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Background

This survey was funded by Agriculture Western Australia Farm Forestry Development Project and Department of CALM. It was initiated by the Bridgetown Land Conservation District Committee and was supported by the Shire of Bridgetown and Bunnings Treefarms.

The aim was to identify farmers' individual and community issues and concerns. The report was to be presented to the community and agencies with the intention of stimulating on-going action to address the issues.

The survey process

The process used for this survey is called Participative Rural Appraisal. It was conducted by a 12 member survey team. There were three days of workshop sessions in which the team developed common goals and were trained in interview skills such as active listening and open questioning. It was agreed that the questions would be open ended, asking farmers to talk about the main rural issues that were important to them. The team selected a broad cross section of about 60 land holders from district lists, with the assistance of two local farmers and arranged interviews by telephone. The same eight general questions were asked at all interviews, reflecting the four survey aims (see Appendix 1).

The interviews were conducted by team pairs, one interviewing and the other scribing. Each conducted three interviews of 1.5-3 hours duration per day and team members changed partners every day to reduce bias. They debriefed after each interview, discussing and noting the main issues on cards.

Forty farmers and their families were interviewed. Their land holdings were from 15-5,000 ha and included a cross section of enterprises.

A protocol was agreed to and applied in all cases to ensure that those interviewed were treated with respect. Strict confidentiality of information was guaranteed to all participating in the survey. Interviewees' names were not mentioned in any of the reports (see Appendix 2).

Arriving at an outcome from the interviews was mainly about crystallising what we had learnt from farmers and one another. It involved assembling the information - farmers' comments and issues - which we had scribed on paper. We wrote these on cards then sorted them into clusters and distilled those ideas into a report. Two more days were spent on this but more time was needed.
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The team's conclusions about the survey, in relation to the stated aims

AIM 1: To find out the main concerns and rural issues held by landowners

To address the first aim of the survey, the question 'State the 3-4 main issues that came out in your interviews' was put to the team and issues listed. Four theme issues stood out as they were mentioned four times by different team members:

- **Low prices - high costs - cost squeeze**

  There was frustration about unpredictable markets and inability to influence costs and prices. Other issues relating to this were:
  - Less disposable income.
  - Less employed on farm.
  - Must spend money to make money.
  - Land prices hold up - equity stable.
  - Succession.

- **Isolation socially**

  Farmers don't communicate enough about important issues. Other social issues listed were:
  - Social issues are very real and very complex.
  - Loss/lack of social opportunities.
  - Schooling - cost of sending kids to boarding school (no upper schools in Bridgetown or Boyup).
  - Lack of young people.
  - Concern for young.

- **Have to diversify**

  Most farmers could see an economic need to diversify their farming operation; many were working off-farm. Related issues listed were:
  - Working off-farm.
  - People didn't have set goals/plans.
  - Plan economic options.

- **The farmers are against whole farm plantations**

  Most farmers thought whole farm plantations were damaging to the district, but were not against integrating some trees in their farming operation. Other 'tree related' issues were:
  - Trees are a real economic option.
  - Awareness of trees but people need time to implement.
  - Loss of farmer populations linked to plantations.
  - Lack of knowledge of integrating trees on farms.

**Farmers are now more conscious environmentally** was an issue mentioned only once by team members. However, the large number of issue cards generated from interviews about land management and landcare (including salinity and conservation) identify this as a fifth theme issue. It was probably not considered by team members to be one of the farmers' main concerns, because it was not seen as crucial to their survival on the land in the short term.
The interview teams' summary of what we found in relation to the other survey aims
The group revisited the survey aims the day after interviews were completed and made concluding comments:

**AIM2: To find out about management practice**

Many farmers are being forced to look at this area. Some have attempted to adopt best management practice, for example, controlled grazing, or diversify into enterprises which are new to them, for example, cauliflowers but have been hit by further declining commodity prices.

More commercial farmers will have to diversify in future or find off-farm work.

Farmers might be inadvertently causing more damage to the land because they can't afford to put in conservation measures.

In future there will be probably be more subdivisions - land is available for this in the area.

**AIM3: Recognise the contribution that farming families have in shaping the future here**

There is no doubt that, even with the growing tourism, forestry and mining contribution to the area, the future health and vitality of the shires will continue to depend on a healthy farming sector.

