

My Submission to the Senate Committee Inquiry into "Native Vegetation Laws, Greenhouse Gas Abatement and Climate Change Measures" follows.

My Submission is in a "dot point" form.
NATIVE VEGETATION LAWS.

- I am a total believer in conservation, protection of bio-diversity, absolutely essential.
- On our 8,400 ha grazing we rotationally graze, conservatively stocked this has allowed good re-establish of desirable under-story shrubs.
- Laws radically changing clearing rules, etc. without compensation, for income foregone, because of changes, totally unjust + un-fair, should fix!
- Consider also counter productive, as tends to encourage land-holders to clear early, to circumvent possible change to rules.
- Making it extremely difficult, to get permit to do small percentage development on an area left natural, certainly penalises the environmentally aware operator, as usual!
- Don't think National Parks always the best conservation form, recon some form of co-management, would, in many cases be better socially, economically + environmentally.
- Vegetation rules MUST fit the area, according to local rainfall etc., what is a problem plant at Coff's Harbour may be beneficial, excellent in low rainfall area, useful but not totally invasive.
- An extreme example, which I use, to illustrate, that in rules, "ONE BOOT DOESN'T FIT ALL"

CLIMATE CHANGE MEASURES + REASONS FOR DOUBTING PERCENTAGE OF

FOSSIL FUEL/HUMAN INVOLVEMENT

- I believe "Climate Change" largely cyclical + natural, relatively small human input.
 - In the past tree rings indicate similar dry periods, usually followed by a wet one.
 - Several ancient civilisations show very strong indications of having been destroyed by drought, not a lot of humans + no great use of fossil fuel then!
 - I note that in Global Warming graphs, most show significant temperature rise in the early 1990s, but reasonably stable to present, which to me indicates an external influence at work.
 - Heard, short time ago, that other monitored planets, in our solar system, also show warming trend, over similar time frame, coincidence???
 - Wasn't much said about "climate change" in the generally above average rainfall period, (Murray/Darling Basin) 1950s - 1970s, irrigation licences "given out like lollies"
 - Causing over allocation of water, encouraging large M.L.S. schemes, allowing water trading, taking advantage of the good times, not considering the possible "Seven Fat cows, followed by seven lean cows" scenario, which is exactly what has occurred/is occurring!
 - Second half of 20th century, markedly wetter than first.
 - Heard W.R.C. officer, in Court case at Moree, in 1981, state with conviction, in a case concerning large water licences for cotton growing "that any water that reaches the end of a tributary is wasted!"
 - What a ridiculous OFFICIAL viewpoint

totally at variance to now, sadly got a lot of people taking this view, use water near its source don't let escape, financially good short term; disastrous environmentally, kills rivers + ecosystem.

- Believe current drought is largely "years of plenty" in reverse; remember Australia definitely is a land of "Droughts + flooding rains"

HYPOCRISY ABOUND.

- "Climate Change" talk you will note, is always POLITICALLY CORRECT, i.e. large cities etc. ("Eating up" farmland + bio-diversity) + totally unsustainable human population increase, which are the REAL + OBVIOUS causes of excessive CO₂ emissions, barely or rarely get a mention!!

- Reducing money for Agricultural research, vandalism to the sector, + the environment, certainly not doing anything to reduce emissions. "These Savings?" I recon, "Save a penny to spend a pound."

- Exporting as much coal + iron ore, as rapidly as we can dig them up, economically good, in short term.

- If CO₂ "Global warming" theory correct, disastrous for the environment,

- How about a bit left for later??

- Our "throw away" society, excessive garbage created, CO₂ created manufacturing it, more cleaning up.

- Excessively cheap items abound, many non-essential, financially I love it BUT believe is, sadly, bad in almost every way, largely just more junk, very few small items repairable!

GREENHOUSE GAS ABATEMENT.

- I am quite sceptical as to human caused global warming, percentage wise, but do believe emissions from fossil fuels should be reduced, my thoughts below.
- Why wasn't significant amount of the "Stimulus Package" invested in solar power plant trials? Would have been win/win, employment & green power for the future, recon wasted opportunity.
- Heard, March 14, that sugar mill co-generation plants in financial trouble, due to lower value of Renewable Energy Certificates, the Federal Government should definitely assist.
- Also illegal for the plants to access, for fuel, waste burnable materials from demolished houses, goes to land-fill! Similarly illegal to use trees removed from new housing sites, OK to be burnt on site, how stupid can our laws get?
- E.T.S. I can't see, if brought in, sadly that it's much more than a "feel good" item, a big money spinner for large banks & open, I believe to robbing.
- Some form of tax better, still don't like, but, I think the better, if unavoidable.
- Compensating consumers for more than the expected additional cost of "Green Power" CRAZY!
- Politically acceptable, environmentally ridiculous.
- To work it's got to be somewhat more expensive, to everyone.
- We definitely should be reducing CO₂ emissions, precautionary; of even more importance is reducing reliance on fossil fuels, are a very finite resource, and should be conserved, also as they tend to "run out", extracting them will be increasingly more environmentally damaging.

15195 6/6

• Treating animal emissions, same as fossil fuel crazy, is part of natural cycle.

• Trees + pasture would, virtually always sequester more than produced, thus not adding.

• Only recognising mono-culture tree plantations, as carbon sequesters; CRAZY agro forestry, on farms much better, environmentally, ecologically + economically.

• The argument that other sequestration types too hard to quantify, believe "cop out" over simplification, trees grow at different rates, so what real difference.

• Better farming methods also more environmentally friendly, reduced tillage, etc.

I conclude by noting that I am sceptical + believe that what we do will not be "magic", but that we should definitely be reducing our reliance on fossil fuels + thus reducing our CO₂ emissions, as sensible, for thinking people, as they are very finite resource.
Use carrots not sticks, better for all

Thanking you in anticipation,

Yours faithfully

REX ANDREWS.