

SUBMISSION

To: The Chairman
Biodiversity Legislation Review
P.O.Box A290
SYDNEY SOUTH. NSW 1232

From: [REDACTED]

Dear Sir,

I wish to raise the following issues in my brief submission.

1) I note that your review panel does not include any of the stake holders who are directly and financially affected by the Native Veg. Act and the other Acts under review, namely, the farming community. Why was not at least one panel member drawn from the various farming groups and why was NSW Farmers Organisation not asked to nominate some panel members?

I am not questioning the expertise of the current panel, however, unless the most affected stakeholders are represented, this review lacks credibility.

2) The review needs to accept the premise that the original Native Veg. Act, Sepp 46, was introduced about 20 years ago in part so that Australia could meet its obligation under the Kyoto Protocol on greenhouse gas. This has meant that it is almost exclusively the rural community that bore the financial burden of this obligation.

If the government (ie the community) want to stop land clearing as a greenhouse abatement measure, that is fine and it is a good objective.

However, if the community want to stop land clearing, then the community in general must pay the costs, not just the farming community. In other words, there should be compensation paid if farmers are stripped of their rights to utilise their assets.

3) On more specific issues:

A) Landholders should be able to commercially log mature trees with a much simpler approval process. This makes economic sense for the farmers (and the economy!!) and also lock up carbon for maybe 100 years. The panel needs to recognise that trees do grow again!!!

B) The current restriction of clearing only 6 metres either side of fence lines is unduly onerous. Fences are expensive to erect and maintain, without the added expense of trees falling over them. We need to be able to clear at least 30 metres either side of a fence.

C) We need to be able to control invasive woody weeds and regrowth trees more than 10 years old on a regular basis.

D) We need to be legally able to cull kangaroos on a regular basis. Most people do not like culling kangaroos (it is also time consuming and expensive!!) but if the numbers are not controlled our paddocks will end up the same as many rural golf courses. The current hassles of getting a licence every 3 months (or less!) is ridiculous and most people simply don't comply. Three year permits would be a more practical option.

It is quite difficult to operate a grazing property these days without committing a criminal act involving native fauna and flora nearly every week. The situation exists where the rural community has disdain rather than respect for a lot of the legislation.

This situation needs to be changed.

P.A. Bagshaw