

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [yminquiry](mailto:yminquiry)  
**Subject:** Planned Vegetation Management Bill 2016.  
**Date:** Sunday, 24 April 2016 8:55:10 PM

---

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to express in the strongest possible way, my complete objection to the proposed changes to the vegetation management forecast in the "Vegetation Management and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 introduced into Parliament in March 2016. My objections include:

1. The changes have been introduced with no consultation with farmers, rural small business and professional agribusiness groups dependant on agriculture for their livelihood and whose work contributes so much to the prosperity of Queensland rural communities and the whole of the Queensland economy.
2. I consider the proposed reversal of the onus of proof an assault on the basic democratic rights of Australians. A move which should disgust anyone associated with its introduction into our Parliament; a Parliament based on hard fought democratic rights. This time last year I was sitting in the freezing cold at Gallipoli waiting to celebrate a 100 years since this heroic landing. Soldiers left their homeland to fight for basic democratic principles which are under threat by this Bill.
3. Similarly I see the "mistake of fact" defence planned to be abolished in this bill also an attack on our basic democratic rights.
4. In my own case the maps I received from DNRM this week, did not even have the portion of my property in the right place or the right shape. Two portions I enquired about are superimposed over the rest of my property and the school next door. Parts of my land apparently now belong to my neighbour; Perhaps they have already been resumed by the Government and I have not been consulted. How can "mistake of fact" be abolished when some maps are so grossly wrong; why is the onus of proof once again on the landholder when the basic information upon which this legislation is based, is so wrong.
5. On my property (if I assume the vegetation maps are correct) proposed Category C land has appeared almost the same area as the Category B area. I can provide photographic proof that much of this country was totally cleared by my Great Grandfather and my Grandfather. This lower sloping country has survived over 100 years with no detriment to the basic land unit.
6. I have only taken over this property in the last six years and began an extensive redevelopment of the property. These change will severely restrict the potential development of my property and my chance of improving the viability of the farm. Already financial institutions and Real Estate Agents are arming themselves with these new maps. Banks will use these maps to limit loans or charge higher risk premiums due the limits these laws put on the potential development of properties.
7. If the purpose of these laws are truly to ensure the preservation of the agricultural environment for the future of all Queenslanders then all Queenslanders should have to pay for such proposed changes. Framers should be compensated for the setting aside of their land for the future benefit of all Australians. Why am I bearing the total cost of these proposed changes when they are being introduced to benefit all Australians.

In summary, I object strongly to both the content of the proposed bill and the manner in which it

is being implemented. It is an unjust attack on my civil liberties and will lead to unnecessary hardship by restricting the potential development of my property. This Bill will not only effect my viability but the combined effect will reduce the potential wealth of all Queenslanders and reduce the future food security of this great country.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Cahill

Hillview QLD 4285