



Mr Bill Tait (Jnr.) Esq.

Tuesday, the 3rd day of January,
in the year of 2017 CE.

The Hon. Glenn Butcher MP,
Chairman of the Agriculture and
Environment Committee,
The Legislative Assembly of Queensland,
Parliament House,
George Street,
Brisbane, QLD, 4000.

re the proposed "Inquiry into the
impacts of invasive plants (weeds)
and their control in Queensland"
of last November and related
matters.

Dear sir,

Well, I'll stop short of any greater
analysis, like, earlier in the piece
here, so to say, if you don't mind,

of the, distinctions, between the, sort of, literal, more general meanings, of the terms of, "invasive (species of) plants", and, "weeds", for, notwithstanding the, presumably, more limited purview, of a literal reading of, the terms (in point) of, schedules No.1 and No.2, of the Biosecurity Act 2014 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act"), last I checked, a good-English-dictionary (worth its salt that is - so to speak), would seem to provide, to the effect of that, the very term, of "weed", would denote or have the "ordinary meaning (if you like)" of - something like "any unwanted plant in a cultivated area" - or (like I say) words to that effect, which, as I've alluded to above, already, might, not necessarily, be restricted, just to, so-called invasive plants, moreover...

well, e.g. some species of plants, including, perhaps, even imported - if you like (or you know foreign) - pasture grasses, may well be, somewhat invasive in nature, whilst, not being seen as, entirely undesirable - or weeds at all, at least by some, and, well, be that as it may, perhaps, if I have the time - and available resources (and the like), and after having made some more in depth study of the said schedules etc., I might endeavour, if I may, to return to this matter - or (like) opening point, later, below, herein. ...

To begin with though, I would like to say, only with great respect of course, that is, that, my first impression, would seem to be, to the effect of that, I might

just be inclined, to think that, maybe, I can plainly see, already, I mean, right here at the very outset that is, just where, somewhat inevitably, this enquiry, might be going - or sort of destined (dare I say it - perhaps - a predetermined-kind of thing) to end up, and, well, need I remind you - and your committee (there) more broadly that is to say, whilst, as I say, still, maintaining all due respect, to the effect of that, the political decisions, to allow pesticides - including herbicides that is - to be released, for commercial exploitation, made, all those decades ago, now, were, in the very first instances anyhow, predicated upon, the very argument that, doing so, would be necessary, in the course of developments, in res-

Page-No. 4

peck at, industries, based around, intensive agricultural pursuits - or (mostly then anyhow) so-called broad acre-farming (if you like), in order to - like - boost productivity in the hope of keeping up with exponentially burgeoning population growth that is, er, ah, an argument, such that, in my book anyway, as opposed to, merely more (like) anecdotal information, from this or that bit of isolated so-called "research" - or (you know) really quite limited "field trials" and/or sort of "tightly controlled" laboratory experiments, has never, truly been, backed up, with any 'scientific evidence' - worth its salt anyhow, whereas... well, at the behest of the large ~~multina~~ multinational corporations (like Bayer and Monsanto for example) who

Page - No. 5.

pushed for such develop-
ments - at the very outset, the
current dominant paradigm - or
"maybe I could better say) group-
think", which has seen, the appli-
cations, of pesticides - and herbi-
cides especially (of late anyhow),
become, so all pervasive, like,
~~across~~ across-the-board, even in
purely domestic sites - or (if you
like) urban settings - i.e. by both
local authorities and individual
citizens alike, sort of, regardless;
that is, similarly, er... well, as I
say, it all, seems to have, prac-
tically become, like, all but "the
norm" - so to speak, with a, kind
of, nonchalant disregard, that is
to say, for any truly valid eviden-
ce-based approach, or I dare
say, albeit, whilst I, do not
page-No. 6.

purport to hold, any formal scientific qualifications - as such, myself, that is. ...

