

Protected Areas in a Time of Change

Penny Figgis



2008

Romeo Lahey Memorial Lecture

National Parks Association of Queensland

Romeo Lahey

The Memorial Lecture honours the principal founder of the National Parks Association of Queensland - Romeo Watkins Lahey. Born into a Canungra timber family with sawmilling interests, he is remembered as a dedicated conservationist who succeeded in having the wonderful rainforests of Lamington Plateau and surrounds declared as a National Park in 1915. He saw that a visible, knowledgeable public involvement in the National Park movement was essential, and with others founded the National Parks Association in 1930. He remained President for over 30 years, and was instrumental in convincing the Queensland Government to declare many of the National Parks gazetted up to the 1970s.

sector of conservation and tourism and the environment. She was national lobbyist for the Australian Conservation Foundation in the 1980s and served 17 yrs on Council and as Vice President. Other roles include the boards or committees of Uluru Kata Tjuta National Park, the Australian Bush Heritage Fund, the Nature Conservation Council of NSW, the Australian Tourist Commission, the NSW Environment Protection Authority, the Great Barrier Reef Consultative Committee, Landcare Australia and the Jenolan Caves Trust.

In 1994 she was made a Member of the Order of Australia (AM) for her services to conservation and the environment, and in 2006 was given one of Australia's highest honours, Officer in the Order of Australia (AO) for service to the environment, nature conservation and sustainable tourism.

Penny Figgis

Penelope Figgis is Vice Chair for Australia and New Zealand of the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas. She is also Chair of the Parklands Advisory Committee, member of the Northern Territory Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council and Visiting Fellow at the Graduate School of the Environment, Macquarie University.

Penny has been a senior member of the Australian environment movement for 30 yrs contributing through governance, writing, policy development, advocacy and public speaking. She has written and spoken extensively on protected areas, World Heritage, the private land

Protected Areas in a Time of Change

Penelope Figgis AO

(This is an edited version of the address transcript which was based on a powerpoint presentation.)

Thank you very much for giving me this honour - I know they are easy words to say but I really do mean them. When you hear stories of activists, those people who were pioneers of the National Parks movement in Australia, one can only feel the most intense gratitude for what they have done, for the wonderful wild places that we have in this country, for their role in starting a whole movement.

Very often they acted in a culture that wasn't particularly sympathetic or mindful of the need for conservation, that indeed was paid to clear the land, but they had the presence of mind to look ahead. All of us who love our National Parks, who love nature are so grateful to them. So thank you to the Lahey family for being here tonight, and thank you for giving me this opportunity to commemorate what Romeo Lahey achieved and to talk about my favourite topic which is Protected Areas.

THE WAY WE WERE

I'm going to start where we all started. Although the earliest National Parks were created in the late 1880s, the real impetus for national parks in Australia was post

war and about 1970. This is a time that I can speak about with authority because I was well and truly there, as I think many of you were. I think all of us who love nature thought we had the answer. We loved nature but saw many stresses and strains developing. We were reading the Club of Rome reports, the Population Bomb or Rachel Carson's Silent Spring. A lot of us were witness to the enormous juggernaut of change and development, the conversion of lands, and felt that nature was truly in danger.

We thought we had the answer and it was expressed in all the "Save The...." Campaigns of the 70s - Moreton Island, the Daintree, the Franklin, Terania Creek, etc. We knew exactly what we needed to do to save nature, to draw a line and declare these areas National Park. And if it was National Park, it would be 'saved'.

We principally concentrated on the areas that we loved and knew. Understandably these were areas that we were aware of - for example, an area of coast subject to mining - that's where our campaigns were focused. Think of the great campaigns for Fraser Island. Or it might have been a magnificent area of forest along the ranges were we bushwalked, and we found out that it was going to be logged or dammed. So we concentrated a lot of the campaigns for National Parks on the familiar lands of coasts and forests.



Partners In Conservation

Back in the 70s, even 80s, we also saw parks as a reasonably simple business involving only a few players. It was the environment movement's job to campaign, the politician's job to declare them, and government's job to get on and manage them.

