



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

IN THIS ISSUE

Royal Society of Arts Think Tank Endorses Basic Income	1
None of The Above Schemes Challenge the Monopoly of Credit by Wallace Klinck	1
Natural Cost as Differentiated from Financial Cost by Betty Luks	2
Mixed bag of NEWS from #ReduceImmigration in 2015	3
Ideology and the InterGenerational Report by James Reed	5
The Great Australian Water War by Arnis Luks and Ian Wilson LL.B.	6
Ban Niqab, Burka in all Public Places by Raheel Raza	8

**THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK:** Luke 16:10 “One who is faithful in a very little is also faithful in much, and one who is dishonest in a very little is also dishonest in much.

**ROYAL SOCIETY OF ARTS THINK TANK ENDORSES BASIC INCOME**  
by Tyler Prochazka of BIEN (Basic Income Earth Network)

The article reads: “Interest in the Universal Basic Income (UBI) is sweeping across Europe, with British think tank RSA coming out in support of the UBI in a new report launched on December 17 at a public debate. The Royal Society for the encouragement of Arts Manufactures and Commerce, also known as RSA, is a prestigious institution founded in 1754 and granted Royal Charter in 1847.

Report authors Anthony Painter and Chris Thoung said the current approach to welfare “is no longer fit-for-purpose” and requires a new approach.

“The major concern is ultimately people: the lives we are able to lead, our ability to have a sense of security so we can pursue our ambition, and our ability to contribute to supporting one another, innovating, and developing the creative potential of society,” the report said.

“That is where Basic Income has the potential to be so much stronger than our current welfare state.”

The RSA endorsement follows another high-profile British think tank, the libertarian Adam Smith Institute. They published a report earlier this year also advocating for a basic income in the form of a negative income tax.

**The RSA proposal for a British basic income**

The RSA report suggests replacing the current welfare state with a UBI that would cost an additional 1 percent of UK’s GDP. RSA’s proposal is modeled after the Citizen’s Income Trust (CIT), an affiliate of BIEN, and derives most of its figures from this framework – read the CIT proposal here...<http://www.citizensincome.org/filelibrary/booklet2013.pdf>

Under the RSA, citizens between 25 and 65 would receive an annual income of 3,692 British pounds, or £308 per month. People between 5 and 24 would get an annual payment of £2,925, or £244 per month. Citizens over 65 would receive an annual pension of £7,420, or £618 per month. Parents of children under 4 would receive an additional annual payment of £4,290 for their first child, or £358 per month. They would fetch £3,387 annually, or £282 per month, for additional children under 4.

It suggests potentially gradually rolling out the basic income to different demographics, such as those above age 55 and those below age 25. At the same time, a small basic income could be introduced while gradually reducing other benefits.

Regarding housing, the report notes that housing benefits should not be folded into a basic income because of the high cost of real estate in the UK. It proposes a Basic Rental Income. The idea is to utilize property taxes as a means to ensure universal housing income, but the report does not delve into the specifics. Nonetheless, this novel approach does deserve more discussion in UBI circles....”

**Read further....**<http://www.basicincome.org/news/2015/12/united-kingdom-prestigious-british-think-tank-endorses-basic-income/>

**NONE OF THE ABOVE SCHEMES CHALLENGE THE MONOPOLY OF CREDIT**

- and are all tax funded cautions Wallace Klinck of Canada:

“While these various schemes have slightly different features and do explore certain aspects of the effects to be observed when people have an assured source of income, they are all conspicuous insofar as none of them challenge the Monopoly of Credit and its appropriation of the communal capital. One might expect them to face little opposition from the Banking fraternity. Indeed, there is some evidence that they are being extended some support from those quarters because they pose no threat to the progressive centralization of wealth and power which the present financial system engenders. These proposals are, I believe, all tax-funded and to the extent that they force us to share more and more of an increasingly inadequate national income they simply mean greater taxation and do nothing to eliminate the growing need for consumer and public debt. *(continued on next page)*

(continued from previous page)

They have no theoretical position on the nature of natural cost as differentiated from financial cost and have no proposals for reversing the inflation of consumer prices. All in all they do nothing to make self-liquidating an evermore non-self-liquidating price system - nor do they cast any light on the causes of this tendency to insolvency as it relates to the increasing use of automation and technology as replacements for human labour. They do nothing to eliminate the need for exports merely to compensate for an internal domestic deficiency of purchasing-power and do not remove the primary cause of war amongst nations. In short, they are at best a superficial counterfeit "revolution" and are damaging to the Social Credit cause because they tend to act as a "pressure valve" to placate people so they do not turn their attention to the more fundamental issues with which Social Credit deals. The various "welfare" and "charitable" agencies similarly detract from the essential matters which deserve priority attention.

