

## Marine Parks motion – 24 February 2011

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:46):** I am very pleased to support this motion by the member for Finniss. The motion calls on the Minister for Environment and Conservation to place an immediate moratorium on the imposition of the draft sanctuary zones contained within the marine parks' outer boundaries for South Australia.

I commend all the contributions from this side of the house. We have a great concern on this side of the house for our regional communities. In fact, we have a great concern, not just for our regional communities, but for the opportunities for people who live in urban areas and wish to go recreational fishing. This will impact on people right throughout the city and right throughout Labor electorates. There will be male and female fishers from electorates such as West Torrens and Torrens who will be affected by this. There are people in the minister's own seat of Colton who will be affected by this proposal, if it goes ahead. People right across the state will be affected and for what reason?

It has been said that the whole marine parks process is a solution looking for a problem, and that is what I think it is: a solution looking for a problem. It seems to me that there must be some people within the Department of Environment and Natural Resources who seem to think that we need to have a solution because we think there is a problem. What they do not seem to understand—and I think there is some friction between the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry and the Department of Environment on this issue—is that our fisheries are about the best managed in the world.

They are managed under the Fisheries Management Act 2007 and the Aquaculture Act 2001. I will just read a couple of appropriate parts of these acts. In the Aquaculture Act 2001, Division 5—Emergency leases, section 41 is about the granting of leases in circumstances of emergency. I quote from section 41(b):

*the Minister is satisfied that circumstances of emergency exist such that the granting of the lease is warranted for the protection of the environment or the preservation of endangered aquaculture stock.*

I think anyone could understand that, and we would like to think that people on the other side of the house know as well. Under the Fisheries Management Act 2007, section 128—Regulations relating to conservation and management of aquatic resources, management of fisheries and aquatic reserves and regulation of fishing, subsection (1) provides:

*Subject to this section, the Governor may make regulations for the conservation and management of the aquatic resources of the State, the management of fisheries and aquatic reserves and the regulation of fishing.*

They are only two sections from two substantial acts that manage both our commercial and recreational fishing in this state. I think the minister for environment is being led on a merry chase here by a department—I really do. When we had a briefing the other night in this place on fisheries management, I could certainly sense tension between the department of fisheries and the environment department. What is going to happen here if this proposal takes place? We will have is a marine parks act that will take over the management of fishing.

We have already seen tens of millions of dollars pillaged from the primary industries sector over the next four years of the budget period. What will happen? If we are going to lose the right to collect licence fees, permit fees and lease fees—if we are not going to have the Fisheries Management Act or the Aquaculture Act operating—we are going to have a pseudo marine parks act managing our fisheries. Right from the very start we saw advertisements put out by the department and the government saying, 'It's not about fishing,' and then you see a person standing there with a great big snapper, I believe. It is just outrageous.

I spoke at length on marine parks yesterday as well, and another issue is displaced effort. This government has shown it has no money. It is sucking about \$6 billion currently into projects in Adelaide, so it has no money for displaced effort, and it has no money for the secondary areas connected to fishing—the holiday parks, the tourism people. What are all those people going to do when our regional areas are decimated and no-one from the city seats wants to go out there and go fishing because there is no point because they cannot fish.

In closing, I make the point that it is absolutely outrageous that the department—and they have admitted this—can just draw lines on a map to say where they want the sanctuary zones and then go to the people and say, 'We want you to help us alter the lines, but we have to have 25 per cent of the marine parks out of boundaries (44 per cent of the waters) to be sanctuary zones.' There is absolutely no science to this. It is about time we had some scientific debate, got on with the job and did this properly, instead of doing it in such an ad hoc manner. I commend the motion.