

John Oldaker

9 February 2004

Native Vegetation Inquiry
Productivity Commission
LB2, Collins Street East
Melbourne Vic 8003

Dear Sir,

I wish to make some comments on your Draft document. Firstly, have the environment issues gone too far. The answer is yes.

In our state we have imposed forest vegetation to deal with everything that grows more than 5 meters and then require the land owner to have a log harvesting plan without having any commercial timber, this a nonsense.

The Non Forest Vegetation is just as crazy. In all the vegetation issues as land owners, we have a duty of care to the environment of 5% not 105%. If compensation is not paid based on commercial reality there will not be any vegetation protected.

Under the bilateral agreement, the State Government wants to link this to Local Government Planning Schemes. This in itself is flaunt with danger, because if you allow the planning scheme to change agriculture from permitted use as of right to just permitted it then becomes subject to third party appeals and you will get no investment in agriculture and forestry if this is allowed.

For someone to say here is a list of plants and animals that are endangered and must be protected because we only have a small percentage left since European settlement is nonsense. They should be accountable for what they are saying.

The recent bilateral agreement signed by the State and Commonwealth government has nothing to do with protecting anything. It was about State Government getting funding for the DPIWE fund more that 100 positions in the department and with no regard for the farming industry.

Yours faithfully,

JOHN OLDAKER