### NATURAL COST AS DIFFERENTIATED FROM FINANCIAL COST by Betty Luks

I have continued to ponder the words of the "Consider the lilies of the field" parable mentioned in the last 2015 edition of *On Target*. Traditionally the lilies of the field were believed to be flowers growing in the wild and did not form part of the tithing/taxable lands.

The listener to Jesus' words could 'sum up' the natural costs involved in the growing of the lilies – after all it was God who 'clothed the lilies'. J.D. Malan in his booklet "*Natural Costs and the Ownership of Money*" explains what are 'Natural Costs':

"Natural cost is the real, or physical, cost of producing an article or a service. It could be expressed in symbolic form by listing the individual items in terms of weight, volume, energy units, etc. - and such lists could be used to compare the relative costs of two articles, or of the same article produced at different times or under different conditions.

### BUT WHAT OF ALL THAT IS FREELY GIVEN TO MANKIND?

But what of all the blessings mankind receives for which no 'financial or physical cost' is charged? Do take the trouble to look at the Paul Gautschi's Youtube video "Back to Eden". There is a man who has no doubts where his blessings come from - as he tends his very own "Garden of Eden".

#### **The video storyline goes like this:**

When you look at the incredible landscape on planet Earth, all the different terrains, the varying soil conditions, the awesome water features, oceans, lakes, rivers, streams, the waterfalls, the different climates, the huge amounts of plants and ground-covers, the requirements are so varied. Can one fathom how big project that is? When God "designed" the landscape project for planet Earth he was so genius, he "designed" it in such a way that he would never have to show up at work. It is completely self sustained.

As an engineer, Douglas was a practical as well as cultured person who was able to perceive the physical and psychological issues underlying the economic system from the standpoint of natural law whereas the schemes presented in this report tend to be sociological and ideological approaches which are largely detached from realistic economics and matters of finance-accountancy. In consideration that Douglas's ideas spawned a wide-spread world movement advocating Universal Consumer Dividends and Just (Compensated) Prices, etc. over a major part of the 20th Century, it might seem odd that none of these advocates of some form of "guaranteed income", to my knowledge, even mention his name or that of Social Credit. I think that we can be assured that the reason for this omission is that none of these proposals challenge the Monopoly of Credit and the grand larceny it has committed in appropriating the credit of society through its false claim to ownership of the communal capital." \*\*\*

But comparisons of cost expressed in such a multiplicity of units are unnecessarily difficult, and can be simplified by combining them using one common symbol - money. This has one other important advantage by enabling us to observe differences between the figure thus obtained for "natural" cost and what accountants simply refer to as "cost", but which should be described as "financial" cost.

These differences will be items included in financial cost but not in natural cost, and they will all have one common feature - they will relate to items which were physically completed at some time in the past.

If price is based on financial cost, as is inevitable under our present financial system, cost inflation is unavoidable. It is the primary theme of this paper to demonstrate that prices MUST be related to natural cost before inflation can be eliminated..."

After years of back-breaking toil in ground ravaged by the effects of man-made growing systems, Paul Gautschi has discovered a taste of what God intended for mankind in the Garden of Eden. Some of the vital issues facing agriculture today include soil preparation, fertilization, irrigation, weed control, pest control, crop rotation, and PH issues. None of these issues exist in the unaltered state of nature or in Paul's gardens and orchards.

Paul says that the ground is a living organism\*, and as all living organisms the ground too has some sort of protection cover. We have skin to protect us, the animals have fur, fish have scales, birds have feathers, and the soil most of the time is covered with something. If you take the cover off the soil becomes vulnerable and it gets lost. Now the ground in the midwest USA looks almost scary. (continued on next page)

(continued from previous page) It's parched, cracked, hard, and almost looks like desert. There is no topsoil there because it's all blown or washed away. We're losing topsoil, and in nature it takes 100 years to build an inch of it.

Apparently it's OK to lose around four tons of soil, per acre, per year, but is the soil forming at that rate?

When the soil erodes the organic matter erodes and all the nutrients that were in the soil erode and that's a resource that's not there anymore."

### **The spirit or intent of the matter**

But it is the spirit, the intent, of Paul Gautschi that stirs my spirit. His whole approach reminds me of the words of W.R. Inge written over a hundred years ago: "Admission into the spiritual life is after all a matter of degree, and I am jealous of the rich spiritual treasure which resides in the study and knowledge of Nature and its laws."

