

**From:** [Gregory Bamford](#)  
**To:** [Health and Community Services Committee](#)  
**Subject:** Objection to proposed changes of Queensland's system of parks and reserves  
**Date:** Friday, 13 September 2013 4:58:41 PM

---

Health and Community Services Committee  
Parliament House  
George Street  
BRISBANE QLD.

To whom it may concern

We briefly list below three objections to [the proposed amendments to \*Nature Conservation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill \(No 2\) 2013\*](#).

1. In his Explanatory Speech in relation to the proposed amendments, the Minister, the Hon Steve Dickson MP, states that "the *cardinal principle* of national park management, that a national park is managed to the greatest possible extent for the permanent preservation of the area's natural condition and the protection of its cultural resources and values, *will not be changed*" (our emphasis). However, the Minister previously states in this Speech that there is currently not "enough emphasis on achieving recreational and commercial outcomes" in "protected areas". He provides no indication of the nature or extent of such activities, so how can we have the confidence that a cardinal principle of nature conservation will remain so in the management of National Parks?
2. In the Department of National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing's response to FAQs, no justification or even discussion is provided of why "wilderness area, World Heritage management area, and international agreement area tenures" are to be abolished, or what implications this may have on their natural or cultural values - over and above any effects on tourism or Queensland's reputation or standing, at home and abroad, there may be.
3. If areas that are currently classified as 'Conservation Park' or 'Resources Reserve' are reclassified as 'Regional Park', how can anyone have confidence that this will not lead to the destruction or degradation of all or many of the natural values of these areas? The Department's response (to an FAQ) states that these areas will now have "a particular emphasis on recreation and tourism", that commercial activities in them need only be "similar" to what is currently allowed, and that "a level of protection" will be provided to them, but "in a manner that recognises the importance of [these] other priorities." What is 'a level of protection'? How could a conservation park have other priorities imposed upon it without this imposition leading to a diminution of its conservation values? Will a new Regional Park allow dogs on leashes, for example? The presence of dogs in a bushland area, even when the dogs are on a leash, tend to lead to the reduction in the wildlife or wildlife species in that area. This is but one example where a reduction in natural value and its cause would go largely sight unseen, under the weight of other priorities.

Sincerely,

Dr Greg Bamford & Ms Margie Ferguson

CORINDA QLD 4075

