

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
AND FINANCE**

**INQUIRY INTO
IMPACT OF STATE GOVERNMENT ACTIONS AND PROCESSES
ON THE USE AND ENJOYMENT OF FREEHOLD AND LEASEHOLD LAND
IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA**

**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE TAKEN
AT PERTH
ON WEDNESDAY, 12 MARCH 2003**

Members

**Hon Barry House (Chairman
Hon Ed Dermer (Deputy Chairman)
Hon Murray Criddle
Hon John Fischer
Hon Dee Margetts
Hon Ken Travers
Hon Sue Ellery**

Committee met at 1.42 pm

SCHAPPER, DR HENRY PAUL
Honorary Senior Research Fellow,
University of Western Australia,
examined:

The CHAIRMAN: Welcome, Dr Schapper. I will first go through some short formalities. On behalf of the committee I welcome you to the meeting. To begin with, please state your full name, contact address and the capacity in which you appear before the committee.

Dr Schapper: My name is Henry Paul Schapper. I am an Honorary Senior Research Fellow at the University of Western Australia for which I do not get paid, which I suppose means that I am retired. I appear before the committee in my capacity as a citizen with an interest in the sustainability of agricultural and pastoral land.

The CHAIRMAN: You will have signed a document entitled "Information for Witnesses". Have you read and understood that document?

Dr Schapper: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: These proceedings are being recorded by Hansard. A transcript of your evidence will be provided to you. To assist the committee and Hansard, please quote the full title of any document you refer to during the course of this hearing for the record. I remind you that your transcript will become a matter for the public record. If for some reason you wish to make a confidential statement during today's proceedings, you should request that the evidence be taken in closed session. If the committee grants your request, any public and media in attendance will be excluded from the hearing. Please note that until such time as the transcript of your public evidence is finalised, it should not be made public. Premature publication or disclosure of public evidence may constitute a contempt of Parliament and may mean that the material published or disclosed is not subject to parliamentary privilege.

Dr Schapper, thank you very much for the submission that you have been kind enough to provide to the committee. Would you like to make an opening statement and perhaps speak to the submission that you have provided to the committee?

Dr Schapper: I understand that the submission has been pre-circulated to committee members, which of course does not mean that it has been pre-read.

The CHAIRMAN: You know human nature pretty well, Dr Schapper. Some of us have attempted to read some parts of it at least. The best thing to do is to assume little knowledge.

Dr Schapper: I suppose the first thing that I would like you to note about my submission is that it is not evidence; rather, it contains ideas that do not seem to have been within the scope of the relevant government agencies for some time. It is as vague as ideas can be vague, rather than as hard as evidence can be. The centrepiece or central idea of my notion is presented in the form of a proposal that society or the State should be the final, publicly known, publicly stated and publicly claimed guarantor of the sustainability of naturally renewable resources in agriculture and pastoralism. It is not quite the same thing as what I think the State has or may have in mind - one does not know. The Soil and Land Conservation Act, which was the first relevant Act in this general area, was passed in 1945, and the Land Administration Act was passed in its recent form in 1997. In many respects the Land Administration Act, which deals with pastoralism, is quite good, but it does not go as far as I would wish it to. The proposition is that it is for society and the State to ensure the sustainable use of agricultural and pastoral natural resources, and this requires an

operational policy. I remind you that all we have in this regard is the Soil and Land Conservation Act, which I think is widely regarded as a failure, and the Land Administration Act 1997, which has hardly yet got under way. From my point of view, we have very little or nothing in this area, let alone an operational policy.

Sustainability is one thing. I see it as a proper state function for it to assure the community that land use is sustainable. By that I mean that it is continuous. I do not mean that it should be continuous today or tomorrow, but that it should be continuous intergenerationally. That is far beyond the time horizon that farmers and pastoralists generally follow. I am also aware that economic activity or use of natural resources in agriculture and pastoralism is a private economic affair. It is not run by government, it is private. Government influences it and so on, but it is a private matter. It is a feature of our brand of capitalism. It is not a state activity. In other words, on the one hand I am saying that sustainability should be a function of a Government to guarantee and yet on the other hand the use of these resources is governed by markets and economic considerations, which are private.

