

Warren Jones briefs the NSW Upper House:

“2.26 Mr Jones noted that smoke contains particles that damage human health. It is the highest risk pollutant in Australia and there is no safe threshold for health impacts. Experts are now particularly worried about the health impacts of tiny particles of 2.5 micrometres or less (PM2.5) which can be absorbed into the lungs.

2.27 The national standards for exposure to particles relate to 24 hour time periods. This means that when burning events take place over four or five hours they may not exceed the daily pollution limits but there might still be significant health impacts.

” www.parliament.nsw.gov.au/.../Conference%20attendance%20report.pdf

Warren Jones was the Director of EPA Tasmania

The link no longer works

Credit: Garry Stannus 2010

Warren, if you had your time again ...



ByEditor

Posted on November 3, 2010



Warren Jones 1980 – October 2010

EPA Board Member

<http://www.epa.tas.gov.au/index.aspx?base=95>

“Warren Jones worked in the Tasmanian environment agency since 1980. He also worked as a teacher at both secondary and tertiary levels and in the private sector. During his time in the environment agency, Mr Jones occupied many positions ranging from regulatory roles through to policy development. He was the General Manager of the Environment Division since 1998 and also held the statutory position of Director of the Environment Protection Authority established under the Environmental Management and Pollution Control Act.

Mr Jones holds a Bachelor of Science Degree with Honours and a Masters Degree in Environmental Studies.

He sat on a number of decision-making and advisory bodies including the Assessment Committee for Dam Construction, the Marine Farming Planning Review Panel and the Forest Practices Advisory Council.”



Warren Jones

Minister Recognises Environmental Contribution Of EPA Director, Above

<http://www.media.tas.gov.au/release.php?id=30557>

The Minister for Environment, Parks and Heritage, David O'Byrne, today paid tribute to the long serving Director of the State's Environment Protection Authority, Warren Jones, who retired in the 2nd week of October 2010

Mr O'Byrne said Mr Jones has played a major role in enhancing and protecting the Tasmanian environment, including a key role in establishing the independent environmental regulator.

"Over 30 years in the various forms the environmental regulator's office has taken, Warren has worked in a number of roles to assist in developing rigorous and scientific environmental standards," Mr O'Byrne said.

"Over that time, Warren's professionalism, personal integrity, and scientific knowledge have been highly regarded across industry, the community and all sides of politics.

"It was that reputation he has carved out in his professional life that saw him identified as the best candidate to help establish the Environment Protection Authority as an independent agency in recent years."

Mr O'Byrne said Mr Jones would be missed by colleagues across government.

"The immediate reaction from all manner of employees and managers has been one of disappointment," Mr O'Byrne said.

"His depth of knowledge of his field and the regard he is held in will be difficult to replace along with his ability to stay abreast of the latest standards and requirements in a continually evolving area."

Forest Practices Authority

<http://www.fpa.tas.gov.au/index.php?id=88#c219>

The following persons have been appointed as members of the Forest Practices Advisory Council by the Minister in accordance with s.37A of the Forest Practices Act –

- a person with knowledge of the State's resource management and planning system, nominated by the Secretary of the responsible Department in relation to the Environmental Management and Pollution Control Act 1994 – WARREN JONES

Allow me to expand on these...

I first got to know Warren back in 2008 and it was not under the best of circumstances. At the time I was suffering very serious health effects from forestry planned burn smoke. Our air quality was shocking and I distinctly remember Warren becoming nervous and not wanting to talk on the telephone about it. He cut the call short. Breath was too valuable anyway for me to be talking.

This account is recorded at: <http://www.cleanairtas.com/outwards/warrenJonesEPA13.10.08.doc>

On the 14th October 2008 Warren, to his credit, wrote back to me saying he had (now) read my submission to the FPA and that, "Outside the fire permit period the general offence provisions of EMPCA do apply and can be enforced by the EPA or a Council officer."

On the 11th November 2008 I was allowed 10 minutes in Launceston to 'meet the EPA Board'. I asked the Board members if they were aware of my health status as a result of the smoke.

