

Division 64: Fisheries, \$26 160 000 -

Mrs D.J. Guise, Chairman.

Mr J.J.M. Bowler, Minister for Local Government and Regional Development representing the Minister for Fisheries.

Dr P.P. Rogers, Executive Director.

Mr B. Mezzatesta, Manager, Financial and Administrative Services.

Dr J. Penn, Director of Fisheries Research.

Mr P.J. Millington, Director, Fisheries Management Services.

Mr N.L. Sarti, Acting Manager, Strategic Planning and Policy.

Mr A.C. Walker, Acting Manager, Regional Services.

The CHAIRMAN: This estimates committee will be reported by Hansard staff. The daily proof *Hansard* will be published at 9.00 am tomorrow.

The estimates committee's consideration of the estimates will be restricted to discussion of those items for which a vote of money is proposed in the consolidated fund. This is the prime focus of the committee. While there is scope for members to examine many matters, questions need to be clearly related to a page number, item, program or amount within the volumes. For example, members are free to pursue performance indicators that are included in the budget statements while there remains a clear link between the questions and the estimates. It is the intention of the Chairperson to ensure that as many questions as possible are asked and answered and that both questions and answers are short and to the point.

The minister may agree to provide supplementary information to the committee, rather than asking that the question be put on notice for the next sitting week. For the purpose of following up the provision of this information, I ask the minister to clearly indicate to the committee which supplementary information he agrees to provide, and I will then allocate a reference number. If supplementary information is to be provided, I seek the minister's cooperation in ensuring that it is delivered to the committee clerk by 17 June 2005, so that members may read it before the report and third reading stages. If the supplementary information cannot be provided within that time, written advice is required of the day by which the information will be made available. Details in relation to supplementary information have been provided to both members and advisers, and accordingly I ask the minister to cooperate with those requirements.

I caution members that if a minister asks that a matter be put on notice, it is up to the member to lodge the question on notice with the clerk's office. Only supplementary information that the minister agrees to provide will be sought by 17 June 2005.

Dr G.G. JACOBS: I draw the minister's attention to the third dot point on page 1063, which refers to the increased pressure for integrated marine planning. Is the minister aware that a group of people in my area of Esperance, Esperance Bay and the Recherche Archipelago have an expectation that a new marine reserve will be declared? Can the minister inform me whether that process is under way? Part of the increased pressure is coming from a group of people who are calling for a marine management plan to be prepared. Following that, they obviously want a reserve in that area because of the proposal to use the bay for a tuna farm.

Mr J.J.M. BOWLER: I thank the member for the question. The only trouble is that he should ask the minister responsible, because it relates more to the Department of Conservation and Land Management.

Dr G.G. JACOBS: I did that this morning.

Mr J.J.M. BOWLER: And she referred the member to the Minister for Fisheries?

Dr G.G. JACOBS: There was some suggestion that I should refer part of that question to the minister.

Mr J.J.M. BOWLER: The declaration of marine parks definitely is not within the budget of the Department of Fisheries, as the member would expect. However, I have met the people to whom the member has referred. I am aware of their expectations, as I am aware of the proposed tuna farm. As the Minister for Goldfields-Esperance and Great Southern, I have met representatives of the MG Kailis Group. However, more specifically, the member wants to know whether a higher level of environmental assessment will be imposed on the MG Kailis tuna farm. As I have said, that does not really relate to the Department of Fisheries; that is up to the Minister for the Environment.

Dr G.G. JACOBS: There is increased pressure for a management plan for the archipelago. I am concerned that the progress of that management plan is rather slow and could be used as an excuse to delay a possible valid

industry for the archipelago. I am concerned that this increased pressure for a management plan is an excuse to slow down the development of a possible valid tuna farm with environmental sustainability.

Mr J.J.M. BOWLER: As I have said, the bulk of the member's question about environmental management plans for the Archipelago of the Recherche should be directed to the Minister for the Environment. However, the Department of Fisheries has been involved in that process, so I will ask the executive director to respond to that part of the question.

Dr P.P. Rogers: More specifically, the question relates to the Department of Fisheries' consideration of an aquaculture application for that site under the Fish Resources Management Act. It cannot progress until we get a formal application. Once we get a formal application, those provisions of the FRMA will be dealt with. So far, no formal application has been received.

Dr G.G. JACOBS: Will that process come after the assessment by the Environmental Protection Authority?

