

---

# THE ENVIRONMENT

---

## **John Howard, 1997**

Source: [Parliament of Australia](#)

Since its election the government has addressed the critical issue of global warming in a way that effectively promotes Australia's national interests.

Those interests lie in both protecting Australian jobs and Australian industry whilst ensuring that Australia plays her part in the worldwide effort needed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

From the start, we have made it plain that Australia would not accept an unfair share of the burden. We have rejected and will continue to reject mandatory uniform targets which advantage many developed countries to the distinct disadvantage of Australia.

We have also made it plain that we are not prepared to see Australian jobs sacrificed and efficient Australian industries, particularly in the resources sector, robbed of

their hard-earned, competitive advantage.

Moreover, we have persistently stressed the need to involve developing countries as their participation is crucial to any lasting solution to the global warming problem.

These principles have guided our approach to the greenhouse gas issue.

## **Peter McGauran, 1997**

Source: [Parliament of Australia](#)

I thank the member for Hinkler for his question. Representing, as he does, the city of Gladstone, he has a vital interest in all matters greenhouse. There is a great deal of misinformation and at times hysteria, often deliberately manufactured, about the issue of climate change. The government has always accepted that the balance of scientific evidence suggests the earth's average temperature is increasing, thereby causing the climate to change. We do not, however, accept wild doomsday predictions based on faulty or non-existent science—to do so would be to

sell out Australia and Australian jobs.

We instead rely in the formulation of policy on credible scientific data. The latest estimates on the consequences of greenhouse emissions by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change —IPCC, which was set up jointly by the World Meteorological Organisation and the United Nations Environment Program and represents the views of several hundred recognised experts from around the world—are that temperatures have risen between 0.3 and 0.6 degrees Centigrade since the last century and are expected to rise by about two degrees by the year 2100—more than a hundred years from now.

### **Kevin Rudd, 2009**

Source: [Parliament of Australia](#)

Responding to climate change will be the great challenge for this generation. If we do not rise to the challenge what we will end up doing is condemning future generations of Australians to live with the consequences of our failure. This

government has resolved to act. Climate change is not an abstract concept, it is not an abstract problem and it does not exist over the horizon; it is here, it is present, it is real and its consequences are being felt across every continent on earth.

### **John Howard, 2003**

Source: [Parliament of Australia](#)

The reason why we have not been willing to ratify the Kyoto protocol is that, by doing that, we would impose costs on Australia that would not be passed on to countries like China and Russia that might well be our competitors, particularly in relation to resource projects. What the Labor Party wants us to do is sign up to something that would place burdens on Australian industry but not impose the same burdens on the industries of other countries that could well be our competitors. For us to sign the Kyoto protocol in its current form would destroy jobs in many of the industrial areas in Australia—it would be bad news for the Hunter Valley region, it would be bad news

for the electorate represented by the member for Hunter, it would be bad news for Australian exporters. Overall, I am not going to be party to something that destroys jobs and destroys the competitiveness of Australian industry.

### **Anthony Albanese, 2006**

Source: [Parliament of Australia](#)

The 2006 budget did not mention climate change, for the 11th year in a row. The budget had no initiatives for clean renewable energy. This bill is consistent with the government's irresponsible approach of doing very little to avoid dangerous climate change—the greatest environmental challenge facing the world. There is overwhelming scientific evidence that climate change caused by carbon pollution is making Australia hotter, the ocean warmer and our cities and towns drier. The CSIRO says climate change is directly affecting the water supply of every city and town and is threatening the Great Barrier Reef and Kakadu. The science is pretty clear that climate change increases the intensity of

cyclones and hurricanes. Climate change means we will have more category 4 and category 5 cyclones. If climate change remains unchecked, it will severely damage Australia's agricultural and tourism industries while also impacting on many Australians through health effects, weather events and further water restrictions. There is no doubt that recent steep rises in temperature can be put down to human activity.

But the government's hypocrisy in having the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, who is responsible for water, gagging a debate on renewable energy, which has a direct impact on climate change and therefore on water, shows the bankruptcy of the government's approach. Surely, the recent destruction caused by Cyclone Larry should have been a reminder of the severe weather we must prepare for at home as our planet warms. If for no other reason, Australia's self-interest dictates we must support clean renewable energy. To do so is prudent and not to do so is irresponsible.