Warren looked at me across the table and said 'no.' That simply was incorrect.

I researched, wrote letters, made 'phone calls, and put in lengthy submissions. I spoke to other people who were having the same problems with their health because of the smoke and I believe the common denominator in all this was the Environment Protection Authority under Warren's command as EPA Director.

Warren I believe was supportive of seeking funding for the BLANKET air monitoring system, which incidentally, is a system that does not comply with Australian Ambient Air Monitoring Standards.

The main aim of this system is to monitor smoke from planned burning and the main aim of the Coordinated Smoke Management Strategy trials run by the Forest Practices Authority is to allow the maximum amount of particulates to be released into each of the many made-up airsheds. The EPA has 'gone along with' the smoke trials despite how the EMPCA reads. Even according to the EPA there are no exemptions under EMPCA, except by TFS during a fire permit period.

Further, Warren was having an input into our Australian Air Quality NEPM standards by being a National Environment Protection Council (NEPC) committee member. Warren was also a Forest Practices advisory council member. Maybe I was wrong but I felt a picture was starting to form. Under a Memorandum of Understanding between the EPA and the FPA (Warren was a signatory) our EPA who claims to administer the primary environmental Act, the EMPCA in this state, then signed away its authority to investigate our forestry smoke complaints.

http://www.fpa.tas.gov.au/fileadmin/user_upload/PDFs/Admin/FPE_EPA_MOU.pdf

Warren, or the EPA Board, has advised me:

- *That general offence provisions do apply and can be enforced by the EPA, [but never have been in relation to poor air quality].*
- *The Environment Management and Pollution Control Act is the principal Tasmanian law relating to air quality. The Act establishes the EPA as comprising the EPA Board and the EPA Director. This was Warren Jones.*
- *Many planned burns will be lit when the wind direction can be said to be broadly to a populated area whether this be to a small town, hamlet, or city at some distance, ranging from several kilometres away to hundreds of kilometres at the other end of the island.*

This is despite the fundamental basis of the Environment Management and Pollution Control Act (EMPCA) being the prevention, reduction and remediation of environmental harm.

The EMPCA states:

“any adverse effect on the environment (of whatever degree or duration) and includes an environmental nuisance” (the latter is defined as ‘the emission of a pollutant that unreasonably interferes with, or is likely to interfere with, a person’s enjoyment of the environment’)” And, *The Environment Protection Policy (Air Quality) 2004 which provides a framework for the management and regulation of both point and diffuse sources of emissions to air for pollutants with the potential to cause environmental harm.*

The environmental values to be protected under the Air Quality Policy are:

- *The life, health and well-being of humans,*
- *The life, health and well-being of other forms of life,*
- *Visual amenity.*
- The EPA under Warren did not instigate successful proceedings against any burner despite our deliberate very poor air quality at times, and
- The EPA now refuses to allocate resources to investigate any of my smoke complaints.

This is despite what we heard previously that Warren ‘worked in a number of roles to assist in developing rigorous and scientific environmental standards’...standards that he was, I believe, never prepared to uphold. The Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP) has advised Warren on two of our most serious smoke events there was no chance of a prosecution succeeding

So much for the rigorous environmental standards and policy development.

Only could our state Minister for Environment (David O’Byrne MP who has been in office for just a few short months) claim Warren ‘played a major role in enhancing and protecting the Tasmanian environment’. When it comes to something as important as air pollution, we have been smoked out for years by pernicious forestry smoke.

Warren played ‘a key role in establishing the independent environmental regulator’ and yet this body (EPA) is toothless. It has no regulatory control over planned burns conducted by the major burners, e.g., Forestry Tasmania, private forest companies, Tasmania Fire Service, or Parks and Wildlife.

Let me digress a little...

I was at Pontville army range one evening many years ago. The nature of the exercise was to observe troops on patrol moving under the cover of half-light and a smoke screen. The odd parachute flare would be deployed to light up the night.