How did we see other groups with interests in lands and seas?

Indigenous issues were seen as a heritage issue - they were about protecting cave paintings, canoe trees, heritage associated with the past. I am the first to admit that I wrote a thesis on wilderness conservation in 1978, and it did not have one single word about indigenous people in it. The conservation movement in the 70s did a wilderness survey of Australia, and we put great big lines around bits of Australia that we wanted for wilderness, but did not make any effort to communicate with indigenous people, nor did we generally see them as partners.

Farmers and pastoralists on the other hand were part of the problem. We saw things fairly simply - we were the people who cared about nature, and the farmers were clearing trees, causing soil erosion and creating problems like salinity.

If we did get a National Park then the next problem was tourists. Tourism 'spoil' nature. People like us were fine, bushwalking or camping, but tourists generally were considered negatively. 'Private interest' and

'business' were seen as dirty words. A private interest was a commercial interest; it was about profit and not about conservation.

Our main methodology for gaining public support was a moral appeal - a moral obligation to do the right thing by our children and future generations.

DRIVERS OF CHANGE

I believe that there has been change and that there needs to be more change, but what are the drivers of change?

Losing the Species Battle

First of all, we are losing the battle. The truth is that despite all our efforts and despite our achievements, we are losing the battle to save the wonderful plants and animals of this ancient and unique country. The 2002 National Biodiversity Audit made it quite clear that we have 1600 species that are threatened. Recent figures from Northern Australia are truly disturbing. So National Parks alone are not saving Australia's biodiversity.

That is not to say they are doing a bad job, they are just not enough!

Urbanisation

I don't need to tell anyone in South-East Queensland about urbanisation and its risks to biodiversity, here and all over the world. We have now reached the halfway mark - there are more than 50% of the world's people living in cities.



At almost 2m tall when in flower, *Phaius australis* is one of the largest and most endangered orchids in Eastern Australia - urban development continues to threaten this species.

Population Growth

It is quite extraordinary to think that when our grandparents were alive, there were one billion people in the world. There are now over six billion people in the world, and most forecasters believe it will go to nine billion before there is any levelling off. This creates a gigantic vacuum cleaner for the world's resources.

Science

Accumulated knowledge is also a driver of change. We actually know more. More about what we are

losing and more about how we can save what is left. In recent years we have collected reliable data about where vegetation remains, where species remain, where they are gone, what's happening to our soils, what's happening to our waters. So a major engine of change is actually finding out what the real situation is and the development of new tools to plan better outcomes.

Indigenous Rights

Another driver of change has been the rise of Indigenous rights. From a situation worldwide where Indigenous people were suppressed everywhere, to one of increasing assertiveness culminating in real rights over land, and in some instances seas, embodied in policy and practice.

The Rise of Tourism

I don't need to tell anyone in Queensland about tourism - it is a huge force in Australia and it is focused on National Parks. Name the key tourist attractions of any state and you will be naming the key Parks. The numbers and impacts have gone down dramatically over the decades but so has the recognition of the tourism industry of the importance of this 'resource'.

The Retreat of Government

While the problems examined have increased, been exacerbated and become more complex, we've also had the Reagan and Thatcher era of small government. Their attitude was that government should not be involved in everything, with a trend

in reducing budgets, and the rise of the private sector.

Biorecognition

Biorecognition threats are another huge driver of change. One of the biggest threats to Australia is the introduction of new pathogens and new species from overseas. We have an enormous virtually unprotected border to our North, where a single species could enter and wipe out complete ecosystems and industries.

Climate Change

All the different threats to biodiversity - weeds, land clearing, inappropriate fire regimes, salinity - all of these will be exacerbated by climate change. I'm not going to go into any great detail here, but in terms of threats to biodiversity this is the mother of them all. Climate change will mean that things get hotter and dryer, and that we will have more extreme events. It is extremely friendly to all the 'baddies' - species with short generation times, good dispersal, broad climatic tolerances, generalists and opportunists. Climate change will not be a problem for the thistles or the cane toads or the foxes. But unfortunately it's extremely different for our wildlife, which has evolved on this ancient continent through long generation times, often poor dispersal, narrow climatic ranges and tolerances. These are species that tend to be specialists, some may need large home ranges, others exist in isolated populations - all characteristics that make them extremely vulnerable to change.

argue is that isolated conservation entities carry the seeds of their own destruction, that they will not persist overtime.

