

Name: Alexander Wallace Brierty and Irene Brierty

Background: Irene and her husband Alexander Brierty run goats, sheep and cattle on a 1172 ha hobby farm on the outskirts of _____, S-W Queensland. It consists of 660 ha leasehold tenure and 512 ha of freehold.

Briertys have operated the farm in partnership for over 30 years. Alexander is now in his 80's and is in failing health. Irene is also an age pensioner who cares for both Alex and her 96-year-old mother, as well as running the grazing operation. Alex is a JP (Qual.) who for many years sat on the bench as Magistrate in _____ and was a Councillor on the Balonne Shire Council (based in St George, S-W Qld) for many years also. He operated the butcher shop in _____ in conjunction with the grazing operation until about 10 years ago and is widely recognized as the local historian.

Irene grew up on a 28,000 acre sheep/cattle grazing property between Bollon and Goodooga which was managed by her father.

Between them, they have over 100 years of land management experience and Alex has been granted the lease of the 660 ha continuously for the past 50 years.

Submission: Terms of Reference – (1) (d)

- **History:** Alex took up the lease of the 660 ha as an adjunct to the butcher shop. The terms of the lease were adhered to and it was always renewed without problems. We cleared according to sound farming practice on the freehold, there was never any broadscale clearing.

In 2003, the Qld Government introduced the PMAV (Property Map of Assessable Vegetation) process and in 2006 we 'locked in' the mapped non-remnant portion of the freehold property (shown in white). We paid \$577.20 for this process, which supposedly guaranteed that our property could be maintained without a permit (category 'X').

We made application to clear portion of the leasehold and were granted permission (with conditions such as how we were to deal with debris). This permit runs out on 23/1/2012 so we are forced either to get in and clear before then (whether we can afford to or not) or forgo the opportunity altogether.

- **Lack of security:**

We hear stories of many PMAVs being blatantly incorrect regarding what is remnant and what is non-remnant, and the ensuing difficulties (and extra expense) encountered by landholders in trying to correct them. It worries us, also, when we hear that, for instance, a stand of lantana (a declared noxious weed), has been wrongly depicted on a PMAV as remnant vegetation.

With the way the Greens can manipulate a Labour Government with threats of directing their preferences away from Labour, we have no confidence in any pre-election promises of the current Labour Government in regards to clearing laws. The Greens did not get what they wanted after the 2009 election – they wanted the moratorium on clearing to apply to properties with a PMAV as well as those without – so they will be more determined than ever to use their preferences to influence Labour in the 2012 election.

The uncertainty we feel (that our PMAV may be changed, on a whim, by someone who has no idea of what it is like to battle the elements, live long distances from basic services, etc.) adds to the constant stress we suffer.

But, we will continue to stand our ground.

- **Conclusion:**

Our management strategy has always been to selectively clear country at a time of our choosing but this right has been taken from us.

If we are to be able to manage our land sustainably and environmentally soundly, we need to have restored to us the ability to make our own decisions (based on the knowledge and skills gained during our joint lifetimes on the land) in the best interests of our land, our stock and our bottom line.

Submission: Terms of Reference – (2)

We do not agree with the Government's proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS). Where is all that money going to go? How is it going to do any good in affecting climate change? We cannot afford such an increase in our cost of living.

How disgusting that the Labor Government took 114 people on the junket to Copenhagen when it is reported that India and other major players had delegations of only 20-40 people.

The Coalition's Direct Action plan has more benefits for Australia and Australians than the scheme cooked up by Labor and we ask the Senate to continue to reject Labor's CPRS.