

TO THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON ENVIROMENT, COMMUNICATIONS
AND THE ARTS

FROM T.SAUNDERS

DEAR SIRS

IT WITH EXTREME CONCERN THAT I SEND THIS SUBMISSION
TO YOU REGARDING THE REVIEW AND PLANNED LEGISLATIVE
CHANGES TO THE GREAT BARRIER REEF MARINE PARK BILL.

IT IS APPARENT THAT THE BILL WAS BADLY DRAFTED, CONFUSING TO
THE STAKEHOLDERS. AND THE POLICING OF IT, WITH CRIMINAL
CONVICTIONS AGAINST PEOPLE, WHO HAD NO KNOWLEDGE OR MEANS
TO DETERMINE THAT THEY WERE "ILLEGALY" FISHING. THE
OVERTURNING OF THESE CONVICTIONS AGAINST NORMAL LAW
ABIDING CITIZENS, SHOULD BE PARAMOUNT.

IN THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE BILL, SECTION 9 THAT
RELATES TO "TAKING OF AND SEARCHING FOR FISH BY ELECTRONIC
MEANS" BEING CONSIDERED A ILLEGAL ACTIVITY. THIS IS BEING
BROUGHT ON BECAUSE A CITIZEN EXERCISED HIS LEGAL RIGHTS AND
TOOK GBRMPA TO COURT, AND WON, BECAUSE THE MAGISTRATE
RULED THAT A GPS DEVICE AND THE MAPS GPRMPA PUBLISHED
COULD NOT ACCURATLEY SHOW WHERE A "GREEN ZONE" WAS.

GBRMPA NOW HAVE PROPOSED THE ABOVE DRACONIAN, CATCH ALL
AMENDMENT WHICH HAS CONSEQUENCES FAR BEYOND FISHING. WILL
A BOAT NOT ENGAGED IN FISHING, NAVIGATING THROUGH A ZONE
HAVE TO TURN HIS DEPTH SOUNDER/GPS OFF? (BOTH SYSTEMS ARE
OFTEN COMBINED IN ONE UNIT) WILL GBRMPA BE LIABLE FOR
PROPERTY LOSS/DAMAGE OR INJURY, IF THE USE OF THIS PIECE OF
VITAL NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT IS MADE ILLEGAL? I THINK NOT.

THE "PRECAUTIONARY PRINCIPLE" CLAUSE WOULD GIVE GBRMPA AN
OUT CLAUSE TO FURTHER RESTRICT CITIZENS RIGHTS TO ENJOY THEIR
PASTIMES AND THE ENVIROMENT, WHEN THEY CAN'T PROVE AN
ENVIROMENTAL OR ECONOMIC REASON TO IMPLEMENT FURTHER
CLOSURES.

IN SIMPLE TERMS THE AMENDMENTS MAKE THE ACT OF LOOKING
LIKE GOING FISHING, BEING THE COMMITMENT OF THE CRIME OF
FISHING IN THE WRONG AREA.

T. SAUNDERS