So, well, your committee, may well appreciate then, my, er, if you like, concerns, in that, while, in my very own humble opinion, to say the least, I guess, the many and varied potential harms (or - if you like - like - sort of "side effects" - so to say - i.e. not merely against human beings - in particular - but the wider environment we live in to boot), such that, may just be associated with, the manufacturing and use of pesticides etc., seem, despite the 'efforts (or - maybe I should just say - operations - like - to date)' of this or that so-called regulating authority, to have, relatively speaking anyway, only gone on, practically

Page - No. 7

unchecked... well, it's the very-
if you like - so-called "bottom
line", or, more succinctly, I
might just say, corporate pro-
fits - involved (in it all), that
would appear, under that, said,
sort of, mythically based, domi-
nant paradigm, to be, the real,
and that is, the only primary,
driving force, or, maybe I could
say, not always openly acknow-
ledged, kind of, "consideration",
behind the (purportedly so) regu-
latory political decisions, to al-
low for the applications - and
(associated then) sort of ad hoc
vigorous (I might say - for want
of a better term that is) mar-
keting - of herbicides - and pesti-
cides more generally speaking - across
the land - and in the waters to
boot (I'll just bother to note - spe-

critically - as well), er, ah, which, I'll just note further, seems to have become, even all the more pervasive, like, in the kind of modern era, with the - at times - in my (somewhat informed) opinion anyhow - seemingly almost fraudulent intellectual conundrums of the modern day would-be wannabe environmental movement - and associated "programmes" backed up by practically unquestioned governmental appropriations - e.g. LANCACARE [and (once anyhow) related ones - being apparently for not much less than - like - modern day slavery - e.g. The Green Army - so-called - and its precursor (work for the Dole that is)*].

* and I'll just refrain, from getting too much into, the implications of, the most recently mooted form of such seemingly unconstitutional schemes - i.e. the so-called "path" ...
Page - No. 9.

Oh, so, I do, certainly, sincerely hope, that I haven't begun to lose you all - or any, by going into all the seemingly so hidden - or underlying - details, of the matter, like this, and, well, moreover, I guess that, I'd better, like, "cut to the chase (as they say)", of my initial primary point, to be outlined - as alluded to above - herein, to the effect of that, well, continuing, as I say, with all due respect, and of course, in the very public interest, in a bona fide exercise of Free Speech (in our, purportedly so, free, fair, and democratic, society), I would feel (like) compelled, to just say, that, I, for one, was more than, merely disappointed, to discover, from your media release (in point) of the last 11th of November, even read

in the context of the committee's paper (No. 3/55th Parliament) of the same month, the indication, to the effect of that, aside from, to boot, what might have been necessarily - or (if you like) sort of reversely-^{very}implied (from the terms of such), even the, very strictly literal reading, of the - far more broadly ranging - generally worded formal Terms of Reference (TOR) - set down in the said paper - for this inquiry, ~~are~~^{is} to be, like, only whittled down - or away, upon, the kind of obscured basis, of no real (or greatly compelling) reasons, that I would be aware of anyhow*, to become, merely, not much more than (presumably a kind of "desktop") set of) three so-called "case studies (ie. involving "the impact of [only] three invasive plant species" namely "prickly

* i.e. despite, as I seem to vaguely recall it now, some, perhaps professed needs, to conserve the relatively boundless governmental resources available (for such a monumental matter).

and "fireweed")", and, what is more -
to the very point, well, my fear,
if you like, is that, especially
so, in light of, the said-kind of -
dominant paradigm, alluded to
above - herein - already, the likely
outcome - or results (over time) at
any rate, of this matter, and es-
pecially if one believes the re-
cent media-hype (or - dare I say
it - perhaps - blurbs contained the
therein), in point, might appear,
to be shaping up, to be, something
like, "O.K.", for the committee's
had a quick look, at these three
organisms, and certainly it's con-
vinced that they're already ha-
ving some sort of profound ad-
verse impacts - out there, so,
for all intents and purposes, it's
sort of inevitable - like, that, the
only thing, that can happen next,

is that, governmental funds, be hastily rolled out*, in order to, not to mention, relieve - both private and public - landholders of their own responsibilities (to look after - and/or have looked after - their own lands etc.) - whilst (all the while) boosting up (or just kind of "rebooting") those said unconstitutional regimes of (like) modern day slavery, but, er, "of course", like, primarily, to bolster, once again - or even further that is, the profit margins of chemicals distributors and manufacturers, sort of, as I say, regardless of any kind of side effects - or (dare I clarify - yet again) potential for environmental harm and/or adverse anthropological impacts (so to say).

* oh, in "the public interest", now, "of course!"

