

SENATE INQUIRY
Into
THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF RURAL WIND FARMS

Submission By
JOCELYN MITCHELL

This submission is a personal account of my experiences over four years from the time I became aware of a proposed wind farm in the vicinity of my home in 2006 through the panel hearing in May/June 2010

Jocelyn Mitchell
(...)

5 February, 2011

Summary

Submission by Jocelyn Mitchell

Life on an historic farming property, Heritage listed garden and major Arts and Crafts house – before and after a proposal to erect a wind project in the area	3
Community Relations	7
Landscape	10
Flora and Fauna	12
Noise and Health	13
Heritage	13
Final Comments	14
Biography of the Author	17

My home until recently was at Mawallok where for almost 30 years I have spent all my available time and much of our family's farming income on the restoration and maintenance of the Heritage listed garden and the major Arts and Crafts house at Mawallok, our property close to Stockyard Hill. Mawallok is a historic rural property settled in 1842 is situated in the picturesque stony rise country around Stockyard Hill in Victoria. The landscape is part of the Victorian Volcanic plains and remains little changed from the time when the explorer Major Mitchell crossed the Pyrenees (which he named) in 1837. According to his biography, he was so enchanted with the area he called it "Australia Felix".

The property, according to the Australia-wide manager of a prestigious rural real estate company, is "considered one of the finest true "station" type properties in the Western District and is, without question, in the top 2% of rural holdings in Victoria". It is renowned for its superb water supply which comes from a number of springs and its fine wool growing pastures.

Mawallok is also well known as one of the major historic gardens in Australia and indeed is also known to overseas garden enthusiasts. It is included in the British publication "1001 GARDENS you must see before you die." It is acknowledged by garden experts as the best William Guilfoyle (designer of the Melbourne Botanic Gardens) garden remaining in private hands today. The garden is on the National estate register and is listed by Heritage Victoria.

Today, virtually all of the original buildings on the property survive and are still used for the purpose for which they were built.

The property is exceptionally well watered by three springs which arise in the paddocks. Two of these springs supply a high pressure water main around the whole property for stock water and irrigation. The largest spring also directly provides water for 5 houses, the garden, machinery sheds and workshops.

The name Mawallok derives from the aborigines who were camped at the spring when the first settlers arrived in 1842. They were asked what they called the place and replied "Mawallok", indicating the noise of the bull frogs at the spring.

The Russell family were the first settlers at Mawallok in 1842 and the following five generations of their family farmed there until my family purchased it in 1980.

The property has many historical associations apart from its rural history: with noted architect Rodney Alsop of Alsop & Klingender who designed the present Arts and

Crafts house in 1908; with William Guilfoyle, the second Director of the Melbourne Botanic Gardens who designed the garden in 1909, and with Sir John Monash, who engineered the damming of the main spring to form the present lake. The house is now over 103 years old and the garden 102 this year.

There are a number of other historical buildings on the property apart from the main homestead, these include an earlier (1857 and 1869) bluestone homestead, bluestone stables, bluestone coach house and a number of ancillary buildings associated with farming, the blacksmith shop, men's quarters, pump house, shearing shed and Managers cottage. All these buildings are registered by Heritage Victoria.

The present homestead and garden were carefully designed to take advantage of the view across the lawns and lake to Mt. Cole and both house and garden remain remarkably unchanged and true to their creators' vision since their construction.

Soon after taking over the property, and with expert advice and help, I began to restore and rejuvenate the garden. Whilst there had been changes over previous years, the general layout of the garden and most of the original trees and shrubs were still there. A decision was taken at the outset to restore and maintain the garden as close as possible to Guilfoyle's original design and plantings. For example, one of the first projects undertaken with the help of the original plan was to restore Guilfoyle's signature winding paths on either side of the garden where an earlier generation had straightened them.

Over the succeeding years, with a large amount of effort and expense, the garden improved greatly. However, the cost of maintaining it was extremely onerous and far more than we had anticipated. After considering a number of options to help with the expense it was decided to set up a plant nursery specializing in unusual plants and hardy plants, many propagated from the garden to help defray the garden expenses.

