

Corry Blue

NSW 2343

24. 7 2012

Dear Sir

I would like to make a recommend.
on Native Vegetation in our case we
have 600HA of which we only have
approx 80HA cleared. which is not a
living area, we feel that you should
be aloud. to have a least 250HA to 300HA
of this amount cleared.
we have been behind the eight ball
since Neville Ran came to power
They froze 41 property in gunnedak area
with witch we were one of the property's
It took nine years to get it into freehold.
Then SEPH6 came in and you could
still clear 2HA but then that changed
now you can't do anything

Yours sincerely
P A Hean
Margaret Hean

Laws are lose-lose

WHY, after 17 years of native vegetation laws are farmers – the people affected by these laws – still walking out?

Is it because the laws are unconstitutional, an attack on their freedoms or any of the other reasons given at the recent regulation "consultation" meetings?

Yes, but if the native veg laws were good and just, fair and equitable, would these farmers still be unhappy? I think these reasons are just a symptom of the malaise.

So what is the problem?

These farmers who are voting to repeal the legislation and walking out of meetings are those farmers who are most affected by it.

So the answer is really very simple.

The native veg act is grossly unfair and unreasonable to those farmers who have a lot of native vegetation on their property.

If you have 20 per cent native veg on your property you don't have a problem. But if you have 80pc native veg on your property, you have a big problem.

It puts the majority of the cost of this so-called "community good" onto the people who lose the most.

It turns an asset into a liability.

And while ever native vegetation is, or is seen to be, a liability native vegetation will not and

cannot be sustained.

The laws create a lose-lose position.

CRAIG MITCHELL,
"Gaerlook",
Cooma.

Repeal the Act

LAST month I attended the community forum held in Cooma to hear from representatives of the Office of Environment and Heritage details of proposed changes to the Native Vegetation Act regulations.

When the meeting resumed after morning tea a motion was moved and seconded requesting the NSW government repeal the Act.

There were about six speakers for and none against and the motion was carried unanimously on a show of hands.

About half of those present then left the meeting as they could see little point in further discussions.

It needs to be recognised that the NSW government has an unprecedented mandate to govern according to the political beliefs of both Coalition parties.

And the government needs to be reminded of key elements of those beliefs of relevance to this issue: reducing to a minimum government interference in people's lives; to guarantee security of private property ownership; to pay just compensation when interference is unavoidable; to promote opportunity for all to follow their chosen occupation, and to encourage individual responsibility to the community.

All these noble aspirations are directly or indirectly compromised by the Native Vegetation Act.

The government must demonstrate the courage of their convictions and repeal this act.

JAMES LITCHFIELD,
"Myalla",
Cooma.