[1.50 pm]

There is, therefore, a need to somehow integrate these two concepts. One way of integrating them is for the Government to do all sorts of experiments and to show farmers what and how by telling them. That is not compatible with the notion of private enterprise in agriculture as we know it - or as farmers would wish it to be - which I think is most efficient.

Hon ED DERMER: What did you say was most deficient?

Dr Schapper: Private enterprise in agriculture is more efficient than government enterprise in agriculture. That does not mean that private enterprise can operate without Government.

Hon ED DERMER: What about the traditional advisory role performed by Department of Agriculture officers?

Dr Schapper: Yes, I suppose the emphasis would be on tradition, but you put it on advisory. We could argue about that forever, I suppose.

Hon ED DERMER: Traditional was not the main point. What about the advisory role provided, for example, by the Department of Agriculture and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation?

Dr Schapper: I do not know what you want me to say about it, but I would say let us go back a little while.

Hon ED DERMER: I thought you said it was deficient and I wondered whether you regarded that type of advisory role as deficient or helpful?

Dr Schapper: Yes, it is often helpful but I believe it can often be done without. For example, subterranean clover in Western Australia is a real technological breakthrough. Farmers discovered that, not the Department of Agriculture. The Department of Agriculture adopted it. The committee will probably recall that first there were varieties such as Mt Barker and Tallarook which were for the 18-inch rainfall and then a decade later it got down to 17-inch and 16-inch rainfall after farmers had successfully grown it in 15-inch rainfall. It was then adopted by the Department of Agriculture as suitable for 15-inch rainfall long after farmers had been growing other varieties reasonably well in 12-inch rainfall. In other words, the Department of Agriculture, good as it is, usually is not the innovator; it comes in later. There is therefore a mutuality there. Nowadays agriculture departments have hardly any advisory role. I do not know what their advice is about salinity, but farmers can get on pretty well without them. That does not mean that agriculture departments have not helped farmers in many ways, but they have wound down their activities considerably. In fact, in New Zealand - which I know reasonably well - farmers who phone the Department of Agriculture for advice are charged for those phone calls. It has no field staff whatsoever.

In my living memory - I do not know about the members of the committee - I recall that Western Australia originally had two advisers in the whole field and the Government thought at that time that they should be doubled. I think subsequently the advisers were increased to 15 or 16. Then, of course, the advice from the Department of Agriculture is often wrong. If you get me started on this, it will be ridiculous in a way. I was at the forefront helping farmers import their own advisers from New Zealand because they were concerned about managerial advice as distinct from traditional advice - your word - or technological advice - my word. The committee can figure it out for itself. As a result of my efforts and the efforts of some farmers privately, we advised that the advisers in the Department of Agriculture not apply for these jobs. As a direct result of that, about 50 or 60 farm management advisers were employed over a period of eight to 10 years, but that was to give non-Department of Agriculture advice, not traditional Department of Agriculture advice. However, that is a long and different story, and not a story about which we are here.

Hon ED DERMER: You have helped me by fleshing out what you said in your initial proposition.

Dr Schapper: The fact of the matter is that responsibility for the financial viability of a farm is the owner's, the entrepreneur's or the farmer's, not the Government's responsibility, although many farmers believe it should be the Government's responsibility. On one hand you have my notion that only the Government can ensure the long-term sustainable use of pastoral and agricultural land and, on the other hand, it can keep its fingers out of the economic management of the land - as it has successfully done - which is the responsibility of the farmer. Therefore, sustainable and land-use viability functions are the responsibility of the Government and the financial viability is the responsibility of the farmer. It appears to me that those matters must be separated. If they are not separated conceptually, farmers will believe that the Government should make it profitable and the word "viability" unqualified should be a function of Government. Of course, the lobbies are keeping quiet about financial viability; they want subsidies and all those sorts of things, although they say they do not.

The notion in my mind is how to ensure societal, government or state assurances of sustainability, yet maintain private independence and private market orientation for the land user. That is the question that I am trying to deal with.

[2.00 pm]

Let me pause and ask whether anybody is unsure about what I have said.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you like us to ask you questions now?

Dr Schapper: Please do. I would like you to butt in, so to speak.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I want to clarify in my mind that I read your paper correctly. Is your proposition that someone who owns freehold or leasehold land has an obligation to ensure that the land is managed sustainably, and that the land will not be degraded or have a degrading impact on surrounding land? If you have a freehold right, you still have an absolute responsibility to ensure that the land or any surrounding land is not degraded by activity conducted on your land.

