

From;
Craig Mitchell



Submission to biodiversity legislation review

Production and Productivity.

Our biodiversity legislation creates a lose lose position.

Farmers lose so the environment loses.

- The biggest cost of this “community good” is lost agricultural production. This cost is carried by the people who can least afford to bear it. Those with the least productive farms.
- Our biodiversity legislation turns an asset into a liability. Farmers who have native veg on their properties are the protectors/custodians of that native veg. If **farmers** cannot see value (monetary, environmental, heritage, community good...) in sustaining native veg, then that native veg will not be sustained.

On the Monaro, native veg pastures will carry about 1 sheep to the acre. Improved pastures 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 of income every year, that’s **every** year.

Plus, if we add in productivity increases, the difference between the two accelerates apart. **Having native veg on your farm becomes an even bigger disaster.**

So who is paying for this community good?

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

If the community wishes to preserve what it believes to be “native veg”, then the community should pay. The cost should not be imposed onto **only** those farms with native veg. It should be shared across the whole community.

The Act creates a lose lose situation.

The farm loses. The environment loses.

The Government has a real problem.