For the next 12 years I worked firstly to set up the wholesale and retail nursery. As the business grew I was soon employing 3 local women to help with the propagation of plants, sales and distribution. All this time the garden with 2 employees had to be managed as well. It was 12 years of extremely hard work but of course it had its rewards. The income helped with garden expenses and people came from near and far to visit the garden and nursery.

All this time the garden was open to anyone who was interested. We had countless tours, many of which came from interstate and some from overseas. Horticultural students, garden clubs, Probus groups, handicapped groups and many others visited the garden. The income from the nursery and garden visits helped with garden expenses, and local women, all farmers wives, had employment that otherwise would be extremely difficult for them to find.

In addition to these tours the garden was opened 15 times for Australia's Open Garden Scheme, and functions for local charities. Later concerts in the garden were held with approximately 1000 people attending, in aid of the Royal Children's Hospital and the National Stroke Foundation. Several Christmas Fairs were also held in aid of CARE Australia, a major Australian overseas aid organization of which I was a Director. Many local young people came to have their wedding photos taken in the garden, neighbours with visitors from overseas or with an interest in gardens were always welcome.

My family and I always felt that we were custodians of the property and as such a special and historical place it was right and proper that we should share it with anyone who was interested.

From the mid nineties on with the onset of drought, I noticed that many of the Western District great gardens were gradually being lost or contracted as water became scarcer and farm incomes declined. I felt very lucky to have such a good water supply from the main spring at the bottom of the garden. The Mawallock garden is an oasis during the hot summers and visitors are astounded when they arrive from the dry and brown countryside, walk around to the front of the house and see the lush green lawns and the magnificent vista across them to Mt Cole.

Late in 2006 we heard about a proposal for a wind farm in the area, and were told by a neighbour that a number of turbines were to be sited on a low range of hills which run across the landscape between the garden and the view to Mt Cole. On making enquiries, we found that a wind company had been quietly approaching certain landholders in the area and that a number of farmers and neighbours had agreed to host wind turbines on their land. None of these neighbours had told us, or indeed had discussed this with us and we found that other neighbours who had not been offered turbines knew nothing about it either.

On calling the Pyrenees Shire for information about the project, we found that they did not know anything about the project either in spite of the fact that they had

worked closely with the same proponent on two other wind projects in the shire. Residents of the towns of Beaufort and Skipton were also unaware of the project. It was a deliberately secretive exercise.

Although at this time we did not know much about wind turbines, we became concerned that they would compromise the vista of the garden as well as the amenity of our home.

Anxious for information, 2 members of the family attended a meeting called by the proponent in a nearby hall. There they were in for a shock. The meeting consisted mainly of farmers who were prospective stakeholders and who were extremely hostile to them and other locals who had come seeking some information. It was a very unpleasant experience and on returning from the meeting, the family members were upset and shaken to the extent that they called the police and locked the front gate fearing that threats made to them and others at the meeting would be carried out.

Soon after, my husband Peter called the proponent and arranged to meet the Managing Director in Melbourne to discuss the effect of the proposed turbines on Mawallok. He took photos of the garden to the meeting but the director had no interest in looking at them. Instead he made a proposal that if he took the turbines off the ridge in front of Mawallok would Peter agree not to oppose the project. Peter did not answer the question as it was hypothetical and not an offer, also he felt that at this time he did not believe he could trust him.

He also did not feel he had enough knowledge of the project or indeed wind power and what it entailed to make a decision. Twice, directors of Wind Power were invited to visit Mawallok to see the place and the garden, however, these invitations were never taken up.

As word of the project spread, a number of locals became concerned about the effect the turbines might have on their homes, the landscape and in particular on the broilgas which breed in our area. Broilgas are much loved, and the bush telegraph swings into action whenever a nest is spotted or even if they are about. There was much concern about their numbers which were in decline because of the dry years we had experienced. So a number of neighbours got together and decided to form the Western Plains Landscape Guardians, (WPLGA). There was a lot of interest and in a short space of time close to 100 people had joined the association.

