

Whorouly South  
Victoria

Regulation of Australian Agriculture,  
Productivity Commission.  
Locked Bag 2, Collins St. East PO,  
Melbourne VIC 8003.

SUBMISSION ISSUES PAPER December 2015  
from Alison G Walpole 5<sup>th</sup> February 2016

For over 60 years I have been involved in Agriculture in Victoria, Australia. A history of good years, drought years, fires, floods, the Korean wool boom, the cattle depression and now what is called "THE GREAT

st , advertisement Public  
Notices Wangaratta Chronicle 29<sup>th</sup> January 2016 and Submission No 360 Senate Select  
Committee Inquiry into Murray Darling Basin Plan 14<sup>th</sup> October 2015 David Evans, Chairman  
Upper Catchment Committee, Victoria.

I believe The Council of Australian Governments (COAG) administered through the Office of  
the Prime Minister enables by passing of parliamentary control of regulation of Land Tenure and  
Land Planning, constitutionally State responsibilities, now influenced by Federal  
(Commonwealth) Law in the WATER ACT 2007(cmth) and ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION  
and BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION ACT 1999(cmth) ( EPBC ).

2/

Direct connection between LAND TENURE and FINANCE is influenced by “water trading”, over allocation of water systems and poorly administered property rights. The current call for a Royal Commission Inquiry into the Murray Darling Basin Authority (MDBA) and Murray Darling Basin Plan (MDBP) indicates the seriousness of the situation. There is also concern in rural communities regarding Foreign Ownership of Agricultural Land as small areas are purchased and accumulated. Will there be law to prevent introduction of foreign labor to, and direct export of produce from, these foreign owned properties by passing government control?

I WELCOME YOUR INQUIRY. I trust you will ensure there is a major effort to ensure contact, discussion and response from Australia’s many small farming businesses and communities.

The current Victorian Government Review of WATERWAYS is relevant to your inquiry. I attached copy my submission available as a public document,

ALISON G WALPOLE  
5<sup>th</sup> February 2016.

The Commonwealth Water Act 2007 commenced on March 3, 2008, to "reform" water management in Australia. It established the Murray-Darling Basin Authority (MDBA), with the power to "manage" Basin water resources, adopting a centralist approach, rather than continue the state-by-state basis which was the former status quo.

The MDBA managed the water resources of the Murray-Darling Basin through the Basin Plan which set out legally binding "sustainable version limits", that is so-called sustainable limits on the quantity of water that farmers can take from surface and groundwater sources. As well, the MDBA measures and monitors water resources and plays an advisory role, offering advice to the Commonwealth Minister for Climate Change and Water. The Water Act 2007 also established water charge rules, adapted within a market framework, embracing "efficient" water pricing, water markets and trade, with the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC) standing by to ensure that the water market is played according to the rules of the free market economic game. As has been said, the MDBA prepares a Basin Plan that places limits on both the surface and groundwater that can be taken on a "sustainable basis" - this is known as the "long-term sustainable diversion limits". All of this is within the context of articulating an environmental water plan which allegedly optimises environmental outcomes for the Basin through watering priorities, environmental objectives and Basin water resource targets.

As well, rules about the trading of water rights are also given. In short the relevant thrust of the Water Act 2007 for farmers was the establishment of legally enforceable limits of the amount of water that can be taken from the Basin for, we see, environmental matters. That meant - much less water.

#### **The Environmentalist Agenda**

Mick Keogh in the Ag Forum (Farm Institute.org, October 20, 2010) rightly says that environmental issues have dominated the issue of the interpretation of the requirements of the Water Act 2007 and what the Murray Darling Basin Authority should consider in its plan. He notes that Malcolm Turnbull, who at October 20, 2010 was the Minister who introduced the legislation, argued in an opinion piece in *The Sydney Morning Herald* that a "balancing act" is required between environmental and socio-economic factors. Turnbull said: "Finalisation of the Basin Plan inevitably involves balancing the claims of the environment against the requirements of agriculture and other water users in the basin. That is why, contrary to the claims of Simon Crean and Tony Burke, the 2007 Water Act expressly requires the authority and Minister to "act on the basis of the best available scientific knowledge and socio-economic analysis" and consider "the consumptive and other economic uses of basin water resources".

