

**From:** Janette Neilson  
**Sent:** Monday, 16 July 2012 10:38 AM  
**To:** EHPP Landscapes & Ecosystems Section Mailbox  
**Cc:** office@constance.minister.nsw.gov.au  
**Subject:** Native Vegetation Regulations.

**Attachments:** 16 July 2012.pdf



16 July 2012.pdf  
(183 KB)

Please find enclosed submission on the above regulations and proposed changes.

I must add that I attended a meeting in Bega with the CMA and at no stage during that meeting did they indicate that there was an option available to repeal the act in September 2012. I believe the majority of the farmers present were also unaware of this option. In discussion with a prominent farmer later I was very disturbed to learn that even he was certainly unaware of this option.

Just because the average farmer is far too busy working seven days a week to be bothered reading myriads of discussion papers, assessment methodologies etc. is no reason to just walk over his rights. No doubt the environmental movement held meetings to discuss their submissions to continue and if possible extend restriction on freehold land. I repeat, I am very disturbed by what I consider to be the lack of transparency in this matter.

Janette Neilson

16 July 2012

Native Vegetation Regulation Review,  
Level 12,  
PO Box A290  
Sydney South NSW 1232.

Dear Sir,

I consider the native vegetation regulations act should be repealed as it does nothing to allow a property owner to ensure security of food supply for the nation into the future.

To suggest in option 1 that this act should not be repealed because of "administrative problems" quite shocked me when I read it. This is absolutely no justification for attempting to continue an unjust and unfair restriction of a person's rights on his own freehold property. The only administrative problem I see is the loss of employment for those working to make the farmer's life a misery.

A great deal of NSW is already locked up in national parks, forestry, crown land and private conservation agreements. There is therefore no basis for further continuing this restriction on a farmer's rights to use his land as he sees fit to ensure a reasonable income for his family, ensure continuation of primary production into the future and protecting the nation's food supply.

Any real farmer knows that native vegetation has minimal supplies of nutrients for food production. This means that anyone who attempts to farm on native grasses has to bring in hay, silage etc. from elsewhere. This leads to the spread of weeds from other areas and to excessive costs for a farmer in the present difficult financial climate.

If the government continues with this native vegetation restrictions along with the dairy deregulation and other government engineered constraints on farm land we will see the remainder of our youth decide to quite farming (as is already happening) and migrate to the cities where they can earn a significant income without any of the long hours and risks involved in farming. This would be a further drain on regional economies already suffering through situations beyond their control.

One should consider the cost benefit of restricting farming practises on freehold farming land. From an economic standpoint there is no benefit in retaining native vegetation on freehold land. From an environmental standpoint there is far more benefit to retaining native vegetation in government controlled lands i.e. national parks and crown lands in particular where they may be grazed by native animals and grow in their natural environment. The average farmland to remain viable is forced to upgrade the quality and quantity of vegetation.

The government does not enter a factory and tell the owner how to run his business and what materials he can use. Nor does the government require that a portion of his property be set aside to preserve it. Why then does the government believe it has the right to do just this to a primary producer who is by the nature of his industry not only feeding the nation but also building this country's economic future well being.

This government has an opportunity to put right an injustice that was perpetrated on our primary producers and has caused much anger and resentment from the farming community for no gain at all for the state.

In conclusion I believe that this unjust and restrictive act should be repealed as originally intended in September 2012.

Yours sincerely,

Janette Neilson

A black rectangular redaction mark covering the signature of Janette Neilson.

c.c. Minister Andrew Constance  
Member for Bega