The troops on patrol were deployed across the valley from where the observers and mortars were firing (I was an observer). Kaboom, the mortars started firing their smoke bombs and soon a thick

blanket of smoke appeared in a line across the other side of the gulley. We had observed troop movement in the area just preceding the firing and now there was nothing to be seen. Then a flare went up, then another after a short time. Each mortar flares lit the area for about two minutes by memory.

The troops on patrol knew the drill. When they heard a flare go up they took cover before it illuminated. If they were caught out in the open they stood still and were to close one eye to protect their night vision. When the flare had burnt out they were to continue their mission.

The troops on patrol soon joined us without being spotted. They had escaped under the cover of that smoke screen.

Warren you knew about the smoke that forestry has been firing at us for years. You retired as Director of the EPA literally under that cloud of smoke. Every time an incendiary flare was dropped from a helicopter you seemed to me to stand still, and when it extinguished it was allowed to continue.

Warren Jones would you protect the environment from the deliberate affects of pernicious planned burn smoke if you had your time again?

COMMENTS:

24 COMMENTS



1.

Dave Groves

November 3, 2010 at 7:25 am

Its the human condition melded to Tasmanian politics Clive.

A sad thing on so many levels.

[REPLY](#)



2.

Garry Stannus

November 3, 2010 at 9:33 am

Thank you Clive. EPA Director retiring 'under a cloud of smoke'. We will continue the battle for clean air.

[REPLY](#)



3.

Buck and Joan Emberg

November 3, 2010 at 10:56 am

Good one Clive...you would have made a good military general.

[REPLY](#)



4.

max

November 3, 2010 at 11:16 am

After reading your article Clive, I can only come to the sad conclusion that David O'Byrne MP is following his sister in the tradition of see nothing and do nothing for the health of people affected by smoke. That's every one in Tasmania as there is no safe level of smoke.

[REPLY](#)



5. **Just Frank**

November 3, 2010 at 12:30 pm

Yes Clive, a sad reality of our era.

Over the last 25 years I met a number ...

After reading your above record, Minister for Environment, Parks and Heritage, David O'Byrne, may at least confirm he is now being made aware of your sad, truthful report...

Yet another example of "Tasmania: Explore Pretender Island".

The Brand of Tasmania will continue to be undermined as long as the old guard has the influence as our political representatives of all directions.

[REPLY](#)



6. **Geraldine Allan**

November 3, 2010 at 12:34 pm

#4 Max, you may recall that Clive had to create his own 'cloud of smoke' in Minister O'Byrne's sister's office, in an attempt to flush her, the then Minister for the Environment, out from behind closed doors and provide him some assistance as per her duty.

His effort failed; apparently rather than face him, she preferred to choke.

[REPLY](#)



7. **Shirley**

November 3, 2010 at 2:38 pm

Well done Clive!

... what has he done for the many people that are affected by this incredibly stupid burning!?

[REPLY](#)



8. **mike seabrook**

November 3, 2010 at 4:20 pm

will the wine-makers (who bought the gunns wine grape business) and the other winegrape growers take legal action if their grape vines / wines are smoke or otherwise tainted by tamar valley emissions etc in the lead up to harvesting.

against whom ??????? – the contractors – the forest owners (MIS forest punters) – the fire & pollution permit issuers ?????

surprisingly this may be more effective in addressing this issue than events experienced by asthmatics etc. – precedents available from mainland smoke events.

probably hard to identify the location of the smoke if a lot of people are putting in open fires & wood heaters to warm their houses, so as to avoid the massively increasing power prices.

REPLY



9.

Erin

November 3, 2010 at 4:21 pm

It's just like "Yes, Minister", isn't it?

REPLY



10.

Peter Bright

November 3, 2010 at 5:32 pm

Clive's definition quote (above) starting with the words "The EMPCA states .." reminded me of my own recent efforts to motivate the Glenorchy City Council and failing that, the Glenorchy Police, to enforce the EMPCA's prohibition on environmental nuisance.

