

This is typical of the Australian government – the same 1950's decision making process they have brought to the energy debate. Not only are they making a complete balls up up the current energy debate by wanting to fire up or extend the life of uneconomical and antiquated technology and have the tax payer foot the bill, instead of investing more in cleaner and renewable energy, they now want to bring the same thought to our oceans. Much like pumping crap into the atmosphere from coal power stations was seen to be OK in the 1950' – the ocean was seen as an endless resource and that we can take what we like. Well, we know (and the smarter humans agree) that pumping crap into the atmosphere is bad, as do we know that constant plundering of the ocean is having a dramatic effect on the marine environment . The poor old ocean ocean cops it from all directions, and the smarter humans agree that, coral bleaching, ocean acidification, sediment from rivers, plastic, overfishing, pollution from industry, sewage from us etc. is killing the ocean – the biggest driver of climate and one of the worlds most precious resourcesand what does our government do – remove protections so they can fish more and contribute to the further decline .

My theory is, that the government stands less chance of being embarrassed on the international stage when it cant follow through on its commitment to manage its protected areas, if it has less protected areas to manage !

Greg Hunt weaselled the Australian Government out of being severely embarrassed by the Great Barrier Reef debacle. How they think more of the 1950's mentality is OK is beyond me.

Consecutive governments have failed our marine and terrestrial ecosystems for decades, we are now starting to pay the price – but to wind back protections is simply irresponsible and to be frank the decision of stupid people.

Cheers,

Jamie.