----Original Message----

From:

Sent: Tuesday, 21 August 2012 1:15 PM

To: EHPP Landscapes & Ecosystems Section Mailbox

Subject: Submission on the Review of the NSW Native Vegetation Regulation

I write with regard to serious problems with the current native vegetation laws and the Review now in process.

The current Review has so far ignored major economic, social and environmental costs imposed by the Native Vegetation Regulation.

For these reasons, I reject the proposed Native Vegetation Regulation.

I call on the government to move towards the repeal of the Native Vegetation \mbox{Act} and $\mbox{Regulation}$ by re-doing the Regulatory \mbox{Impact} Statement properly.

I submit that the Regulatory Impact Statement must wherever possible quantify the costs of the Regulation that were ignored, including:

the extent to which the native vegetation Regulation promotes weeds, and is actively worse for biodiversity, sustainability and native ecology

- * the costs in terms of reduced productivity
- * the cost of all federal, state and local government salaries, taxation, superannuation, all leave categories, offices, cars, phones, mobile phones, training, travel, and accommodation devoted to promoting, making, administering and enforcing the native vegetation laws
- $\ ^{\star}$ the time and money costs to all farmers of compliance, administration and resource allocation
 - * the number of jobs, businesses and industries destroyed
- $\ ^{\star}$ the number of people dispossessed of their farms as a result of the native vegetation laws
- $\,\,^*$ the extent to which the native vegetation laws have reduced local council services including roads due to the funds they would need to comply with
- * the difference between the value of land impacted by Native Vegetation Regulation as opposed to land un-impacted.
- * the high value of the principles of innocent until proven guilty, protection from search without warrant, the privilege against self-incrimination, Constitutional protection of property rights, etc.
- $\,\,$ $\,$ reduction in the quantity of food and clothing produced and the need for agriculture to produce far more that it currently does to meet world food requirements

*

Yours sincerely Lionel Delaney

Rylstone 2849