In the more general policy field the IUCN World Parks Congresses are great generators of thinking. Occurring once every 10 years, they attract the heads of Parks and chief policy people and scientists from across the globe. In 1992 in Caracas, Venezuela, the whole issue of connectivity, non-fragmentation and the integration of Parks into broader landscapes started to be discussed. It was where the first arguments about involving more people in the community, using inclusive models, started. The last World Parks Conference in Durban, South Africa, in 2003 had a strong emphasis on the rights agenda - the need to have conservation which was socially equitable and which respected human rights, especially those of indigenous people.

Other drivers of change come from big international instruments like the Convention on Biological Diversity. They have set major goals, in fact they have a program of works on Protected Areas, which is supposed to guide our governments. They have argued profoundly for comprehensive Protected Area Systems.

Another source of innovative thinking is the increasing understanding of nature and natural systems as not just beautiful places for quiet recreation and wildlife but as essential parts of the infrastructure of human society.

Ecological infrastructure is a new term, but increasingly it's being used around the world to say that our ecosystems are as much a part of our infrastructure as our transport systems or schools or hospitals. It is a recognition of what we all know - that our natural systems produce clean air and water, underpin our health system, and provide places for people to recreate. They generate and protect our fisheries and protect our coastlines and hill sides against major events. More recently, discussion has turned to the critical role that our natural systems play in both holding and pulling down carbon.

SO WHERE ARE WE HEADING?

What sort of change are we talking about? Change captured by the six C's - Complexity, Comprehensiveness, Connectivity, Cooperation, Challenges and Communication. So let's go through some of these.

COMPLEXITY

Complexity is really the overarching summary of all the other changes - you will see that each of the areas we felt were fixtures of National Parks policy have fundamental shifted to a more complex form.

COMPREHENSIVENESS

Here we have gone away from examining the coasts and the forests alone, to an emerging national consensus for fully comprehensive, adequate and representative Protected Areas. So we are not just trying to save the green, the wet,



The vulnerable Black grevillea (*Grevillea scortechini* ssp. *scortechini*) - small range, low dispersal ability and not found in protected areas.

SOURCES OF NEW THINKING

So if there is an impetus for change, a need to address new challenges, where will the inspiration come from? One area is of course science and an important area of new thinking is Conservation Biology. Michael Soule is perhaps the best known proponent, and he has argued against isolation and fragmentation - that islands of biodiversity will not work. If you think about it, this is the problem that most of our National Parks face. Areas like the Stirling Range in Western Australia are islands, completely surrounded by wheat fields. What Soule and others

and the tall, but also the flat, the brown and even the uninteresting, because we know that all of these pieces matter.

One of the ways we have done this is to divide Australia into bioregions. Through the National Reserves Direction Statement, the Federal Government is committed to preserving 80% of these bioregions. Some ecosystems are incredibly difficult to protect because wheat fields or other land uses have virtually obliterated them. However this is a framework that is happening and that all levels of government are really committed to.

I like to insert a caveat into the comprehensiveness issue. It can lead to the view that all we need is a sample of that and sample of this. There is a danger in this - if we had just taken the sample approach, we probably never would have had the northern area of the Blue Mountains National Park - its dominant systems were well represented elsewhere. This was campaigned for on the basis of its intrinsic values and for the love of this beautiful and wild place. And that's where we found the Wollemi Pine! We must remember we do not have total knowledge, we cannot always know which 'bit' really matters; therefore we must save as much as possible.

When I'm talking about new values, you don't abandon old values. There are very good reasons to add rather than to subtract. Indeed, we should

be committed to all ecosystems being represented. People like ourselves must advocate for the flat, brown and uninteresting, as well as the gorgeous, green and steep.

