

R v E. A. Stanford.

27th February, 2010

Senate Finance & Public Administration Committee

P.O. Box 6100

Parliament House

Canberra, A.C.T. 2600

SUBMISSION:-

We purchased our 1392 H freehold property 3-1-2002 with the intentions of making a living for my wife & myself. We are now 73 years old, & not wanting to access the Old age Pension so long as we are able to keep ourselves on the land. (8 years of pension saved). This property was overrun with regrowth, which we have partly cleared, leaving enough vegetation for nature to thrive in. (Birds & animals).

We applied to clear 98 hectares of an area of 150ha - which is old re-growth country. This application was sent to Natural Resources & Mines on 15-6-2002 which was acknowledged.

This application was not processed until 13-1-2004 and was refused. Part of the Report read:- Both soil & water salinity levels were checked. All readings were low. However there is a possibility that salt contained in the soil in the transmission zone between the proposed clearing & the potential & known discharge areas might be mobilised in the future. This part of our property is virtually useless for grazing with thickening regrowth & bad erosion. The properties we have previously owned we all left in better condition than when we purchased them. Since the Vegetation Management Act the land owner has no control over their land, which they bought improved at great cost. This land has been stolen from us by a non democratic government. What ever happened to 'a fair go'? We feel we are owed compensation for loss of income.

Yours faithfully,

Hon + Elizabeth Stanford.