Dr Schapper: In an abstract and a moral sense, a lot of people will say yes - that is, that a freeholder has a moral obligation to ensure the long-term sustainability of that land. However, assert to farmers that that obligation should be written into the conditions for land tenure agreement, and hands are thrown up in horror for some reason or other. The answer given is no. It comes down to a code of honour, in a way. I do not rubbish that, but I feel it is not very effective commercially speaking. That concept does not apply to agriculture alone - it applies anywhere. The Government does not believe that proposition as far as crown pastoral lands are concerned. The terms of the agreement, as in the Land Administration Act, read -

A pastoral lessee must . . . at all times manage and work the land under the lease to its best advantage as a pastoral property.

Whatever does that mean? The agreement explains what it might mean, and how it might be affected. In other words, it is not an abstract moral obligation. It is black and white as management of land under pastoral leases in the Act. I am not sure of your question.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: To clarify in my mind, your principal proposition was that someone who has leasehold or freehold land has either a legal or moral obligation, whatever, to maintain that land sustainably. I want to clarify whether the Government needs to come into play to ensure that that occurs, and not rely only on trust.

Dr Schapper: In brutal language, the farmer does not have the obligation.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Are you saying he should?

Dr Schapper: I suppose that because he does not have the obligation, society expects the Government to ensure as far as possible that he acts in that way. How do you get him to act in that way? That is the operational proposition put forward. Society is shot through full of examples of this happening. Take old people's homes. They are not left to the good intentions, kindness and moral obligations of their keepers or owners. Competition plays a part, but you have seen the furore over the past few years about the condition of nursing homes. Governments have to set up standards and state, "You'll be out of business if you do not comply." It is as blunt as that. Nothing like that exists in agriculture. I do not go as far as suggesting that such extremes be applied by any means, but I suggest that potential government pressure is needed because of the way people are.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: That leads to my next point. When considering the sale of property, a great deal of damage could have been done if someone has owned a property for 10 years before it is sold. If business has been bad for a period of time the farmer may have driven the property harder in an effort to double-up; it is like going to the casino. If that situation is not monitored on an ongoing basis, people will drive the land harder in the hope that the good times will return and they can then pay back the land and fix up the property.

Dr Schapper: Your picture is a very real one. I have put it in other words in my submission. Many farmers are driven to that extent, and it may be through no fault of their own. The terms of trade may be so far against them that they otherwise must walk off the land or feed their kids boiled wheat and rabbits. You all know those stories. They may take another crop out of the land next year. They know they should not, but they do it anyway. They may do it again the next year as it may not have been too bad for the land on the first occasion.

That takes us to the next point: farmers rely almost entirely on judgments on how far they can draw down the naturally recoverable fertility. In other words, making such judgments is part of the occupation of agriculture. The hazard is: how far do you go before you reach the conceptual and physical point of no return with the condition of the land? Farmers have to judge that point. It is very hard to do, particularly when the Department of Agriculture advice is not forthcoming on that point, and particularly when the Government itself does not have such standards; I call these standards degradation limits. The department does not say where they are, but a farmer must judge them. Competition between farmers means that they tend to push harder and harder. It is a very difficult concept for which nothing has been done.

Hon JOHN FISCHER: Where do we start as a State? The Pastoral Lands Board has had the ability to set stocking rates and remove bad managers from properties. To my knowledge, no-one has been moved off a pastoral property for degradation.

Dr Schapper: Right.

Hon JOHN FISCHER: I read your paper. It is very interesting as I hear you speaking about it, as it has changed one or two perceptions I had about your submission.

Dr Schapper: Have I contradicted myself?

Hon JOHN FISCHER: I do not suggest that. You have explained it, and I have accepted you better listening to you than I did reading the submission.

Dr Schapper: Right.

[2.10 pm]

Hon JOHN FISCHER: The problem that I see you bringing out is trying to get the individual, the Government and perhaps the Department of Agriculture, or an overseeing division, to come to some conclusions; to be able to build something that you can actually work on. I go back to what I said initially, that we have had a Pastoral Board in this State with the power and the ability to hand down resolutions, but, to my knowledge, it has never ever done so.