As well as understanding the immediate and long-term threat of climate change, the most important thing to understand about dangerous climate change is that it can be avoided. I repeat: dangerous climate change can be avoided. If governments, communities and businesses work together to get us out of the heat trap which is developing around the world, we can avoid dangerous climate change. Humans have become a force of nature. We are changing the climate, and what happens next really is up to us. Climate change has been caused by humans; but, thankfully, solutions already exist to address it. We can and should act now to address the problem.

**Greg Combet, 2012**

Source: [Parliament of Australia](#)

The Australian government accepts the advice of climate scientists that greenhouse gas emissions are contributing to climate change and that this poses great risks to our environment, our economy and our society.

Climate change is a diabolical international problem with an achievable international solution. In this matter, Australia has a choice.

We can be part of growing international action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and use the market to reduce emissions at least cost to our economy.

Or we as a country can reject the advice of scientists, reject the advice of economists, ignore our international responsibility, and in so doing put our future prosperity at risk.

The Australian government has a responsibility to act in our national interest to be part of the international solution. Australia will not ignore that responsibility. This government will not ignore it.

**Kevin Andrews, 2011**

Source: [Parliament of Australia](#)

Can I say at the outset that, apart from the Prime Minister's broken promise—'there will be no carbon tax under a government I lead'—there is a gross deception at the heart of this legislation. Time and

again, day after day, week after week, month after month, Labor members proclaim that this is a tax only on the 500 biggest polluters in the nation, the implication being that the financial penalty of this legislation will only fall upon these companies—500 companies, of course, that the government cannot, or refuse to, actually name. They do not know which 500 companies they are. A company could be No. 499 or No. 501 and they would have no clue at the moment as to which one they were.

But, leaving that aside, let us tackle this proposition from the government that this is a tax the financial and fiscal impact of which will only fall on the 500 biggest polluters in the nation. Let us assume for a moment that that is true. If that were true then why is there a need for a vast compensation package in these bills? The fact is that the claim that only the 500 biggest polluters will pay is political spin. It reminds me of George Orwell's quip: 'Political language ... is designed to make lies sound

truthful and murder respectable, and to give an appearance of solidity to pure wind.' That is about the reality of what we hear coming from this government.

### **Tony Abbott, 2011**

Source: [Parliament of Australia](#)

Let me repeat it for the benefit of the rather raucous member opposite. The Prime Minister said, five days before the election, 'There will be no carbon tax under the government I lead.' That was the commitment that the Prime Minister made on behalf of every single Labor member of this House.

She made that commitment on their behalf and I am giving this parliament and those members, including the raucous member opposite, the chance to turn what would otherwise be a lie into a truth. I am giving members opposite the chance to turn a lie into a truth, to make honest politicians of the Prime Minister and themselves by deferring the actual proclamation of this carbon tax until after the next election. We had the member

for Moreton today say very publicly that he was determined to keep faith with the people of Moreton by ensuring that the person they voted for as Prime Minister at the 2010 election stayed in that job. The amendment that I am moving now gives every member of parliament a chance to keep faith with their electorates. When the Prime Minister made that promise five days before the election she was not doing it as a private person and she was not doing it as just the member for Lalor; she was doing it as the Leader of the Labor Party; she was doing it as the leader of every member opposite. So if they want to keep faith with their electors they will support this amendment, because it is a contemptible thing for a government to say one thing before an election to win votes and do the opposite after the election to stay in power.

I say to members opposite: if they want to stand up for truth in public life, if they want to stand up for the jobs of their constituents, if they want to stand up for truth-telling

and if they want to ensure that the Labor Party really is the party of truth-telling, they will back this amendment. In the end, my amendment is not about whether you support a carbon tax—obviously I do not; some people in this parliament do—this is about whether you support democracy and whether you support integrity in public life. That is why this amendment should be supported by this parliament.

### **Tony Abbott, 2011**

Source: [Parliament of Australia](#)

I welcome the opportunity to speak on this climate change legislation. Let us be absolutely blunt about the bills now before the parliament. This is a bad tax based on a lie and it should be rejected by this parliament. The Prime Minister said yesterday that the question for members of this parliament was: 'Are you or are you not on the right side of history?' Let me say that this is arrogant presumption by a Prime Minister who is on the wrong side of truth. That is the Prime Minister's problem: she is on

the wrong side of truth when it comes to this issue.