I prepared a simple document in support of my claim for relief from neighbours' cigarette smoke invading my conjoined pensioner unit night and day to the ongoing detriment of my health. Here's a section of that document:

DEFINITION of TERMS

Environmental harm is defined in the Act as 'any adverse affect on the environment (of whatever degree or duration) and includes an environmental nuisance' â€“ Section 5

Environmental Harm has three categories –

Serious environmental harm;

Material environmental harm;

(The maximum penalties for breaches of these are extreme and include prison)

and Environmental nuisance

(The maximum penalty is \$36,000)

—o0o—

An Environmental Nuisance –

is the emission of a pollutant that unreasonably interferes with, or is likely to unreasonably interfere with, a person's enjoyment of the environment – Section 3

The Environment means components of the earth, including ‘

(a) land, air and water; and

(b) any organic matter and inorganic matter and any living organism; and

(c) human-made or modified structures and areas ‘

’ and ‘air’ includes any layer of the atmosphere

– Section 3

Whereas Clive's legitimate gripe is about the adverse effects of burn-off smoke on his health and welfare, my own gripe is about the wilful emission of toxic tobacco fumes into my local environment that does the same.

My call for help from the Glenorchy City Council was denied on the grounds that the EMPCA did not apply to cigarette smoke where I live. There was no response to my request for justification of this denial of service according to the provisions of the EMPCA which councils are authorised to implement.

I then lodged four formal complaints with the Glenorchy Police because Tasmania Police are also authorised enforcement agents for the EMPCA. These complaints were accompanied by lots of quality documentation in support of my call for help.

Glenorchy Police replied several days ago saying that nothing had been done because of scarcity of police resources which made complaints such as mine of minimal, indeed negligible importance.

When I asked “If resources [i]were/[i] available, would police intervention be implemented under s.53 of the EMPCA as requested”

The answer was “Yes.”

So in Clives' case and mine we both know full well that we have entirely legitimate causes for the application of the fine words in the EMPCA – yet we don't get it.

It seems that those in authority don't really get it either.

REPLY



11.

William Boeder

November 3, 2010 at 6:22 pm

#7. Shirley, ... part of the team that in my opinion has not really shown much interest in the effects of wood-smoke upon the populous.

REPLY



12.

john hayward

November 3, 2010 at 7:07 pm

This man clearly desires a chair in the Tassie pantheon alongside the likes of Dave Llewellyn, Roscoe, Bob Gordon, Robin and however many O'Byrnes and Hodgmans can find a well-upholstered seat.

Tassie's Golden Age just keeps going on.

John Hayward

[REPLY](#)



13.

William Boeder

November 3, 2010 at 10:39 pm

Comment #7 has been rather severely guillotined by the ubiquitous moderator, thus the content of my comment has thus presented itself as a void of nothingness, quite obviously sterilized to become totally devoid of its intended meaningful substance!

??????????

[REPLY](#)



14.

Clive Stott

November 4, 2010 at 1:53 am

#10: Peter I am really sorry to hear about your smoke problems. Smoke is smoke, it is all harmful.

This sounds like a case of defective administration.

Have you thought about asking the Ombudsman to review the matter?

By the way there is a dedicated cigarette complaints officer in this state. I happened to be put through to her by mistake just recently. That person was with DHHS Environmental Health, I think. If not, was with EPA.

[REPLY](#)



15.

Peter Bright

November 4, 2010 at 5:41 am

Clive (#13) I really do appreciate your interest, however I can assure you that everything that seems appropriate has been tried over the last two years including multiple phone calls to the female officer in the Environment Division to whom you refer. All have failed.

My multiple efforts for peaceful resolution include communications with and/or visits to the government's Environment Division, the Glenorchy City Council, The Environmental Defender's Office, Tasmania Police

at Glenorchy – and also its Head Office, The Tasmanian Greens, Quit Tasmania and of course the insensitive, obtuse, unintelligent, uncaring and irresponsible owner of this complex of pensioner units, Housing Tasmania, whose staff have repeatedly declared that all its tenants have a right to smoke a legal product in the privacy of their own units. Such a speciously ridiculous statement compares with a murderer pleading Not Guilty because although he stabbed his wife to death he did it with a legally obtained knife in the privacy of their own unit.