In "The Religious Philosophy of Plotinus and Some Modern Philosophies of Religion," he saw that modern man had conceived of spiritual life as something entirely different from the mental life. "It is different," he said quoting W. Tudor Jones, "but only as the bud is different from the blossom; it means at the religious level a greater unfolding of a life which has been present at every stage in the history of civilisation and culture..."

### **A Pearl of Great Price**

Life is now viewed as consisting in a great and constant quest after these religious ideals... A break takes place with the natural self; the mental life of concepts, though necessary, is now seen to be insufficient; and life is now viewed as having a pearl of great price before its gaze. Here the *Stirb* and *werde*\*\* of (St) Paul and Goethe becomes necessary.

The real education of man now begins. His life becomes guided and governed by norms whose limits cannot be discovered, and which have never been realized in their wholeness on the face of our earth..."

### **Comments**

\* I would have some trouble with Paul Gautschi's words here. The ground should not be thought of as 'Gaia' or mother earth. I think Geoffrey Dobbs' description of it as a 'complex association of associations' is more accurate.

\*\* *Stirb* and *werde* "die and become". Internet explanation:

The phrase is so close to the idea of death and rebirth that the special meaning of 'werden' is easily overlooked. It means of course 'to become' but has the further sense, common in German but strange in English, of growing and developing, becoming something else, so that the real sense here is probably that the self must die in order to be one with the 'world-soul' and to grow in time and space along with it. In the end "Selige Sehnsucht" proves to be not a poem about entry into a higher existence in the sense of a supernatural one, but about re-entry into the natural order in a more intense (*gesteigert*) form.

### **I will finish with Wallace Klinck's remarks to a New Zealand friend:**

"I believe that we were put here to live and experience the gift of life at every moment of time in both spiritual and physical domains and that the two have an inseparable relationship. I don't agree with the "Manichaeism Heresy" which separates the mind from the "evil" body and I tend to think rather in terms of an integrated whole. To me nothing else makes sense.

The physical world is not innately evil—it just is what it is and we should relate to it in a constructive and grateful manner." \*\*\*

## **MIXED BAG OF NEWS FOR #REDUCEIMMIGRATION IN 2015**

Denis McCormack of #Reduce Immigration sent us the following report:

"High immigration adversely affects our environmental and economic sustainability, social cohesion and cultural integrity. A summary of the continuing need for the REDUCE IMMIGRATION write-on campaign can be found in our Select Bibliography for 2015.

In the year just ending, immigration issues have created harrowing times for Europe and many other parts of the world. Here are a few items of special relevance to Australia.

### **The Good News...**

Australia's net overseas immigration (NOM) has reduced a little. The Australian Bureau of Statistics

has released (in Australian Demographic Statistics, June 2015) its preliminary estimates for the financial year 2014-15:

The preliminary estimate of net overseas migration recorded for the year ended 30 June 2015 (168,200 people) was 11.4%, or 21,600 people lower than the net overseas migration recorded for the year ended 30 June 2014 (189,800 people).

### **The Bad News...**

Despite the slight fall in intake that's reported above as Good News, the 2014-15 actual NOM figure represents 1.6 times the capacity of the Melbourne Cricket Ground, or approximately two federal electorates – that's a lot of immigrants!

(continued on next page)

**"ON TARGET"** is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights,  
Level 9, Suite 8, 118-120 Queen Street, Melbourne, 3000

Postal Address: GPO Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001. Telephone: (03) 9600 0677

Subscription \$45.00 p.a.

(continued from previous page) And the immigration targets for Australia are still excessively high. For 2015-16, the government has provided for up to 190,000 permanent migration places and 13,750 humanitarian places, plus an additional 12,000 humanitarian places for Syrian refugees, with ongoing pressure to accept more.

At its AGM on 4 July 2015, Victoria First retreated from its earlier endorsement of the REDUCE IMMIGRATION write-on campaign, due to a short-sighted lack of courage by its Executive. (Their only fresh idea for the future is to fold their tent, and wind up the association – with their modest residual funds being directed to the Victorian & Tasmanian branch of Sustainable Population Australia.)

### **A Mixed Bag...**

In September, the Australian Institute for Progress released its report on a survey conducted in November 2014, Australian Attitudes to Immigration. While the sample group was, by their own admission, severely limited through ‘a significant skew towards Greens and Labor’ – ‘we miss out on many blue-collar, working-class voters’ – the research valiantly attempts to wrestle with the complex issues associated with understanding how Australians view immigration.