Mick Keogh readily shows that Turnbull's interpretation of the Water Act 2007 is flawed. Although the Act does mention consideration of socio-economic factors, this is done after first meeting the environmental requirements. Paul Kildea and George Williams, "The Water Act and the Murray-Darling Basin Plan", Public Law Review, volume 22, 2011, pp. 9-14, point out that while section 21 of the Act states that the Minister must take into account social and economic factors, subsection 21 (1) of the Act states that the Basin Plan is to implement international agreements "to the extent to which those agreements are relevant to the use and management of the Basin water resources". Subsection 4 (1) of the Act defines "relevant international agreement" to be (a) the RAMSAR Convention; (b) the Biodiversity Convention; (c) the Desertification Convention; (d) the Bonn Convention; (e) CAMBA; (f) JAMBA; (g) ROKAMBA; (h) the Climate Change Convention and (i) "any other international convention to which Australia is a party and that is; (i) relevant to the use and management of the Basin water resources; and (ii) prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this paragraph".

**This is indeed the entire environmentalist kitchen sink; and we can see the agenda of the New World Order here, the same globalist "one world" ideology as embodied in environmentalist/sustainable development programs such as the UN's Agenda 21.**

Readers would do well to consider an essay on the Basin Plan by our own Louis Cook in Economic Democracy. <http://www.alor.org/Economic%20Democracy/Guide%20to%20the%20Proposed%20Basin%20Plan.htm>

A related point has been made in a submission by Prof John Briscoe of Environmental Engineering, Harvard University, February 24, 2011, who saw "opportunistic politics" the real motivation for the Water Act 2007.

**To explain:** the Liberal Party sought to do something about Labour's environmental vote, while also ensuring further centralisation of power; as Prof Briscoe puts it, they came up with an "environmental Act in which Canberra would tell states and communities and farmers what to do".

This has led to a centralised planning approach which is intrinsic to the conceptual framework of the Water Act 2007 which is, Prof Briscoe says, a secretive Plan of: "we will run the numbers and the science behind closed doors and then tell you the result". Thus, science will tell the people what they are to do, but science alone dictate that 100% of the river waters should go to the environment because the native environment predated civilisation - thus leading to the extinction of farms and rural communities!

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page)

Prof Briscoe concluded his letter by saying: "I believe that the Water Act 2007 was founded on a political deception and that that original sin is responsible for most of the detour on which Australian water management now finds itself. I am well aware that unpredictability is an enemy and that there are large environmental, social and economic costs of uncertainty. But I also believe that Australia cannot find its way in water management if this Act is the guide. I would urge the Government to start again, to redefine principles, to engage all who have a stake in this vital issue, and to produce, as rapidly as possible, a new Act which can serve Australia for generations to come".

A further hint of dissatisfaction with the Water Act 2007 can be found buried in the Report of the Independent Review of the Water Act 2007, which has as one of its main conclusions that: "In relation to the interplay between the Act, State Legislation, the Murray-Darling Basin Agreement and the bodies they establish, many stakeholders maintain that the arrangements are overly complex, difficult to understand, poorly coordinated and in some instances duplicative. This has also contributed to a perception that costs - including costs imposed on water users - are both lacking in transparency and higher than might be the case under simple governance arrangements". If this is not a reason for a review of the very basis of the Water Act 2007, what could be?

