


The Chairman,  
Health and Community Services,  
Parliament House  
George Street, Brisbane QLD 4000  
[hesc@parliament.qld.gov.au](mailto:hesc@parliament.qld.gov.au)

12 September 2013

Robert Clemens  
  
Bardon, Qld 4065

Chairman,

I wish to formally submit my objections to the: **Amendments to the Nature Conservation Act 1992, Nature Conservation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill (No 2) 2013.**

These amendments mark a huge step backward for Queensland, and its protection of nature, National Parks, and biodiversity. The current legislation provides primarily for the protection of nature, something which can be built on, until in a few hundred years a number of jewels will remain in Queensland that our great, great, great.... grandchildren would be proud of.

These amendments, however, strip the primary aim, of nature protection, out of the act. This opens the door to a resultant network of protected areas that are far less interesting than they are now. These areas are currently full of unique biodiversity in landscapes that offer unique and timeless experiences in the natural world.

There is no reason to open the door to the erosion of the protections of what we plan to leave future generations. Many of the amendments to this act look to reduce the existing conservation estate, or reduce its potential to grow. With only 5 to 10% of Queensland designated as natural areas, there is 90%+ of the state to do other things including development of eco-tourism.

Abolishing the classes of protected areas, makes expansion of the conservation estate more difficult. Again, I don't think Queenslanders are so greedy, that we have no need to conserve beauty, unique species, or the awesome experiences that can be had in a pristine natural environment. Some of these amendments seem aimed at promoting park visitation, but if you impact the unique ecology, and experiences available within parks you lose many of the reasons tourists and Queenslanders alike so like to visit the bush in this state.

Reducing planning would not be considered for any state asset thought to be important; and indicates just how uninformed authors of these amendments are on the subject of conservation of biodiversity.

I'm increasingly ashamed of the backward moves these amendments represent.

Sincerely,

Robert Clemens