Nevertheless, the questions they pose are interesting, and the mixed bag of responses gives food for thought. Their media release on the launch of their report suggests that it reveals ‘a nation deeply divided on issues around immigration, refugee policy and arrivals from Islamic countries’ and shows that ‘Australians are not only polarised on immigration, but they are very much “talking past” one another – using the same words to indicate radically different things’. Many respondents, for example, are so fixated on the illegal arrival of refugees (part of the Humanitarian program) that they are unable to comment rationally on the larger immigration program and picture. Every day, we see and hear such distortion of perception reflected in the media; this report epitomises the problem, but also lays a foundation for further research on complex and thorny issues.

### **Still Pending...**

In November, the Productivity Commission released its draft report, Migrant Intake into Australia.

Elements from our submission are reported in Box 4.2 (page 115) and Box 6.2 (page 186). As we noted at the time, the focus of the report’s recommendations is unfortunately on immigrants, not on ‘incumbent Australians’ or the environment. Public hearings on the draft report were held in December. At the Melbourne hearings, the REDUCE IMMIGRATION arguments were made persuasively by several speakers who out-numbered those from the pro-immigration lobby. Submissions and transcripts are available on the Commission’s website. We await the final report in March 2016.

The Department of Immigration and Border Control released a discussion paper on ‘Australian Citizenship – your right, your responsibility’ and invited public submissions by the end of June 2015 – but has not made it clear if or when they will produce a response to those submissions. A bit odd, if they truly wanted to hear our views! Meanwhile, quiet panic on the topic of social cohesion continues: see Rita Panahi’s report, ‘Immigrants to sit “cultural respect” test to earn Australian citizenship under proposal’, *Herald Sun*, 9 December 2015.

Plebiscites are an excellent way to assess public opinion as a guide to government action. Earlier this year we canvassed the idea of a REDUCE IMMIGRATION Yes/No plebiscite not long before (then) PM Tony Abbott rightly decided the people should have a say on the (less important than immigration levels) issue of ‘Gay Marriage’. We have made sure the PM and many others have received our communications on the REDUCE IMMIGRATION plebiscite. We hope for its eventual inclusion!

### **If Only...**

This year, if only they had known about the REDUCE IMMIGRATION write-on campaign, 7,199,273 Australian voters had the opportunity to send the REDUCE IMMIGRATION message through the electoral process (not counting local government polls). These were the people who lodged formal votes at the New South Wales state election (4,404,334), the Queensland state election (2,623,443), and at federal by-elections in Canning WA (89,717) and North Sydney (81,779).

If only a number of high-profile people and organisations who are on the public record as having concerns about Australia’s immigration-driven population growth had spoken up about this non-partisan campaign! For reasons not clear to us, the following have been dismissive up to now about the REDUCE IMMIGRATION write-on campaign: Dick Smith, Graham Turner, Bob Carr, Tim Flannery, Ian Lowe, Ross Gittins, Andrew Bolt, Rita Panahi, Tom Elliott, William Bourke, Kelvin Thompson, the Australian Conservation Foundation, the Greens, Sustainable Population Australia and the Sustainable Population Party. Feel free to pester them on this issue!

### **Looking Ahead...**

A federal election is due at some stage in 2016. Also, the Northern Territory is expected to go to the polls on 27 August 2016 and the Australian Capital Territory on 15 October 2016. See how to participate in the REDUCE IMMIGRATION write-on campaign, and check our FAQ page for further information. We encourage all readers to spread news of the REDUCE IMMIGRATION write-on campaign to friends, family, elected representatives and influential leaders. Happy New Year!

\*\*\*

## MULTICULTURALISING SOUTHERN NEW ZEALAND by Paul Walker

I know of people who see that the end is nigh for Australia and whom our looking to New Zealand to escape to for a light landing when the crash comes. As far as multicultural diversity goes New Zealand is behind Australia, but catching up quickly. Statistics from the latest census show that for Dunedin, the main city in the Otago region, the Maori population rose to 7.7%, Asians to 6.2% with smaller increases in other population groups. New Zealand elites are striving to make the place more diverse and cosmopolitan by changing the ethnic composition of the traditionally

### KATTER CALLS FOR CUT TO MASS MIGRATION – visas to be in line with job creation

Federal Member for Kennedy Bob Katter has this week called for a cut to 'mass migration' and for visas to be limited to one-half of the jobs generated annually in Australia, launching an online petition on the steps of Parliament House with members of the Jewish and Sikh communities, David Adler and Amar Singh. "For me this started off as an issue about the economy, but if there was any doubt in my mind that we shouldn't be moving aggressively on this issue, then recent events reinforce that," Mr Katter said. "Social Services Minister Christian Porter has said that welfare is exploding and that it will rise from \$157bn a year (a quarter the Federal budget) to \$277bn a year (nearly half the Federal budget) within a decade".