From the outset the Association decided not to oppose wind farms projects but to work to protect the landscape, flora and fauna and to ensure that turbines were sited where they did not disrupt people's lives, cause environmental damage or decrease property values.

Around this time I visited a number of neighbours whom I believed had agreed to host turbines to ask them why they were doing so. Most said simply that they needed the money, which was understandable considering the drought conditions we were experiencing. Not one said that they were concerned about clean/green energy or saving greenhouse gas.

When I tried to discuss the fact that there were some negatives about wind farms, especially if they were too close to houses, there was complete denial. The company had told them that turbines don't make a noise had assured them that everybody liked them. Also, since their neighbours had agreed to have them, they may as well, as they would be surrounded by them anyway. They were not told of any possible negatives. In short, the proponent had done a good brainwashing job.

The proponent was fortunate in their timing- our area had been in drought for about 8 years at the time so farmers were really hurting. A lot of the farms in the Stockyard Hill area are soldier settler blocks and holdings are not extensive, in fact, there are few large holdings in the area and so it is closely settled compared to most parts of the Western District.

At this time my family began to seriously research wind power. It was impossible to obtain information about the project from the proponent. Most of our information came from experiences from projects overseas and other Landscape Guardian groups in Australia. It appeared typical of Wind companies world wide that they would sign people up in secret before releasing any information to local government, local townships or people who may be affected by their project.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS

The SHWF project was clouded from the start by secrecy, misinformation and non-disclosure of critical information. The company caused major confusion and significant community division and hostility through their actions in the community. These impacts will be long lasting and have caused irreparable damage to the fabric of rural life in our district.

The WPLG (of which I was chair at the time) met willingly with Socum who were appointed by the proponent to conduct their community relations. After discussions we gave them a list of questions for the proponent. When they eventually came back to us, our questions had been rephrased and so the replies were completely uninformative and unsatisfactory. After several meetings it appeared Socum no longer worked for the proponent and that they had employed a single person as a community liaison officer to deal with the local populace.

This officer arranged 2 or 3 “information days” over the next year. These were held at the tiny Lake Goldsmith Hall. Lake Goldsmith consists of this small bluestone Hall sitting alone in the countryside. People in the townships of Beaufort & Skipton were unlikely to attend as generally only very local events are held there. Of course, it was in the heart of potential stakeholder properties.

At the first of these, many non-stakeholders attended hoping to get some information and answers to their questions, but found it was a complete waste of time. The mantra was repeated: turbines do not make a noise; do not kill birds; do not affect health, and do not devalue neighbouring properties. We were assured that the savings in greenhouse gas was significant, a fact now largely discredited. (E.g. In December 2008 the wind industry in Britain was forced to downgrade its claimed GHG savings by half and that was before back-up was understood by the authorities and the public.) These meetings served chiefly to bring together those who were hosting turbines, to keep up the barrage of “good” information, to keep them enthused until the contracts were signed. By this time potential stakeholders were a tightly knit group, they wanted the money turbines would bring and did not want to know about possible problems or negatives. These events were promotions not information days. Two very different things.

The proponent was repeatedly asked by both the Pyrenees Shire and the WPGLA to hold a public meeting to inform the residents of the shire about their project. These requests were refused, on the grounds that the meetings would be “disrupted”.

By this time, the community division was terrible. Objectors and non stake holders were treated with contempt by the public relations officer, even to the point of denigrating some non-stakeholders to their neighbours. His attitude exacerbated the split in the community and made those who had concerns angry, suspicious and distressed. A stakeholder neighbor told us that a director of the proponent had told them not to worry about the turbines in the Mawalok view as they were put there

just to "let the Mitchells sweat it out". Requests by my family for talks with the proponent were declined and at no time in the 3 and a half years up to the panel hearing would they meet us. One time the community relations officer asked if he and one of their expert witnesses could visit Mawalok so that he could negotiate with us and they could take photographs for a montage. We agreed to the visit on condition that we could have a copy of the montage. After taking photographs no negotiations took place as they said 'time had run out and we have another commitment'. Big surprise! I do not believe that they had any intention of negotiating from the start. I and the family felt that they had come to Mawalok under false pretenses. The montage was promised in 2-3 weeks but actually took several months of emails and phone calls to obtain.