In the 1970s we were very terrestrially focused. There were some marine conservationists but many more keen bushwalking terrestrial types. We finally remembered that 71% of the Earth is actually ocean - advocates of Parks need to be advocates of terrestrial and marine protected areas. Fortunately we now have a national process under way for a comprehensive system of marine protected areas. Queensland is well served by a gigantic marine park, but must develop new marine parks in inshore waters.

CONNECTIVITY

I have already alluded to the fact that parks alone can be isolated, and that we need to connect them across the landscape. This is a major direction that has emerged from the World Congresses and the Convention on Biological Diversity - we call it **connectivity conservation**.

With climate change we are going to need permeability in the landscape. If a species cannot move, clearly its future is very grim. We need to have corridors and stepping stones in the landscape, to turn the islands into networks, into integrated connections across land and sea. This means all tenures, all local government lands, all indigenous lands, and private lands.

A study was done last year by WWF and ourselves on climate change and protected areas. The key recommendation was that we need to focus on areas that have traditionally been refugia - resilient areas and areas that species have retreated to in difficult times.



Elevated montane swamps - endangered ecological communities and critical refugia areas.

We need to focus on these strongholds, to create permeability and improve resilience. The other major finding was that we have to manage threatening processes because if protected areas, however well designed or connected, are full of weeds, have inappropriate fire

regimes or feral animals, they won't do the job. So the change there is to advocate for National Parks as the basis for these broader, multi-tenure networks.

COOPERATION

Not only is the task of nature conservation too large and too important for formal parks alone, the task is too great for governments alone - we need to greatly increase the cooperation of the whole community and forge a new paradigm which says conservation is in everyone's interest and it's everyone's job. Let's take some particular groups.

Indigenous Australians

I've mentioned Indigenous people several times. They are one of the biggest land owners in Australia, especially in the Northern Territory where 45% of land is under Indigenous ownership. I'm not sure what the percentage is in Queensland but it is quite substantial. Indigenous owners will be a key component of the next segment, which is Cooperation. We cannot have connectivity unless we have components of society working together, and Indigenous Australians are a critical component.

No doubt all of you are aware of the innovative Indigenous Protected Area (IPA) system. Some people have raised questions about this tool because it's not permanent. It is effectively a contract with government; Indigenous people have to enter it voluntarily. They approach government and work out a Management Plan for the area,

and then that Plan is implemented. This Program is bringing hundreds of thousands of hectares into active conservation management, lands that would otherwise be very vulnerable to the biosecurity problems that I mentioned earlier.

One of its major benefits is that not only has this Program addressed the rights agenda, but it has had other interesting impacts. Most importantly it has created work where people can stay on country, where they can use traditional knowledge where it is really needed, because in Northern Australia who else is actually there. There are very small numbers of people and very large threats. They are the people who can pick up the ghost nets, every one potentially full of microorganisms that could impact very seriously on our marine life.

The other interesting thing about Indigenous protected areas is that a study done last year showed that, where Indigenous people are involved in land and sea management, the children go to school more and the levels of addiction are lower, as are the levels of domestic violence. All the things we hope for in Indigenous communities, in terms of social benefit, are improved by involving people in land and sea management.

Community Groups

Community groups are a vital resource in conservation. I was talking to someone earlier about the incredible role of communities and what amazing jobs they can do. I was down at Iluka

in Northern NSW last year, where I spent a lot of time when I was a child. There was once a magnificent piece of coastal littoral rainforest, beautiful and pristine. Then the sand miners came through and it was almost completely wrecked and full of weeds. However in the last few years the local community, led interestingly by a fisherman's wife, has worked relentlessly to completely restore a large area of littoral rainforest (now World Heritage) once choked with lantana and asparagus fern to a healthy recovering state.



Landcare members discuss how best to manage fire for biodiversity outcomes on the New England Tableland.