### How Can We Fight This?

Readers may rightly wonder how all of this is possible given section 100 of the Australian Constitution which states: "The Commonwealth shall not, by any law or regulation of trade or commerce, abridge the right of a State or of the residence therein to the reasonable use of the waters of rivers for conservation or irrigation". That would seem to end the matter, but alas, it does not. In 2007 the Liberals asked the Basin States for a referral of powers under section 51 (xxxvii) of the Constitution, but Victoria held out on this. Consequently the Liberals ploughed ahead with the Act using a Dagwood Sandwich approach, combining its Constitutional powers of coercion, including the corporations power (section 51 (xx)), external affairs power (section 51 (xxix)), the trade and commerce power (section 51 (i)) and the power relating to acquisition of property (section 51 (xxxi)).

The approach adopted is that by slamming all of these powers together the Commonwealth is able to essentially get most of the legislation that it wants. We say "most" because when the Rudd regime took power the States did a limited referral of constitutional powers to the extent of enabling various amendments to the Water Act 2007 to be passed. This could indicate a possible constitutional legal weakness in the Act, namely that the Act has exceeded Commonwealth constitutional power. Indeed, as Paul Kildea and George Williams, "The Constitution and the Management of Water in Australia's Rivers", Sydney Law Review, vol. 32, 2010, pp. 595-616, note section 100 of the Constitution has not been considered by the High Court of Australia outside of the Tasmanian Dam Case (Commonwealth v Tasmania (1983) 158 CLR 1).

Nevertheless the High Court since its very beginning has pursued a centralist role which has essentially undermined Australian Federalism and we should not expect any radical defence of States rights to come from that source. See James Allan and Nicholas Aroney, "An Uncommon Court: How the High Court of Australia has Undermined Australian Federalism", Sydney Law Review, vol. 30, 2008, pp.245-294.

**In conclusion**, this battle must be a political one. It is made difficult by what Dr Katharine Betts in *The Great Divide*, (Duffy and Snellgrove, 1999) identified as a major fracture in Australian society between a "traditional" Australia, (*generally a rural outlook-ed*) and the globalist, cosmopolitan one, (*highly urban, comprised of a "new class" of professional-ed*). This growing body of anti-traditionalist - growing through mass migration - support environmentalism and the globalist concerns. They would thus support further Canberra centralised power.

Resisting this centralism and restoring power back to the people must be a key goal of any political movement aimed to reclaim traditional Australia. Hence there is no quick and easy answer to the "water problem" for farmers. We all need to remember that all the mainstream political parties have sold us out to the globalists on this and many other related issues. Thus there needs to be a concerted challenge against the globalist "values, philosophies and politics", inherit in the water and other centralist issues.

\*\*\*

### TO THE EDITOR

**To the AGE:** George Williams is right that 'the slide towards ever greater government power and fewer rights for the people needs to be stopped' ('The growing assault on our democratic rights', 28/12), but his remedy - the enactment of a bill of rights - is worse than the disease. It is wrong in principle that government should be entrusted with deciding what rights the people have, since some rights are, as it were, God-given.

If politicians cannot be counted on to uphold our most important rights, why are they able to be trusted to formulate and pass a suitable bill? It will be better if the public itself acts more decisively in its own interests and puts pressure on the Parliament to withdraw and amend offending legislation. Our intellectuals and religious leaders should lead the way and not be distracted by foolish campaigns for 'politically correct' sacred cows.

Nigel Jackson, Belgrave



# Do you have a right to farm?

I WAS interested in an article that I read in which the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP) is asking for Local Government assistance in making submissions on what effectively is the right to farm.

DELWP have formed an animal advisory committee to consider how the planning system can support the establishment and expansion of productive, competitive and market-responsible animal industries in Victoria, while balancing environmental outcomes and community expectations.

It is giving local government just four weeks to submit on a broad ranging, but still isolated part of agriculture.

