

**From:**  
**To:** [Committee, MDBP \(SEN\)](#)  
**Subject:** Willing sellers  
**Date:** Wednesday, 16 September 2015 7:54:25 AM

---

It is often quoted that the water purchased for the MDBA plan was from willing sellers. My experience through the millennium drought was disastrous , financially. I grew crops for eight years of the 10 years with very little yield and in some cases the crop was not harvested. These crops were expensive to plant.

Farm overheads had to be paid ,including my Murray Irrigation charges for my water licences which were approximately \$30,000 per year and for most of those years very little water was received.

When you add the crop expenses , the Murray Irrigation fess and charges and an increased loan margin from the bank for being outside the loan agreement you end up with a vast amount of money to be repaid.

The decision to either sell out all together or sell part of your water had to be made.

Selling your farm in a drought is a poor decision in most cases. In my case my family has been on this farm for five generations .

Selling part of my water was the only option for my farm. My bank was anxious for me to sell part of my water to get my loan back within its limits. I was not alone. I have discussed this aspect of water buybacks with many farmers and they were in the same position as me.

Unless there is a dictionary somewhere in the bowels of the MDBA that has another interpretation of "willing", I will stick with the interpretation that I have known all my life and tell you that at least 90% of sellers of water were forced or coerced.

Graeme Pyle