

From: Wildlife Bayside Branch [mailto:wildlifebb@bigpond.com]
Sent: Tuesday, 10 September 2013 8:32 PM
To: Health and Community Services Committee
Subject: Submission to Nature Conservation and other legislation Bill No 2 2013

10 September 2013
[REDACTED] Thornlands
4164

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

Re: Nature Conservation and other legislation Bill No 2, 2013

- It was stated that the amendments leave the cardinal principle for national park management untouched. However by changing the Object, the cardinal principle has potentially lost much of its legal strength. It has been the foundation for the protection, to the greatest possible extent, of the natural and cultural resources on national parks.
- The proposed amendment to the Object of the Act in Section 4 completely changes the purpose of the Act. No longer will it be primarily concerned with the conservation of nature, as it should be, but it will now have social, cultural and commercial use of protected areas as an object. This can not be allowed as the object of an Act is the first place that a court of law looks when interpreting any provision of an Act.
- I strongly suggest that the amendments to the Object of the Act should be removed. It is clearly not in the best interests of national parks, because the three proposed additions only refer to protected areas, when the Act also contains provisions relating to the conservation of wildlife outside protected areas. The proposed changes have no place in the Object. The additions are all presently encompassed by the management principles for each class of protected area, where certain uses are qualified in terms of the extent to which they can apply. By placing them in the Object in such a broad and unqualified manner you are changing the whole basis of the Act.
- The proposed abolition of 8 classes of protected area is a step too far with minimal gain and some potentially substantial losses. It is true that no areas had been declared as wilderness areas, World Heritage management areas and international agreement areas. So nothing changes by abolishing them. However, nothing is gained either. WHMAs and IGAs could have a place in the future and, in fact, were considered for declaration in the past. Why remove that flexibility when its presence has absolutely no effect, financially or in terms of so-called green tape, on the management of protected areas?
- Conservation parks and resources reserves have been abolished and rolled into a new class of protected area known as regional parks. When you combine two classes of protected area in a hierarchy, the resulting management principles tend to shift towards the lowest common denominator.
- The abolition of coordinated conservation areas is not a substantial loss. It has been used sparingly and its objectives can be achieved through nature refuges.
- The loss of national park (scientific) and national park (recovery) needs to be reconsidered. The loss of these two classes of protected area achieves virtually nothing. Combining them 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 (the term used in NSW). These areas involve strict protection and management for a particular conservation purpose. Public access is strongly controlled. This class of national park is used for parks that protect species such as the bridled nailtail wallabies (Taunton) and northern hairy-nosed wombats.

Yours truly,

Doreen Payne