The Standing Committee on Regional Australia
House of Representatives
Parliament House
CANBERRA   ACT   2600

Dear Committee Members,

Re: **Water Amendment (Water for the Environment Special Account) Bill 2012.**

The saddest indictment, on your deliberations, the work of the Minister and the efforts of the MDBA, in the historical context will be the failure for the words mouthed by the responsible people to ring true. All that has been presented to the public by the federal government and its agencies have been sadly erroneous non-facts.

If we look at this amending legislation we see the deception again clearly enshrined in LAW. The basis for section 86AA is neither the truth nor the best available science. What we have is an ignorant set of clauses which demonstrate, for the World to see, that the people making law about the most important river system in our nation do not understand what makes a river or a wetland healthy. Their ignorance is palpable and unforgivable because the Chairman of the National Water Commission has published and promoted the best available science relating to river and wetland health only to be shunned by the Minister, the Department, the MDBA and the politicians who strut their ignorance in a quaint state of arrogant belief in their own cleverness.

The arrant nonsense that derives from insane mantra developed in South Australia by egocentric, self-assessed experts who have spent over seventy years mis-educating South Australians through repetition of simplistic non-facts. Before any constraints are removed from any part of the Murray-Darling Rivers and Wetlands systems the estuary of the River Murray needs to be restored to a natural condition. Unless this is done all other measures will be in vain. The first four clauses in 86AA(2) are immediately solved if the estuary is restored to a natural ecosystem.

South Australia needs to remove all of the drainage channels in its South East region before it can look upstream and point fingers about engineered works. The South East drainage schemes have arrested the natural progression of the littoral coastline where the Murray mouth occurs. The nineteenth landlocked coastline of the South East has been severely compromised by the actions of the South Australian engineering schemes.

Until South Australia restores the natural order no-one should consider their arguments about the need for water down the Murray and appeals over man-made Ramsar wetlands such as the Coorong.

Why hasn't the Australian Government registered all rice fields in Australia under the Ramsar Agreement? These are after all the most efficient rice fields on the planet and should be expanded to relieve those areas around the globe suffering from poor land management and poor water management. If we are citizens of the World that would be an immediate step that should be taken to prove our commitment to humanity.

Section 86AA(3)(a) is absurd beyond belief because it implies the greatest acts of environmental vandalism in Australia's history will need to be undertaken by governments for no real reason other than a 40 year commitment to improved water capture, storage and release.

1

Section 86AA(3)(b) is as unnecessary as the Water Act 2007 all of its amendments and the MDB Plan by the MDBA's own admission of calculation errors. For most of its life the MDBA has based its calculations on the income of fresh water to the MDBA being about 500,000GL. In its Proposed Draft MDB Plan it used for the first time a more accurate figure of 530,000GL. With its asserted 6% being runoff this introduced a further 1,800GL to the water budget. This has never been adjusted in the MDBA calculations. Why not?

Section 86AD needs to see national action to build new storages, develop new water capture schemes for the environment and for food production. Unless this is done and not just talked about 86AD again shows the shallowness of those making this law.
I attach my submission to the MDBA in response to the Draft Plan of November 2011 for your edification. I know the answers to all 1462 questions and the research to substantiate the answers can be done if funds are provided to allow me to do so. I have had no response from the MDBA and I am sure it is because no-one at the MDBA ever read my submission despite a Part-time Member of the MDBA asking me to prepare my submission along with the urging of a senior MDBA Manager for me to ask the questions their key documents raised.

You would do well to base any law on facts not fiction. You would do this nation a great service if you found out the truth, encouraged the best available science to be employed and got the management of the MDB right for the first time in history.

But you won't because you are politicians playing a game with our Nation and not caring about the outcomes you leash onto those of us working and living in regional Australia. You do not have the capacity or the fortitude to serve the Nation as Statesmen and women because your politics does not allow for national development, futures for our coming generations and a legacy of prosperity for those who work hard to generate the wealth you live upon.

Yours in despair and disbelief

Terry Inglis

Attachment A: My Submission to the MDBA in response to the invitation to comment
                     on the Proposed MDB Plan released on 5 November 2011.

My submission was based on the four documents
:
    1. Delivering a Healthy Working Basin: About the draft Basin Plan
    2. The Draft Basin Plan: Catchment by Catchment
    3. Plain English Summary of the proposed Basin Plan – including explanatory notes
    4. Socioeconomic analysis and the draft Basin Plan; Part A Overview and analysis.

These were the documents released with the Proposed Basin Plan on 5 November 2011 and proclaimed by Mr Knowles to be the basis of the Plan. He said in Griffith in December 2011 that these four documents would answer all the questions anyone had about the plan. Evidently he relied on advisers and had not read any of the four documents.