The advisory committee is to provide advice to the Minister of Planning and the Minister for Agriculture on:

- the role and function of the planning system in supporting the establishment and expansion of



By **KEN CLARKE, WANGARATTA  
CERTIFIED PRACTISING  
ACCOUNTANT**

[kenclarke11@bigpond.com](mailto:kenclarke11@bigpond.com)

animal industries in the context of changing industry practice to increase production, be competitive and respond to market changes; and

- the adequacy of the definition of "intensive animal husbandry" in clause 74 of the Victorian Planning Provisions and all planning schemes having regard to emerging farming systems and practices, incremental changes to existing operations over time and changing consumer preference.

A discussion paper has been released and submissions are invited, but any submissions must be received by the close of business on February 5.

What are the issues?

Livestock production systems are changing.

On the one hand, free range pig and poultry production systems are growing to meet consumer demands, whilst on the other hand more intensive grazing and production systems are being adopted in the sheep, beef and dairy industries.

The trend towards more intensive production systems is likely to continue, some say it needs to continue if Victorian agriculture is to meet the growing overseas demand for its produce.

All livestock production systems have the potential for off-farm impacts on the environment and community. Community and local residents' expectations are changing with more 'non farming' or hobby farm residents living in farming zones.

Tourism-based agricultural enterprises, such as wineries with cellar door sales and restaurants, eco-tourism, and farm stays are taking

advantage of Victoria's rural amenity and increasing in number.

The Victorian Government has identified six priority sectors that will underpin the state's future economy and jobs growth.

The food and fibre sector, which includes animal industries, is one of these sectors.

In 2013-2014 it accounted for 48 per cent of the state's total goods exports, valued at \$11.8 billion.

The food and fibre sector employs 191,700 people and underpins the prosperity of many local communities across Victoria.

These communities each have their own particular mix of number, type and intensity of animal industries.

This variety can be understood in terms of different types of production systems.

Interesting to note that the overwhelming majority of Australia's cattle are raised on grass in pasture-based systems with only about 2 to 3

per cent being raised in feedlots.

The greater efficiency of feedlots means that feedlot cattle are responsible for about 34 per cent of beef production.

Grain feeding of dairy cattle is increasing, but the Australian dairy industry remains predominately pasture based.

The dairy industry has recognised five main feeding systems in Australia which range from predominantly pasture-based with low grain input to total mixed ration with no grazing.

In Victoria, most dairy is grazed pasture with moderate to high grain concentrate.

I would believe that there will be big changes to how farmers can operate into the future, local government will have a bigger say on what can and cannot happen, so if you are concerned, visit the DELWP website and download the discussion paper.

But there is not much time for your submission.

## Ombudsman files application in Supreme Court

**Monday 1 February 2016**

The Victorian Ombudsman has filed an application seeking a determination by the Supreme Court as to whether she has jurisdiction to investigate a recent referral from the Legislative Council.

A vote by the Legislative Council on 25 November 2015 referred to the Ombudsman for investigation allegations that ALP Members of the Victorian Parliament misused Members staff budget entitlements against the provisions of the Members Guide, and any other breach in relation to these allegations.

The referral was made under Section 16 of the Ombudsman Act.

In order to obtain legal clarity, the Ombudsman has elected to seek a declaration from the Supreme Court, pursuant to section 27 of the Ombudsman Act, on whether the matter is within jurisdiction.

"I have formed the view that there is genuine controversy as to my jurisdiction to investigate the matters in the Parliamentary referral.

"In the absence of any precedent on the scope of section 16 of the Act, to pre-empt any unnecessary cost being incurred, and given my role as an independent officer of the Parliament, I believe the present application is the most appropriate way to determine the matter," said Ms Glass.

The Ombudsman has written to the Legislative Council to advise that she will remain neutral on the question, and will be putting submissions to the Court to present both views about the scope of section 16 of the Act. A copy of the submissions will be provided to the Parliament prior to the hearing.

The Ombudsman is not available for interview.

The Ombudsman's affidavit filed with the court can be found [here](#).

