SUBMISSION

In providing this submission I refer directly to the key provisions of the legislation which may be amended.

1. Removing High Value Agriculture and Irrigated High Value Agriculture from the Vegetation Management Framework
This change will take away our ability as land holders and primary producers to clear small areas of land to develop and increase farm output. **It will limit our capability to drought proof our business for the future and future generations by the reduction of existing usable area.** **It will restrict our ability to and add to the cost of managing weeds especially noxious weeds.** **It will place an onerous burden on us to ensure we comply and the cost of compliance will greatly affect our viability and development.**
2. Retaining Self-Assessable Codes
Science-based self-assessable codes help farmers carry out the routine vegetation management practices necessary to sustainably produce food and fibre. **The self-assessable codes help farmers ensure trees and grass stay in balance, avoid soil erosion and feed animals in drought. Farmers are not required to obtain permits for work done under the self-assessable codes, but they are required to notify the Queensland Government.** **I submit that even these codes and their requirements infringe upon our rights as owners of freehold land and our right to undertake legitimate business thereon.**
3. Including High Value Regrowth as an additional layer of regulation under the Vegetation Management Framework on leasehold, freehold and indigenous land
The re-inclusion of High Value Regrowth (HVR) as an additional layer of regulation on leasehold, freehold and indigenous land is an overt grab by Queensland Government in search of targets for meeting international treaties such as the Paris Protocol. In 2009 when initially introduced, this HVR layer was prepared hastily in a 'desk-top' mapping exercise with associated errors including areas of non-native vegetation (such as orchards) and bare earth. **That which is classed as HVR is not necessarily HVR and the cost and responsibility to determine this should not fall on the land holders.** **A period of assessment at no cost to the landholder should exist and such areas should be**

determined in direct consultation with the landholder rather than by blanket desktop application.

In our case we lose 50 % of our land area when neighbouring properties are exempt and such exemption is arbitrarily decided by a fence line.

We have long term development plans that have now been effectively destroyed. We have not cleared this area of land previously because of budgeting the cost of development over time (years) and planned development is by its very nature long term.

The Government is essentially adding an extra regulation over FREEHOLD land and are not with in their rights to do so.

Do we tell people who live in the city they cannot remove a tree to put in a pool, a new pavement or shed in their backyard? No and it is because the Government coverts our land and we are a minority.

4. Increasing Category R regrowth watercourse vegetation to include additional catchments in the Burnett Mary, Eastern Cape York and Fitzroy Great Barrier Reef Catchments.

This is effectively more red tape and governmental management where they have neither knowledge nor expertise other than at desktop level. Individual management of freehold land by freehold land owners with the assistance of local non politically influenced bodies will achieve a far better result.

5. That no compensation will be payable to landholders subject to added layers of regulation – high value regrowth, regrowth watercourses and essential habitat during transitional arrangements

The issue of compensation arises with the addition of these layers. Where is the recompense for Queensland farmer's consequential losses?

The dollar value of High Value regrowth is effectively being transferred to Government. This is THEFT. Farmers will never see any real money for this as the government will unjustly take fees for permits (a tax) force costly regulation (more tax) and royalty (even more tax)for a resource stolen from freehold land.

6. Increasing compliance measures and penalties under vegetation management laws.

The Bill potentially breaches fundamental legislative principles (FLPs) as outlined in section 4 of the Legislative Standards Act 1992.

Legislation should have sufficient regard to the rights and liberties of individuals and

consequently should not adversely affect rights and liberties, or impose obligations, retrospectively.

In addition, penalties have effectively been tripled indicating there is a sense the Government thinks farmers are not being bullied enough to comply.

7. Other matters relevant to the Vegetation Management and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 that the review committee should consider appropriate and worth some consideration

Farmers/producers will develop sustainably if given the appropriate frameworks, i.e.

Consistent long term, fair and just legislation,

The ability to get investment from banks or private investments due to long term consistany change when governments change,

The ability to build and drought proof our business for a sustainable future,

Freedom from ever changing regulation and interference from regulators,

Well-developed self-assessable Codes as guidelines to assist with farm/ land development plans rather than more useless bureaucratic applications to lodge,

Funded programs of education, field officers, resource compilation etc for innovative or above standard practices/ways to manage the vegetation and improve outcomes on property and increase the level of care and high standard of environmental standards all farmers and landholders apply to their land.

Signed:	A.W. M. (Tony) May
Address:	
Date:	19/3/2018