Dr P.P. Rogers: It can occur in parallel or separately. The legislation determines the role of both agencies and, of course, we cannot, under the FRMA, make a final decision until the question of the environmental considerations has been answered under the appropriate environmental legislation.

Mr G. SNOOK: I refer the minister to the service and appropriation summary on page 1064. Service 3 is the development and promotion of the state's aquaculture industry. There is a reduction in the appropriation amount for aquaculture, and it is reflected on page 1068 in the detailed information on service 3. In light of the increasing pressure on the wild fish stock fisheries, why is the government decreasing expenditure on the development and promotion of the aquaculture industry?

Mr J.J.M. BOWLER: The member is right; the figures give the appearance of a decrease. The reduction occurred in the 2004-05 financial year and was offset by an increase in the pearling component of this service. The pearling activities will decrease in 2005-06 and that will affect the whole aquaculture reduction. I understand that the decrease has been caused almost entirely by the pearling component. Is this the \$8 million that has been reduced to \$6.9 million?

[7.10 pm]

Mr G. SNOOK: That is the one: \$8.017 million down to \$6.849 million.

Mr J.J.M. BOWLER: The aquaculture program was reduced as a result of a major policy decision made in 2002-03 as a result of the report of the Functional Review Taskforce. That is a part of the reduction, but the other cause was the pearling activity. Dr Rogers will explain how the pearling activity affects this in particular.

Dr P.P. Rogers: Yes, it can have that effect. An increase in activity in the last financial year was reduced this year. The estimates have been changed because of a review requirement in the pearling management legislation and the hatchery policy for the pearling industry. That is reflected by a reduction in the cost recovery arrangements for the pearling industry this year. The reduction in aquaculture that occurred in 2002-03 amounted to about \$500 000 as a result of the Functional Review Taskforce, which was a broader review of the delivery of government services in that year. It was a combined impact.

Mr J.J.M. BOWLER: So \$500 000 resulted from the functional review process, and \$500 000 resulted from changes in the pearling program.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: I refer to the fifth dot point on page 1063, which refers to a continuing requirement to improve seafood quality and marketing. The last three words in that sentence - increased production costs - apply somewhat to the minister. There are complaints about the lack of transparency in the cost recovery program. Is a review or some process coming up soon to have another look at the allocation of costs? As the minister knows, some of these fisheries have been under a fair bit of pressure. These things are never argued as much when crayfish, or whatever, are getting a good price, but recent times have been lean for some of these fisheries. Is there a process, other than the councils formed by the government, by which people can demand more transparency in cost recovery?

Mr J.J.M. BOWLER: Coming from a mining background, I am fully aware of the impact of the value of the Australian dollar. Somewhere around US50c was a nice little figure in my life, but others do not like that. I was surprised to see, delving into the fishing industry, just how much of an impact the value of the dollar has on that industry, and on the member's industry, agriculture. The executive director will speak more specifically on those reviews.

Dr P.P. Rogers: I can comment on two aspects. One is that all of the costs in relation to the cost recovery program are subject to review by the relevant management advisory committee, and its representation. That is an ongoing process that takes place each year, so it is subject to continuous review. We also have a committee consisting of representatives of the Western Australia Fishing Industry Council and the department to look at the

overview of all of the fisheries under cost recovery, in terms of the business rules and the business model. It has been an ongoing and fairly transparent process.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: It is probably unfair to ask the minister how transparent it is. Would there not be a use for a process under which some sort of a report is submitted to Parliament, so that we can also ask questions about that transparency?

Mr J.J.M. BOWLER: I was going to defer to the executive director, but he has just whispered to me that it is in the annual report each year.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: The problem with annual reports is that they come out 18 months after the action. That is the first thing wrong with them. The second thing is that they are fairly global in their application.

Dr P.P. Rogers: The only comment I can make is that we generally table our reports around October or November each year.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: Which is 18 months after the action.

Dr P.P. Rogers: No.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: Yes.

Dr P.P. Rogers: Not to my knowledge. It is not the case.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: We will not argue about that but it is.

Mr P.B. WATSON: I refer to the major achievements for 2004-05 at page 1066. A number of achievements refer to the west coast, but there is nothing for the south coast in either achievements for 2004-05 or initiatives for 2005-06. Does the minister realise there is a south coast fishery, and are there any plans for major initiatives for the area in 2005-06?