Further information: Rory Cahill Tel 03 9613 6235 | Mob 0409 936 235  
[rory.cahill@ombudsman.vic.gov.au](mailto:rory.cahill@ombudsman.vic.gov.au) | Follow [@VicOmbudsman](#)

Water Bill  
Exposure Draft

Part 3.2—Statutory Rights

---

- (7) Subsection (6) does not apply to a use (other than domestic and stock use) of—
- (a) water from a spring or soak; or
  - (b) water in or from a private dam (to the extent that it is not rainwater supplied to the dam from the roof of a building).
- (8) A right conferred by this section is limited only to the extent to which an intention to limit it is expressly (and not merely impliedly) provided by—
- (a) this Act or the regulations; or
  - (b) a water resource management order; or
  - (c) any licence issued, or other authority given, under this Act; or
  - (d) any agreement made under this Act; or
  - (e) any other Act or any authority given under any other Act.

Note

See, for example, section 586.

- (9) This section does not authorise any act or omission that may—
- (a) cause any water to be polluted; or
  - (b) obstruct the flow of any water in a waterway; or
  - (c) erode or otherwise damage the surrounds of any waterway.

**35 Water corporation and Council rights to stormwater**

- (1) A water corporation has the right to take and use water that is in its stormwater works.
  - (2) A Council has the right to take and use water that is in its stormwater works.
-



- That the definition of waterway, particularly as it applies to running water, be amended to take account of physical characteristics such as size, length of stream etc. The Murray River is rather different to a furrow on a farm, or a small gully, where water runs from time to time.
- That the value of farm dams for aerial fire fighting purposes be acknowledged.

Further to the comments above, the definition of "waterway", on page 597 of the Draft is far too imprecise given the wide ranging provisions and disciplines provided for in the Draft Bill.

As noted above, as an example, a gutter dug with a shovel at the back of my machinery shed, some 50 metres long, runs spring water for six or eight weeks during the wet part of winter. By definition in the Bill, it is a waterway, and at least theoretically, subject to all the restrictions pertaining thereto.

It is somewhat different to the Murray River, covered by exactly the same definition!

We therefore submit the following amendment for consideration in Dictionary page 597, *waterway means – after the words "continuously or intermittently" add "and shall be further defined as (1) major rivers, (2) tributary rivers, (3) significant creeks, (4) minor creeks, being waterways with flow generally generated and largely or wholly situated on private land (5) any other minor drainage channel, including channels artificially created, and that all streams can only be subject to the provisions of this Act if proclaimed by regulation or like instrument after consultation by the Minister with relevant Authorities, including Catchment Management Authorities, and following consultation with affected communities, landowners and individuals, after advertising for submissions in a newspaper generally circulating in the area."*

This suggestion may, at first glance, seem a prodigious task, but we suggest that sections (1), (2) and (3) are probably already categorised, and need only confirmation, while (4) and (5) can be done on a district, parish or similar basis. The necessary maps are probably available from Google.

This finer definition, particularly for (4) and (5) will give a far more practical approach to land management, any disciplines in the many issues dealt with in the Bill, and a significant amount of sense in dealing with any works on private land.

---



[PDF] A WALPOLE (PDF FILE - 1-28- Depoultal.

8<sup>th</sup> July 2015

SUBMISSION

SEPP (Waters) Review,  
Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning,  
PO Box 500,  
MELBOURNE VIC 8002.

References

Submission Victorian Environmental Assessment Council 17<sup>th</sup> June 2015  
Letters to Wangaratta Chronicle 1<sup>st</sup> July 2015 by John Vance and Brian Fox.  
Letter to Wangaratta Chronicle 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2015 by Peter Walsh Leader of the Nationals.  
Letter to Wangaratta Chronicle 1<sup>st</sup> July as yet unpublished by Alison G Walpole.

I acknowledge receipt of hard copy State Environment Protection Policy (Waters) Review on 8<sup>th</sup> July 2015. Time limits prevent making a fully research submission.

BRIEFLY

Would you please forward hard copy of the stage 2 Discussion Paper immediately it is available.