Dr Schapper: You have put your finger very nicely on a point I am very conscious of. The point is, why have they not done so? To answer in one way, I think always at the back of their mind is a court case. In this democracy of ours, you can always take the other bloke to court, and that is fair enough. The difficulty I have with the Pastoral Board is that it does not want to end up in court. The reason that is a very tricky area in agriculture, is that there is no objective standard. The Pastoral Board does not have an objective standard. It says a farmer has overgrazed, or he has over-burnt, or he has let the rabbits get away or what have you, but to try to fight that in court, and to pin it on the farmer, is not the same situation as you have in the case of nursing homes, where there is a set of standards governing the slope of the floor, ramps, rails and bathrooms, and it is yes or no, or black and white. I am suggesting that the Government have standards for each major soil type. There are acres of soil and climate maps of Australia in Canberra. They sit there and they are not used. I suggest that scientists and farmers work together to objectify the limit to which each particular soil type can be degraded, without being eroded to the sea, or whatever. In other words, scientists and farmers are to cooperate - as they can do - to determine, as objectively as possible, the standards. All standards are false. They are all abstract and changeable; figments of the imagination. I am shooting from one thing to another here, but take road traffic as an example. Somehow or other it was decided that 40 kilometres an hour was to be the limit in one place, and 110 somewhere else. Some experts got together with government people and the Government of the day decided that those were to be the limits. They became the objective legal limits, not the notion of speeding. Who knows what speeding is? That is not good enough. There had to be a limit. Either you are over 60 or you are not - one or the other - and you can fight it out in a court of law. That is the ultimate point. I am not suggesting that we do have litigation; I am suggesting that litigation is the backstop, so to speak. The reason is the lack of objective standards, and the Government, through farmers and scientists together, should objectify major forms of soil degradation throughout Australia. We invent standards, in other words, as we have invented them for buildings. In almost every walk of life you run into government standards, except in agriculture, where we must hold someone's hand and tell them what to do, as if the Department of Agriculture knew what to do, and often it does not.

Hon MURRAY CRIDDLE: Hello to you Dr Schapper, I have watched and worked with you for many years on the farm.

Dr Schapper: I cannot read your name.

Hon MURRAY CRIDDLE: Murray Criddle. We have met a few times over the years, and I was involved in the "clear-a-million-acres-a-year" time, when we started out.

Dr Schapper: Some politicians can be - dare I say it - no, I will not. Go on.

Hon MURRAY CRIDDLE: You had better say it. You cannot let that get away.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: You cannot leave it like that!

Hon MURRAY CRIDDLE: I am one of the few who are still farming and have survived. I am interested in the process you talk about. You say that the Department of Agriculture is worried

about litigation. In fact, in agriculture nowadays we get a broad range of advice from private enterprise, across the board, and I have never heard of any of those people being charged as a result of any particular bad advice. I am interested in the process that you think should be put in place, and that may well assist in overcoming what some see as degradation. I would argue that the farmer that is profitable is probably the best placed person to deal with an improvement in the environmental aspects of his farming operation. The best are those who are successful now, and you must be profitable to do that. I am interested in the process that you would like to see put in place, because we are all about process.

Dr Schapper: Simply because there is a lack of objective standards, and farmers therefore have to guess, and their advisers are forced into trying to objectify woolly non-standards, is not to say that there are not many successful farmers, or that all nursing homes are bad, and that all road users are speedsters. They are not, but that is not an argument for saying that there should be no traffic rules, nursing home standards or farming standards. I am not arguing that at all. If it does not affect some farmers because, for some reason or other, they are able to discern where this margin of use is short of degradation, and are wealthy enough to cope with adverse economic circumstances at all times, and they do not have to try their luck by taking those few extra wheat crops out, that is no reason for not having standards. Some farmers are not making a profit. The number of farmers is decreasing every year, and one way of making a profit is to cannibalise your neighbour, but that is not confined to agriculture. None of this says that we should not have standards.

The next question is how these standards are used. How do you know that a farmer is not complying? Some farmers are gobbled up by their neighbours. Some farmers get away with it, but I do not think the community is satisfied with it. Although we have had the Soil Conservation Act - good or bad as it might be - since 1945, somehow or other there has been a tremendous amount of soil erosion, not to mention salinity, since then.