I recognise Housing Tasmania's neutral policy but where it fails absolutely, and actually condones thousands of ongoing offences, is when offending tenants break environmental law – for example by emitting excessive noise. The same section 53 of the EMPCA applies to the unlawful emission of smoke, fumes and odours as it does to noise, and can attract the same \$260 penalty by way of infringement notice. The Glenorchy City Council quite wrongly denies all responsibility and the Glenorchy Police cannot spare the manpower to verify my allegations – so even as I sit here typing at 2 am, woken by my neighbour's particularly toxic fumes in my bedroom that travelled through the cracks and gaps and ceiling in this block of four conjoined units, I am sneezing, wheezing and coughing. Medical certificates have been supplied to Housing Tasmania and Glenorchy police but to no avail.

It has always been found that the Ombudsman's office is as useful as a doorknob on an iceberg while it is understaffed, under-resourced and overloaded. This is a state where help is often denied at every level simply because nearly every approached institution does not want to get involved. I have never known a people so cowardly as Tasmanians.

I recognise that our legal system is insidiously onerous and that it is particularly oppressive on the impecunious, many of whom eventually find that they cannot secure lawful solutions to local problems and who then feel compelled to either implement their own remedy, lawful or unlawful, or to relocate. They feel driven out of their own homes by neighbourhood problems deliberately left unattended by the state's appointed regulatory authorities with the main offenders being the state's councils – those 29 ignorant and incompetent bodies designated as control agents by sensible legislation which authorises them to secure operating funds through the issuance of infringement notices. It has been found that councils don't want to do this – so they don't. They have found that they can get away with this ubiquitous denial of duty because there's no feared compulsion upon them to actually discharge it, and I've been told by a senior government officer that there never will be.

Whereas this distressing health problem over cigarette smoking appears, on the face of it, to involve only me, the beneficial environmental ramifications behind a successful outcome are immense and statewide, involving as they will the physical health of every non-smoker who is being slowly killed by invasive toxic fumes from his uncaring neighbours in conjoined units and apartment buildings whose structure is porous to fumes, and also those nearby who are similarly adversely affected for example by wind-blown smoke from some distance away.

The reality is this: the entire tobacco industry is utterly evil, comprised as it is of wholly unprincipled persons willing to occasion misery, disease and death on their fellow man for financial gain. It should be outlawed throughout the world. The Sydney-based website Action on Smoking and Health (ASH) at <http://www.ashaust.org.au/default.htm> is most informative and offers this statement:

“Tobacco is Australia’s No.1 preventable cause of death and disease. Every year, tobacco smoking and smoke exposure kills more than 15,000 people – including one child every 10 days; and costs the nation over \$31 billion – far more than the tax it raises.”

I am hoping to set a precedent by utilising Tasmania’s environment laws to secure prompt relief from the devastating effects of tobacco smoke no matter where or when it is emitted, or in what quantity. I believe that s.53 and s.53A of the EMPCA are the only relevant laws we have for this task, however when enforcement is denied by every appointed regulatory authority we are back to that doorknob on the iceberg.

[REPLY](#)



16.

Observer

November 4, 2010 at 8:43 am

9. It’s just like “Yes, Minister”, isn’t it?

[REPLY](#)



17.

Garry Stannus

November 4, 2010 at 12:18 pm

Peter Bright (#15, following #10)

What a powerful post. There is obvious bureaucratic disfunction. I feel the frustration.

A week ago I tried to talk the local garbos out of tipping the whole street’s recycling bins in with the garbage that they’d just done. He wasn’t having any of that and so I kept my recycling bin from him and he/they tipped in everybody else’s into with the rubbish in the back of their truck. Go to the Council, he ‘suggested’.

I did. At the counter you can never ever speak to the person who is responsible. That is Rule No 1. So they emailed the person nominally responsible, with details, and with both my mobile and land lines numbers.

Guess what! Nada! So, when I get off writing this to you, I’ll go down again. I have to say, this is not the first time, not the second and not the third time.

