OTTO MUELLER 7 HAMER AVENUE WEMBLEY DOWNS 6019 AUSTRALIA 18 JUNE 2002

To the Director SUSTAINABLE POLICY UNIT Dept of the Premier and Cabinet 15th fl. 197 St George's Terrace Perth 6000

Dear Sir

I apologize for being late with my submission. However, there have been many in the past with no impact what so ever. Considering the amount of delays with governmental correspondence experienced three month is not too bad.

SUSTAINABILITY is no exception. It has been around for many years. Yet as recently as two weeks ago the Chairman of the EPA found it necessary to call for another public discussion on the meaning of the work in the Alexander Library.

This is 10 YEARS after the Rio Conference and your government has already coined another meaning to suit their policies/agendas as indicated on Page 2 and to reinvent the wheel in

A CONSULTATION PAPER FOR THE STATE SUSTAINABILITY STRATEGY FOR WA

Your unit needs to remember (since there is no more consistency) for how long successive governments and others at all levels have TALKED and WRITTEN about a subject which is inherently incompatible with the doctrines of economic rationalism and deregulation.

- 1. World Conservation Strategy IUCN 1980
- 2. State Conservation Strategy for WA Jan. 1087
- 3. WA Environmental Review 1986 September 1987
- 4. Towards sustainable development in WA October 1989
- 5. Towards Sustainable Cons. Council Discuss. Paper February 1990
- 6. The Environmental Charter for WA December 1990
- 7. A draft Nature Conservation Strategy for WA January 1992
- 8. Global Warming-cool it Fed. Govmt. 1997
- 9. Getting in step with the Environment. Cons. Council 1998
- 10. Renewable Energy Shell Public. May 1998
- 11. National Emission Trading Creating a market AGO Disc. Paper 1999
- 12. State of the Environment Report for WA 1998 page 99
- 13. Global Warming-cool it (again!) Feder. Govmt. April 2002.

These are only 13 publications in my possession, relating in one way or another to that "word"! I do not wish to bore the reader with a similar amount of titles on this affluent society's over consumption of resources and the resulting creation of waste. The so called three R's. Water also rates highly in my disapproval. The WA Water

Authority and its successors produced many papers on our freshwater, grey water and sewerage and the city's supplies. They also claim to be sustainable despite the seemingly endless increase in human population. It is the latter if it continues to grow, that our "ecological footprint" (so nicely explained on page 8) will cause more havoc.

This latest product out of a supposedly downsized government bureaucracy uses boxed (case studies – page4?) to highlight certain WA ESD Features. Many of those boxed photos and texts have been around, promoted and worked on for many years.

Eg. The human aspects of Fremantle City, Lake Toolbin, Mine site rehabilitation (but poor compliance), Wind farms (albeit very slowly), Offshore gas production, Local government and its very late and meek attempts to embrace Agenda 21 with energy audits(?) and perhaps Ribbons of Blue (which some how failed to avoid the Swan and other rivers' frequent blooms).

There are no Brownie Points for the current government's sustainability performance in those mentioned examples/case studies, they predated the ALP's election by a long time.

COTTESLOE REEF, yes a very good community effort (NOT the Fisheries Dpt!) but will it help the capacity fished stocks of this world?

OLDMALLEE PROJECT, yes excellent, but will it at least on a trial basis materialize by the end of this year?

FUEL CELL BUSSES, again hopefully, they will come about on a trial basis only next year. This is the sum total after 15 years talking and now we are asked again to FOCUS ON THE FUTURE!

Did I miss any of the employment creating green Industries and those opportunities?

The Federal Government will soon go to Johannesburg with great fanfare and tell the world about community involvement.

When rating will your unit give to the \$400 million Rio Tinto HI Smelt Project in Kwinana? It will create a mere 65 jobs and <u>require huge amounts of water--sustainable-green?</u> Where is the ore and the coal?

I notice that Australians in the Northwest of this State asked, that (foreign) companies set up their plants in a planned for and designated industrial area. An ALP Minister <u>flatly rejected such community demands</u>---remember the Swan Brewery saga?

I trust further that your unit notices the public contempt for the EPA in its great efforts to avoid prosecuting polluters (West Australian 15-6-02 just as a sample).

Does it show intergenerational or cultural concern when the Public is told that <u>1800</u> <u>Burrup Rock Art artefacts</u> have been carelessly dumped in a northwest store yard for decades because they were just in the way?

Yet as per page 4 in your paper the Departments are still producing another ELEVEN more plans and strategies from Citizenship over Future Perth ot a State Industry Policy ---all in the name promoting a very elsive goal in a community dedicated to increased consumption.

Would we not have otherwise even more unemployment?

Des anybody notice at all the lobbying building Industry and its agenda?

Surely those additional plans require, if ever implemented, more rules and regulations. How does that reconcile with the decreed opinion to deregulate and reduce costs to "the bare bones" in the public services, that is to pauperise the public domain?

The EPA's lead role for the next State of the Environment Report was outlined on page 5. That paragraph is a master piece of "government speak" and certainly makes sure that "restricted resources: are not employed I the field, community or market place but in government offices. Why indeed should a treasurer announce financial incentives to promote car-gas conversions, biodiesel production, photovoltaics, water saving gardens and smaller, instead of ever bigger, houses?

Otto Mueller