[2.20 pm]

I am suggesting we objectify our standards and enforce them. In other words, help farmers avoid the limit of degradation by making the point that a farm will be inspected every time it changes hands. That might be once in a generation but every farm changes hands at some time. Farm transfers must be registered by the State otherwise they are not in business. That must be a long-term practice. Transfers must be registered otherwise banks will not recognise farms as legal entities. The validity of registration should be held up until a farm has been inspected for sustainability. A farm either meets those standards or it does not. If it does, no harm is done. If it does not, there may be a court case or the farmer may say he deserves what is coming to him. What is coming to him is not punishment but that he has to restore or pay for the non-sustainable results. In other words, the proposal is that farmers cannot get away with it. It should be done in the manner that is least inquisitorial; it does not tell the farmer what to do. The farmer knows what are the standards years before he dies and passes on the farm to his sons or sells out. Knowing that, if he transgresses beyond the accepted level of degradation he has to pay. It is not punishment; he just has to pay - he cannot get away with it. I can see a weakness in that. A person may be farming a farm for 50 years and it may be ruined by the end of that time. In that case, the Government would go to the farmer's estate in the event of him dying. At the moment it cannot. Currently, the State bears the loss; the community sees land going downhill.

Hon DEE MARGETTS: Thank you for that, you have presented a lot of interesting ideas. I have three questions arising from your presentation. You mentioned issues with the terms of trade. I think that is crucial in respect of land clearing. As you mentioned, farmers are pushed to increase production but we also know that it does not mean that the unit prices will go up. In fact, they generally go down and the input costs go up. We also know that the costs to the ecosystem are generally not in that equation. Debate about terms of trade is on the periphery of the free trade debate. How can we in Australia bring those discussions into the mainstream? Are we paying too little for agricultural products in Australia and in other countries? Are we globally running down

agricultural land and production by concentrating on international competitiveness for commodities, which may not include some of the other associated costs?

Dr Schapper: I am not quite sure that I fully understand you. Australian Governments are generally committed to free trade and a free international competitive market. Someone might say that to be sustainable higher costs will have to be incurred. Is that what you are suggesting?

Hon DEE MARGETTS: No. I was picking up on what you said about the terms of trade. I was going to clarify what that might mean for the debate on land clearing. I assumed that you are saying that farmers are being pushed to produce more from their land.

Dr Schapper: They can be through the terms of trade, which can be adverse. Is that right?

Hon DEE MARGETTS: Yes. We all know that the input costs for farmers are - on a graph - upwards. The unit price for commodities is going downwards. In countries like Australia, how do we bring that debate into the mainstream so we talk about whether we are paying the right price for primary products in this country and overseas?

Dr Schapper: The right price is the market price under the market philosophy. I think you are implying that if this goes too far it will mean that farmers will start going crook and start politicising and demanding a higher income. They will get their lobby organisations together and go for a higher income. The Government of the day may put a levy on milk to consumers in order to bail out dairy farmers. Alternatively, it may put a levy on sugar to bail out sugar farmers and so on. Without arguing about those things, there are ways by which the Government can ease the economic pain if it wants to. The number of farmers may be declining so rapidly that the Government believes it is not a good thing to have so few farmers. It may decide to keep them on land although, at the moment, things seem to be going the opposite way. It is saying there are too many dairy farmers and that they should be got rid of. Consumers are being charged partly for that cost. It is regarded that there are too many sugar farmers. The industry is being "reconstructed" - that is the nice term used when getting rid of farmers.

Hon DEE MARGETTS: I think you may have misunderstood. I was not clear enough. How do we factor the cost of land degradation into the cost of commodities? How do we make sure that they are part of the real costs and that the markets recognise the real costs of degradation? We must not charge so little that the market price is so low that it does not recognise the cost of degradation. The natural environment must not subsidise production.

Dr Schapper: Generally speaking, the market does not. Competition means that the competitive price will be what is the competitive price regardless of what Governments do. Under the World Trade Organisation, Governments are not supposed to help farmers. That does not mean to say - it is a philosophical question - that we let sustainability go by the board, or does it? Do we insist on sustainability? In other words, we are ruling out farmers who can farm only if they do not sustain. That is the name of the game. I do not make the rules but those are the rules.