Division is a terrible thing in a small country community where people help each other in all sorts of ways such as helping out in a crisis, lending tools and machinery, manning the fire trucks together, giving work to neighbours' children and arranging a roster to drive a neighbor to her Chemotherapy appointments in Geelong.

The community consultation for this wind farm has been an absolute disgrace. To the extent that there has been any it reached only a small proportion of the community, was non-transparent, misleading and conducted in a manner which has resulted in significant hostility and long lasting community division.

The proponent always claimed to have community support for this project and that was never the case. How did they arrive at that conclusion? They never said. It was obvious that there was a lot of opposition but as far as I know there has not been any polls to establish support or otherwise. At no time was there any community information or consultation about potential problems such as aviation lighting, overhead power lines and related infrastructure, e.g. substations, health, noise, or devaluation of properties.

Some residents left the area because of the stress and anxiety caused by the proponents' behavior towards residents, particularly the non-stakeholders, and the angst caused by the community division.

A number of residents were offered buyouts as the proponents wished to put turbines close to their homes. It was impossible to know how many were offered as those who accepted the offers were required to sign confidentiality agreements and the proponent refused to divulge how many offers they had made. Depopulation has not been acknowledged by the proponents and was not addressed in their

reports. It has the potential to impact on rates, services, volunteer organizations like the CFA, local businesses and the community as a whole.

Some impacts on the community were described by a prospective wind turbine “host landholder” from Stockyard Hill (and 2007 Rural Woman of the Year) Debbie Bain on ABC Ballarat radio: “Whether you are pro-wind or anti-wind, one thing we all agree on is that the process is inequitable, it is without consultation, it is without a true economic base, it is purely a political process. It causes great anger and angst and sadness in the community.”

In 2009 a new proponent took over the SHWF project and we immediately requested a meeting with them.

They agreed to this but it was clear to our family at the meeting that they had been told by the previous proponent that there was community support for the project. Did the new proponent check it out? Almost certainly they did not, they accepted this as a fact. The employees who came to the meeting had no authority and nothing resulted from the meeting. From our perspective the meeting was a waste of time.

In no way did the community consultation for the SHWF meet the guidelines set by the Victorian Government and the contemptuous attitude of the proponent indicated to us that they did not feel it really mattered to the outcome whether they did or not.

LANDSCAPE

There is no single body to protect the landscape and in the country it is farmers who mostly do so. Fortunately in recent times with the advent of groups like Landcare, attitudes have changed for the better and farmers have become more aware of the importance of preserving and protecting the landscape. Sadly, some farmers place more importance on money than landscape.

There are a number of natural features in the Stockyard Hill area: Stockyard Hill itself, an old volcano; Lake Goldsmith, a shallow lake attracting thousands of birds; Black Lake, the volcano crater and Black’s Creek Reserve. The proponent completely ignored the fact that both Lake Goldsmith and Black Lake were traditional breeding grounds for the threatened southern brolga, and that Black Lake is the aquifer for the many springs that local farmers rely on for all their water needs. The SHWF proposal sought to cover or surround these local icons with

turbines. The attractiveness and environmental qualities of the area would be completely destroyed. Fortunately the SHWF Panel recommended to the Minister that most of these turbines be removed from the project and the Minister complied.

At the Panel Hearing, the attitude of the proponent's expert witness to the Stockyard Hill landscape was an insult. The people who live and work the land feel that they are a relevant community and do not have another landscape. Many families have lived there for generations and Lake Goldsmith is considered a special place, in fact a place that belongs to the community. The witness considered the landscape valueless.