Nearly all the claims that this Prime Minister is making for her carbon tax are wrong. It is a bad tax based on a lie, and the argument that she is marshalling for this tax is one lie after another. She talks about green jobs. A United Kingdom study released in March this year found that for every job created in the renewable energy sector 3.7 existing jobs were lost. A 2009 Spanish study found that for every green job created by subsidies and price supports for renewable power more than two jobs in other industries are lost. Her claims that no-one need worry about this tax because everyone is going to be compensated are wrong, even based on her own figures. Her own figures, in her own carbon Sunday documents, show that more than three million Australian households will be worse off.

These are not just rich people. A teacher married to a shop assistant: worse off under the government's package even by the government's

own figures. A policeman married to a part-time nurse: worse off, under the government's own figures, thanks to the carbon tax. A single-income family with a child, on the government's own modelling, starts to be worse off from below average weekly earnings. That is what this government is doing to the struggling families, the forgotten families, of Australia.

The Prime Minister tells us that we have to introduce a carbon tax to keep up with policies in the rest of the world. Dead wrong. Since Copenhagen, if anything, the rest of the world has been moving against carbon taxes and emissions trading schemes, and in the period in which Australia intends to reduce its emissions by five per cent China is forecast to increase its emissions by 500 per cent and India its by 350 per cent

It is disastrous for our democracy, and it is disastrous for the trust that should exist between members of parliament and their electorates. Why are the members for Throsby and Cunningham

sponsoring such damage to BlueScope and to the coalminers of the Illawarra? Why is the member for Hunter and the other Hunter Valley members of the government doing such damage to the heavy industries and to the coalmines of the Hunter? How can the Climate Change minister talk to his constituents with a straight face, given what he is doing to them? How can the member for Capricornia want to close down so many mines in her electorate? How can the members for Corio and Corangamite be doing this to the cement industry and to the aluminium industry and to the motor industry of Geelong? What we have from this government is politically, economically and environmentally disastrous. But it is more than that; it is going to turn out to be the longest political suicide note in Australian history.

**Ron Boswell, 2011**

Source: [Parliament of Australia](#)

This is a sad day for some on this side of the parliament but it is a joyous day for others—and it will

be a diabolical day for the Labor Party. You have to congratulate Senator Bob Brown. He has performed magnificently and he had led the Labor Party into oblivion. I have never seen anything like it. I have never seen a person who has totally different views from the blue-collar workers of Australia being able to swing a whole party, like a bunch of lemmings going over the cliff. You have to congratulate Senator Brown. He has captured the Labor Party. All that clapping in the gallery when Senator Brown got up to speak reminded me very much of the Labor Party vote slipping and slipping and just ebbing out. While the Greens were rising, the Labor Party was falling.

I cannot see how you get out of this one. I cannot see how the Labor Party get out of this. I cannot see how they got into it. Why would you sell out your soul and your blue-collar workers—the people who have supported you and paid their union fees and religiously turned up to hand out your how-to-vote cards? How could you sell them out? How could you be

conned by a bunch of Greens, who are really the socialist alliance and the hard, hard left of the parliament?

**Eric Abetz, 2011**

Source: [Parliament of Australia](#)

So the Labor Party has no moral commitment to this policy. They know it is bad policy. That is why they said no carbon tax time and time again—indeed, so often you would have thought all the roosters around the country would have started crowing. But on this occasion one of the roosters—Senator Conroy—was very quiet.

The Australian people are entitled to ask a fundamental question: how is it that when over 90 per cent of the parliamentarians in the two houses were elected on a promise of no carbon tax the carbon tax can somehow be legislated? The only way is because somebody has broken their solemn promise to the Australian people. Those who have done so are in fact, on this occasion—surprisingly not the Aus-

tralian Greens—the Australian Labor Party, who will now go out celebrating with the Greens for their betrayal of the Australian people. We will give the Australian people an opportunity to cast a verdict in relation to this legislation at the next election.

**Bob Brown, 2011**

Source: [Parliament of Australia](#)

At times all of us, in our communities and our societies, are faced with enormous challenges, challenges which go beyond the ordinary in history and challenges which reach into the future and call for action that those in the future may not or will not be able to undertake if we do not take safeguarding action for them now. At such moments, history shows us that we see generated in the public discourse not only great effort to rise to those challenges but also great silliness and irresponsibility. If we have ever heard an example of such an irresponsible, silly and doctrinaire contribution, we have just heard one from the Leader of the Nationals in the Senate. I have been

in this place for 15 years and I have never heard such an uninformed diatribe based on false information and calumny about the global scientific community—that is, the global think tank of humanity—from a politician, let alone a leader of a political party. The more the public gets to hear of what Senator Joyce has just said, the more they will understand how fraught the progress of this nation, the wealthiest nation per capita on the face of the planet, could be into the future.