But like you Peter, what do I do if simply, the Council will not do anything about it? It’s not as if I want to spend my time complaining to the Council on my day off. With you, and Clive, and many others, your health and comfort is involved. With me (so far) it’s only my wasted time, the chronic failure in our recycling scheme and yes, frustration: to be charged for a service that I don’t get is just a teensy bit galling.

Great comments.

[REPLY](#)



18.

hugoagogo

November 4, 2010 at 12:41 pm

#13, Hi William,

I'm sure on occasion the editor's intention is merely to limit the suffering among the readership.

REPLY



19.

William Boeder

November 4, 2010 at 6:31 pm

#18 Mr hugoagogo, you yourself are posing as a cartoon character, I have to say with all respect very similar in kind to 'The Riddler' The Joker, (both of Batman fame,) and other feisty fighters of both good and evil.

Now then, when we consider the intellect of such renowned skulduggerous merchants, then we cast ourselves back to the fervid fallacious fustian's that you as Professor Hugoagogo, offer to the attendees of Tas Times?

Perhaps you might consider that the deleted items could have been rather potent penetrating and present plottages, that may well have been filled with the horrors of truth?

Then too, many of the managing minions of the supposed Forestry Industry in Tasmania, they too share the same love for fictitious character and the sharing of cute comical ramblings and diabolicals as you do? Therefore my deleted comments may have actually been 'so close to the bone' that they could have caused severe injury to the pumped-up ego's of the intended persons as referred to therein?

These referred to persons that may have been omitted, are of those types that are generally the recipient of some noble status and position in the State's Public Circus.

Of course this being in return for their trained comical contretemps in dealing with negative and anti-the-people realities, either then dumped upon the man in the street, or cunningly denying to them, (of the truths implicit, so often known to be extant and festering,) by these same high-salaried artful spin-merchants?

Hoever my dear Mr hugoagogo, I will, (if you request it,) read more deeply into your written diabolicals so to more clearly determine the amount of sage advices and iconoclastic revelations as may be so contained in your future comments?

REPLY



20.

Brenda Rosser

November 6, 2010 at 11:46 pm

"I believe that s.53 and s.53A of the EMPCA are the only relevant laws we have for this task, however when enforcement is denied by every appointed regulatory authority we are back to that doorknob on the iceberg." Posted by Peter Bright

Yes, and read the Fire Act for Tasmania. Here's another example of lack of enforcement. The District fire officer has not responded at all to my email requesting the minutes of the Arthur District Fire Management Committee (despite assuring me I would get a response). He has failed to name the name of a single individual who sits on this Committee. The word from a Waratah-Wynyard Councillor was that Kevin Hyland (mayor) was on this committee but he told me over the phone that he is not. In any case, he added, the Committee doesn't meet.

The Tasmanian fire service is in breach of its legislation. It MUST have a functioning Fire Management Committee. Meanwhile the meagre (and unmaintained) fire 'clearing' next to our house is a mere 50 metres away from a 13 year old Niten plantation. The bushfire risk assessment concluded that any house within 80 metres of a 'forest' has a 60% chance of being burnt down in the case of a fire outbreak in that forest. That means that many, many dwellings on the North West Coast have NO chance at all.

Let's give a big slow clap to the Tasmanian Fire Service. They also give the permits to corporate conglomerates who invest in Gunns (Commonwealth Bank, Macquarie Bank, Deutsche Bank, etc) who light the match (indirectly) and choke us out of house and health.

What is going on today. I believe it's nothing less than social breakdown. We've entered another 'dark age' where those in power have whittled away access to justice so much that there no longer remains a functional social context.

REPLY



21.

Michael

November 7, 2010 at 10:51 am

#20 – Get rid of your own wood-heater, Brenda, before you come here complaining about others.

REPLY



22.

Peter Bright

November 7, 2010 at 11:25 am

Yes Brenda (#20) we are indeed on the slippery slide to social breakdown, and it's worsening as the state's appointed regulatory authorities such as councils increasingly refuse without fair cause to properly utilise the various elements of state legislation that authorise their remedial intervention to alleviate or solve neighbourhood problems such as environmental issues causing distress.