Mr J.J.M. BOWLER: I am fully aware and that is why the government is going to build a small boat harbour in the member's home town of Albany at considerable cost to the taxpayers of Western Australia.

Mr P.B. WATSON: It is no good having a small boat harbour if there are no strategies for the fish.

Mr J.J.M. BOWLER: I am fully aware of the bluefin tuna industry that operates out of Esperance. I will ask the executive director to comment.

Dr P.P. Rogers: It is a difficult question to answer because, by and large, most fisheries in Western Australia are fully exploited, including those on the south coast. The opportunity for expansion is very limited. If anything, because of the cost-price squeeze on many of the fisheries, including the salmon industry and the shark industry because of some concerns about stocks, we are seeing a retraction in fishing pressure and an adjustment of the number of units because of the long-term cost pressures. Long-term management strategies involve restructuring the industry to keep it viable.

Mr P.B. WATSON: What about the pilchard industry? There were problems with a virus a few years ago. What is the situation at present?

Dr P.P. Rogers: The fishery has largely recovered in a sense that we went through a period in which we had to impose zero quotas. If the member can recall, there were two massive virus events that caused very significant mortality to the pilchard stock. In the same circumstance we have brought quotas down to zero and have rebuilt the quotas to approximately 2 500 tonnes across the entire south coast. In the same period we have also seen a very significant expansion in the South Australian pilchard fishery, which has impacted on the markets because supply from that industry has affected the markets Australia-wide. It is fair to say that people in the south coast pilchard fishery still find it difficult, even though the stocks have recovered, because of the changing market circumstances.

Mr J.J.M. BOWLER: The executive director mentioned the exploitation of all fish stocks; they are fairly low in almost every case. I am also advised that Western Australia has amongst the best-managed fisheries in the world. Although the stocks may be low in Western Australia, they are better managed than almost everywhere else.

The CHAIRMAN: On the call list I have the members for Roe, Alfred Cove, Collie-Wellington and Moore, and the Leader of the National Party. After the Leader of the National Party asks his question, I will ask the committee where it wants to proceed given that it has to deal with three other divisions before eight o'clock.

Dr G.G. JACOBS: The sixth dot point at page 1063 refers to the continued interest in the development of aquaculture industries. As the minister is probably aware, Bremer Bay has two abalone onshore farms, which consist of culture infantile stock. It takes some years for the stock to mature. Does the continued interest go far

enough in providing power and funding support? If so, what was the funding support in 2004-05 for the two abalone farms and what is the proposed funding support for 2005-06?

[7.20 pm]

Mr J.J.M. BOWLER: I visited the abalone farms last month and saw the existing Bayside Abalone Farm, which has been under way now for two to three years. I saw the public-funded company building its facility next door. I met the management of both companies. Both of the undertakings are at different stages and both have different problems and aspirations. The state government did provide funding for Bayside through my predecessor, the former Minister for Fisheries. Maybe the executive director can explain exactly what was provided.

Dr P.P. Rogers: What was provided was a guarantee for the lending arrangement for the development of a new industry. I think the extent of the guarantee was \$800 000. That enabled Bayside to extend its credit and further its development. Subsequent to that, the priority of the terms of the guarantee was changed by the government, and through the Department of Industry and Resources, which allowed the company to borrow a further sum of money, the commercial details of which were not given to me, to extend its line of credit through a commercial bank so that it can continue its development to a point where it is in a cash-flow positive position. That is about the sum of the direct assistance given to Bremer Bay abalone farmers.

Dr G.G. JACOBS: The harvest of wild captured fish worldwide is generally at its maximum sustainable level. I want to ask Dr Rogers, through the minister, if I may, about an issue that was touched on earlier by the member for Albany. I refer to the pilchard stocks on the southern coast. For Esperance to support a full tuna farm of 15 cages, which MG Kailis Group proposes after the trial period of its pilot farm, will demand something like 7 000 tonnes of pilchards. Is that pilchard biomass sustainable, recognising that the minister has said that the pilchard stock has largely recovered?

Mr J.J.M. BOWLER: I understand that MG Kailis Group is also looking at alternatives to that food source, but the executive director can answer the question.