Stockyard Hill and Black Lake are also extremely important to local residents. To cover and surround them with wind turbines is considered by them as landscape vandalism. The expert witness considered the visual impact of turbines surrounding the local road network would be low because "viewer" numbers will be low. In other words, because viewers are mostly locals it doesn't much matter. This argument is also used for the impact of power lines, substations and terminal stations. Arguments that the level of cumulative impact is low are based on his opinion that the landscape is highly modified and that there is a low number of "viewers". If the number of "viewers" was high, does that mean the impact would be unacceptable? If that was so, doesn't that mean that the resident "viewers" are of no account? This aspect of his evidence was criticised by the Panel as well as a number of other aspects of his evidence.

The witness also relied on perception studies to claim that people like wind turbines yet admitted under questioning that no such studies have been done post construction among people living near them. Liking them visually in passing is hardly comparable to living amongst them. Also the turbine dimensions in the proponents montages produced at the Panel were found to be incorrect, that is smaller than they should have been. This was fortunately picked up by an objector and the panel ordered a revised set to be produced.

There is no doubt that this huge project will transform 156sq. kms of countryside beyond recognition. It will never recover. The small Pyrenees Shire will be covered with turbines as this will be the third wind farm in it. There are now 550 either built or planned that we know about and with the current rush to put in plans for more, there surely will be more to come. Those who can, will move out of the area, land will be leased or farmed by absent owners and the community decimated.

FLORA and FAUNA.

The Flora and Fauna study conducted by BLA for the proponent was shown by objectors and their experts to be clearly flawed. I fail to understand why BLA is still the expert of choice for many developers. He has been discredited so many times by panels for shoddy work, but developers continue to use him. It clearly does not matter to the outcome. Once again it appears to outsiders that the quality of the work is not important to developers as long as they get the answers they want. As it was with Stockyard Hill, the panel had to put together information from many sources to try to understand the true situation, this applied particularly to the broilgas. In their final report, the Panel recommended that 57 turbines be removed to protect the breeding areas.

At the hearing, when asked by the panel why Black Lake was excluded from his report, the BLA witness replied: "Black Lake was excluded because it is an extremely valuable wind resource". So Black Lake was to be sacrificed as a community resource in order to construct turbines. How many people will visit it to see a 360 degrees view of turbines?

Local long time residents are an excellent source of knowledge on flora and fauna and if BLA had spent some time in the area talking to them he would have increased his knowledge and would have a better understanding of local conditions.

Our own experience illustrates the off hand way BLA approached this study. We were happy to welcome BLA employees to Mawallok to observe a nest and egg in 2007 and they came 3 or 4 times to do so. Each time they had to cross a causeway between 2 large lakes to reach the paddock where the nest was. These lakes are teeming with bird life most of the year, (including breeding pairs of the threatened Blue Billed Duck (found by our own expert), but this did not appear to interest them even after I had pointed them out. The four spring-fed lakes on Mawallok did not appear on any map displayed by the witness or the proponent in spite of the property being almost surrounded by turbines. Under questioning about Mawallok at the Panel Hearing the witness did not seem to have heard of Mawallok- six thousand acres inside the wind farm area!

NOISE and HEALTH

The proponent's attitude to the possibility of health problems at the SHWF was complete denial and this denial occurs at every wind farm where there are adverse health symptoms. It appears comparable to attitudes taken by manufacturers of asbestos and cigarettes until much later their products were proved to be harmful. Wind Farm proponents are able to take this stance because there has been a lack of detailed research anywhere in the world so far on this issue. However, a number of adverse health symptoms are being experienced by people in a number of places around the world, often causing them to flee their homes. Research is needed to ascertain the cause of these symptoms. Siting turbines 5 kms from residences in the meantime would help solve the problem until some answers are found and save the suffering being visited on many rural families. The SHWF Panel agreed with the need for research in this area and recommended in their report: "a properly designed and professionally conducted epidemiological investigation funded by the government and the wind industry should be undertaken at wind farms where there have been health complaints to see if any physical factors might be identified that are common to those complaints and thereby similar circumstances minimized at the SHWF and other WEF's."