Common sense is totally with this package from Labor and the Greens. As I began by saying, the silliness and irresponsibility is in the opposition package. I predict that we will see growing support for this package as Australians see that the predictions of Senator Joyce, which we just heard, simply are not carried through, any more than his earlier prediction that this legislation would see farmers having their land taken from them. It is an extraordinary form of political behaviour which may have short-term traction but in the long term demeans the whole process of a

polity based on intelligence, being informed and taking responsible action. I congratulate the government, my Greens colleagues and the Independents, Mr Windsor and Mr Oakeshott, for delivering this package to this parliament, through which it will pass, to the benefit of this great nation for decades to come.

### **Christine Milne, 2011**

Source: [Parliament of Australia](#)

I rise today on what is an historic day in the Australian Senate. This is the day when the Senate will begin to consider the clean energy package and will start delivering real action on climate change in Australia as these bills pass. It is an historic day in Australia and globally because it is the day when the seven-billionth person is expected to join us on the planet. We live on a finite planet and the non-renewable resources of the earth are under huge pressure. Equally, the earth's atmosphere, oceans and rivers do not have an unlimited capacity to absorb waste. That is why we are suffering the consequences

of global warming already. Global warming is accelerating. In 2011, at the end of the first decade of this century, it poses the greatest threat to human civilisation and to the ongoing health and wellbeing of the fellow species and ecosystems with whom we share this beautiful planet.

### **Tony Abbott, 2014**

Source: [Parliament of Australia](#)

The Australian people pronounced their judgement against the carbon tax. They want it gone and this bill delivers. It delivers on the coalition's commitment to the Australian people to scrap this toxic tax.

Repealing the carbon tax will reduce costs for all Australian businesses—for every single one of them.

The carbon tax has ripped through the economy hitting schools, hospitals, nursing homes, charities, churches, council swimming pools and community centres. It has hit each and every group, and each and every individ-

ual that uses power. That was always its goal to make electricity more expensive. That was the intention of the previous government to put power prices up, because that was their way of reducing emissions.

So we will scrap the carbon tax and then proceed with our direct action plan. The centrepiece of this direct action plan will be the Emissions Reduction Fund, a market-based mechanism for reducing carbon dioxide emissions, a fund that provides a powerful and direct additional incentive for businesses to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions.

### **Bill Shorten, 2014**

Source: [Parliament of Australia](#)

In late 2009, this nation was on the verge of making a decision about which we could have been collectively proud. We could have made this parliament a place of inspiration, with a national response to climate change, supported by both government and opposition. It was a policy of both government and opposition that built upon the

previous government's decision—a government not of our party—but consistent with the best practice in the world. Indeed, this week is the seventh anniversary of Prime Minister Howard announcing his support for an emissions trading scheme.

Those debates in 2009 took our nation to a higher level. The myths, fears and uncertainties would be set aside, not just for the national interest but for all generations for all future time. But since that time the hope that we could develop a national commitment has been frittered away. For his part, our current Prime Minister wrested away the leadership of the Liberal party from the person who believed most in the evidence and the need for a response. For our part, we walked away from calling an election which the nation was entitled to have. We did the second best thing. We worked to achieve a national response, but we settled for second best, transforming the international pricing of carbon into a carbon tax. But we were right to

have international pricing. We were right to support an emissions trading scheme. We were right to have climate change as a political priority of the previous government. We were right to establish the Climate Change Authority, the Clean Energy Finance Corporation and the Australian Renewable Energy Agency. We were right to back the renewable energy target. We were right to listen to the scientific world. We had a responsibility to work within the political realities to achieve the best national outcomes for the best international response. For this, Labor does not apologise. From this Labor does not resile. We are not sceptics. We believe the science. We understand that what is necessary is an effective international solution. In that international solution we aim for best practice, to be among the leaders, working with the progressive, continuously testing the facts. In that international solution we want practical outcomes, the best solutions, not just some vague promises. We would prefer to be part of a national consensus, but where we

cannot we shall advocate our position. We want to nurture the debate. Last week's staggering display of this government's special blend of blustering arrogance and incompetence made one thing abundantly clear: only one party in Australia has a serious, substantial and credible climate change policy. That party is the Australian Labor Party.

