



11 November 2019

Chair of Senate Committee  
Parliament House  
Canberra, ACT 2600

Dear Chair,

Please find below the FRDC factual corrections for the Proof Hansards from the Supplementary Budget hearing held 22 October 2019.

### **Significant or factual corrections**

---

I would like to correct the terminology I used in my response to Senator Whish-Wilson's question on page 93 of the Hansard:

When you read through that to the next few pages, it talks about how your RD&E program should support fishing and aquaculture sustainability and improved perceptions of the Australian seafood industry. It goes on to describe your key deliverables in that regard.

I wish to advise the committee that the correct terminology for the above wording is as follows:

When you read through that to the next few pages, it talks about how your RD&E program should support fishing and aquaculture sustainability and improve under perceptions of the Australian seafood industry. It goes on to describe your key deliverables in that regard.

---

I would like to correct the terminology I used in my response to Senator Whish-Wilson's question on page 93 of the Hansard:

**Dr Hone:** The Edgar paper, are you talking about? Oh, the rebuttal paper.

I wish to advise the committee that the correct terminology for the above wording is as follows:

**Dr Hone:** The Edgar paper, are you talking about? Or, the rebuttal paper.

---

I would like to correct the terminology I used in my response to Senator Whish-Wilson's question on page 93 of the Hansard:

**Mr Ashby:** That's a really good question

I wish to advise the committee that the correct terminology for the above wording is as follows:

**Dr Hone:** That's a really good question

---





I would like to correct the terminology I used in my response to Senator Sterle's question on page 99 of the Hansard:

**Dr Hone:** Subsequent to our last conversation, we have published the science report on the biomass of carp in the River Murray. It was within the estimates that we originally put forward as part of the program. It also maps out the hotspots of carp in the river, which was a key component of developing the risk based approach if you were to deploy a virus. That report has now been published. It's probably fair to say that the carp numbers are as high as we thought they were. They are significant. We are talking about millions of tonnes. The question is: how do you get rid of those fish over such a large network of rivers, streams and billabongs?

I wish to advise the committee that the correct terminology for the above paragraph is below.

Dr Hone: Subsequent to our last conversation, we have almost published the science report on the biomass of carp in the River Murray. It was within the estimates that we originally put forward as part of the program. It also maps out the hotspots of carp in the river, which was a key component of developing the risk based approach if you were to deploy a virus. That report has now been published. It's probably fair to say that the carp numbers are as high as we thought they were. They are significant. We are talking about many hundreds of thousands of tonnes. The question is: how do you get rid of those fish over such a large network of rivers, streams and billabongs

I would like to correct the terminology I used in my response to Senator Sterle's question on page 99 of the Hansard:

**Dr Hone:** I don't think you can draw that conclusion. One thing we do know about native fish is that they have evolved for our drought conditions better than carp. We know that they have the ability to find the deeper holes to reside in. Their metabolic conditions are such that they can go into almost a no-feeding component, while carp are much more metabolically active. So I don't think you can draw the conclusion that, if you see dead carp, the system is worse. But I can get you some scientific evidence for that if you want.

I wish to advise the committee that the correct terminology for the above paragraph is below.

**Dr Hone:** In many circumstances carp are able to tolerate poor water quality better than most native fish but it depends on a number of factors. I don't think you can draw that conclusion. One thing we do know about native fish is that they have evolved for our drought conditions better than carp. We know that they have the ability to find the deeper holes to

Page 100 Senate Tuesday, 22 October 2019

RURAL AND REGIONAL AFFAIRS AND TRANSPORT LEGISLATION COMMITTEE

reside in. Their metabolic conditions are such that they can go into almost a no feeding component, while carp are much more metabolically active. So I don't think you can draw the conclusion that, if you see dead carp, the system is worse. But I can get you some scientific evidence for that if you want



**Australian Government**  
**Fisheries Research and Development Corporation**

---

Yours sincerely

Dr Patrick Hone  
Managing Director



---

Fisheries Research and Development Corporation  
Postal address: Locked Bag 222, Deakin West ACT 2600 Australia  
Office location: Fisheries Research House, 25 Geills Court Deakin ACT  
**T: 02 6285 0400 E: [frdc@frdc.com.au](mailto:frdc@frdc.com.au) [www.frdc.com.au](http://www.frdc.com.au)**

