

HERE IS THE TRUTH



I would like to VOICE MY strong opinion AGAINST the NEW VEGETATION LAWS, and my SUPPORT FOR THE SELF Assessable Thinning Codes that have just been superceded. We have been using the old Self Assessable codes in conjunction with the fodder permit. In our situation the fodder permit is not sustainable on its own because we only have small patches of straight Mulga eligible for fodder feeding, but by also using the self assessable thinning code, feeding our cattle becomes viable whilst managing the thickening problem. 2 birds with one stone.

THE REALITY

IT is important to keep the old self assessable codes as they are, as management decisions on the land can change from day to day. For instance, dams going boggy sooner than expected, major breakdown of bores where you may be out of water for some time, meaning you have to relocate stock immediately. If you have an unforeseen situation arise like this you cannot tell the cows to go somewhere else to get their food. The decision to relocate 400 or 500 head of cattle must be made overnight. You might not be able to shift these cattle quickly if they have young calves, so this is a very slow process of relocation and you may have to cart water for them as they are shifted slowly across the paddocks, following the food supply behind the machines to another supply of fodder and a new water source which can be 5 – 10 kilometres away. If you are unable to utilize the self assesable Thinning code and have to shift them quickly, this will lead to mis mothered calves that will perish and die as well as distraught cows looking for calves who will also die.

THE CONSEQUENCES

If I were able to continue to use the combination of the old fodder code and the old thinning code to feed my stock, at the same rate that I have been for the last 3 years and manage my thickened areas at the same time , it would take me 13 years of CONTINUAL drought before I ran out of mulga. But, of course this would never happen as after 10 years I would have to go back to the start to manage the first lot of thickening which by then would have thickened back to the original state or thicker.

Although the old codes are difficult to comply with due to practicality , they are achievable and financially viable (just)

The Development Assessment system is impractable and totally unviable, costly (\$3130 for application fees and quotes of \$10000 and up for application work) and no guarantee you will be approved anyway. The time frame for assessing the applications was not able to be specified by the department during your committee hearing. Hungry cattle cannot wait while these applications are being assessed. If you are not approved what do you do with the hungry cattle who by this stage may be too weak to sell? Will the department come out and help us shoot them? Where is the animal welfare here?? These development codes have

effectively cut the thinning portion of our property down to 10 percent (See page 19 of State Code 16 under Table 16.3 Reference Tables.

Whoever wrote this Legislation has obviously no concept of feeding large numbers of cattle, the thickening problem we have with our Mulga lands and to positively manage ecosystems, nature, animal care and vegetation management let alone how to be viable in a business. Does the Department intend to run REAL working models with REAL CATTLE to educate us farmers on how this can be achieved with the new legislation? We will personally donate 10,000 acres for DNRM research to prove to us how stock can viably be kept alive within this new Legislation.

THE REAL FACTS

These are REAL figures based on REAL life. No computer models used. These are FACTS. This is how it is. PLEASE listen to us.

We have areas of Category C on our new Veg Maps and there is absolutely no difference in the type of country/trees/ecosystem/vegetation that is marked as Category X. As we are unable to get staff at DNRM to reply to our phone calls for help uploading the KMZ files onto our GIS KIT mapping programme, we are unable to provide reliable, accurate, GPS'd photos at this stage. We are totally open for anyone to come and show us the difference.

This Legislation has no regard to the rights and liberties of us as individuals and consequently adversely affect us .

LISTEN TO THE RIGHT PEOPLE

I have been a certified Organic Cattle producer for over 30 years. I KNOW how to look after my cattle and my environment in a way that each can improve and flourish whilst I remain viable. I have been mustering (low level flying) staring into the constant thickening Mulga Lands for over 27 years with a total of 11046 hours. That's a lot of field research. I think I have more creditability than a satellite image. I am also the South West Qld representative for Queensland Water and Land Carers and have been actively educating the public on the management and history of Mulga for some time now. I have been involved in Landcare groups for over 25 years. I feel these proposed new Laws are too rushed through as was proved when officers of the DNRM were asked at the Committee Hearing if the Government had done any modelling on the effect that this Legislation was going to have on Qld Agriculture . The answer was A RESOUNDING NO , and an equally resounding NO to future modelling.

I am appalled that a Government would admit to introducing new Legislation without due course. What sort of logic is this?

SCIENCE VS PRACTICALITY

I know there has been a lot of science used by both sides of the argument, and science is great.... In moderation..... I feel as though its all about Science . I don't think it hurts to stop and listen to what people have to say and look at the practical side of things to be balanced with science. We, South West Mulga Land Farmers and Indigenous Groups) have 100 years plus of practical knowledge of managing these Mulga Lands that no body want to know about.

THE HISTORY

The Mulga Lands are historically known as Breeder Country. That is to say we breed the stock that more fertile areas of Queensland use to purchase and fatten. By diminishing the area of land we can use by not allowing us to manage our thickening problem, this Legislation will effectively create a domino affect for the rest of the Qld cattle industry and eventually ,the price of beef for the city. Same demand but less supply.

FINANCIAL

We borrowed the money to buy this property 3 years ago on a 5 year plan using the old Vegetation Management Laws as guidelines for our repayment schedule and counting on the Mulga as our Insurance in case of drought. We have now been in continual drought so, YES, we will be looking for compensation if the laws change. Without a doubt!!!

EVIDENCE

I would ask the Committee to look at the attached two videos.. One of poorly managed Regrowth Mulga Country – which is what the Mulga Lands can only HOPE to look like with this legislation and the other is well managed Mulga Lands using the Self Assessable code theory. Which country do you think is better?

Opposition to proposed vegetation management laws

Eligibility - Queensland residents

Principal Petitioner: Scott Sargood Halton 66868 Warrego Highway CHARLEVILLE QLD 4478	Sponsoring Member: Ms Ann Leahy MP Posting Date: 13/02/2018 Closing Date: 29/04/2018 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Share this E-Petition
--	--

Total Signatures - 6819

Sign this E-Petition

Scott Sargood

