

**SUBMISSION TO:****Vegetation Management (Reinstatement) and Other Legislation  
Amendment Bill 2016****SUBMISSION COVER SHEET****Closing date for submissions is 25 April 2016.**

Please complete and submit this form with your submission to:

**Email:**  
vminquiry@parliament.qld.gov.au**Post:** **Fax:** 07 3553 6699Research Director  
Agriculture and Environment  
Committee  
Parliament House  
BRISBANE QLD 4000**Organisation or individual:**

Glengland Station

**Principal contact:**

Michael Ross

**Position:**

- Station manager

**Telephone:****Fax:****Mobile:****Email address:****Street address:****Suburb/City:****State:****Postcode:****Postal address:****Suburb/City:****State:****Postcode:****Is all or part of your  
submission confidential?**Yes, all ☐Yes, part ☐No ☒☒ (copy box to indicate answer)**If part, please identify  
which sections are  
confidential:****Reason for confidentiality:**

For example, Indigenous landowners on the Gilbert River in northern Queensland preparing to submit IHVA applications have now been denied the possibility of stabilising beef production and employing community labour on their properties.

\*B. With being unable to develop my land any further it will make it hard for me to make more money through development, to buy more fencing gear, saddles, motor cars to continue to muster cattle. Also to buy horses to access more of our land to muster more cattle and brand more cattle.

## 2. Re-introducing Reverse Onus-of-Proof

### Background

The inclusion of Reverse Onus of Proof in Queensland Government's Vegetation Management Framework is a direct affront to the rights and liberties of farmers. Reverse Onus relegates farmers clearing vegetation to a level below that of criminals, where they are denied common justice under Section 24 of the Criminal Code: Mistake of fact. In Queensland not only are farmers presumed guilty until they are proven innocent, but they are refused the possibility of making a mistake.

\*C. I think it unfair that we are guilty and have to prove ourselves innocent. Also that we were never talked to or asked for our input in the changes in the vegetation management framework.

## 3. That no compensation will be payable to HVA, IHVA and Property Map of Assessable Vegetation (PMAV) applicants during transitional arrangements

### Background

The proposal that compensation will not be available for HVA, IHVA or PMAV applicants during the Bill transition period may be a tactic to prevent panic clearing, but the implications for compensation for vegetation management in the broader sense are quite alarming.

With the cessation of broad scale land-clearing, compensation for landholders to offset opportunity cost, lost development potential and decreased property value has been a critical omission from the Vegetation Management Regulatory Framework. The issue of compensation has been debated heavily by federal and state legislators, however a precedent was set by the Beattie Government in 2004 with provision of \$150 million over 5 years to offset landholder losses due to the removal of their rights to clear. This however was a copout with the funds unable to provide effective recompense for opportunity costs incurred, despite prior assessment undertaken for the Commonwealth Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry in 2003. In 2004, there was no doubt considerable rejoicing by the Queensland Government who boasted of compensating carbon dioxide abatement for less than \$1 a tonne!

5. Increasing Category R vegetation to include the Burdekin, Mackay, Whitsunday and Wet Tropics Great Barrier Reef catchments and additional catchments Burnett Mary, Eastern Cape York and Fitzroy.

**Background**

This increase in Category R provisions is a further restriction on development in Northern Queensland, which is in stark contrast to the development imperatives contained with the White Paper on Developing Northern Australia.

The science is completely unproven on the necessity to include  $\geq 50$  metre buffers along streamlines. In fact, a study conducted in Queensland and published in 2016 shows that grass is a far better assimilator for nitrogen to prevent leaching into waterways. The current bleaching of the Great Barrier Reef is not caused by high nutrient runoff from agricultural lands.

\*F.\* This will further restrict my people on my station & potentially have tourists come onto our land. We want to have the right to build sheds or pumps to make our station better. If we can't do this then we can't make more money.

6. Other matters relevant to the Vegetation Management (Reinstatement) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 that the review committee should consider appropriate and worth some consideration

\*G.\* I want to run my land my way, and keep my station going for ~~the~~ the next generation.

Signed:	
Address:	
Date:	13/4/16