

Unfortunately the process of vegetation management has become polarized and is unjustifiably causing an imbalance of impact on land users. Firstly the over development of farming caused the problem and the farmers are the winners in all out comes of the legislation. Those who were more cautious in development have had to pay an excessive price for their restraints. Land management by those that did not clear all the trees, but looked for a better balance, have had their ability to continue to achieve a balance legislated out of the game. Trees, whether native or otherwise, have a valuable function within the landscape but they are only one part of a biodiversity, and the legislation does not reflect the need to manage the complexity of the landscape. If land use is required to be managed then why don't we have production legislation? I know why!!!! Trees are a much easier subject politically. If there were restrictions on production it would be possible to prove a case for compensation. I believe there should be an ability to maintain the integrity of the landscape. This includes the removal of invasive species and thinning where necessary. The back door approach to curtail farming has only managed to make it impossible for graziers to maintain their production levels. The difference between public land and state land is no longer there, as far as management and control is concerned, and if the government feel that it needs more environmental land then it should buy it, or at least rent from the private land holders. I believe that there is a real need for education as to land management possibly with a carrot but not a stick. Education is far better than legislation.

Richard Bucknell