### **Christine Milne, 2014**

Source: [Parliament of Australia](#)

A vote for the abolition of the clean energy package is a vote for failure because it is a recognition that this parliament does not want to face up to the four to six degrees of warming, which is the trajectory we are on as a planet. They do not want to face up to what is intergenerational theft, because a planet facing the warming that we are now being subjected to, and will be subjected to, is a planet experiencing the sixth extinction crisis. It will be a planet suffering rising sea levels. It will be a planet suffering food security crises and it will be a nation, Australia, failing to play

our role in global negotiations. We will be a global pariah as the rest of the world moves to try to secure a treaty in 2015 to give people on this planet a chance of survival in the face of a climate emergency. Australia will be relegated to a pariah and a backwater. But it is also a failure to understand that the future is going to be powered by renewable energy, by innovation, by excitement and by new manufacturing.

If this parliament votes to abandon the clean energy package, you are voting against the best interests of the nation. It is a huge opportunity cost to Australia. We will be sidelined in global capital markets. We will be sidelined in innovation. Already GE is out today saying that the pipeline of investment in renewable energy is in jeopardy because of what Australia is doing. This is an appalling day for Australia when a government, rather than lead in the face of what the world is facing up to and rather than lead and be ahead in the race to the future, is determined to stick with the past. So the Greens say,

absolutely: this will be a short-lived victory for the Abbott government and those who vote with it today, because Australia will not stand for it. People want this country to lead. People want innovation. People want the clean energy future and people will understand very quickly that the supposed benefits will not be realised. But what people will face is another summer of extreme weather events and more summers after that, as our Pacific neighbours will

**Sarah Hanson-Young, 2014**

Source: [Parliament of Australia](#)

Putting our heads in the sand, as Mr Abbott—the Prime Minister—would prefer and ignoring the science will not help protect our children's future. We owe it to the next generation to stand up, to raise our voice and to fight for the action not just that we need to continue but that which we have already put in place.

We know that young people, in particular across this country are desperate for real action on climate

change. In fact, when you look at the attitudes of voters and attitudes of citizens in this country, overwhelmingly the largest amount of support for direct action—that is, urgent action and action that will reduce emissions for climate change—is amongst Australia's youngest citizens. Why is that? I guess it is because it is their future that we are talking about. We must always be thinking of our younger citizens when we make decisions in this place.

**Bruce Goodluck, 1983**

Source: [Parliament of Australia](#)

Government supporters talk about the wilderness. The wilderness is not just for a few cranks with haversacks on their backs. It is for some of the good people in my electorate who cannot afford it. Honourable members opposite are always against the rich. They always purport to be for the workers. What about the workers who are employed in Tasmania and the poor people there? Of course we are going to develop roads. That will open up the tourist industry.

My colleagues and I will stand by this principle. One of my colleagues might not—that is his business. I do not care. When we fight we fight dashed hard. That is the only way to win. If we lose the battle we will win the fight.

### **Andrew Theophanous, 1983**

Source: [Parliament of Australia](#)

A rich area of natural beauty such as South West Tasmania is not the treasure of one State only, or even of one nation, but it is, I submit, the heritage of all humanity. Future generations, not only of Australians but also of people from all over the planet, are entitled to strong action on our part to preserve this heritage. It is because of this that both the previous Tasmanian Government and the previous Federal Government placed this area on the World Heritage List.

What about the Aboriginal relics in the area? Archaeologists are developing new techniques all the time. If we flood this area and destroy things of interest to archaeologists we will, in fact, do a great disservice to humanity because

that area, important in terms of research, will be destroyed forever. Archaeologists and scientists will not be in a position to study this area and find out what it can tell us about primitive man and about the early Australian Aborigines. Of course, I know that honourable members opposite do not give a damn about the origins of man and other important scientific investigations. They are not concerned about that at all. They think that to provide a piddling amount of electricity is more important than the destruction of this area in terms of its archaeological importance, leaving aside its importance for conservation reasons.

### **Ray Groom, 1983**

Source: [Parliament of Australia](#)

We are very proud of our record in Tasmania of looking after our environment. Some honourable members have gone with the Tasmanian Wilderness Society and camped on the Franklin River or the Gordon River. But have they really seen Tasmania? Have they seen how beautiful our State is? I

am sick and tired of people referring to Tasmanians as vandals. We have protected our environment far better than any other State has. Twenty-seven per cent of Tasmania is national park or conservation area. We have the beautiful Freycinet National Park. How many honourable members have been to that beautiful Freycinet National Park, which I believe is our great national park in Tasmania? I wonder how many people know where it is. How many honourable members have been to Cradle Mountain and Lake St Clair National Park? How many of them have walked through the beautiful bush lands of Tasmania and seen our wonderful beaches? What about the Arthur River? When the radicals from the Tasmanian Wilderness Society come to see me and start asking questions, not knowing that I happen to be the local member and have lived in the area most of my life, I say to them: 'What about the Arthur River?'

