

Letter to Andrew Constance MP Prue Acton 05.10

Dear Andrew

I find it impossible to understand why, in the press, you are only bagging forest protesters at Mumbulla Mountain who have tried every avenue through this dreadful Labor government and their shockingly run department of forestry.

Despite this being a public asset you stand by whilst the road into the major tourism destination, Mumbulla Falls, is gutted, and now the water catchment of oyster growers is logged.

You have not stood up for the traditional owners whose Aboriginal Places were trashed by the illegal logging carried out under FNSW supervision. What compensation are they to be given? Will you stand up and ask this in Parliament?

The rules governing forests are so tight, thanks to Bob Carr and John Howard, that it seems only Sartor can take McDonald to task. So if ministers won't act and the opposition is scared then what can the people do to stop this degradation?

There are a few machines, worth millions of dollars governments have paid for, racing through thousands of trees in days – how many jobs in that?

And for what - 95% woodchips to be sold at a taxpayer loss in a world market that does not want native forest chips? The markets are demanding at very least FSC; Gunns and Tasmanian forests are on their knees; there are few ships docking at Eden; like Gunns, Nippon Paper is unpopular so they will find their sales continue to erode – “dead koala” woodchips and power is not a good look.

When will you stand up to Labor instead of supporting them?

Surely you do not support the continued woodchipping of our forests whilst the regions threatened and endangered animals list grows? And whilst logging is proven to dry out forests making them more fire prone, reducing water supplies and affecting rainfall?

And with the option of sequestering carbon - around 2% of Australia's CO₂ emissions come from SEFE.

It is not about jobs; this is a dying forestry sector; other archaic industries have failed; workers need structural packages to move on.

You could tie in the stand-off over commercialization of National Parks by suggesting that State Forest additions could be special reserves allowing more commercial activities but not intensive logging currently driven by loss making, unwanted woodchips.

Regards

Prue