It remains to be seen if this recommendation will be taken up by the government as it certainly will not be by the wind industry. The Waubra Foundation has been formed recently to ensure that proper and independent research is undertaken into health impacts of wind turbines on residents. Wind projects should be put on hold until this is done.

Lawsuits that focus on noise pollution and health are pending in a number of countries and it is only a matter of time before this occurs in Australia.

HERITAGE

In regard to our family property Mawallock, the proponent was aware all along of its heritage value and objected to the registering of the vista by Heritage Victoria. They marshalled two extensive 'expert' reports, a legal challenge and a further expert witness at the Panel Hearing to oppose this issue.

My family had to engage 4 experts in landscape and historic architecture to refute their arguments. When I asked Heritage Victoria if they would appear for us at the

Panel hearing, they said they were not allowed as they were part of the Ministry of Planning-the Department responsible for wind energy decisions!

We were fortunate that the Panel found in our favour and recommended that 21 turbines be removed from the garden vista and I quote from their report: “....the importance of the Mawallok house and garden and the nature and severity of the erosion of the cultural significance of the place are such that on balance this outweighs the benefits to the community of the development of those wind turbines which could have been in the centre view from the Mawallok terrace and in particular their contribution to renewable energy.”

It took the family 4 years of angst, stress, and very large expense to fight to save our homestead and the garden from certain desecration.

The developers care nothing for history and heritage, only about making obscene profits. A reward for vandalism on a grand scale. They are aware of the damage they cause to rural people’s lives and assets but will not even acknowledge this.

FINAL COMMENTS

Many questions about the SHWF project were not answered at the hearing Panel. It beggars belief that the proponent does not know where they will source the huge amount of water required for the project. Of course they know. Perhaps they do not want the issue brought before the community. Or indeed the Panel. The decision was left to the proponent and the local water supplier to work out and the local farmers whose livelihoods depend on water are not likely to be consulted. My family and others who rely on the spring water are all understandably concerned about the impact on the aquifer for the springs if bores are sunk.

Land values are not required to be considered by the panels. This is clearly wrong. While proponents deny that land values of non-stakeholders properties decline where there are wind turbines nearby, it can be readily demonstrated that this is untrue. In our own case, when we were considering whether to put Mawallok on the market we had it valued by the Australia-wide manager of a well known rural real estate company. He told us that it would be devalued by 30-40% from his valuation if the turbines went ahead. Even then it would be difficult to find a buyer for a property of this type.

Fire is another concern for country people and Western Victoria is an extremely fire prone area. While fires are not frequent, they are impossible to fight. As an example,

at a recent turbine fire in South Australia fire fighters were forced to retreat to one kilometer from the fire because of flying embers and then were required by OH&S to retreat a further kilometer. Yet turbines are allowed to be placed 500m from homes!

Country people are, generally speaking, conservative; they are not quick to protest, as living in harmony with their neighbours is essential to their wellbeing and to their community. People should not be put in the position when their homes, health and amenity may be badly affected and they are at a severe disadvantage in objecting. They must object at their own financial and emotional cost, and most simply cannot afford to at an effective level. Many cannot attend hearings without taking time off from work or sacrificing annual leave.

Why should landholders be subject to problems that inadequate guidelines and a biased process strongly favours developers? Perhaps we are a different species to those who live in the city where a project that would severely affect their amenity would not be tolerated and there would be sufficient numbers of people to make a protest that would have an impact.

Or, if the project was essential, they should at least be compensated for the disruption to their lives as were Western District farmers who were forced to have huge power lines for the Portland aluminium smelter cross their lands and buildings some years ago.

The SHWF should not be built in such a closely settled area, but developers are allowed free rein to go wherever they like and they only focus on profits and not the people whose lives they will be disrupting. The lack of proper guidelines allow them to do this. In the words of a proponent director, "there are no rules" and proponents conduct themselves accordingly. The subsidies and Government guarantee of huge profits encourage "cowboy" behavior and proponents ride roughshod over rural communities in pursuit of their profits. Often they do not even behave within the guidelines as they believe their project will be passed whatever they do as Governments are so keen to show that they are doing something about the reduction of greenhouse gases. With the SHWF project, residents now face 4 years of construction, concrete batching plants, concrete trucks, road making machinery, cranes and workers vehicles all competing on our narrow roads with grain trucks, school buses and local traffic. There is no compensation for those impacted, they have to put up with it or leave if they are able.