Farm production has always been the lifeblood of the shires. Farming families have struggled in often isolated conditions through many industry changes and against a worsening cost price squeeze that now threatens the viability of many grazing enterprises. This is illustrated by a quote from a farmer born and bred in the area who had spent his entire career on the same farm:

"In 1965 I made 10 pounds 15 shillings (the basic wage) out of 10 dairy cows. By 1974-75 you needed 30 cows to make that......" He is now running beef, working off the farm, has thought about diversifying into trees but sees impediments.

Farming families need the community and Government agencies to recognise their issues and help tackle the challenge they face - that of adapting their farm businesses to stay financially viable. For the problems to be solved, many farmers see a need to overcome their isolation by working together and establishing communication channels between themselves, Government and industry.

**AIM4: To find out farmers' experiences and views of trees on farms**

Whole block plantations were not liked for social and aesthetic reasons.

"Some farmers had sold their whole block over to it...... then there's only casual outside workers and this is bad for them."

However in general, most farmers were not averse to integrating trees on farms. The younger generation was generally happy to plant trees but some older people (who had been involved in clearing trees) were not.
Most farmers had thought about planting trees but were unsure about where they could integrate them in the farm business and aesthetics and effect on land values and future prices.

A feeling often expressed was that having a company tree lease would make the land very difficult to sell for what it was worth.

Contracts were very variable. 'Some farmers had their fingers burnt'.

"The time factor needs to be considered - people need a couple of years to make such a radical decision" (to diversify into trees).

A lot of farmers would integrate some trees on their farms if it meant they could keep farming and if they could get the spare cash to plant and fence them.

**Team members' conclusions about the PRA process**

- Team training is important and with hindsight we could have done it better.
- More time was needed for debriefing.
- More time was needed for sorting data.
- Many in the survey team felt they didn't have the skills to disassociate after hearing shattering 'hard luck' stories. "Some people dumped a lot of 'heavy stuff' on the interviewers need to listen without getting involved not get too involved with the personal and emotional."

**Feelings expressed by team members after completing their interviews**

"Apart from two large land holders, I don't know anyone in the Bridgetown area that's doing well. It would have been nice if my opinions had been wrong, but the interviews confirmed that perception. I've been doing a lot of soul searching on the weekend about our own future on the land. Economically people are being forced to consider selling their land that's emotionally very difficult when they've never done anything else and it's been handed down from generation to generation." (farmer team member).

"Isolation - people don't seem to have networks where they can go and talk to other people about problems" .. these social issues don't generally come up in pub, cattle sales conversation. You don't talk to your neighbour about it because it shows your insecurity, that you're not doing well."

"Mobile counselling services have been very helpful still in existence. Federally funded." (personal experience of two group members)
Survey results
The results are presented under the major themes of:

- Economics
- Diversification
- Social issues
- Land Management
- Trees on farms

Economics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Commodity Prices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High cost input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost squeeze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low return on capital investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to expand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review of Economic Management/Efficiency Options

- Off-farm income
- Diversity e.g. trees
- Sell or Lease Farm
- Stay - Ride out

The cost price squeeze
A substantial majority of farmers made at least one comment on the theme of costs having risen much more than commodity prices, putting pressure on them.

- "We are producing, but have no control over returns".
- "Our market prices are about the same as 15-20 years ago - cost of labour, machinery etc. has risen".
- "Unable to fund maintenance of property".
- "Not enough profit to be able to afford to get into debt".
- "We were in a cash flow problem - the cash flowed out!"

Economic management/efficiency
Farmers were responding to the cost price squeeze in various ways.

Sitting tight, doing nothing different and hoping to ride it out.

- "Been through it all before and will sit it out..... but at the moment there is no light at the end of the tunnel (prices)."
Cutting costs in the short term while trying to be more efficient at their grazing enterprises.

"We’ve pulled our sheep flock through a very tough season ... if wool prices don’t go up, we can’t afford to feed sheep through another hard time" (large sheep farmer).

**Cost of labour**

Several farmers mentioned farm labour: comments were all negative.

"Who can employ people to work on a farm now?"
"Suitable and skilled labour was more available in the old days. Now we can’t afford to employ labourers!"