### IDEOLOGY AND THE INTERGENERATIONAL REPORT by James Reed

Immigration researchers Drs. Katharine Betts and Bob Birrell have a small article "Truthy Untruths: Behind the Facade of the Intergenerational Report", The Conversation.com, July 24, 2015.

The 2015 Intergenerational Report is concerned with Australia's demographic future over the next 40 years and seeks to justify Australia's high annual net overseas migration of 215,000 from 2018-2019 which will explode Australia's population from 23.8 million today to 39.7 million in 40 years time.

The Report claims (page 57) that infrastructure costs "are not linked explicitly to demographic factors". This claim is known to be false with population growth increasing the costs of housing and contributing to the need to replace, repair and upgrade infrastructure.

### MARION LE PEN AND DEMOCRACY by Peter West

The elites have been falling over themselves in excitement following the results of the December 2015 French regional elections which saw the mainstream parties all uniting against Le Pen's Front National. The French Socialists committed political suicide for the sake of globalism and immigration, dropping out of the second round of the election cycle. Thus, Front National candidate Marion Maréchal-Le Pen got around 45% of the vote, but no representation. She observed that there is thus now a two-party system in France, no longer between Left and Right, "but between those who favour globalisation and patriots".

Australians would do well to learn from this result.

majority European population by steadily increasing the numbers of people of non-European ethnicities.

In 1961 92% of the population identified as European but by 2006 67.6% identified as European. It is probably about the same percent in Australia, but dropping rapidly. New Zealand though is greener, wetter and less densely populated, so it still may be an escape route for Aussies who see no hope for Australia but think that they can survive the coming collapse in the wilds of New Zealand. \*\*\*

"But he hasn't said where the explosion is coming from – well I'm pinning the tale on the donkey.

"There are over 620,000 visas being issued in Australia each year but there are only 200,000 jobs created. On top of that there are around 200,000 school leavers and young people seeking jobs (not including tourist visas).

"That means that over 800,000 people are chasing only 200,000 jobs.

"The visa entrants are almost all from low wage countries, they therefore will get preference over Australians, so it is Australians that are forced onto welfare queues." \*\*\*

The Report, as well, ignores the environmental costs of immigration-fuelled population growth as the "level of Commonwealth Government spending on the environment is not directly linked with demographic factors". (Page 40) This too is nonsense.

The Report claims that high immigration results in a younger population than there would be without it. The supposed economic ill-effects of ageing are trivial. They should be easily managed by future generations themselves, provided they are not overwhelmed by the costs of bloated cities and environmental decay. As expected these style of government reports, as I see it, are not scientific, but rather ideological "justifications" for Australia's nationally suicidal immigration policy. \*\*\*

Writing in *The Times* (reproduced *The Australian*, December 17, 2015, p.10) Roger Boyes observes that the establishment elites are "fatigued" and that problems continue to grow for them. These problems will fuel support for the "Right". Migration bottlenecks will continue; the strain on local resources will worsen and the Right will be able to pose not as just anti-globalisers but as a form of citizens' defence. Boyes himself says that the substance of the nationalist cause needs to be addressed, but this is not going to occur because the Establishment is completely committed to the ideology of globalism which is inherently destructive of the sovereignty of nations. \*\*\*

## THE GREAT AUSTRALIAN "WATER WAR":

### The Water Act 2007 and the Murray-Darling Basin Plan by Arnis Luks and Ian Wilson LL.B.

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 (xxxii)).

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*



## BAN NIQAB, BURKA IN ALL PUBLIC PLACES

As a Muslim mother who never saw a niqab when I was growing up in Karachi, Pakistan, I am astonished to see Canada's judiciary caving in to Islamists who have nothing but contempt for Canada's values of gender equality.

I write as a Muslim Canadian who does not have any specific political leanings. But in the 25 years I have called Canada home, I have seen a steady rise of Muslim women being strangled in the pernicious black tent that is passed off to naive and guilt-ridden white, mainstream Canadians as an essential Islamic practice. The niqab and burka have nothing to do with Islam. They're the political flags of the Muslim Brotherhood, ISIS, the Taliban, al-Qaida and Saudi Arabia.