Dr P.P. Rogers: In terms of direct product from the south coast pilchard fishery, the answer is no. It would need to be sourced elsewhere in Australia. Noting that the total allowable catch in tuna that is controlled by the commonwealth is limited, any development of tuna farming in the Esperance area - assuming that we received an application and it was approved - that was sourcing its product from Australian sources of feedstock would probably need to source that feedstock from South Australia, where the bulk of it is being sourced at the present time.

Dr G.G. JACOBS: Through the minister, may I ask Dr Rogers whether the quotas for pilchard fishing out of Port Lincoln are sustainable? I think there is a 50 000-tonne quota all up.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that question might be a bit outside our ambit of budget.

Mr J.J.M. BOWLER: I think it is a bit unfair to be asked to provide an opinion about another state's fishery, but if Dr Rogers is prepared to qualify it in some way, I will leave it to him.

Dr P.P. Rogers: To be helpful, based on the South Australian assessment of the pilchard stock off South Australia, the judgment is that it is sustainable. One thing that I have noticed about the industry in Western Australia, relative to South Australia, is the difference in the strength of recruitment; that is, the strength of young fish coming through the population, which determines the biomass and ultimately the take. Recruitment of the fish stock is much stronger in the centre of the fishery, which tends to be around the coast of South Australia, particularly the Port Lincoln area, rather than off the west coast. By the time the fishery gets to the west coast of Western Australia, the variability of recruitment is so up and down that the reliability that is achieved in South Australia in terms of fish numbers and fishery exploitation cannot be achieved in Western Australia. My best judgment of the information that we have seen is that it is sustainable.

Dr J.M. WOOLLARD: Measures have been introduced to reduce the decline in number of the sandbar shark. I looked through the "State of the Fisheries Report 2003/04" and was amazed at the number of sharks that were listed. In relation to the shark population, which sharks are declining in number and which are considered to be stable? I ask the minister to identify each of the species that is declining in number, the ones that are considered to be stable and the species on which we have insufficient information to determine the number. Which reports are being used on which to base the findings for those three categories?

Mr J.J.M. BOWLER: I will hand over to the executive director.

Dr P.P. Rogers: I will ask Dr Jim Penn to comment shortly, but I want to make a number of comments. By and large, shark groups are made up of a large number of animals. Some sharks are long-living and have low fecundity; therefore, their capacity to reproduce and produce a large number of animals each year on a sustainable basis is fairly low. Typically, the rate of replacement is around two per cent to 2.5 per cent. The

dusky whaler, the sandbar sharks, and some long-living sharks, such as the pigeye and lemon sharks, and a few others of that type, are very difficult to manage in terms of a long-term sustainable fishery and take. Other groups of sharks, like gummy sharks and to some extent blacktip sharks in northern Australia, are much faster growing and mature a lot earlier. They are more fecund, which means that the biomass can increase by six, seven or even eight per cent a year. Those fisheries are much more sustainable on a year-by-year basis. A significant report was prepared by our research division on sandbar sharks, which will be publicly available in the near future. The advice has been given to the minister. It is going through a peer review at this time. There are ongoing concerns about the exploitation of other stocks of shark like the whiskery shark, which is found in more temperate areas. The management proposal that is before the minister for his consideration goes through the management advisory process needed to reduce the further exploitation of those shark stocks. It is fair to say that the department is taking the question of the management of the fishery on a sustainable basis very seriously. We must report to the federal Department of the Environment and Heritage. We must ensure that our fisheries are sustainable under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act, so that we can continue to get approval for exports. It is not as a consequence of that, but that is a factor in taking a very determined position on ensuring that shark stocks are maintained. There is no question that the impact of the Chinese market on the shark-fin industry has been significant in affecting the behaviour of fishermen in the exploitation of shark stocks. There has been a tremendous effort by the department in the past 12 months to bring that to account. Substantial documentation has been presented to the minister so that he can finally determine a range of outcomes for the ongoing management of those shark fisheries. I think the minister announced the other day the closure of the shark fishery from North West Cape to Broome, which is a fairly significant area in any dimension. That is in addition to an existing closure of shark fishing from 26 degrees 30 minutes, which is near the South Passage, all the way to Broome. There is already an extensive area of shark stocks in Western Australia that is now proposed to be closed to shark fishing.

