

ONLINE SUBMISSION DETAILS	
Date Received	16/02/2017
Name	[REDACTED]
Organisation	
Email	[REDACTED]
Postcode	3465
Privacy Options	I am making this submission as an individual. I request my submission be published anonymously including only my postcode
Privacy Statement Correct?	Yes
Privacy Collection Notice Read?	Yes
Submission Type	Farmer
Previous engagement in review?	Info session 2015
	Workshop 2015/16
	Targetted consultation
	SRG
	Written submission to CP?
	Other? Describe
Will changes improve function of regs?	
Reasons	Only if the owners of the trees are compensated. Otherwise farmers will become more disinterested in the outcome
Implementation issue with proposed changes?	Yes
Reasons	<p>As a person who has been associated with trees all my life I am appalled at the inadequate and corrupted education of the current bureaucrats and general public who have a perceived view that once cut down all trees will not regenerate but are lost forever and also that farmers rights are easily dismissed. Eucalyptus trees are very different to European trees in the way they can regenerate and reclaim land areas. Fire and flood also often have a huge impact on this outcome.</p> <p>Farmers need a carrot not a stick to encourage them to keep or regenerate trees on their properties because taking away their rights will only alienate them further from the city based populations.</p> <p>After all, farmers are producing what those of the public arena want in the production of clean air by keeping vegetation on their land. Without any return then there is no incentive to do this. Reduced income for farmers is what created the dustbowl in America so we need to maintain viability of Australian farmers to encourage conservation of the land itself not just the vegetation which requires that land for growth and production. Remember that land is also essential for food production which will become increasingly important as the world population continues to increase.</p> <p>With the never-ending cost/price squeeze impacting farming operations then some incentive must be implemented for farmers to not only retain the vegetation preferred by the general public but to plant more of the same.</p>
Guidelines – guidance or clarification needed?	Yes
Details	Determine who owns the trees (or vegetation) and what right has any person or body of people to take away the right as to what that owner does with their property without providing due compensation.
Terms to include in guidelines glossary?	Yes

<p>Details</p>	<p>Ownership of Trees and vegetation.</p> <p>Production from vegetation eg Oxygen, carbon sequestration, timber, reduced salinity and erosion, aesthetics, Flora and Fauna habitat.</p> <p>Fire danger created by restrictions on selective clearing of any trees.</p> <p>Dangers to travellers on roads from falling trees and limbs.</p> <p>Payment to landholders for desired vegetation.</p>
<p>Subscribe to e-newsletter?</p>	<p>Yes. Please send information updates to my email address</p>
<p>Other comments</p>	<p>There is no mention of compensation for taking away the rights of landowners by preventing them from doing with what they own as they please on their own property.</p> <p>Should the people of Australia want to keep trees on private land then compensation must be paid to landowners before that right to make such a decision is transferred.</p> <p>As a farmer for 65 years who purchased his own farm and maintained a good coverage of vegetation currently growing thereon; then, also having inherited a farm selected by my forebears I feel I have rights to decide what I do with that vegetation. Otherwise we are living in a dictatorial situation.</p> <p>While my forebears were forced to clear the land under the terms of selection as part of the grant conditions at that time; the expectations of the population of this country now have a different view of the value of vegetation. The only difference is that much of the vegetation they are trying to control is no longer on Crown land but is privately owned. For that reason, the owners should be compensated for retaining what the population wants.</p> <p>This shows a similarity to dictating to Australian people that they must pay some foreign entity for the emission of greenhouse gases when our emissions per cubic metre of air controlled is an immensely smaller amount than any other country on the planet.</p> <p>For the amount of atmosphere we control then Australians should be receiving huge compensation figures from those countries who are polluting their own air (eventually ours also) in much greater proportions than we in Australia are. That compensation could then be paid to landholders who retain trees and vegetation on their land which is dissipating those greenhouse gases. Oceans controlled should also come into the equation because plankton absorbs much of the greenhouse gases as well. Just because Australia is a large supplier of coal does not mean we are responsible for any carbon emissions when burnt by a foreign entity.</p> <p>The issue of revegetation also comes into question under these controls because once established then new plantings will also likely end up out of the control of the landholder planting that vegetation.</p> <p>Grassroots knowledge and experience gained over generations and my own time working in the bush provides a far better understanding of the situation than institutionalised indoctrination.</p> <p>Should science be able to prove the argument for increasing vegetation then farmers can only be encouraged to do so when that necessity is proven beyond doubt and they are duly compensated for supplying that want.</p> <p>The issue of revegetation also comes into question under these controls because once established then new plantings will also likely end up out of the control of the landholder planting that vegetation.</p> <p>Grassroots knowledge and experience gained over generations and my own time working in the bush provides a far better understanding of the situation than institutionalised indoctrination.</p> <p>Should science be able to prove the argument for increasing vegetation then farmers can only be encouraged to do so when that necessity is proven beyond doubt and they are duly compensated for supplying that want.</p>

Written submission provided?	
------------------------------	--