

The Impact of Regulations –  
Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999

Introduction

A number of points need to be considered:

- a) Australia – as a continent – is Geologically old.
- b) The topsoil depth of the continent is thin.
- c) The mineral content of the topsoil is poor.
- d) The applications of European farming practices are not (and have not been) suitable to the Australian continent.
- e) The application of European water catchment, storage and distribution methods are not (and have not been) suitable to the Australian continent.

---

In the light of the above points, it is not necessary to consider the “implications of the new regimes”, rather, do the regulations address the issues raised in the introduction.

It is essential that we live with the Australian continent i.e. developing a broader view of how the mineral content of the soil, the rainfall distribution and the seasonal temperature variations set the parameters of how we are to effectively and efficiently utilise the Australian continent.

Utilisation, meaning productive farming (animal and plant) practices within the parameters naturally established.

This means non-European practices.

It means developing Australian practices.

However, if we wish to alter the parameters – which the annual drought AND the stripping of land of natural vegetation in order to expose low mineral content soil for short-term crop growing, consistently underlines that we do – under which Australian practices can flourish, then we need to examine these parameters and whether they can be altered, without long-term damage being the outcome.

The latter, quite naturally, must be the premise on which any action is built.

After all a country that cannot produce to feed itself, cannot produce for export and must, therefore, import. The economic effects of that scenario are all too apparent.

Which parameters affect Australian practices?

As has been stated:

- a) Temperature
- b) Rainfall
- c) Mineral content of the topsoil.

Which of these parameters can be altered so as to improve Australian practices without long-term damage? None.

However, number 2 is not what it seems.

It is not the amount of annual rainfall on the Australian continent that is the problem. It is the European solutions/practices that have been applied to the catchment and distribution of rainfall that have set the parameters and so have caused the annual problems, and so have set the long-term direction and damage to Australia.

Couple this European approach of water usage to European approaches to crop production and husbandry, and we have the combination (along with completely ignoring the fact that this Australia not Europe), which has brought us to the present state of affairs.

Mineral content of the soil determines productivity more than abundant supplies of carbon dioxide, water and sunlight.

It is the Law of Limiting Factors.

The introduction of large-scale European monoculture farming to a low mineral environment meant high returns, initially, followed by annually lower returns.

Unless, of course, you choose to

- a) constantly add chemical “fertilisers” to artificially raise the mineral content – with the subsequent side effects of which we are all aware in rivers and along on-shore coastlines.
- b) strip Native vegetation to expose more low mineral content soil for more monoculture production..... and the cycle is self-generating.

We have yet to address the damage done to the Native Australian fauna and flora – which are essential to the micro and macro ecological environments that as an integrated whole make up the natural, living environment called Australia.

Arising from the above are the Ethical and Moral obligations that we have as occupiers and users of the land to other native species – if, of course, such obligations exist within ourselves or have they become subservient to the Agricultural economic drive of the State/Commonwealth?

Yet we are well aware of the perilous state of the “Australian” Agricultural Economy due to the employment of European practices.

Finally, what considerations have been given to the Australians who husband the land?

The decimation of their lives and lives in the associated communities are shown each year, across the Nation, in print and on screen.

Their devastation is due to agricultural practices imported from Europe and rigorously and vigorously applied to a non-European continent.

Their devastation is due to water practices imported from Europe and rigorously and vigorously applied to a non-European continent.

Both State and Federal Governments have supported both sets of practices, rigorously and vigorously, throughout Australia’s brief History.

Now it is time to change.

Quite literally, before it is too late.

I would be intrigued to hear the Moral and Ethical defence for the amount of taxpayer’s money spent on protection against potential/virtual foes of the Australian

Nation – while it fast approaches an inability to feed its people and the land is degrading under our feet.

The task of altering water catchment+distribution methods and altering farming practices in order to sustain food production and communities across Australia will require a National approach.

It will require non-partisan politics and politicians.

It will require non-partisan States and Territories.

It will, in fact, require Australia to become a Nation, united towards saving the land on which we depend and developing a relationship with the continent that is truly Australian.

Gerard Flanagan

3<sup>rd</sup> June 2003