### **Brian Harradine, 1983**

Source: [Parliament of Australia](#)

Tasmania's rights are being sacrificed at the altar of modern day pantheism. This ceremony is being conducted in this chamber as the debate on the World Heritage Properties Conservation Bill draws inevitably to its conclusion. The genesis of this legislation is in itself a revelation. There are people so dogmatic about revering what they call the wilderness that they are prepared to deify it and seek to preserve each species of flora and fauna intact. Does not this reveal a pantheistic view of nature which is both inhuman and inconsistent with the proven body of scientific knowledge of mutations of organisms? Compare their concern to preserve all such species of non-human life with the support that some of them give to the destruction of life of infinitely greater value, that is, the life of unborn human beings.

True, there are supporters of this measure who adhere to the principle that the world was created for our benefit. It is possible to engage

in rational discussion and debate with these supporters. They agree that the environment may be disturbed for an overriding common human good. They are distinct from those people who are so dogmatic about not disturbing the environment and so dogmatic, in an unscientific way, about 'preserving' all species of flora and fauna. I hasten to add that with those supporters one can have some common ground. My common ground with them is that what must be done is what is best for the common good. They have a different opinion from mine on how best this can be determined. So far as I am concerned this question surely must be determined, and appropriately determined, by the group with the information and the responsibility so to do.

### **Rosemary Crowley, 1983**

Source: [Parliament of Australia](#)

I think it is interesting to note that, over recent years, there has been an enormous increase—already alluded to by Senator Mason—in awareness of the values that

we want to place on things on this planet. This has shifted considerably from what it was in, let us say, the time of our parents. We are now looking at people in our community who place a lot of value on the need to preserve certain areas and sites, not only for ourselves but for the world and our children. One of the things to which this Bill addresses itself is, if you like, adding to the list of the wonders of the world.

When I was a child there were seven wonders of the world. I never did know them; I still could not tell honourable senators what they are. But I think we are now saying that there are many wonders in our world. The Leaning Tower of Pisa is one of the wonders that I recall, but I never knew where the Hanging Gardens of Babylon were. I think one of the things that colour the way in which we now look at the wonders of the world is that we do not just want our community to vote for technological advances or wonders. We unashamedly commend things such as the Sydney Opera House or the Taj Mahal. I am

sure that people are very pleased to celebrate those mighty technological advances. But at the same time people are placing a great value on things other than technological advances. They are now saying that there is a great value in preserving bushland.

There are many examples of this in Australia. Already areas are preserved which are not on the World Heritage List but which are regarded with great favour by Australian people. In South Australia we have the preservation of what is called Flinders Chase on Kangaroo Island. A large part of that island is natural bushland, as it ever has been. I know that not only South Australians but all Australians are delighted that that piece of original Australian bushland remains. If any honourable senators ever have the chance to visit Flinders Chase they will find pens there to keep in the people and to keep out the animals. Humans are seen as intruders or temporary visitors. Another of the places that are on the World Heritage List or are on record as places of value in this country is

Lord Howe Island. We are now talking about South West Tasmania. But other places in our world, such as the Grand Canyon in the United States of America, are not places of technological advance. In fact, the Grand Canyon is probably an ancient place with no technology but only that which has been performed by natural world forces, such as volcanoes and rivers.

To return again to Australia, there are places such as the south coastland of Victoria, the rain forests of eastern Australia and the Flinders Ranges in South Australia. Any number of arguments will now be advanced to support the preserving or maintaining of these places unspoilt, as it were. There are places which some people regard as areas of peace and perspective-places to which people can withdraw and put into perspective their lives in the cities. These are temporary places for people. There are also places that allow the preservation of our native flora and fauna. One thing that is most singular about Australia-in fact, the Minister for Sport, Recreation and

Tourism, Mr John Brown, drew it to our attention last week-is the animal life in this country. Although the Minister is wont to say that there is more about Australia that is marvellous than our kangaroos and koalas, they are very distinctive to this continent and I think they are things that all Australians unashamedly want to see preserved.