**Cost of land**

The price of land was generally seen to be too high in relation to what could be produced from it.

"Can’t expand in area - land too dear if you want to buy ... not if you want to sell."

**Markets**

Many farmers made comments about markets, with most expressing frustration or resignation over their lack of control of markets and the instability of commodity prices.

On commodity prices:

"Ours goes up and down like a yo-yo!"
"We’re flat out producing: we can’t afford to go out and do marketing!"

A few saw the need for more market regulation.

"What is needed is a basic price for rural produce".
"We should use the quota system for wool, lambs and grain."

The need for protection from unscrupulous operators was noted.

"Too many fly by night marketing businesses who don’t pay for produce" (horticultural).
"Resale giants will source cheaper produce offshore."

Two saw benefits in free market systems.

"I like competition."
"Downturns are good for efficiency."

**Diversification**

Some were diversifying for economic reasons. Over half of the farmers surveyed were considering it. A minority were already diversifying into such things as:

other cash crops, for example, canola (northern and eastern parts of survey area),
animals, for example, pigs.
Some had moved into trees. A few had horticulture:

- farm stays
- marron
- viticulture.

Labour costs and/or lack of adequate fresh water, and market oversupply were seen as impediments to these more intensive industries.

A few mentioned the importance of off-farm investments.

**Working off the farm**

Many farmers commented that off-farm work was necessary to their economic survival. More than half had at least one of the family members who were living on the farm working at least part-time off the farm.

> "The land has no capacity to repay, particularly with conventional farming" (two farm families with off-farm incomes).
> "20-30 years ago, most farmers and their wives worked on the farms. Now very few (around Bridgetown) do not work off the farm".

**Social issues**

**Social isolation**

Many noted how isolated farmers were:

> "They get stuck in their own routine."
> "People on farms seem socially isolated compared to those in the city."
> "They don't share their problems; they don't talk over the fence."
> "If I walk down the street now I don't know anybody...."
> "People used to talk, but now people are involved with computers..." A's not talking to B.

Familiarity and knowing one's neighbours seemed to be disappearing.

Newcomers were also affected by the change - especially the isolation. "Isolation really hit me down here" (woman new in district).

Some comments on community groups and voluntary involvement were:

> "Volunteers are an extinct breed."
> "Young people not interested in taking responsibilities in voluntary agencies."
> "....no interest in executive part of meeting."
> "Too many groups ... killing the community by having too much variety."

**Farming as a lifestyle**

Life on the land still enjoyable.

> "It's pretty where we are... it's not economical but a way of life."
> "Idyllic lifestyle.... it lacks town pressures."
“A farmer is producing something tangible.”
“It’s lucky land around here.”

However some doubted whether it was still worth the risk:

“People work so hard and yet it can be all blown away or wiped off by the elements.”

**The social structure had changed**

“I don’t know half the people any more.”

People were separated by shifting and changing populations. Some of the earlier social activities were no longer available.

“Used to have local bands, weekly dances, picture theatres. There is now no place to go dancing.”

**Population change**

While Boyup Shire is losing population, Bridgetown’s population is changing in composition and in some areas is expanding.

There were various feelings. On the one hand there were comments such as “shit from the city” had moved in and that there were “less people and not much progress”.

On the other hand, new people had come to the area

“because they liked what they saw”.

Empty houses on farms were noted in some localities

“12 or so around here used to be occupied.” This comment related to Unicup, which is just outside the Boyup Shire boundary in Manjimup and Cranbrook Shires. Nine farms in this locality are now bluegum and pine plantations and a similar situation is happening around Bokerup in the east of the Boyup Shire.

“Neighbours have windows boarded up.”

Other observations were:

“... shift of population over 40 years.”

“A lot of outsiders are coming into Bridgetown.”

**Health - ageing - retirement**

A lot of farmers are tired, disillusioned, pessimistic, cynical and stressed. Rural youth suicide is high.

“People around here are very tired and very disillusioned with sheep and farming in general.”

The farming life demands good health and is also important to the enjoyment of life. However due to isolation, health facilities and services in general were seen as not adequate. Many farmers, particularly males in country areas are not easily able to discuss problems.
"They (men) don't talk about it, because they don't socialise. Telling someone about that small lump."