[7.30 pm]

Mr M.P. MURRAY: The first and second dot points under major initiatives for 2005-06 on page 1066 refer to a review of western rock lobster managed fisheries, specifically quota versus input. Can the minister expand on the quota versus input scenario? The zones are referred to in the second dot point. I assume that the zones are part of the management structure as well. About five or six years ago there were zones within the rock lobster industry. In the past two or three years the cape-to-cape fishery has been bombarded with boats that could not previously come from the north. In the past couple of years half the fleet has been coming down to that area. I thought the zones had been abolished.

Mr J.J.M. BOWLER: I will ask Dr Rogers to respond.

Dr P.P. Rogers: As part of the department's obligations under the national competition policy it has prepared a strategy aimed at looking at the long-term management arrangements for the rock lobster industry. The strategy looks at the question of quota versus input controls for that fishery. The department has commissioned a number of pieces of work that will be tabled with industry during October this year and following that there will be considerable discussion around what is the best long-term strategy for the management of the industry. We must make ongoing adjustments with total catch trends as fishing efficiency grows. That will take a year or two to resolve, but it is a significant issue for the fishing industry and the rock lobster industry in particular.

The member raised the question of resource sustainability management packages for zones A, B and C. There are three zones in the rock lobster fishery. Zone C extends in broad terms from the thirtieth parallel down to Cape Leeuwin. North of the thirtieth parallel the area extends to the North West Cape. In terms of zones A and B, there is an Abrolhos zone A and a coastal zone, which operate during part of the year. Those with a zone B licence can fish right through the year in simple terms, whereas those with the Abrolhos Island zone A licence can fish on the coast up until 14 March. On 15 March they are permitted to operate in the Abrolhos Islands, which is an offshore area out of Geraldton. Those three zones have been in the fishery for as long as I have been in the department, which is over 30 years. In fact, they were created in about 1968. The member is alluding to zone E in relation to the cape-to-cape issue. The member for Moore probably knows more than I do. Those management changes occurred sometime around the late 1970s when, at that time, the zone E boundary was at 33 degrees south and 10 licences fished out of that area. The zone E and zone D fishermen had access to waters south of 33 degrees south. Zone C vessels did not have access south of 33 degrees. For good or bad, a decision was made by management and governments at the time resulting in the zone E boundary being removed and every zone C licence that fishes 30 degrees south, just north of Greenhead, now has access to Cape Leeuwin. What occurred last year is a consequence of what happens approximately every five years following very big settlement; that is, an abundance of puerulus one-year-old, juvenile rock lobster. The result is large abundances south of Bunbury. That abundance creates a hiatus, as a large number of boats go down there to take the benefit of that increased abundance. That led to the Minister for Fisheries at the time, Hon Kim Chance, introducing a range of measures that were not necessarily popular with the industry. The measures closed off some of the in-

shore surfing areas, where most of the conflict occurred. Discussions are ongoing on three or four locations where there is some argument about where boundaries should be drawn from the point of view of safety in the interaction between surfers, to some extent the recreation fishers and the commercial industry. That process is to take place in June, with further advice to go to the minister on whether some of those areas should be amended in terms of the current closures under section 43. A section 43 notice effectively prohibits commercial fishermen and their boats from fishing in those closed areas. It is very unpopular with the commercial industry because it does not see the equity between recreational and commercial fishers in the interaction area. That is where the debate is at the present time.

Mr J.J.M. BOWLER: I understand those commercial fishers still operate in the same catchment, but further out to sea.

Dr P.P. Rogers: Most of the time they do, but there is no question that part of the interaction in those near-shore areas at the time of the conflict occurred in the area between the two capes.

Mr G. SNOOK: Fishing is a very interesting topic and is beneficial to both the economy and our health. Therefore, more than an hour should have been allocated to this division. I will make my question fairly brief. I refer to the first dot point under major initiatives at page 1070. I refer to the decision by the Minister for the Environment and her government not to take the Department of Fisheries' advice about the extension of the conservation area at Ningaloo. In relation to marine planning and engagement with other government departments, when will the government fulfil its election promise to review processes for the establishment of marine reserves and bio-regional planning in consultation with all fisheries stakeholders and the wider community?

Mr J.J.M. BOWLER: I am not aware of that, but Dr Rogers will answer that question.

