

43 Boscombe Ave.
City Beach, 6015
22nd Mar., 99

ESD Inquiry
Productivity Commission
L B 2 Collins St. East P O
Melbourne, Vic. 8003

Submission No. 2

I do not know that the reader of my second submission is aware of the first; therefore the enclosure of Submission No. I.

This submission involves the consideration of the connection between the ecological environment and human numbers. That there is such a connection, I think plainly true. A serious and specialized discussion of the environment assumes two fundamental problems: human numbers and human consumption. Because the Productivity Commission is about a responsible accommodation of development and the environment does not allow those fundamentals to be minimized. The privilege of submission does not include a discussion of ways and means. But, by way of emphasis of the merit of inclusion of the subject in the Final Report, I abuse the privilege to the least degree that I'm able.

About Consumption:

Frequently quoted statistics declare that some few individuals (Australia included) consume 50 times more than most individuals. This fact leads to consideration of means to share wealth or create wealth. More about that later.

About numbers:

Since the exposition of the principle of population, about 225 years ago, there have been those that rejected on the claim that the ingenuity of man is infinite or that man is perfectible or both. Those who still reject (honestly) do so by the claim that, "it just hasn't happened; we're better off then we ever were".

The fallacy of that rejection of the principle is as follows:

1. We that are better off are a diminishing few.
2. The 200 years in example experienced a phenomenal migration and development of underpopulated and underdeveloped areas of the globe.
3. The last 60 years of that period has produced the most exponential jump in human numbers. (In my lifetime alone, from 2.2 to over 6 billion)

Now back to Consumption, Sharing and Creating.

It is generally agreed that we few could consume less and more wisely, but seldom emphasized that we are such a small proportion that the sharing as such could not solve the massive problem. 1.3 billion people have no access to clean water-(that's a

World Bank statistic; not ABS) It may be so that ingenious man can develop agricultural and waste management practices to alleviate that condition. But would it not be prudent to accept and exercise population control until that is accomplished. An example of development is the Aswan Dam as the solution to water problems of Egypt. Less than 25 years later, due to population increase (either by domestic prolificacy or migration) Egypt is in critical need of water. And, suppose that Sudan asks for a dam too.

Now back to numbers:

300 human babies born every one minute: not just a US Bureau statistic (which is the source of UN statistics) but by the French Bureau also. I can only guess at the number of conceptions required to produce 300 births. When the sharing of the earth's habitable land areas is considered, I come to a similar conclusion to that of sharing consumption. In only a very few places are we not now over populated. The time for any area or nation to relieve it's problem by migration is past. For Australia (or any other nation) to project itself as needing migrants does great global harm by excusing the governments of severely over populated nations from responsibility. For Australia to accept migrants prior to solution of our manifest ecological and environmental problems is inconsistent with the ESD core objectives cited on page 151 of the Draft Report.

The frequent appeal to humanitarian motives can not be justified. We clearly can not accept all who need to escape and the selected few are the ones needed in their own nation.

Although the problem at this stage is more global than national, Australia is not immune.

We best serve humanitarian goals by using our foreign aid to help governments of those nations worst affected to adopt and implement population control programs. Each can determine what method suits them. Although we should set an example worthy of emulation, we should not participate in establishing international bureaus to invade their sovereignty.

We should agree that this finite earth could not support an infinite number of human beings. A realistic analysis of the 300 born (and the many more conceived) every one minute should tell us that we can not rely on one preferred solution. Family Planning may help some, Empowering Women can help in some cases, Education in Biological Consequences seems necessary among some; but the natural urge to proliferate must be restricted. Promulgation of the notion that it is a *human right* is a luxury we can no longer afford.

Human dignity requires that each nation and maybe certain cultural groups within a nation make their own decisions within their own national boundary: conquest either by force or by decree from a global judiciary is not any longer an option.

Sincerely
Jack Griffin