[2.30 pm]

Hon DEE MARGETTS: You have mentioned limit markers for soil types. Obviously a lot of local knowledge would be necessary; it would need to be interactive. What kinds of things could be limit markers?

Dr Schapper: Let me first disclaim any technical knowledge of this matter. The limit markers could be a number of things, and certainly the local farmers and the scientists would have to agree. There is no way of objectifying soil fertility; you have to invent it. It might be the percentage of organic matter or living biota in the soil, the presence of certain minerals, or the water-holding capacity. I do not know. I am sure that upwards of a dozen factors would need to be factored in as being the workable objective definition of soil fertility or sustainability in a particular soil type.

The CHAIRMAN: Can you respond to the trend in recent years whereby the Department of Agriculture has stopped, either as a policy decision or through lack of resources, having input into certain public administration decisions in Western Australia? For example, the Department of Agriculture no longer has input into subdivision applications, and as a result of new legislation it will no longer have input into a series of normal farming practices involving things like land clearing and other aspects of farming. How does that relate to what you have been saying?

Dr Schapper: I did not know that, but I do not think it matters. If we objectify sustainability and the State says that it will ensure that farmers behave in a way that sustains sustainability, then farmers can do whatever they like so long as they are within that limit, in the same way that we can drive on the roads at whatever speed we like and in whatever manner we like but we must not exceed the speed limit.

The CHAIRMAN: Or at least you must not get caught!

Dr Schapper: That is right. That raises the important question that in order to take on a particular responsibility we need to have a compliance measure. In the case of traffic, we all know what the compliance measure is. In the case of farmers, the compliance measure is that we will catch them at the transfer of the property. You may say it needs to be more frequent than that. Well, I would say you need to invent another way of doing it. I am trying to do it in the simplest way. A farmer cannot escape. In other words, a farmer can do what he likes, but it must be sustainable according to standards that have been agreed on by farmers and scientists in his area.

Hon ED DERMER: We are often confronted with the situation in which as a matter of policy the Government wants to preserve sustainability in a particular area. How can we apply a universal standard to two farms that are next door to each other if one person has cleared 50 per cent of his farm, being sensible, and he now wants to clear another 10 per cent, leaving 40 per cent in place, and his neighbour has cleared 98 per cent of his farm?

Dr Schapper: Can you say that again? I do not quite understand.

Hon ED DERMER: You are endeavouring to set a soil conservation standard for farms that may be in a valley, for example -

Dr Schapper: Remember it is a limit standard.

Hon ED DERMER: Historically, farmer A has cleared 98 per cent of his surface area and farmer B next door has cleared 50 per cent and he now wants to clear another 10 per cent but the authorities say that he cannot clear any more because that will not leave enough vegetation in the entire valley. You are talking about setting standards for farmers in an area. It would be historically difficult to apply a universal standard in that situation because one farm has been cleared far more than the other?

Dr Schapper: I had not thought of such a case, but I am sure it exists. Does your question imply that there is no answer?

Hon ED DERMER: The problem that has been put to us is that if a farmer has been more responsible than his neighbour in the sense that he has cleared less of his farm but he now wants to clear a bit more, he is told that he will not get permission to clear a bit more.

Dr Schapper: In other words, he is much better off. Relative to the standard, he is higher. He now wants to come a bit closer to the standard, but he is not there. That is all. That is my answer. He must avoid the limit marker of degradation - the point at which irreversible degradation starts - because that is the standard. If he is so much better, okay. The other chap, who is below the standard already, is up for a penalty, is he not - or not a penalty; he has to make good.

Hon ED DERMER: So you set a standard for all the farmers in the area, and the ones who have cleared more of their area need to do something to remedy the situation.

Dr Schapper: It is not a standard for farmers. It is a standard for sustainability. The question is whether the farmer is above, below or at the standard. He can be at the standard, but if he is below it then he has to rectify it during his lifetime, or he can postpone it until death and his estate will have to do it.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr Schapper. You have had a vast experience in these matters for a long time. Would you like to say anything in conclusion?

[2.40 pm]

Dr Schapper: No, but I am grateful for this opportunity to be listened to. Most people rubbish me. On this occasion you have forgone that enjoyment, for which I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr Schapper. We appreciate your input.

Committee adjourned at 2.40 pm