A large ageing population in the district shows the need for associated services and the lack thereof is quite a worry for some. However one farmer quotes:

'My retirement will be full. If I live to 100 I'll never have enough time.'

Then others said:

"Like to retire on the coast ...."
"No, I'll never retire".
"I might die on the farm ... don't particularly want to retire in the city or on the coast!"

Education

Education of children was stated as a problem. A notable issue was the cost of education, especially where there was a need or desire to send kids to boarding school rather than local schools.

"I prefer to send children to boarding school because quality of education is not up to scratch here."
"We have too many assets but not enough income or cash. This considerably affects us regarding educational costs."

Young people

The future for youth was a theme with lack of a future and moving away most often mentioned.

"All kids have left the district."
"Young people do not want to go farming."
"We told 'em not to come back, there's no future in it!"

Succession

Many farmers don't see a future in farming and wouldn't encourage their children to take over the farm.

"I don't see my children's future here in Bridgetown."
"There's not enough money in farming to entice the young to stay."

A lesser number expressed a desire for the farm to stay in the family unit, or were already farming as a family unit.

"My son runs the whole show."
"I'd like to pass the farm on but may have to sell!"

Employment

Employment has decreased on farms (encompassing all areas) over the past decade or so and no improvement could be seen in the future.
"Farmers are not making any money so not hiring any people."
"Employment was better then for young people. More working married women now. Job opportunities scarce for children."
"1973 wages paid in 1996 the reason the young ones are leaving" (the district).

The issue was seen as relating to economics and ergonomics. Modernisation equals more production with less labour content:

"Economies have forced wives to seek work off farms to put kids through Uni."

Or was it as someone stated:

"People don't want to work!"

Subdivisions and hobby farms
Advantages and disadvantages were highlighted. On the negative side the breaking up of viable farms for hobby farms or smaller holdings increased the price of land and was making it hard for those farmers wishing to expand. On the other hand the towns were being revived. Many people wanted more industry, be it cottage or other.

"Subdivisions make land values increase - that's worse - but build up populations."
"Hobby farms are not doing anything for agriculture, but not a bad thing for towns."
"I believe all this country will be small holdings."
"More intensive crops are needed."
"Cottage industry and subdivision is supporting Bridgetown population" (relating to rural population change).

Criticism of government agencies
Most of the criticisms were against CALM:

"I think they (CALM) have left a hell of a mess; they have almost cut everything. This destruction seems to be without reason."
"I am growing about the stuff they have left behind, it will take hundreds of years before this area will be a good forest again."

A few related to the changing role of Agriculture Western Australia:

"Agriculture Western Australia have emasculated themselves."
"Agriculture Western Australia is harsfrung... lack of funding to personally advise farmers.... the least they could do is share their experiences."

Land management
Land owners were aware of the evolving problems on their own and their neighbours' land:

Soil erosion
Water problems
Over clearing
Soil acidity
Remnant bush management
Parrot damage.
There was an awareness of better practical techniques and also of the cost of implementation - that the cost of doing something is dollars spent now, but the cost for doing nothing would be decreasing viability.

The desire to maintain the farm standards was there, but the farm disposable income was not. Concern was expressed at the lack of financial incentives, for example, tax rebates.

“We want to do more (Landcare) but time is the problem, and we need more (tax) incentives.”

“Farmers in the area generally do the work themselves.”

“Maybe get someone else to fence but probably not because I like to do it myself.”

**Landcare**

The need to balance cost and availability of funds with environmental needs was seen as foremost.

“Landcare aims are of low priority, when economic survival is uppermost.”

“When years are good, money goes in.”

Institutional funding for Landcare was not seen to be going to the right areas.

“Some conservation funds have a caveat restricting farmer use of the area, this discourages farmers from seeking funding.”

“Landcare got off on the wrong foot out here. It was started (in this catchment) by two land holders who had a vested interest in it!”

“The funding seems to go to the wrong targets.”

LCDCs were like a bad taste in the mouths of almost everybody who mentioned them ..... “They’ve been tagged as radical green.”

On Landcare funding, “it goes to where it can be seen by government” (that is, closer to town).

A typical complaint was about too much red tape.

“Landcare is going forward slowly, there’s too much red tape, too many up top not on the ground.”

