

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 6699

Research Director
Agriculture and Environment
Committee
Parliament House
BRISBANE QLD 4000

Organisation or individual:

Principal contact:

David Liddy

Position:

Telephone:

Fax:

Mobile:

Email address:

Street address:

Suburb/City:

Coen

State:

Qld

Postcode:

4892

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. We would like the opportunity to have a small hay paddock. So we can ~~grow~~ grow some fodder to feed the cattle when they are in the yards. Instead of getting in hay from down South.

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. This makes me angry as I'm a Australian who should be treated with respect not looked upon as a criminal.

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 ≥ 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. The state government gave back Lamalama to the peoples. But now want to restrict us to develop it for our future & next generation. They gave with one hand & now are taking with the other.

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. Lama Lama are the best people to manage our lands. We want the opportunity to be able to develop only small portion for future generations

Signed:	
Address:	
Date:	13/4/16