

KIMBERLEY MARINE PARKS — SANCTUARY ZONES

**723. Hon SALLY TALBOT to the Minister for Fisheries:**

I refer to the government's planned marine parks in the Kimberley.

- (1) Has the minister been asked to consider areas other than the Champagny Island group and the Montgomery Islands reef as sanctuary zones or designated no-take areas?
- (2) Does the minister support the inclusion of areas other than the two I have mentioned?
- (3) If so, which areas; and, if not, why not?

**Hon NORMAN MOORE replied:**

I thank the member for the question without notice.

- (1)–(3) I am in constant conversation with the Minister for Environment, who has carriage of the development by the government of the marine park at Camden Sound in the Kimberley. I do not propose to publicly enter into a discussion about what might or might not eventuate with the marine park. For those members who are interested in the matter, marine parks can be set up for a range of different purposes. The original purpose for this particular marine park was for the preservation of whales, as that part of the ocean is important for whale calving. It is possible to attach within the marine park a different set of conditions to various parts of the marine park, and some of those can in fact be sanctuary zones. Fundamentally, sanctuary zones are no-go areas for anything other than boats sailing across them. It is important when looking at the development of a marine park, as the previous government did when it considered these matters, to make sure that we get the right balance between what the fishing industry requires to be sustainable and viable and the preservation of those environmentally important areas. The legislation proposes a proper process whereby the Minister for Environment, the Minister for Fisheries and the Minister for Mines and Petroleum work together to come up with what the government considers to be a fair and reasonable balance between the competing interests. The member will be interested to know that the Minister for Mines and Petroleum and the Minister for Fisheries have many discussions about this to make sure that they are singing from the same song sheet! The legislation provides that both those ministers are required to provide their concurrence on marine parks. That was set up under legislation that I did not create, because it was thought to be important to make sure that the competing interests are considered.

I am not proposing to comment publicly about the detailed discussions that have taken place in government, but in due course—it should not be very long—the member will see everything when the marine park is revealed. The member is aware that the indicative management plans have been made public. She might even have made a submission; I do not know. That has been out for public consideration and is being considered now within government. A final decision will be made in due course.