Oh, but, no doubt, the esteemed members of the committee (there), would be, minded to find, to the effect of that, in any event, the relevant regulatory authorities - of the (kind of) executive arm of government no less, would - sufficiently - take care of, all that, however, well, with respect, again, I would only hasten to register, my dissent, there, as well, for, likewise, albeit, in my humble - unqualified - opinion, I dare say that, a bit of a, truly informed assay, of the recent performance of e.g. the relevant federal body's work, would only, objectively reveal, that, somewhat in tune with the said dominant paradigm - if not one or two other things,

and quite contrary to the very public interest - inter alia (ie. like e.g. the tenet of Ecologically Sustainable Development [ESD] envisaging that constant natural capital ought to be preserved etc. for the very benefit of future generations), that body's approach seems to only be, more of, one, to step out, in each instance - case - before it, upon the presumptions, to the effect of that, ultimately, the practical application of the particular chemical substance in point then, would be inevitable, sooner rather than later, to boot, perhaps, and the most that it could do then, is - like - tweak things up - a bit, with one or two added - like - "conditions (of the use of the substance in question then)", or at least,

that's, kind of, how it seems to have been going, to me, like I say, these days, without any great-if any (at all) real-consideration-of more organic sorts of alternatives that is to say. ...

So, well, that's all, like, about, all, that I could-or should (given the very position that I've taken then)-say, about the matter-of the committee's said proposed inquiry that is, I mean, it might seem only somewhat like-or overstepping the mark (so to speak) anyhow, for me, to be, seen to, kind of, descend into the arena-so to say, now, i.e. beyond that, in order to attempt to address any-like-more technical scientific aspects such that may-or may not-pertain to the said proposed-like-sort of-sol't

Page - No. 16.

options of the very three case studies - to be.

Nonetheless, and certainly, without waiver from that said position, I would beg of you - and the committee as a whole, to, er, kind of, "indulge" me - if you like, whilst, as a kind of bit of an aside, as it were, I might return (briefly) to that said opening point - and one seemingly so related matter (of the very current content of the Act), in that, whilst having, now, had an, albeit very brief opportunity, to peruse (some of) the Act, I've noticed that, despite the committee's said paper (No. 3) having narrowed the matter down itself - i.e. "for the (very) purposer of the (said proposed) inquiry" - to matters mentioned in the two said schedules, there does not appear to be - i.e. whether in the Dictionary-schedule or ~~else~~ elsewhere in the Act - any formal

Page-No. 17.

definition of just exactly what the term of "weed" might denote - (as I say) in the statutory scheme itself, which is... well, prima facie, it might seem somewhat problematic, I mean, surely, it would have been, a relatively small matter, to have had the inquiry-papers, only referring to e.g. the Part 3 of the said schedule - No. 1 and the matters listed as invasive plants under Part 2 of the schedule - No. 2 of the Act, er, you know, without risking any possibility of any confusion in point then... moreover, well, I note that, whilst some common names of organisms listed in the said parts of the said schedules (No. 1 and No. 2) include the term of "weed", that might see the very purview at least in the minds of some, of certain provisions of the Act, like read down, in that, whilst, albeit,

Page-No. 18.

I, for one, would accept the tenet - or very statutory provisions (based - as I seem to recall - on previously established common law)* - to the effect of that a footnote does not formally constitute a part of an enactment[†], I noted, like, in passing, in the course of my said more recent perusal of the Act[‡], that there were, a few footnotes - therein (so to say), which gave examples of e.g. (as I seem to recall it now) the unlawful spreading around of "weed seeds" so - well, you know, like I say, some, more frivolous - and/or vesca-tiously minded - individuals, might just be minded, I suppose, to see that

☺ or well, the 2016 version - linked to your electronic info on the Parliamentary website, whereas, the Parliamentary Counsel website (as of 13/1/18 anyway), apparently only recognises an earlier (2006) one. ...

† although I'm not so sure that such might not just be seen as relevant "extrinsic material" -

* see e.g. the relevant provisions of the Acts Interpretation Act 1957 (Qld).

sort of thing - or state of af-
fairs (let's say), or, some kind of
loophole, to be exploited - for this
or that improper purpose (so to
say) sort of thing, but anyway - or
(like) anyhow (I suppose I could
say - somewhat tongue in cheek -
and - as I say - albeit - still - with
all due respect etc.) - I guess that
yourself - and the rest - of the as-
tute members of your committee -
would see just what I'm getting
at there.

So, enough said then, I suppose,
I mean, I'm sorry that I can't
help you any further, with this
matter, at this time, but I've
got plenty of other similarly im-
portant matters to attend to here
and I only hope then, that, this in-
formation, is of some use, to the
committee, in the course of its inquiry.

Yours sincerely

Bill Tait

Mr William "Bill (Billy)" Peter Tait
Page - No. 20.