

From: [Gary Opit](#)
To: [Health and Community Services Committee](#)
Subject: A submission on the proposed amendment to the Object of the Act in Section 4.
Date: Tuesday, 10 September 2013 10:44:20 AM

Gary Opit

[REDACTED]
North Tamborine, 4271

10/09/2013

The Chairman,
Health and Community Services,
Parliament House
George Street, Brisbane QLD 4000

Dear Sir / Madam

This is a submission on the proposed amendment to the Object of the Act in Section 4.

I am very concerned by this proposed amendment because it changes the purpose of the Act which is primarily concerned with the conservation of nature. The protection of our natural ecosystems is essential for human survival, civilisation & business, not just for wildlife. People are becoming so intellectually removed from nature that they forget it that we are all part of nature, the living surface of our planet. The object of an Act is the first port of call by a court of law when interpreting any provision of an Act.

The Act as it stands also contains provisions relating to the conservation of wildlife outside protected areas. The proposed abolition of 8 classes of protected area has absolutely no effect on the management of protected areas. The removal of national park (scientific) and national park (recovery) substantially undermines the level of protection that is afforded to national parks. National parks (scientific) satisfies the IUCN category of protected area generally known as a nature reserve.

Many activities that are legitimately carried out in national parks (scientific) and national parks (recovery) would be in breach of the cardinal principle of national park management. National parks (scientific) are areas of strict protection and management in order to ensure the survival of critically endangered species such as bridled nailtail wallabies and northern hairy-nosed wombats. To absorb them into national parks and provide for a special management area (scientific) is unacceptable.

National park (recovery) is designed to allow for restoration of land that is destined to become national park which take many years to achieve and there is nothing to be gained and much to be lost by abolishing this class of protected area. Consequently, the proposed action makes an absolute mockery of the cardinal principle of national park management and of national park status.

The proposed amendments abolish the requirement for each park, or aggregation of parks, to have a management plan and to replace it with a requirement to prepare a management statement which involves no consultation with the public prior to coming into force. Any park that was subject to activities that are contrary to the cardinal principle, such as tourist resort development and grazing, should have a management plan developed before such an activity could be authorised. That would ensure that the key values of the park had been clearly assessed and expressed. Management statements must be subject to a public consultation process.

Forest reserve tenure should be retained as it acts as a holding tenure in the SEQ Forest Agreement process.

Sincerely,
Gary Opit.