

SDNRAIDC

From: Stirling Taverer [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 13 March 2018 9:03 AM
To: SDNRAIDC
Subject: Opposition to Change the Vegetation Management Act.

Categories: SUBMISSIONS, correspondence

I would like my opposition to the proposed Change the Vegetation Management Act noted.

The laws we have currently, deliver fair balance. Policy settings can be adjusted by Governments – one Government may open the tap up – whilst another one can close it. They don't need to change the legislation – they can stop tree clearing through policy without going to the floor of Parliament – as we are seeing now. This State legislation proposes to take that whole tap away! Many indigenous and non-indigenous communities, particularly in the Cape and Gulf, aspire for Agricultural development to provide employment and opportunity in what is a low socio-economic area. These opportunities should not just be afforded to southern areas, that have had centuries of development. We have largely intact landscapes up here in North Queensland. The Cape is over 98% remnant, the Einasleigh Uplands, 96.5% remnant vegetation and the Gulf plains is higher than that again. At the end of the day when we hear about a one-size-fits-all approach is not appropriate.

The Labor State Government has been 'cherry-picking' science. The fact is, even with the rise in annual clearing rates reported in the SLATS Report 2012-2014, we now have 437,000ha of more trees. This Government has chosen to ignore vegetation regrowth data from their own report to meet their own political end. The report shows that while 296,000ha were cleared, tree coverage increased almost twice the size of the ACT in just three years. In fact tree coverage increased in 51 of 77 council areas across Queensland. The fact is that trees grow, and right now they are regrowing at a much faster rate than they are being managed.

We can have Agricultural production and environment co-exist. We must move away from approaches that place economic and social development at loggerheads with the Environment. They are not diametrically opposed.

How will we feed our growing population if we can't maintain existing productive areas and where appropriate use only good quality, highly productive land?

Regards,

[Stirling Taverer, MBA, BAgSc, BSc, GAICD, CMgr MIML](#)

[REDACTED]