Attached copy of my letter to Wangaratta Chronicle dated 1st July 2015 as yet unpublished. This letter records my concerns at the inadequate understanding by the community of the constitutional relationships and responsibilities between the Federal and State Governments and the constitutional relationship of Local Government to these two Governments.

My husband's family has held farming land in the catchment of the Whorouly Creek, Ovens River, Murray River Catchment for almost 100 years. Family diaries record the increasing difficulty to understand controls to land and water being introduced by the 3 levels of government.

Unfortunately decisions are being made by people lacking experience and understanding of basic history of the land and management. Land owners involved today in management lack time, opportunity and in some cases confidence to influence these decisions at grass roots level.

The list of questions in your discussion paper for response imposes directions not a consultation. The emphasis on internet response limits access<sup>etg</sup>, not all people are computer literate. There is need for return to personal contact by resident field officers, able to establish confidence from communities, to conduct background research and response.

Alison G Walpole  
Rural resident rate payer.



Copy

VICTORIAN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESMENT COUNCIL  
STATEWIDE ASSESSMENT OF PUBLIC LAND

SUBMISSION 17<sup>th</sup> June 2015.  
From MRS ALISON.G.WALPOLE.

REFERENCE, attached  
Submission Legislative Council Select Committee on Public Land Development 21<sup>st</sup> Sept 2007  
Supplementary 26<sup>th</sup> September 2007  
Letter to Director Victorian Environmental Assessment Council 5<sup>th</sup> October 2007  
Letter Mr Richard Willis Secretary Select Committee on Public Land Development Legislative Council Victoria v 14<sup>th</sup> January 2008.

It is my belief based on this attached documented information that Local Government in the Rural City of Wangaratta, at present controlled by appointed administrators, is making decisions about the use of Public Land without understanding of the history of the land or the communities in which it is situated,

An example, the attempt by the Rural City of Wangaratta to sell the Whorouly South Recreation Centre which includes the Crown Grant for a Scout Hall. Fortunately the Whorouly South Community aware of changes of land and families in their community were able to retain the land for future community residents to use.

The visits of Rural City of Wangaratta staff to Wangaratta Schools to present the development of a Splash Park as compensation for Council closure of the local Yarrunga swimming pool (developed by community residents) is an example of community manipulation.

I request full investigation of the history of public land prior to any consideration of change of use or sale. Local Government which is not recognized in the Australian Commonwealth Government constitution but controlled by the State Government, needs to be restored to control by elected local Councillors to restore democracy to rural communities.

Alison G Walpole.  
Resident rural ratepayer,  
Rural City of Wangaratta.

## LETTERS

### Pool closure swims against the tide

I COULDN'T help see the irony when reading last Friday's *Wangaratta Chronicle*.

I was reading a story where a state coroner was calling for mandatory swimming education and lessons for primary school children - a call which local principals and swimming educators strongly supported.

Yet all I could think of was the closure of the Yarrunga pool by our council administrators Ailsa Fox, Rod Roscholler and Irene Grant.

Brian Fox, Wangaratta

### Clearer labelling needed in politics

IT concerns me that the word independent is being misused.

It seems policy of certain parties to use the term "independent" to cover up for unspecified policies, which they then roll out as having been put together by public consultation.

The Independent Local Government Review Panel (2013) appears to be such a organisation.

Policies by the previous federal Labor Party were said to be in consultation with the general public, when in fact the panel revealed itself by its policies which mirrored the Labor Party's policies.

Then we have the locally elected MPs: in their campaign they ended up using the same policies as the locally unelectable party.

It's like buying a car without a brand name; until you drive it, and look under the bonnet, you won't know what you're getting.

The council previously, before 2013, made great noises about being a non-political party council, but standing behind costly environmental policies.

These now appear to be the major cost in council, as it tries to be "sustainable" and keeps putting up rates to our peril.

Surely, in this day and age, an honest political party should not be ashamed to admit their leanings and policies.

