

Submitted on Sunday, October 28, 2018 - 14:58

DETAILS

Company: [REDACTED]
First name: Clive
Last name: Edwards
Address: [REDACTED]
Suburb: [REDACTED]
State: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Phone: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]
Sector: Agriculture

NATIVE VEGETATION CLEARING

1 . Would a strategic approach to clearing, through a strategic purpose permit, benefit you?

Response: no
Comments:

2. Is the 'purpose component' reasonable to apply considering the added complexity of assessing this type of clearing permit?

Response: unsure
Comments:

3. Is the proposed fee structure fair and does it adequately reflect differences in the financial capacity of clearing permit applicants?

Response: unsure
Comments:

4. What is the likely impact on your business or industry of the proposed clearing fee structure?

Comments:

None as my land is cleared

5. Additional comments regarding Native Vegetation Clearing not addressed in the questions above.

Comments:

WATER

6. Do you consider it reasonable for taxpayers to pay 100 per cent of the cost of assessing water licence and permit applications and if so, why?

Response: no

Comments:

My major concern here is that those that are involved in the agriculture sector should have access to their water for free after having to pay for all of the associated costs in accessing and then maintaining the infrastructure to keep the water flowing. Nearly all of the income and profit generated by the agriculture and livestock sector, especially the fruit and veg and other smaller intensive operations, stay in the local or wider community.

Whereas the mining sector, who only appear to be paying less than \$1m of the proposed \$30m to be raised, send the vast majority of their \$Billions profits offshore. They should be made to pay the majority of the \$30m as a form of social tax to help offset and safeguard our ability to feed the population. They use an incredible amount of groundwater that has had an enormous effect on numerous aquifers throughout our state with very little remuneration for the privilege. In several communities this has caused a great deal of argument between farmers, local shires and the mining companies in who should be allocated how much of the resource.

7. If water licence and permit assessment fees were introduced, what do you consider to be an appropriate fee for a water licence or permit application?

Comments:

The cost born by the agriculture sector should be the absolute bare minimum, if any at all.

As I have stated, I think the mining sector and possibly the big end of the agriculture sector should bare the brunt of any cost recovery by government.

8. Would you consider a risk-based model for determining water licence and permit application fees to be appropriate? If not, what basis could the department use to structure fees?

Response: yes

Comments:

I think risk based is fine but that where agriculture is involved there should only be restrictions on the quantities that are allowed to be taken by those with bores. Not a fee attached to their quota unless they wish to trade it.

9. What would be the likely impact on your business or industry if water licence and permit fees were introduced?

Comments:

Like many small operators the impact is significant. It is another cost along with all the other government fees and charges that are already levied against us in trying to provide the public with the best and freshest produce for a reasonable price.

*10. If water licence and permit assessment fees were introduced, how could the collection of fees be

timed to better support your business or industry?

For example, would you benefit from paying fees up front, at the end of a licence assessment or annualised over the term of the licence?*

Response: unsure

Comments

I don't want to have to pay any fees!

11 . Additional comments regarding Water licences and permits not addressed in the questions above.

Comments:

This issue was brought up by the Liberals when they were in power several years ago and was strongly rejected by Labor then and argued as an attack on our ability to feed the state for a fair price. As a result it was quickly withdrawn and forgotten.

Now that Labor is in power and looking to raise money from every avenue possible it is now seen as a perfectly viable method of having the very sector that is surviving on tight shoestring budgets have to bare the brunt of \$\$\$s to be raised while mining companies with multi billion dollar profits who probably use many more megalitres than they report pay a pittance!