Wind proponents make extravagant claims of the community benefits of wind farms. In the SHWF case, traders in Beaufort and Skipton will benefit from the project during construction and community groups will benefit from the community fund yet residents in these towns will neither see nor hear the turbines. All the impacts will be felt by the Stockyard Hill community with the benefits going to turbine hosts to the detriment of other residents.

My husband and I have now left the district as has our daughter and her family. Our son remains there, at least until the extent of the disruption is realized. The community division, angst, stress and uncertainty made our lives intolerable. Instead of living in a purpose-built retirement home on the property near our children and grandchildren we felt driven to move from the area.

Many other families will be adversely affected by this project, some substantially. Many do not realize that there are negatives to living near wind turbines as they are assured by the proponents that there are none. The families that have been bought out will leave the community which will likely be decimated as others find they cannot live there when the turbines are built and become operational. This has happened around other wind farms both in Australia and overseas. Some will have to stay and suffer as they will not be able to sell their properties.

Many believe that the problems associated with wind farms have become more severe in recent times as the size of turbines has grown.

Many more wind projects are proposed for the Western Plains, and all projects are considered in isolation from others. No one yet understands the cumulative effects of so many wind farms but they will be approved regardless. If approvals are granted at the rate they are now, turbines will stretch across the Western Plains from Ballarat to Portland. The giant concrete and steel towers will change our landscape forever.

Other than wind industry claims and Government spin, we have not been able to find a single study anywhere in the world that proves wind energy saves greenhouse gases, whereas there is an incredible amount of information claiming that it does not. Requests to the wind industry and the Government by many people for proof of savings remain unanswered. It is hardly surprising that this seems suspicious by many people.

I fervently hope that this enquiry will be able to shed some light on this matter.



BIOGRAPHY

MITCHELL Jocelyn Elizabeth; GradDipCareersEduc (RMIT); Retired; daughter of: James Benjamin Low and Janet Margaret Strong; b. May 13, 1937, Lockhart, NSW; ed. Corowa H Sch. (NSW), Clyde Sch. (Vic.), Kindergarten Training Coll., RMIT; career: Proprietor Mawalok Country Nursery 1985-97, Careers Advr Lauriston Girls Sch. 1979-80, Tchr Glamorgan Sch. 1975-77, Dir Fishermans Bend Kindergarten 1974, Tchr Church Nursery Sch. (USA) 1966-67, Dir Grange Rd Kindergarten 1958-59; Memb. Adv. CI CARE Aust. since 2007, Bd Dir 1992-2006, Chrmn Beaufort & Skipton Health Svces 2003-04, Bd Dir 1998-2007, Chrmn Regional Cttee Aust. Open Garden Scheme (Vic.) 1993-95, Bd Dir Aust. Open Garden Scheme 1992-95, Cttee Memb. Vic. Garden Scheme 1990-92, Chrmn Nat. Cttee Aust. Garden Hist. Socy 1985-91, Cttee Memb. 1982-91, Convr Family Planning Grp Women's Electrical Lobby 1974-75, Co-Ed. Nat. Jrnl 1973-74, Ed. Newsletter (Vic.) 1972-75; m. Nov. 10, 1961 Peter Richard Mitchell, son of: Norman Harold Mitchell and Thelma Louise Haig; children: 2 s 1 d; recreations: reading, gardening, travel; address: Vic.

1. My fondest school age memory is...

"my three years at Clyde School where I was happy, made many friendships which still endure, and participated in sport, drama and singing."

2. Which teacher has had the greatest influence on you and why?

"Olga Hay: Headmaster of Clyde School. She was forthright, down to earth, and astute, and had always earned her own living. An excellent role model in most respects."