Personal plans and action on landcare:

“We try and maintain the health of trees in our paddocks, we put wire around some trees to prevent stock damage. We have planted more trees near salt problems.”

“Landcare is in it’s infancy ...... we don’t know it all.”

“Needed some trees and some drains (for Landcare) - need an expert to say where and what? (sheep farmer with large acreage).”

**Salinity**

Though salinity was not one of the biggest concerns to come out of the survey, some of those that mentioned it saw it as a major issue facing today’s and tomorrow’s farmers.
Generally people were saying it has got worse. Only through change have they seen this - salt scalds appearing, some land no longer viable, degradation of native vegetation on river banks, creeks and stream reserves, inability to use river water as they used to.

"Hell-a-va lot more salt areas. Anyone who totally cleared, didn't leave gully lines or a couple of trees, probably made a mistake!"

"Water quality has changed."

"People used to wash sheep in river before shearing."

"Used to be fish and marron, when I used to go swimming as a kid."

"Now a lot is salty."

"Salt areas have got bigger, there's nothing you can do about it - just keep fencing it off."

A few said it wasn't an issue, or weren't convinced that it was.

Some believed salt was around before the clearing of land, or that it is part of the cycle, others believe good wet seasons will wash it all away.

"Salinity - still searching for ideas, there's a lot to learn I reckon" (young farmer).

"Salinity is a national problem...... it's not a problem here!"

There was little evidence that farmers understood the process of salinisation locally.

**Chemicals**

Chemicals were mentioned as a concern by a minority:

"Chemicals are an integral part of farming", but

"most farmers are looking for a way out; because of the cost price squeeze it is hard to get off the tread mill."

Australia's image as being pollution-free was noted:

"My mother-in-law in Italy would love to have Australian olives because we are not affected by the pollution of European countries."

The use of chemicals was worrying to some younger farmers because of the impact on bio-diversity.

"Problem is doing everything with chemicals - not specific - kills goodies and baddies."

"Worry about chemicals' impact on bio-diversity. Don't like spraying."

**Farm management**

Many had good intentions, summed up with these comments:

"Trying to farm to best practice techniques."

"The need to put the heart back into the country."

Some felt that total farm planning may be the way to go.

"I reckon total farm planning is a good idea."
Others could see the need to improve farm practice.

"The other choice is to use best practice techniques."
"Direct drilling, no longer ploughing, it works well, much better than I thought it would."

Other points raised in the area of farm management were about stock.

"Breed all our own stock. Footrot and lice - never had these things and don't want them."

**Trees on farms**

**Impediments**

There were many negative comments relating to trees on farms but more were opposed to whole farm plantations. Especially those who spent much of their first years clearing saw trees as a 'bit of a bother'.

"That was a good farm, now it's only blue gums."

A majority expressed concern about tree plantations, they were seen as leading to a down turn in the rural community as people move off the land when farms are planted to trees 'fence to fence'. This may have coloured some opinions of trees on farms. Certainly, tree monoculture raised a few eyebrows in that it was seen by some as making land more expensive, restricting the ability to expand the home farm so as to regain viability.

"The high cost of land expansion is a result of subdivision and buying land for plantations."
"The purchase of land for bluegums increases the cost of land, preventing us from expansion."

Other impediments stopping many farmer land holders from planting certain areas or protecting remnant vegetation related to:

- The cost of:
  - fencing
  - controlling weeds
  - controlling ferals - foxes, pigs, parrots
  - complications with managing stock.
- Dislike of bluegums.
- The world food shortage. A few thought that planting trees on the best land was morally wrong.
  "I think we will need the best land to feed the world."

"The other choice is to use best practice techniques."
The future of tree farming

There was a feeling that prices would drop as more and more farms are turned over to trees.

"Nobody is sure what the future will be for blue gums."
"By the time they mature they won't be worth anything."

Trees on farms - positives

Positive comments, plans or actions about integrating trees on farms outnumbered negative comments by about two to one but there were few positive comments about plantations.

The main reasons stated for planting trees were purely financial, though some were concerned for the environment.

"You could be earning three times as much for it (land under trees) as running animals".
"Trees for cash? I am tempted to put trees in, for the income."

Trees had been left or were being planted on many properties for the purpose of halting soil erosion for shelter belts. Others had purely environmental reasons.