It would not surprise me if Tasmania has a steady outflow of frustrated citizens just too fed up to bear this abominable stupidity any longer and leaving here with the belief that surely nowhere else could be as unintelligent as circumstances in this place.

For example, I have always found that getting Tasmania's barking laws enforced by councils is like sitting in a row-boat trying to raise the Titanic with a fishing rod. Just when it seems there's been movement it's realised that it's the waves that moved, and not the Titanic.

But it's not always councils which are to blame. I know that some councils have raised their Barking Complaint Fee, a fee set by each council to suit its local conditions, and which ranges throughout the state from \$10 to \$65. This fee requirement was originally authorised in the Dog Control Act 1987 and maintained in the Dog Control Act 2000 in the belief that its imposition would separate the false allegation from the true.

But in some instances this fee increase was improperly motivated by a recklessly illicit desire to deliberately reduce the number of formal barking complaints lodged by aggrieved citizens. Most deplorably, this suggestion was not initiated by councils but by a senior official in the Department of Local Government. It seems that some councils see the public as their enemy rather than the source of their legitimately-earned income for the honourable discharge of appointed duty.

What does a distressed citizen do when he eventually realises that his council will not help him? My impression is that councils retreat into their dark caves of do-nothing in order to avoid all potential for legal entanglements because of their forensic ignorance and employee incompetence. Their reasoning appears to be that if they do nothing then they cannot be accused of doing something wrong. I believe that council managers are to blame for this grotesque perversion of duty and that they are the secret cause behind council staff, that interface between council management and the public, sometimes denying the blatantly obvious. These employees acquiesce to wrongdoing because their prime concern is their preservation of salary. Sadly, there are very few citizens with the outstanding ethical integrity of Andrew Wilkie, ones who put the public interest way ahead of their own.

I am currently trying to motivate Tasmania Police into investigating such common abandonment of regulatory duty by the state's councils that distressed persons in desperation feel compelled to turn to Tasmania Police for help. Tasmania Police should not be loaded with tasks already quite properly allocated to councils. My initial enquiry revealed that Tasmania Police and state councils are separate autonomous entities that cannot tell each other what to do, yet I know that councils do work in with the police over local matters of mutual interest.

My conclusion to date is that councils will not comply with legislated duty until they are absolutely compelled under threat of feared penalty. It's the fear of imposed penalty that keeps the citizenry in general in compliance with state laws, so in the face of their ongoing and inexcuseable rebelliousness it's entirely appropriate for councils to be similarly forced, by fear, into compliance with Tasmanian law and its citizens' fair and legitimate expectations.

REPLY



23.

Brenda Rosser

November 7, 2010 at 6:17 pm

“...As the Roman Empire slid into the depths of the Dark Ages, the private gradually squeezed out the public until effectively the private sector swallowed everything and the public sector disappeared...Almost by definition feudalism is public power in private hands...People quit building and maintaining...Investment became alien and wealth was lavishly squandered rather than used to promote a better future....The Middle Ages saw vast numbers of houseless people wandering back and forth across the countryside. [Today the homeless are counted in their millions in America].

...The men who ruled...have been described as the “least Christian of men; the least devout, least scrupulous, least compassionate, and among the least chaste...moral behaviour declined to the point that then as now family ties dissolved.

...There was no vision of how one made a better life. They knew that standards of living had been higher in the past, but they were too disorganised to get back to the past or to organize a march to the future. Today there is a similar lack of vision.

The Middle (dark) ages: “a melange of incessant warfare, corruption, lawlessness, obsession with strange myths, an an almost impenetrable mindlessness.”

Sound familiar?

REPLY



24.

Observer

November 7, 2010 at 9:55 pm

#23. The Middle (dark) ages: “a melange of incessant warfare, corruption, lawlessness, obsession with strange myths, an an almost impenetrable mindlessness.”

Sound familiar?

Posted by Brenda Rosser

It sure does. Shouldn't that read, “Forestry Principles” ? Or maybe that's what you'll find if you turn ‘the doorknob on the iceberg’?

REPLY