

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

I object strongly to the concept of the removal of high value agriculture as it will put our cattle producing business under considerable pressure.

Our primary finishing block of land is considered HVA and since 2014 we as a business have been gradually improving the land (we had not done this since the 80's as seasons and cattle prices had not been adequate, Also we had a round of succession planning in place). This development has enabled us to have security to finish stock and has also reduced the pressure on the joining wetland areas. Also through the development it has enabled us to employ 2 full-time employees and on part time to complete the improvements. We would like to continue this as there is a considerable amount of degraded vegetation country still to go.

The better we can make this land reduces the runoff as it increases the grass cover and holds gullies together. Also assisting in getting animals to sale weight earlier thus increasing the value to my business.

2. Retaining Self-Assessable Codes

One of the outstanding issues with the suggested changes to legislation is that we as land managers are no longer trusted to maintain the land in which we inhabit. Self assessment has been built on years of experience and also gives us the ability to manage our land around the guidelines set but the scientists that have no agenda but to protect the land as it is best.

Land without fire needs to be maintained just to keep it in the correct state to slow runoff and allow the natural process of carbon sequestration. I have examples of areas that haven't been managed under self assessable codes and now has been completely lost to production and also has substantial erosion problems.

I like many Queenslanders enjoy the great barrier reef which protects us from the fierce pacific ocean. It disturbs me greatly to see this overgrown are that is out of management lose valuable top soil into the reef.

As our land is on the flood plain I see the good and the bad of land management, it heartens me to note that since the 2010 flood which destroyed the wetland from muddy water. There has been a noticeable improvement in runoff since landholders up stream have resumed management of there land and ground cover has increased.

3. Including High Value Regrowth as an additional layer of regulation under the Vegetation Management Framework on leasehold, freehold and indigenous land

HVR confuses me why we need to put more barriers to entry on an industry that delivers such a large portion of our states GDP. It only increases the amount of unnecessary regulation of an industry already surrounded by it.

Land development is a very expensive practice for over the 100+ years my family have been on the land we have done our best to manage the land as best possible even when we had lease land (that is land that belongs to the state) which stated on the lease the land must be maintained and selectively cleared in a useable state. Because of the expense we haven't been able to cover it completely.

This cost is not taken lightly making it difficult to do on a consistent and regular basis. Now as I understand if we would like to do it but haven't done it recently you are going to lock it up as well. In which other industry / business does this happen.

Also the management of weeds pests and disease in these areas is difficult at best. Leading to the major issues we have with national parks which are fields of High value regrowth AND WEEDS, DINGOS, FERAL PIGS, WILD CATTLE AND POTENTIAL BIO-SECURITY HAZARDS

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

What planet the law makers come from?

Rain doesn't fall in the water coarse if our focus is on the watercourse we have lost the race the erosion of land begins on the step country in the hills / national parks if we want to maintain the reef thats where our focus should be.

We manage the DEE and DON river catchments floodplain. In my lifetime I have seen the rivers dry up completely and the degradation of habitats in the floodplain. I also have land in the headwaters of the same catchment. The only thing that has changed is vegetation upstream. As the amount of grass in regrowth areas has decreased the speed of runoff has increased not allowing absorption into the basin and increasing erosion. My mind bogles that the government now is suggesting that we lock up watercourses because they failed to allow the development of the risk areas.

Also on the coastal ranges where the plantation timber has been introduced there has been a notable change in water quality due to the rating of leaves being the only matter holding solid together.

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

If any person has something one day and they don't have it the next day they lost it, sold it or it was **STOLEN** from them.

As I understand it prior to the introduction we had ownership of all vegetation (except on some leasehold land) now it is subject to mapping which restricts **OWNERSHIP**. With this current proposed legislation change I can see a government attempting to steal what has been ours. Can there be a recommendation from the committee process to whom we should report this crime.

Minister Lynam said "It is all about restoring a sustainable vegetation management framework for managing a valuable **RESOURCE**. Resources by nature have value, why can't we value add the resource and how can a government steal it.

Current law changes with the introduction of category R could easily reduce our business by $\frac{1}{3}$ making us unsustainable.

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.

As I have said with over 100 years of management practices in our business our knowledge and rights will have to be reviewed in a retrospective manner with an increased penalty for non compliance.

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

Traditionally we are a innovative beef producing family. With a company vision to produce sustainable produce to the people of the world with practices that are continually evolving to allow us to have an social licence to operate.

We struggle with the law changing on a regular bases which has added a level of complexity to our business. Also these law changes being put in public lights on an annual or biannual basis is clouding the views of the people we need on our side to manage our environment in a sustainable manner.

With four kids growing up in our business these type of suggested changes makes them uncertain about their futures in our family business.

Please accept this as my submission for the current suggested regulation changes.

Yours faithfully

William Wilson

21/3/2018