising from conference deliberations. I'm very pleased to see recorded, our appreciation to the Honourable I. Bajpai, the Chairman of the Recommendations Committee and its members, the Honourable T. Tangaroa, Mr. Noel Coad, and Mr. Tim Richmond and Secretary, Mr. Geoff Martin. We are grateful also to those delegates who presented keynote addresses which have been the basis of such stimulating and thought-provoking discussion. I would therefore like to record the appreciation of the conference to the Honourable Jim Webster, the Honourable Mr. Kakarya, the Honourable Venn Young, the Honourable I. Bajpai, and Mr. Tongailava. Deserving of special mention, of course, there is Doctor Ray Dasman who had the difficult task of drawing the threads of the conference together for the benefit of delegates. Doctor Dasman handled it with professionalism which of course is widely known. I should also record appreciation to the members of the panel session, convenor Doctor Dahl, the Honourable Venn Young from New Zealand, Mr. Joe Brown from the United States and Mr. Sylvanus Gorio from Papua New Guinea.

Delegates would of course, be well aware that behind the scenes was a lot of planning, thought and effort entailed in organising and managing a conference of this type. It would take too long of course, to mention all those departments, groups and officers involved. But I would like to express sincere thanks to the Director and officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, the management and staff of the Opera House which has provided an unrivalled setting for the conference, and to the New South Wales Transcription Service which has worked so diligently to provide a record of this conference.

Doctor Dasman referred to what must be a unique period in the history of nature conservation in the South Pacific, in its substantial increases in areas devoted to nature conservation which have either been announced or taken effect during the short time of the conference. New South Wales was pleased to be able to participate in this demonstration of our commitment to nature conservation, and I congratulate those other states and countries which have honoured the conference in the centenary of Royal National Park in this manner. I would also like to bring to the attention of delegates that at 4 p.m. today, the Premier of New South Wales, the Honourable Neville Wran and the Prime Minister of Australia, Malcolm Fraser will be announcing the creation in effect of the Sydney Harbour National Park in a state of unrivalled size and grandeur by the exchange voluntary between the state of New South Wales and the Federal Government of lands creating the reservation by reverting to New South Wales National Parks and Wildlife Service, many of the foreshore lands in the Sydney Harbour proper. And this afternoon if you have a chance to watch on the Sydney Harbour you will see indeed the magnificent acreage added to the national park, which will be of course, the great Sydney Harbour National Park.

Many books, brochures and pamphlets were provided by delegates for the information of other delegates attending the conference. These were very welcome indeed, and I thank those delegates responsible for making the literature available.

I would also like to take this opportunity to make available to delegates as a memento of the centenary of the first national park in this country, and the second oldest in the world, the Royal National Park, a presentation copy of a new publication entitled, National Parks in New South Wales. This book provides some interesting information on a few of the areas under the control of the New South Wales National Parks and Wildlife Service.

The success of any conference also depends on the willingness of delegates to participate and to give of themselves for the benefit of others. This is so much more important in a conference of this nature where so many Governments are represented, and I would like to pay tribute to the delegates and observers for their attendance, interest and active participation during the sessions of the conference. We all know that a great deal of discussion on relevant topics ensues outside the formal sessions, and the exchange of ideas through informal gatherings has been most noticeable. I am sure that you will agree with me that the conference has been a most successful one, and will lead to a furtherance of nature conservation in the South Pacific.

I hope that the friendships, contacts and associations established here will be of benefit to the countries represented in the years to come. Once again, may I on behalf of the Government of New South Wales, thank you, delegates and observers, for your attendance and participation at this Second South Pacific Conference on National Parks and Reserves. Some delegates have expressed the desire to share with us some of their views and experiences of the conference and I have much pleasure in now extending an invitation to delegates to do so.

DISCUSSION

LANDA: Mr. Coad, New Zealand

COAD: Mr. Chairman, you have very admirably expressed thanks to so many people who have helped to make this an absolutely outstanding conference. I was involved with the first New Zealand conference. In fact, I had Don Johnstone's position in the first conference and I know what's involved in preparing for and in running a conference like this and I worked on the basis so long as the delegates felt everything went smoothly that was fine, but I knew that behind the scenes and under the surface there was a hell of a lot of paddling going on. Now I know that in this conference, Mr. Chairman, all the delegates have been quite sure that everything has gone so perfectly and so smoothly that it's a real tribute to the people who prepared for it, and I would like to say that we have received such willing service to an extraordinary level that I don't know how any other country that takes on the running of a conference such as this can compete, and on behalf of all the delegates I would like to thank not only New South Wales, not only the Australian Government, not only the Queensland Government and in advance, the Victorian Government, but I would particularly like to thank the people who worked behind the scenes so hard to make this a success. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

LANDA: Delegates, I would like to remind you that tomorrow, weather permitting, and even if it doesn't, we're going to have it - the rededication of Royal National Park by His Excellency the Governor, at a ceremony in the Park. As you know, this conference was organised to coincide with the celebrations of this event and I look forward to seeing you tomorrow with us on this occasion.

I also take this opportunity to wish those delegates who are not joining the post-conference tour, a safe journey home.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Second South Pacific Conference on National Parks and Reserves is now closed.

RICHMOND: The Commonwealth Minister, Senator Webster, has today, together with the Minister responsible for national mapping issued a new map of Australia's National Parks and Reserves, of which they are very proud. Unfortunately, as a result of your action, Minister, and those of certain other Governments in the last few days, the map is already well and truly out of date. However, I really hope that the map will continue to remain out of date for the same sorts of reasons, but it would be appreciated if we could make arrangements for the Secretary to distribute the map to delegates, and I would also like to assure delegates that we will be updating the map as soon as possible.

LANDA: Thank you. Thank you delegates.

.....