Now I learn I have not only to fight the medieval, theocratic adherents of my faith for a safe space for myself, I have to battle the Federal Court of Canada as well, which has come out on the side of these face-masks.

The ruling concerns the case of Zunera Ishaq, a 29-year-old woman who emigrated to Canada from Pakistan in 2008. After previously showing her face to an immigration official in 2013 when taking her citizenship test, she refused to take part in the citizenship ceremony because she would have to show her face while taking the oath of citizenship.

Prime Minister Stephen Harper's government rightly banned facemasks at such ceremonies, but this was found to be unlawful by the Federal Court. With all due respect, let me introduce our Canadian judges to their Pakistani colleague in the jihadi badlands of Peshawar. In November 2004, the Chief Justice of the Peshawar High Court (PHC), Tariq Pervaiz Khan, ordered female lawyers not to wear face veils in courtroom's, saying they couldn't be identified, nor assist the Court properly while wearing veils. He scolded the niqabi women saying, "You are professionals".

Covering the face is not a religious requirement for Muslim women. The injunction in the Qur'an is for modesty (for men and women). Some Muslim women interpret this as covering their head with a scarf or chador.

A scholar of Islamic history, Prof Mohammed Qadeer of Queens University, Kingston wrote in the *Globe and Mail* in the March 2006: "The argument about concealing one's face as a religious obligation, is contentious and is not backed by the evidence".

He added, "in Western societies, the niqab also is a symbol of distrust for fellow citizens and a statement of self-segregation. The wearer of a face veil is conveying: 'I am violated if you look at me'. It is a barrier in civic discourse. It also subverts public trust".

The federal Liberals and NDP are treating Canada's niqabis as a latter day Rosa Parks, fighting for justice. This is a vote-bank politics that is, as my friend Tarek Fatah calls it, "sharia Bolshevism".

**There is just one way forward:** The next government must legislate the complete ban on wearing face masks in public, not just to expose the hypocrisy of the Islamists but for the sake of our security as well.

- Raheel Raza is president of The Council for Muslims Facing Tomorrow, author of *Their Jihad... Not my Jihad*

Ref: <http://www.torontosun.com/2015/09/15/ban-niqab-burka-in-all-public-places>

## PARIS CLIMATE PART AGREES . . .

### to have another Party

Many climate sceptics are celebrating that "nothing in the Paris deal is legally binding."

**They should look deeper.** They have suffered a huge political defeat.

Skeptics are winning the climate science debate, but the main battle is no longer about facts and science – it is about propaganda and politics.

There were few scientists at COP21 talking about atmospheric physics - just politicians, bureaucrats and green activists discussing emission targets, carbon taxes, climate reparations and who will pay.

The Paris party organisers managed to assemble representatives of 196 nations with the aim of getting 100% agreement on something/anything that would assist their clandestine campaign for world government and world taxes. This process will cripple the industrial power and political freedom of the Western democracies.

They achieved agreement because of leadership by UN loving Western centralists like Obama, Merkel, Cameron, Hollande, Trudeau and Turnbull, helped by misguided theologians, and supported by vested interests in mendicant nations and some powerful competitors of the West. They spent two weeks reworking the draft document until there was nothing in it that offended any nation. **Read further:** <http://carbon-sense.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/paris-propaganda-victory.pdf>

**THE LEAGUE'S BOOK SERVICES: — <http://alor.org/>**

**When ordering journals, 'On Target' and 'New Times Survey' – Please make Cheques/Money Orders payable to – 'ALOR Journals'**

**For educational books, videos and DVDs, etc. please make Cheques/Money Orders payable to -- Heritage Bookshop Services'**

**For donations to the League please make payments to-- 'Australian League of Rights' or 'ALOR'**

**Books are available at meetings, at our Melbourne bookshop or by mail order from the following addresses:**

**Victoria, Tasmania:  
Heritage Bookshop,  
Level 9, Suite 8, 118-120 Queen Street,  
Melbourne, 3000  
(G.P.O. Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001).  
Phone: (03) 9600 0677**

**South Australia  
Heritage Book Mailing Service,  
P.O. Box 27, Happy Valley, 5159.  
Phone: (08) 71237131;**

**All Other States:  
To either Victorian or South Australian addresses.**

**VERITASBOOKS ONLINE:  
<http://veritasbooks.com.au/>**