Dr P.P. Rogers: Commitments were given to the stakeholders by Minister Chance and Minister Edwards prior to the last election. I understand that they are honouring those commitments and have progressed a number of elements of them. They include the development of a better mode of operation between ministerial portfolios and the departments in progressing some of the issues around the management of marine parks. A commitment has been given to conduct an independent scientific assessment of the debate on biodiversity and fisheries management issues and the value and worth of sanctuaries and marine park management. Recently I attended the launch of the new Western Australian Institute of Marine Science, at which Minister Edwards made some very positive comments about progressing marine park management.

[7.40 pm]

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: I refer to the development and promotion of the state's aquaculture industry, which is mentioned on page 1068 of the *Budget Statements*. I obviously have a keen interest in aquaculture. I notice that the budget does not contain a line for inland aquaculture, although there is a line about what is being done at Fremantle. Is there any way of finding out what is being done for aquaculture? A line in the budget refers to interaction with foreign fishers. I want to get a measure of how much support the government gives to the future of the industry. I am the first to admit that the market is a bit small, but it will develop over time.

Dr P.P. Rogers: As a point of clarification, there is no significant inland stock of inland fisheries; we are talking about aquaculture.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: There are no line items at all in the budget about aquaculture.

Dr P.P. Rogers: There are. I was at a meeting of the aquaculture development committee today. The committee is trying to focus on developing a sizeable aquaculture industry in Western Australia. One of the key issues it is focusing on is trying to drag the marron industry up by the bootstraps to take a more strategic view of how it will develop its business. The committee is proposing to bring together some of the leaders of industry, as was done for the abalone aquaculture industry, with a view to trying to get some cohesion and think of strategies to grow the business. The answer to the question is that yes, we are.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: What about the koonacs? That was a fairly viable industry that seems to have plateaued at best. Also there are some attempts to operate fin fisheries inland. Is there any money in the budget for the slow development of that industry?

Dr P.P. Rogers: Small amounts of money have been provided. We have been working on trout farming on and off. The emphasis today is on trying to develop large-scale aquaculture, as distinct from small-scale aquaculture. Some very positive work is being done on trout and trout stocking at the Pemberton trout hatchery. That helps to support the small industry on trout aquaculture. We have done some work also on marron. The Fisheries Research and Development Corporation provided some funds that enabled us to develop a superior strain of marron, but that funding is about to come to an end. We are considering selling that commercial stock back to the marron industry. The Leader of the National Party would be aware that some significant money has been

given to TAFE for this type of development. That matter is outside my portfolio. The member for Avon, as the local member, would be fully aware of the work progressing on a suspended tank system within saline waters to grow fish in a very cost-effective way to utilise that water. How far that technology will grow will depend on the success of the new research program as it moves more and more towards commercial feasibility.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: There are currently no funds for marketing?

Dr P.P. Rogers: We have very limited funds for marketing. That is clearly not the role of a government agency in that sense.

The CHAIRMAN: I said I would check after the Leader of the National Party had asked his question. The member for Moore has indicated that he has a question. I know that the member for Alfred Cove would also like to ask a question if I continue with this division. I will leave it up to the committee, considering we have 15 minutes left and three other divisions. The member for Moore can ask his question. Members will then need to indicate again whether they would like to ask a question, otherwise I will give the call to the member for Alfred Cove.

Mr G. SNOOK: Thank you, Madam Chair. This is my last question on fisheries, disappointingly. I refer to page 1077, the fisheries adjustment schemes trust account, line item two. Given that the Labor Party election policy included a commitment to use the provisions of the Fisheries Adjustment Schemes Act to phase out commercial fishing in the Swan and Canning Rivers, what is the anticipated cost of phasing out commercial fishing in the Swan and Canning Rivers, and where has the additional funding for the phase-out been included in the budget?

Mr J.J.M. BOWLER: I will ask Mr Millington to address this question.

Mr P.J. Millington: The current budget to the end of this financial year has about \$1.2 million in it. There is also an appropriation of another \$500 000. The fisheries adjustment scheme for the Swan and Canning Rivers, which I think is the one the member is asking about, is under way at the moment. There are some commercial in-confidence issues that need to be taken into account. Offers have been made to three of the four fishermen involved, and the minister is currently negotiating with those people. Unfortunately I cannot give the member the total figures, because that would give an inference of the actual figure, which is a commercial in-confidence issue until it is settled. I apologise for that. There is sufficient money in that \$1.2 million to cover that budget item.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest that the member for Alfred Cove's further questions be put on notice. I will defer to the committee's wish that I move to the other divisions.

The appropriation was recommended.

[7.50 pm]