In the past, the environment movement would tell people where the Parks should be, and the government would get on and do it. Now this cannot work, the job is too large and the resources of government will never be adequate. Therefore we need inclusive conservation - to involve all these groups - Landcare, Dunecare, Coastcare, Conservation Volunteers, Friends of Parks. We have to invite people in, ask them to contribute, and make them feel like it is their job too. Parks Services have to allocate the funding and the staff, and bring others into the fold with them.

Young People

Nelson Mandela opened the Parks congress in Durban in 2003. We all wanted to say how wonderful we thought he was and clapped and clapped and clapped, and wouldn't stop clapping until eventually he said "That's a nice welcome for an old man without a job". Then he looked around and said "There are too many grey hairs in this room" and he was absolutely right. One of the things we need to really think about with Parks - both in planning and management - is how do we engage younger people.

It may mean revisiting some of our most strongly held views, especially in regard to development in Parks, and force us to think about how we get big school groups interested in protected areas - how we make it part of the curriculum. We may even go down the path of the United States

where they have a lot of park-based summer camps, because people don't love what they don't know.

We really need to get our young people into Parks, because most are growing up behind computers and gameboys.

The Health Sector

The other people that we need to bring into this community are the health sector. I am sure you are aware of *Healthy Parks Healthy People* - an innovative program established in Victoria. The Victorian Parks system actively engaged with the health community to represent their Parks as a health resource. To date they have been endorsed by many health organisations including the Heart Foundation, the Diabetes Foundation, the Mental Health Foundation and the Autistic Society.

Healthy Parks Healthy People have a program called *Feel Good, Touch Green* which takes people who are depressed out into Parks. This is the direction of the future - engaging new communities or supporting new communities. People have to get away from the discourse that 'people are the problem' and engage new communities to care for nature.

The Private Conservation Sector

We talked about how private was once a dirty word. Private is becoming an essential word. This is partly because government will never have the sort of funding we want them to have, even though the situation has improved.

You probably all remember the 'Cat Hat' man - John Wamsley and his cat hat in South Australia. He pioneered nature sanctuaries in Australia - the notion that individuals could buy a sanctuary and set it aside for conservation. The first sanctuaries fenced areas off from feral animals. Now the model has been emulated by other organisations including big land trusts, who are buying substantial areas of land for conservation and are becoming major players.

Some of us worry that this will lead governments down the path of privatising National Parks. But having been fairly close to Bush Heritage, I have to say they have very well managed properties. They have set up whole systems for long term funding, the science and the governance is very high quality, and I think they are important players. To date, Bush Heritage has protected approximately one million hectares of high conservation value land. The Australian Wildlife Conservancy is also up around the million hectare mark. The Nature Conservancy is the largest landowner in the Americas, and is increasingly involved in protecting land in Australia.

We've already mentioned Indigenous Protected Areas, but there are also community conserved areas, smaller scale areas, actually protected by communities; they will all be part of the mix too. Then we get down to economic instruments, and I'll talk more about that in a moment. Private conservation is a critical sector - it's

not the answer, but it's certainly part of the answer, part of the mosaic that we need to be thinking about.



National Parks Association of Queensland Rare Flora Survey members looking for rare and threatened plants on a privately owned Nature Refuge property in a known biodiversity hotspot near Stanthorpe.

Industries

More controversially, I would argue that we shouldn't stop working with anybody, where in the past we tended to see some of the big land users as the enemy. In truth, a lot of the time they were proposing things that were very very detrimental to the environment, and they didn't show much interest in the conservation

of their lands. I believe that is changing, and I believe it could change further.

We already have many people in the agricultural sector involved in conservation farming, covenanting and other means of contributing to biodiversity. But why not the big players - mining and pastoralism. Very often, mining companies own large areas of land but only use quite small areas. Why couldn't we contract with them and Bush Heritage or somebody else to manage those lands for conservation. Similarly the pastoral industry may have high value areas they would be prepared to protect for conservation, were the financial benefits available. Such industries may get a benefit such as tax relief, and it is certainly something they can put on their annual report as part of their triple bottom line. They may even earn carbon credits if they're restoring the carbon holding capacity of that environment. Without private landholders of all sizes we won't have a comprehensive, adequate natural area system. We can't have it, because they've got too much of the land - approximately 70% of Australia - so we need to work with them.

