

## SUBMISSION

Our Business would have liked to articulate the impacts with the proposed legislation in more detail however the limited and unreasonable time frame prevented us from doing this.

In providing this submission I would like you to note the following key principals proposed.

### **1) The proposed legislation is Contradictory**

Currently the Queensland Government is supporting the building of a high voltage powerline through our land that will require the clearing of thousands of hectares. These forest types are habitat for a returning koala population and host for our endangered species the northern bittong and native qual populations ranked as a critical priority.

This power line benefits a primarily Chinese Company proposing to sell power to Queensland whilst disadvantages Queensland land owners and destroying the forest and environment.

*Can someone explain how this is in keeping with the proposed and existing legislation?*

### **2) The proposed legislation is very poor, blunt and most likely an ineffectual way to improve the environment, let alone protect it.**

We believe the individuals within the department will struggle with definitions, interpretation and application of the legistition. The red tape will then expand lengthy time frames that impact our economic viability. The legislation does not allow for specific and regional difference with the impact of clearing and in turn the management of land. There are significant environmental differences in forest tree impacts from Southern Queensland to Northern Queensland. Consequently management of our forests should be science based not legislative based.

### **3) The proposed legislation does not support the fundamentals of increasing environmental benefits along with increasing economic and community benefits**

The legislation polarises the discussion into economic benefit against perceived environmental benefits as the retention of trees. As a result it does not provide opportunities for innovation that provide environmental benefits with economic benefits. Opportunity with the future innovation abound in Northern Australia. This legislation limits these innovations not only for Queensland but all Australia in terms of food production and prosperity. As land managers we need a scientific basis for decisions appropriate to our regional area and ecotone not on an interpretation of legislation.

In addition to the above principals we have simply made one recommendation.

### **Recommendation**

We would recommend that the wording of the legislation in all areas be altered such that clearing of vegetation is allowable, given it adheres to the following:

1. Provides an economic benefit
  - Shows economic viability, is sustainable and future focused.
2. Provides a community/social benefit
  - Ensures local employment and sustainability of (family) communities.
3. Provides an environmental benefit

As shown by:

- a. Increasing diversity of animal and plant life
- b. Increase in soil Carbon levels
- c. Decrease in erosion

This will encourage management changes with benefits to all thus true stewardship of our land.

1. Removing High Value Agriculture and Irrigated High Value Agriculture from the Vegetation Management Framework

The removal of this provision has a significant economic and environmental impact to our family business and our land. We know our land has high potential to become more productive and sustainable through our changing and variable climatic region.

This potential can be reached by strategic clearing and use of water resources. These measures would provide a protein store, a healthy ecology and habitat whilst being utilised to provide drought resilience and therefore reliability of production. We see our production base widening in the form of cropping and animal production increasing due to demand within the next five years.


Preventing future expansion in the north increases our vulnerability and risk. Our planned expansion and economic support from banks is at risk of failure due to these changes.

The removal of the HVA and IHVA will also prevent innovation and opportunity to supply food. A simple blanket removal does not take into account projects that provide significant economic, social and environmental benefits. Surely there should be provision to undertake strategic clearing where the project provides significant ecological benefit.

Our planning and expansion program was developed within the existing framework with Commercial backing. A change of this nature would further undermine the confidence in Agricultural Industries and our confidence to further develop and expand.

In addition, these changes inherently affect the way we operate our business and limit opportunities for family members to join our business (imparting succession plans) simply because our agricultural base is economically constrained and therefore less sustainable.

As a business, the removal of the opportunity to further expand with innovative agriculture is more significant and could never be reimbursed, monetary or otherwise

Signed:	
Address:	GADARA STATION
Date:	22-3-18