



The Secretary,
Senate Environment Communications Information Technology and the Arts
References Committee
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600

"Inquiry into Australia's national parks, conservation reserves
and marine protected areas".

Submission from:
Mr Jim Quadrio,

My submission relates to the responsibilities, and record of governments with regard
to:

- The creation and management of national parks etc.
- My personal case of trying to deal with government / agencies to try to
achieve long term environmental, economical and social sustainability
(EESS).
- CALM record of management (or lack of)
- CALM policy of water deprivation which probably contravenes the Animal
Welfare Act.
- Agency lack of transparency and accountability.

In the late 1990s the Gascoyne Murchison Strategy (GMS) was initiated to restructure
the pastoral industry (not to create a CARS as has been reported in some ministerial
press releases!). Part of this restructure was to set aside 5% (which then became 10-
15%) of "land systems" (NOT land) to become part of the national CARS. Where
such land was acquired a "lease adjustment" mechanism was to apply whereby
neighbours could be given the opportunity to acquire portions to enhance that
property's long term "EESS".

As a member of the GMS steering committee, I was fully conversant of the
agreements, discussions and procedures debated and agreed to, and how the strategy
was supposed to have been implemented.

Granite Peak, through the above process, tried to achieve genuine lease adjustment and after two years of negotiation with relevant agencies, the politicians etc. conceded defeat but concluded that:

- CALM were not prepared in any shape or form to concede any land or enter into any voluntary lease adjustment (VLA) agreements
- CALM cited areas of high scientific and biodiversity value but whenever challenged on describing types / % / areas etc. would not give any detail! The FACT is the model CALM have / are using to determine biodiversity value is very broad and outdated and no surveys have been done on the property in question, to determine such values. Their reasons / answers have been dishonest, negligent and misleading, both to myself but also to the relevant ministers and agencies at the time.
- CALM are totally unaccountable and non transparent almost being a "law unto themselves".
- The use of GMS funds to purchase properties was more about acquiring huge areas of land to comply with international agreements and to "play a role in carbon sequestration", (Minister Edwards press release) rather than genuine biodiversity preservation.
- The acquisition of properties to add to CARS has allowed CALM, with use of federal funds to expand their power base and agency and probably enhance personal careers ie EMPIRE BUILDING!
- The whole process under GMS was totally hypocritical and flawed with no consideration given to the social consequences or genuine restructure of pastoral leases in the rangelands. I believe CALM were in total breach of the good will of the GMS agreement and have treated it with contempt!

In December 2005 Granite submitted a revised restructure proposal to CALM only to again be rejected with no real consideration or evaluation.

In early 2006 Granite Peak advised CALM it would no longer deal with CALM regional office.

On 29 April 2006, accompanied by a mediator, I had a meeting with "CALM Director of Regional Services" and submitted a new land swap proposal whereby CALM would gain land and both parties could achieve their long term objectives. To date there has been no response!

As a major contributor of funds under GMS and for future projects, I believe the federal Government and this committee need to consider the following:

- Is ideology and politics overruling realism and pragmatism in the creation of these reserves? Is it a case of "create reserves no matter what"? Social consequences / considerations MUST be considered!

- Withhold funding to WA environment agencies ie CALM / DEC until they can demonstrate honesty, accountability, transparency and responsibility.
- Reduce state environment agencies to a size that is manageable and through strict funding criteria don't allow them to use such funding to create their own "empires" that basically are untouchable and wield uncontrollable power!
- Are reserves being created more for "carbon sequestration"?
- Where are the dollars going to come from to properly manage all this land? Has a cost benefit analysis been done?
- Negative impact on neighbouring properties such as pest incursion etc. ie wild dogs, kangaroos, feral animal etc.

I would welcome the opportunity to expand on the matters presented in this submission, with supporting information etc.,