We should only look at people announcing proper policies, and anyone who does not do so must be looked at with great suspicion as having hidden aims which are detrimental to our

## WANGARATTA CHRONICLE web poll

Should same sex marriage be legalised?

wangarattachronicle.com.au



**NED'S LEGACY:** Wangaratta's Terry (left) and Lorraine Wisener received a \$1000 donation for Wangaratta's Carevan on Saturday from Ned Kelly Adventure Tours' Matt Shore. The co-founder of Beechworth's Ned Kelly Vault led a night tour of the Woolshed Valley and on to Glenrow commemerate the 135th anniversary of events that led to the Kelly Gang's capture on June 7 1880. Tour participants included descendants of the Sherritts and Lloyds - two families who played a pivotal role in the Kelly Gang saga. The presentation to Carevan - which provides meals three times a week for homeless and vulnerable people in Wangaratta - was made in Glenrowan's Billy Tea Room.

PHOTO: Jamie Krör

advancement in Australia.

We should not be fooled twice like has happened before.

John Vance, Wangaratta

### Ward system flawed by any measure

PERHAPS the waste management co-ordinator should have a talk with the general household, like me.

I see no need for green bins.

I use a compost bin; in go lawn clippings, weeds, leaves, veggie peelings and prunings and leftover food goes to the dog or neighbours' pets.

Administrators could maybe look to spending money on educating people in better household recycling rather than being browns cows and following other councils.

There will certainly be nothing for our household to place in a green bin.

Laurie Meloury, Wangaratta

### There's no secret about stage hit

WHEN a theatre is filled with laughter at a young woman almost slides under the seat front of her from helpless giggling, you know you've got a hit.

When sighs of recognition and the pin-drops of silence of heartfelt empathy emanates from entire audience, you know they've all fallen in love with a talented cast.

Mum's The Word, staged by Wangaratta's The Word, ran to full houses every night as word spread. Superbly acted, bring on the next one.

Marie Pond, Wangaratta

## YOUR SAY

WE welcome your letters to the Editor. Priority is given to typed/emailed letters under 250 words. Every letter must have your full name, address and a daytime phone contact number supplied for verification purposes. Any letter may be edited for reasons of space, content or legibility.

Email

edit.chronicle@nemedla.com.au

Website

wangarattachronicle.com.au

Fax

(03) 57219447

Post

Letters to the Editor

37 Rowan St, Wangaratta 3677

## Beyond the Black Stump

SO HOW'S THE BAND GOING?

I QUIT YESTERDAY IT WAS TOO TIRING

ALL THE LATE NIGHT PARTIES EH?

NO... I WAS PLAYING MY BASS...

THAT'S TIRING?

IT'S WHEN I A MARCHING BAND....

## LETTER

### Public has right to see regional Vic review now

THE State Government must release its review into regional Victoria immediately.

Former Labor Premier John Brumby has provided the government with his review into 'regional economic development and services'.

Yet his 61 recommendations will not be made public until Premier Daniel Andrews' Regional Development Minister, Jaala Pulford, releases her response in October – almost a year into this government.

Regional Victorians have every right to be very nervous about this review, considering Mr Brumby was the architect of the north-south pipeline and desal plant disasters.

We should not have to wait for the government to now review its own review.

Communities deserve to know what Mr Andrews and Ms Pulford are considering for their future.

I already have serious concerns about their Regional Jobs and Infrastructure Fund, which is already almost half-spent and being used to cost-shift money into Melbourne.

If the government has nothing to hide and regional Victorians have nothing to fear in this report, why can't it be released?

**Peter Walsh,**  
leader of the Nationals

Copy

1<sup>st</sup> July 2015 NB Deletion 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence 1<sup>st</sup> July version.

The Editor,  
Wangaratta Chronicle,  
PO Box 221,  
Wangaratta 3676

Dear Sir,

Letters in Wangaratta Chronicle 1<sup>st</sup> July 2015 from John Vance and Brian Fox give me hope we may yet achieve informed discussion of future development for Rural City of Wangaratta Local Government.