I believe we can, and must use all sorts of models. To start, we can use the low level club model, where people simply allocate their lands and join the club, like Land for Wildlife. Then there are covenanting models and Conservation Management Networks - where people with similar biological properties, like the White

Box woodlands in NSW, club together to apply for grants to protect their properties. This change is engaging private landowners in a quiet revolution of sustainable agriculture and biodiversity conservation. I know that this happens in your region; South-East Queensland is well known for its innovations in private land conservation.

Tourism

Baddies, barbarians at the gate, or potential allies? Probably a fair degree of both. Finally the penny has dropped with the tourism industry. In 1987 I got a phone call from Senator Richardson's Office and they said "Oh Penny, we'd like you to be a director of the Australian Tourist Commission" and I said "Tourism? It represents everything I'm against".

The negative perception was similarly strong on the other side. When I went into the Australian Tourist Commission I looked through all its papers, all its mission statements, and there was not one word about the environment. The nearest it got was the statement "Australia has a winning product". Way back in the Paul Hogan days, there was a fairly dysfunctional relationship between tourism and National Parks. But the penny has dropped and the tourism industry does understand that nature is its unique selling point. It's an \$87 billion industry with something like 22 million visits to National Parks every year. Over 50% of all international visitors visit a National Park.

The industry now has some good documents, good intentions and good operators, but they are still inclined to privatise the profits and socialise the costs. In other words, the National Parks Service put in the visitor centres, viewing platforms, the walks, and maintains the roads, but the industry takes the profits. And there is still too much development pressure on Parks.

There is limited understanding in the tourism industry of what is called the 'Tuscan Approach'. The industry tends to think in terms of destinations here or there, but not about total landscapes and beautiful journeys. We go to Tuscany because the whole landscape is beautiful, not just for one destination or another. In other words the tourist industry should defend the whole landscape, not just the waterfalls and gorges. And while I am not hard line on low key accommodation on or near Parks I believe they do have to accept the special status of these places as sanctuaries of life not just human playgrounds and therefore any use has to be very constrained by the specialness of the place.

Having said that, there is need for engagement, to make the best people in the tourism industry real allies. Recently they did a lot of lobbying in Canberra for improvements to the funding of the National Reserve System.

CHALLENGES

Well there are many, and that's no surprise. Despite my identification of many positive trends there are undoubtedly some formidable risks ahead on which I can only touch tonight.

Climate Change

Too many people think that the whole climate change issue is about solar panels, that it's all about energy. If you listen to Penny Wong, she's very plausible and very bright, but she's only talking about energy policy. There's a serious lack of discussion about the role of our natural systems in both agendas, not just as victims - what are we going to do to save the Great Barrier Reef - but also the Great Barrier Reef as a huge holder of carbon.

Brendan Mackey from the Australian National University has just brought out a paper showing that our native forests hold three times the amount of carbon than anybody thought they did. Our native forests are great holders of carbon, and if we augment them, if we make sure that they don't burn down, then they can increase in size and pull down more carbon. It will be a serious risk if we don't understand our natural systems can be part of the solution to combat climate change and as part of the solution be adequately funded from the large amounts of money in the 'carbon economy'.

Responses to Climate Change

Ironically many new problems could emerge from how we respond to the impacts of climate change. Will climate change have people thinking that we have to understand and conserve ecosystems, or will it have them building sea walls instead of preserving mangroves? Will it have them putting in water pipelines from the Kimberly, rather than repairing our riparian zones and stopping the exploitation of our rivers?



.....native forests hold three times the amount of carbon than anyone thought they did.

The Global Financial Crisis

I am sure this is a real issue for everyone in this room. When things

are tough financially the environment doesn't fare terribly well, because there's still a lack of understanding that it's not an optional extra. Many of our problems require huge amounts of money, over long periods of investment - neither characteristic very attractive to governments. The most obvious example is invasive plants and animals, a threat to our biodiversity which is currently a key reason why our species continue to decline. It's hard enough to get funding in good times but in hard times...?

