

## SUBMISSION

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

1. Retaining Self-Assessable Codes
<p><b>The Amendment Bill seeks to deliver on the Government's 2017 election commitments to protect remnant and high conservation value non-remnant vegetation; amend the accepted development vegetation clearing codes to ensure they are</b></p> <p><b>providing appropriate protections based on Queensland Herbarium advice; and align the definition of high value regrowth vegetation with the international definition of High Conservation Value.</b></p> <p><b>Science-based self-assessable codes help farmers carry out the routine vegetation management practices necessary to sustainably produce food and fibre.</b></p> <p><b>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.</b></p> <p><b>Self-Assessable codes have reduced the cost and time taken to make applications for managing vegetation on our property.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>We have used a self-assessable code on our property successfully and would like to have the right to continue to self assess.</b></li> <li>• <b>The benefits are that we can manage Brigalow country so that it can grow grass and not be bare of ground cover which helps with erosion as well as obviously the number of cattle that we can run on the property and in turn the productivity of our land and adds to the value of our land.</b></li> <li>• <b>If the Self-assessable codes were taken away and we were required to undertake a development assessment and approval to do the same activity this would limit our ability to effectively manage our property and would impact on our business.</b></li> </ul>
2. 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
<p><b>Again, the issue of compensation arises with the addition of these layers where is the recompense for Queensland farmers and what is the estimated dollar value of these layers?</b></p> <p><b>Will farmers ever see money (compensation?) for this?</b></p> <p>-</p>
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 does not think farmers who mistakenly clear vegetation are being penalised enough.**

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.**
- **We need legislation not to change every 5 seconds otherwise we cannot plan for the future,**
- **We cannot get investment from banks or private investments due to constant change when governments change**
  - **We want the opportunity to drought proof our business for a sustainable future**
  - **Self-Assessable Codes have been very useful and more cost effective than lodging applications**

**We currently manage the vegetation on our property by clearing regrowth every 10 years. In that time the trees grow to a fair height quite quickly. When the trees are cleared by graziers they are not gone forever. The trees come back thicker than ever. When a developer clears trees they *are* gone forever. We look after our country because if we don't it will not be productive.**

While I realise the intention of the bill is to protect the environment, I believe the laws are too restrictive and remove the right of the landholder to manage his/her own property as required for their purposes.

We have large areas of Brigalow which thickens well past the natural level for this species, in fact once cleared these type of properties require constant management of the vegetation otherwise the rate of regrowth eventually renders the land *useless*. If we cannot clear our Brigalow country, our carrying capacity is severely reduced. We will not be able to run many cattle at all. Our income will be reduced so that our business will not be viable. Our property will be worth very little so that if we try to sell it we will not get what the land is really worth.

Many people in the city, including governments that support this bill, just do not realise that every tree that we clear grows back and actually more trees grow back than were there before. People do not think about where their food comes from at all.

Governments change the laws and think that they understand the consequences and have very little idea about what the true effect will be.

The Australian government has managed to destroy most of our industries so that we do not make anything here anymore. If the government continues to take away our rights without


consideration, they will also destroy the agricultural industry as well. If they are happy to import all our beef and food from other countries, that is where we are heading.

This government needs to STOP and THINK if they really want to destroy the agricultural industry as preceding governments have managed to destroy other industries in our country!

Please listen to the landholders and be thorough with research. Find out the facts. We don't need knee jerk reactions and we don't need policy changes *just to buy green votes!*

- The bill erodes my rights as a landholder to manage my property as I require.
- The effect of clearing on the environment differs wildly between locations and legislation should not be blanket applied across all areas simply because they are near a water course or have regrowth above a specified limit, this is far too simple a solution and is frankly poor Governance · Property owners need to have confidence they can manage vegetation on their own properties without the threat of breaking the law while simply trying to earn a living.

**I am a fourth generation grazier and would like to have security to know that I can pass on a viable, productive property to my children.**

Signed:	
Address:	
Date:	22 MARCH 2018