I welcome assurance from Acting CEO Alan Clark in a letter dated 10<sup>th</sup> June 2015 "We are aware of the IBAC ( Independent Broad-based Anti-corruption Commission ) public information session being held on 24<sup>th</sup> June 2015 and are considering our attendance," Present reports of the IBAC Inquiry into corruption in the Victorian Education Department give reason to suspect further exposure of corruption in the public service.

A full page advertisement Chronicle July 1<sup>st</sup> 2015 from Bridgett McKenzie "The Nations Senator for Victoria" leads me to question how much she understands Federal, State and Local Governments authority and responsibility to Australian Land Owners. In Victoria the State Government controls water and land titles. However over the years, since Federation, Inter-Government Agreements have been signed between the Federal and State Governments. For example what is the present situation with regard to the Murray Darling Basin. The Federal electorate of INDI covers the headwaters of the Murray River. Independent Senator Madigan has recently called for a fresh review of the Murray Darling Basin proposed legislation.

How will this affect Victorian Farmers ? Currently the Victorian Government has announced a review of the Victorian Water Act 1989 covering all surface water and all ground water in Victoria. The discussion paper is open for public comment until 13<sup>th</sup> July 2015. A situation with wide affects on land valuation and the financial industry.

The Prime Minister Tony Abbott has invited State Leaders to discuss Federal/State relations and the Australian Commonwealth Constitution with him in a forum without the presence of public servants. Surely we need more information to discuss these matters, whether around the kitchen table or with our elected representatives. before policies are announced for the coming Federal election.

Alison G Walpole  
Rural resident ratepayer Rural City of Wangaratta.

NB DELITION.

Copy

1<sup>st</sup> July 2015

The Editor,  
Wangaratta Chronicle,  
PO Box 221,  
Wangaratta 3676

Dear Sir,

Letters in Wangaratta Chronicle 1<sup>st</sup> July 2015 from John Vance and Brian Fox give me hope we may yet achieve informed discussion of future development for Rural City of Wangaratta Local Government. ~~Actions of public servants to introduce development of regional governments without explanation from previous and the present State Governments control of the situation has been lacking eg in Hume Region.~~

I welcome assurance from Acting CEO Alan Clark in a letter dated 10<sup>th</sup> June 2015 "We are aware of the IBAC ( Independent Broad-based Anti-corruption Commission ) public information session being held on 24<sup>th</sup> June 2015 and are considering our attendance," Present reports of the IBAC Inquiry into corruption in the Victorian Education Department give reason to suspect further exposure of corruption in the public service.

A full page advertisement Chronicle July 1<sup>st</sup> 2015 from Bridgett McKenzie "The Nations Senator for Victoria" leads me to question how much she understands Federal, State and Local Governments authority and responsibility to Australian Land Owners. In Victoria the State Government controls water and land titles. However over the years, since Federation, Inter-Government Agreements have been signed between the Federal and State Governments. For example what is the present situation with regard to the Murray Darling Basin. The Federal electorate of INDI covers the headwaters of the Murray River. Independent Senator Madigan has recently called for a fresh review of the Murray Darling Basin proposed legislation.

How will this affect Victorian Farmers ? Currently the Victorian Government has announced a review of the Victorian Water Act 1989, covering all surface water and all ground water in Victoria. The discussion paper is open for public comment until 13<sup>th</sup> July 2015. A situation with wide affects on land valuation and the financial industry.

The Prime Minister Tony Abbott has invited State Leaders to discuss Federal/State relations and the Australian Commonwealth Constitution with him in a forum without the presence of public servants. Surely we need more information to discuss these matters, whether around the kitchen table or with our elected representatives, before policies are announced for the coming Federal election.

Alison G Walpole  
Rural resident ratepayer, Rural City of Wangaratta.