

**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:** Don & Belinda Perkins

**Principal contact:** Don Perkins

**Position:** Partner

**Telephone:**

**Mobile:**

**Email address:**

**Street address:**

**Suburb/City:**

Dirranbandi

**State:** QLD

**Postcode:** 4486

**Postal address:**

**Suburb/City:**

Dirranbandi

**State:** QLD

**Postcode:** 4486

**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:**

---

---

## SUBMISSION

I provide my submission in support of the continuation of the Current Vegetation Management Act 1999 and rejection of the changes proposed in the Vegetation Management (Reinstatement) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 ("the Bill").

My overriding issue with the Bill is that its introduction in the Queensland Parliament on 17<sup>th</sup> March represents **yet another** variation to the Vegetation Management Framework, which has been amended over 18 times since its introduction in 1999. This constant change in legislation severely impacts on the ability of farm managers to plan and implement effective long-term property and business management decisions. Ecological processes work in much longer timeframes and can be severely compromised when mismatching, constantly changing regulations are enforced. Farmers have long called for certainty with the vegetation management regulatory framework. Developing a property is a lifetime job and in a lot of cases will cover numerous lifetimes. We also need certainty when we present plans to Financial Institutions.

Many years ago when the Act was first introduced we could apply for a Development Plan, we went to Roma and sat down with the Dept staff and agreed on a plan, where tree lines and clumps were to be retained etc. This was a sensible and sustainable plan. Later all these Plans were totally disregarded and the Vegetation Maps were bought out.

We need to get back to the situation where we can have trust between Landholders and Government representatives. The vast majority of Landholders do the right thing by the Land, it is their interests to look after their land after all they derive their income from it. A health landscape means a healthy return.

You the Government representing 'The People' on one hand demand we farmers produce top quality food & fibre and on the other hand say we have to produce it off land that has no ground cover because of the excessive tree population, this cannot be done, you cannot produce fat stock off land that has no ground cover growing.

We do not want to remove every tree, we desire as many trees as possible, but a balance is needed. We must be allowed to reduce the tree density to a level that allows good ground cover. Good ground cover means efficient rainfall penetration, reduced wind and water erosion. Everyone wins, enough trees are retained, ground cover is maintained the Landholder can make a living. Remember it is very difficult being 'green' if you are 'in the red'. It's those landholders who can produce a surplus from their land that are in the best position to look after their land.

I invite you out to demonstrate that we are Environmentalists at heart the health of the land is of utmost importance to us. We can have an outcome that benefits all parties, it is not difficult as long as we are all prepared to compromise a little. **The plan needs to be long term, stable, sustainable, the landscape needs to be maintained in a healthy state and landholders must be able to make a healthy return on their investment.**

In providing this submission I refer directly to the key provisions of the legislation which the 2016 Bill intends to amend.

|   |
|---|
| <b>1. Removing High Value Agriculture and Irrigated High Value Agriculture from the Vegetation Management Framework</b> |
|---|

**Background**

The removal of High Value Agriculture (HVA) and irrigated HVA (IHVA) affects farmers in regions differently, with those in the north particularly hard hit. Throughout northern Queensland energy and protein become limiting in cattle diets during the dry season and this can cause farmers issues with stock survival and welfare through years of drought. HVA and IHVA permits provide farmers in northern Queensland with the opportunity to grow fodder and grain for supplementing in the dry season and finishing off stock for market.

The removal of HVA and IHVA is in direct conflict with the Australian Government White Paper on the Development of Northern Australia. A current example of this is \$220 million being spent to upgrade roads to communities across Cape York, but Queensland State Government Vegetation Management Framework is preventing indigenous and non-indigenous land holders from developing agriculture projects.

In central and southern Queensland, HVA and IHVA provides opportunity for farmers to drought-proof properties and stabilise production and income over variable climatic and market conditions. Sustainable clearing for relatively small pockets of high value agriculture enable agricultural production to improve continuity of supply to food processors and meet the increasing requirements of international markets and Australia's Free Trade Agreements.

Indigenous development is particularly compromised by the re-inclusion of High Value Regrowth (HVR) as well as the stripping of the right to develop traditional lands as HVA or IHVA. 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>2. Re-introducing Reverse Onus-of-Proof</b> |
|--|

**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.

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!

In the 2016 Bill transition period the situation is quite different to what it was in 2004. The threat to remove HVA and IHVA from farmers' potential to develop property provides considerable grounds for compensation, particularly for those that have structured investments and farm management activities to take advantage of HVA/IHVA in the near future. Also HVA/IHVA has attracted far greater interest in northern Queensland, with large swathes of marginal beef production areas provided the opportunity of growing supplementary feed to overcome the protein drought in the dry season.

The 2003 Commonwealth study mentioned above did not include north or west Queensland Local Government Areas and consequently grossly underestimated the areas to be considered for compensation. Another change since 2004 is the free market recognition of the value of carbon abatement with the recent auction of the Emissions Reduction Fund selling carbon at \$12.25 per tonne. The Queensland State Government needs to recognise the fact that they are robbing the rights of farmers to develop productive HVA/IHVA land sustainably and that the area for development and value for carbon are much greater than they were in 2004.

4. Including High Value Regrowth as an additional layer of regulation under the Vegetation Management Framework on leasehold, freehold and indigenous land

#### Background

The re-inclusion of High Value Regrowth (HVR) as an additional layer of regulation on leasehold, freehold and indigenous land is an overt grab by Queensland Government in search of targets for meeting international treaties such as the Kyoto Protocol and more recently the 2015 Paris Climate Deal. In 2009 when initially introduced, this HVR layer was prepared hastily in a 'desk-top' mapping exercise with associated errors including areas of non-native vegetation (such as

orchards) and bare earth. In preliminary investigations of several properties it appears that the accuracy of the 2016 HVR is no better than that in 2009.



If the free market places a value of \$12.25 per tonne on carbon, what is the estimated dollar value of "High Value Regrowth" and where is the Queensland Government's recompense for farmers and indigenous land holders?

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.

|          |  |
|----------|--|
| Signed:  |                     |
| Address: |  DIRRANBANDI Q 4486 |
| Date:    | 29/4/2016  |