

SUBMISSION NO. 4
Inquiry into the Role of Science
for Fisheries and Aquaculture

Maurice Schinkel

30 April 2012

House of Representatives Standing Committee on Agriculture, Resources,
Fisheries and Forestry
PO Box 6021
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600
arff.reps@aph.gov.au



Dear Mr Adams, Mr Schultz and Committee Members,

**Submission to: Inquiry into the Role of Science for Fisheries and
Aquaculture**

I have formed the belief that Parliamentarians, decision makers and members of the community should be extremely sceptical of the views and opinions of some **scientists** in relation to the marine environment.

This view has been formed after enduring the sham Environment Effects Statement process for the project currently known as
and has been reinforced by an examination of the documentation for the following:

Despite the above three proposals being in disparate locations, there is considerable overlap in the engaging of firms that employ **scientists** to advance the case for the projects.

The following firms and organizations have had an involvement in at least two of the three proposals:

It is apparent from an examination of the documentation for the above three proposals that those wanting to despoil the marine environment trawl the market place for ideas, and find enough biologists and **scientists** who are past caring.

The publication:

**ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL
RESOURCES COMMITTEE**
*Inquiry into the Environment Effects
Statement Process in Victoria*
SEPTEMBER 2011
Parliamentary Paper,

states:

"Concern was raised in submissions regarding the role of expert opinions in the preparation of EES documentation. There is a perception that advice prepared by a consultant engaged by a proponent may be biased in favour of the proponent".

The Committee should be extremely sceptical of scientists who have had involvement in proposals that despoil the marine environment.

Yours faithfully,

Maurice Schinkel