"Our ultimate aim is to have woodlots all over the property."
"I planted for environmental improvement" (8 acres).
"... planting a few hectares at a time, especially in the gullies."
"The global system requires more trees, that's common sense, speaking not as a farmer."

Some saw trees on farms as their superannuation fund.

"It works out well like that, selling or leasing to trees for retirement."
Immediate outcomes of the survey

The survey team organised a public meeting on the evening of 27 September 1996 to present the results to the community. All interviewees were invited to the meeting and it was publicised in two radio interviews.

Fifty-two people attended the meeting, including most of the survey team, several of the farmers interviewed, representatives of agencies and many from the community.

Important outcomes from this meeting were:

- A unanimous agreement with the four main issues identified in the draft report.
- An intent to form a committee of farmers, through the Bridgetown LCDC, to focus on the future of farming and farm diversification in the shires.
- An intent that this committee would personally present the survey report to industry and government agencies, requesting action.

Within four weeks of the meeting:

- There were two more radio talks and a front page article in the Warren Blackwood Times presenting the main issues.
- The Agriculture Western Australia Farm Forestry Development Project Manager and SW Sustainable Rural Development Program Manager were given copies of the report and further recommendations from the survey coordinator.
- At an informal meeting, SW Development Commission representatives offered to support and be a part of such a committee when it is formed.
- Bridgetown LCDC decided to convene a public seminar in November featuring a visiting property planning expert, with the hope of forming the proposed committee (see Appendix 3).
- Copies of this report were sent to all farmers interviewed and to survey team members.
Appendix 1

Questions asked by the Survey Team at interviews

1. "Would you like to tell me a little bit about the property and what is happening at the moment?"

2. (Icebreaker if needed) "And what about history, would you like to tell me about the history and how you got involved in the property?"

3. "Perhaps you would like to describe what the property was like when you became involved?"

4. "Of the changes which have occurred, what can you see as the most substantial change?"

5. "Where do you see yourself in 10 years? Do you have any plans for the property?"

6. "Do you see anything interfering with those plans?"

Part B in district?

7. "What's happening with trees in the district?" ... or "Some agencies and people say that there should be more trees ..."

8. LAST QUESTION - "Is there anything about the property that I haven't asked you that you would like to tell me about?"
Dear

The Bridgetown/Greenbushes and Boyup Brook rural survey you are participating in has been developed by a group including farmers and community members.

The aims of the survey are to:

1) Find out the main concerns and rural issues held by landowners.
2) To find out about management practices.
3) Recognise the contribution that farming families have in shaping the future here.
4) To find out farmers' experience and view of trees on farms.

The results of the survey will be summarised in a report (you will receive a copy) and presented at a public meeting to which you will be invited.

Your name will not be used in recording any of this information.

We value your input and thank you for your involvement and cooperation.

Yours sincerely

Ben Rose
COORDINATOR

This project is supported by Agriculture Western Australia
Appendix 3

What are Your Reactions?

You will remember that we said the information from our activities belongs to you and obviously the content of the report only contains a small part of what went on. So can we decide where we go from here? We would be interested in your feedback on the PRA process and your ideas for future action. If you would like to respond to our questions please fax 71 2544, phone 71 1299 or send to Ben Rose, Agriculture Western Australia, Rose Street, Manjimup WA 6258.

Your Opportunity to Provide Feedback

Please tick boxes and write your comments where appropriate.

1. I was interviewed
2. I was not interviewed
3. I was at the Friday 27 September meeting
4. I was unable to attend the Friday night meeting
5. What were the good things about the meeting

6. What do you feel could be the next step, that is what action should occur now?

7. Would you like to be kept informed of future outcomes of the Survey?

8. Please write any other comments

9. THERE WILL BE A SEMINAR ON WEDNESDAY 13 NOVEMBER TO DISCUSS DIVERSIFICATION AND THE FUTURE OF ARMING IN THE BRIDGETOWN AND BOYUP SHIRES. PROPERTY PLANNING SPECIALIST NIGEL McGUCKIAN WILL BE THE KEYNOTE SPEAKER. ARE YOU INTERESTED?

RSVP by Wednesday 6 November (097) 71 1299 (James Dee)