Urbanisation

Our urbanised, consumption driven, 'shop till you drop', fast food, shopping mall society, is part of the problem and a fundamental threat. I'll give you my tadpole test. How many people in this room caught tadpoles as a child? OK, the vast majority. In other words you actually went out there in nature as a child and interacted with it. But many of the young people who are growing up in cities and shopping malls are not, and that's a real challenge for people with our agenda, for how we communicate with them, how we get them to care. We could be faced with a population of nature deprived people who simply don't give a damn.

COMMUNICATION

In facing these challenges I think it's incredibly important that we increase opportunities for people to experience nature, and I know NPAs are very good at doing that. Does NPA Queensland

run walks? I wonder how many of those are frequented by younger people. It's a real issue because that experience - of immersing yourself in nature - is probably the reason why you're in this room, the reason why you give a lot of your time and energy to conservation. It's because you love natural places. So we have to work out how we can engender that love through experience as the first educator.

Maybe we have to invite more people into our parks. Maybe Parks need to be places for music festivals, for major (suitable of course) events, for fun runs, for charity walks, for all sorts of things that encourage people to see them as enjoyable places where they are invited in. We need to provide for more Australian families those magic times we remember when our parents took us camping with tents. Now with two parents often working, a lot of this experience is being lost. Every Park Service will report that this sort of camping is declining, so we all need to think about whether we can tolerate more cabins adjacent to, even in Parks, to make it easier for working families to just pack a few clothes and some food and head out.

For the hard heads in over stretched governments we also need to produce more and more hard data on the role of our Parks, the quantifiable values of our Parks. We tried to do this in a publication last year, where we actually went into the economics of the non-quantifiable.

CONCLUSION

Parks are our mental and physical health infrastructure. We must never forget that so many human motivations come from the heart and the soul. People really are motivated to care by those special moments and special experiences. We were talking earlier about watching whales or the Brahminy kites over the coast - special moments that I'm sure all of you could give me some examples of.



Nandroya Falls, Palmerston section of Wooroonooran National Park in North Queensland - one of those magical places.

I know when I was a young mother and I was totally depleted, I went to see someone and they said "Well you have to see yourself as a jug. You're pouring out to your children and to your husband and to your work - where do you fill up the jug?" And I hadn't thought about what replenishes me. However I realised that it's those moments, those absolutely wonderful and magical times in the natural world, in the forest, under the desert sky, watching wildlife or sitting and enjoying the view after you've reached the summit. We need to work out how we can expose more people to those experiences that fill up the soul and motivate others.

We also need to maintain our enthusiasm to still wage the "Save the ..." battles where necessary, and to advocate for more parks - albeit parks managed by more people, for more people, and connected to other lands and seas.

On this point I'd like to conclude with my favourite quote:

We shan't save all that we would like to, but we shall save a great deal more than if we never tried.
(Sir Peter Scott)

Thank you for listening.

About the National Parks Association of Queensland

NPAQ promotes the preservation, expansion and wise management of National Parks and the Protected Area Estate in Queensland.

As a non-government, non-party political, private organisation, NPAQ campaigns for more National Parks and protected areas across Queensland by liaising with politicians, the Department of Environment and Resource Management and the Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service.

NPAQ plays a key role in lobbying for the preservation of existing National Parks in their natural condition and also for the reservation of new areas identified as deserving National Park status.

NPAQ has been pursuing this agenda since our inception in 1930, and can rightfully claim to have participated in one form or another in the establishment of 60% of the current Queensland National Park Estate.

For more information, please contact the NPAQ Office on 3367 0878.

Acknowledgements

NPAQ wishes to sincerely thank Jenna Parsons for her comprehensive transcription of the 2008 Romeo Lahey Memorial Lecture!

Editorial Paul Donatui
Brian Egan

Photographs Paul Donatui



Cover photograph - Cascade, Mossman Gorge.
Photograph pg18 - Sunlight on sea and rock,
Recherche Bay, Tasmania.

Printed on recycled paper.