5 March 2010

Senate Finance and Public Administration Committee
PO Box 6100
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600
Australia

Dear Sir/Madam,

Native Vegetation Laws, Greenhouse Gas Abatement and Climate Change Measures

We support the Queensland *Vegetation Management Act 1999*, which includes "the phasing out of broadscale clearing of remnant vegetation by 31 December 2006; and the regulation of particular regrowth vegetation." (Sections 3 (2) (e) and (f)).

1. It has been demonstrated that retention of at least 30% of native vegetation in viable strips and clumps on grazing properties assists productivity in a number of ways, such as -

- Ecosystem services
- Shelter belts for stock
- Frost protection for grass
- Deep nutrient recycling

Therefore no assistance should be given to landholders where the amount of vegetation that has to be retained assists production.

2. Having to retain native vegetation on land that is not suitable for clearing, (e.g. sodic soils, steep slopes) should not attract any compensation. Much of the most productive country in Queensland had already been cleared before the ban on broadscale clearing came in to effect. The *Vegetation Management Act 1999* actually saved some landholders from ruining land unsuitable for clearing.

3. There appears to be a belief that freehold tenure confers the "right" to do whatever the landholder wants. However, government is within its rights to control activities on freehold land. Landholders who can demonstrate that they have been seriously affected financially by being forced to retain native vegetation over and above their 'duty of care', may be helped by stewardship payments or similar.

4. Approximately 70% of Queensland is leasehold. The government is entitled to expect good land management over leasehold land and we do not believe that compensation applies to any restrictions to broadscale clearing. The land belongs to the state and lessees do not own the trees.

Yours faithfully,

Ian and Cathy Herbert