

Submitted on Wednesday, September 20, 2017 - 19:14 Submitted by anonymous user: 49.181.172.56  
Submitted values are:

First Name: Michael

Last Name: Alston

Organisation:

Which sector do you represent? General public Which draft plans are you commenting on?

- Coral Sea
- North Network
- North-west Network
- South-west Network
- Temperate East Network

Which marine park(s) are you commenting on? All What topic(s) or activity(s) are you commenting about? General use and access (including recreational) What part of the plan(s) are you commenting on? Part 3 - Zoning Which program are you commenting on? Assessments and authorisations program Please tick this box if you would like to keep up to date with all the latest information on Australian Marine Parks by subscribing to our email updates. :

Yes please subscribe me to Australian Marine Parks news Your submission may also be published online by the Director of National Parks. Please tick 'No' if you do not want it published. Your submission will still be considered in the Director's Report on the Preparation of the Management Plans, and may be provided to the Minister and tabled before

Parliament: Yes

Does your comment relate to the renaming of marine parks? No Please type your comments below:

Firstly I should make it known that I am a recreational fisherman, and have been since I can remember. Once again we seem to be at a stage of marine management planning where government is considering the "rezoning" of maritime areas.

Unfortunately this means that, generally the "green" oriented groups will be advocating the "lock it up" ethos (in actual fact they'd rather us pesky humans disappear entirely), and commercial fishermen will be pushing for the right to pretty much sweep the seas clean at will, for whatever they deem economically viable.

Rec fishermen such as myself are caught in the middle.

I could debate the merits of each position ad nauseum but I don't actually think it's necessary, because in this case we're not talking about banning child slavery, nor a multinational company moving a warehouse to another location, we're talking about the proper management of our natural resources, for the benefit of all, and for long term sustainability.

Consequently I will argue for one thing only, and that is for the question to be answered scientifically. If the process is conducted using established fact and research at all junctures then I am fairly certain a reasonable outcome will eventuate.

If decisions are made because various green interest groups made emotionally charged submissions not based in science, or because commercial fishers pushed unsustainable quotas/size limits/bycatch allowances due to sheer greed then an unfair and unequitable situation will eventuate.

If all decisions are demonstrably based in science then I am sure the vast majority of the public not connected to extremist interest groups can and will accept the results.

When I hear numbers bandied about such as "1.3 million square kilometres of maritime area to be locked up" I shudder because, frankly, I cannot under any circumstances imagine that it is necessary nor based in science or reason.

I implore you to purge from the decision making process any emotional or unethical input, as it is counter-productive and contrary to logic.

We are a modern, advanced, industrialised nation, but also a nation of ethics, and we should always approach our issues from this standpoint.

Yours sincerely

Michael Alston