

From

Craig Mitchell

[REDACTED]

Cooma 2630

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Submission to Native Vegetation Review

Production and Productivity.

The Native Vegetation Act creates a lose lose position.

- The biggest cost of this “community good” is lost production. This cost is carried by the people who can least afford to bear it. Those with the least productive farms.
- Turns an asset into a liability. While ever native vegetation is, or is seen to be a liability, native vegetation will not and cannot be sustained. Farmers who have native Veg on their properties are the protectors of that native veg. If farmers cannot see value (monetary, environmental, heritage, community good...) in sustaining native veg, then native veg is not sustainable.

On the Monaro Native veg pastures will carry about 1 sheep to the acre.

Improved pastures on the Monaro will carry about 3 sheep to the acre.

You could say...

Native pasture 1 sheep : Improved pasture 3 sheep

Or Native pasture income, \$1.00 : Improved pasture income, \$3.00

So on a farm receiving \$100,000 in annual income from “native veg” pastures, that farm is forgoing a further \$200,000 every year.

That’s \$200,000 worth of reinvestment in the farm (every year) that could be spent on

- Fencing out water ways
- Soil erosion works
- Weed control
- Feral animal control
- Drought mitigation
- Wealth creation and, God forbid,
- Paying tax

So who is paying for this so called community good?

- Not the Green movement
- Not the community
- Not the CMA
- Not the Department of Environment & Heritage
- Not even all farmers
- Just the farmers with native veg on their farms

Some farmers are getting really well paid to manage the Native veg on their farms.
Why not all farmers with Native veg? Is it because the government/community can't afford it?
Well, neither can we!

The Act creates a lose lose situation.
The farm loses. The environment loses.

You people have a real problem.

Repeal the Act!