

## SUBMISSION TO THE PRODUCTIVITY COMMISSION

I come from a line of many generations of farming families from Somerset in England. My great-grandparents, being adventurous of spirit, sailed with the first fleet of free settlers to Victoria in 1862, and took up land near Geelong, a portion of which is still in the family. The farming tradition continues to this day. When I was a young man, my father said to me, "Look after your soil, son, and it will look after you. If you don't, you won't be on it long." It was advice, which had been passed down through the generations. In the years since, I have discovered that many other farmer's sons were given the same advice by their fathers.

There were always those who did not heed this advice. Good farmers would purchase their run-down farms cheaply, restore them, and would often sell them for a profit and look for another run down farm. It was a way of building capital so as to be able to afford to set their sons up on a property when they came of age. There was no Capital Gains Tax in those days but there was probate to plan for.

I mention the above because they demonstrate a number of things;

1) That farmers were conservationists long before it became fashionable to be so. That is not to deny that we have made some monumental blunders over the centuries. We have. And we have always fixed them. Sometimes the problems were corrected quickly, and sometimes they took longer. Some took several generations to solve. Sometimes technology had to develop and land values had to increase to a level where it became economically viable to fix the problems. But historically, farmers have always managed to fix the problems which they have caused, and have grown wiser in doing so. The experiences of millennia have added to a vast encyclopaedia of knowledge which has been passed down from generation to generation. So why should there just now be a crisis of confidence in them? Farmers take a very long term view. Nobody else holds this knowledge, and it is in great danger of being lost in one generation.

2) That the teachers who have taught our children that farmers actively degrade their land out of greed are misinformed and unqualified to teach on such topics. This is not so much the teachers' fault as the fault of those who put such calculated misinformation in the curriculum. These people should be sought out and brought to book. I think most of us would be surprized to find out who they are and to discover that they had an agenda to put the whole community against the farmer. It took but one generation to achieve their aim.

3) That it doesn't matter if there are lazy, greedy, or other categories of bad farmers. They soon go broke or die, and are bought out by good farmers who invariably fix the problems. Thus it has always been. Why would it be any different now?

4) That the claims of the environmental movement that once land is degraded, it takes thousands of years to rejuvenate are clearly incorrect. It is true that if nature is left to itself, it is very slow indeed, but, given a little help, it recovers

remarkably quickly.

It should be remembered that everything comes from the land.... the food we eat, the water we drink, the air we breathe, the clothes we wear, the gadgets we use in everyday life, the homes in which we live. There is nothing in this world which does not come from the land. The producers of the commodities necessary for our very existence are miners and farmers-- Primary Producers. They not only provide us with food and shelter, but also provide us with jobs so as to provide us with the wherewithall to purchase from them the very things necessary for our existence, not to mention those things which give us pleasure and comfort. The importance of the farmer is forgotten in our modern world. We forget that without him there is nothing. Even the miner is unnecessary without the farmer. He is the kingpin of the economy. In fact, without him there is no economy. Farmers were the first economists, the first scientists, the first chemists, surgeons, vets, accountants, businessmen, engineers, etcetera. From them has come every discipline of learning, and every trade. They made it necessary, and they made it possible. I am understandably proud of my farming heritage, but today I am a farmer without a farm, and I have never really come to terms with it. I sometimes think that there are few things sadder than a farmer without a farm. It tears at the heart. I could not see a future there for my children. Our ancestors gave their blood to get rid of serfdom, and those in power today seem determined to re-establish it. I don't wish my descendants to shed their blood as did our ancestors, however, I would not be worthy of the blood shed if I did not put up a fight. I don't wish their blood to have been shed in vain.

There are few economists in the world today who understand the principles of economics, and governments around the world are being advised by these ignorant academics who would dare to experiment with their theories upon the rest of us. Farmers understand the principles of economics because they are practitioners of its principles, not just theoreticians. One of my uncles used to say that academics were only experts, with the emphasis on "only". He was right! For there to be wealth in the economy, something has to be produced. Only primary and secondary industries produce anything, so only they produce wealth. All primary industry produces wealth, but only those things secondary industries manufacture for primary industries produces wealth. The rest consumes wealth. So it is with tertiary industry. Only those services to primary and secondary industries which aid production efficiencies in primary industry produces any wealth. All the rest consume wealth. The economy is like a tree. It must have its roots deeply in the soil and grow upwards to produce limbs and leaves until, in maturity, it eventually bears fruits in their seasons, making it a source of sustenance, and a place of protection from the storms of life, and from the elements. It is not a fickle cloud which floats by causing a trickle down effect when and if it sheds some rain, as is claimed by today's economists who all subscribe to the Harvard theory that nothing needs to be produced for there to be wealth in the economy. They claim that all that is necessary is that a profitable transaction take place. I would point out that someone must produce something before that could take place. This is just reasoning from cause to effect, but in my experience, the more highly "educated" people become today, the less capable they are of reasoning from cause to effect.

My eldest daughter made me aware of the reasons for this. She was in year ten and she complained to me that she was almost to the point where she could no longer think for herself. When I asked her how that could be, she replied that if she gave an answer which revealed evidence that she had reasoned from cause to effect she would be told that she was not to think for herself but was required to give the answer which she had been taught to give, whether or not she agreed with it. If she didn't comply, she would be marked as incorrect. I was horrified, and I was assured by her teachers it that was the case. When I was a student, education was defined as training the mind to think, and being prepared to accept the consequences of that. Today, it is training the mind to regurgitate. And we all know about "garbage in, garbage out"!

I am sure that you have received many submissions from the points of land degradation, sustainability, biodiversity, economic impact, et cetera. As a former farmer who understands the land, and as a scrub clearing contractor who, in the course of his work gets to see things about the land which few do, I could give you more of the same. I don't wish to do this. I am also a philosopher, and so I would like to address some of the philosophical issues.

In the last thirty years, we have seen a huge shift in power from the people to the government. We can no longer legitimately call ourselves a democracy. Laws no longer originate with the citizenry. They originate with governments, and are imposed upon the people. Governments no longer seek to govern for the people. Instead they seek to govern the people. History reminds us that whenever this happens, it results in government against the people. The two party system of government has been turned into "the two wings of the same bird of prey", to use the words of one commentator. There is a very good reason for this. The same people are now financing both parties, so whichever party wins an election, little changes. One may expect to get nothing for nothing, so the will of the financier/\$ is done. The people who think their vote can make a difference are deceived. It is merely a game of charades to keep them happy. The form of democracy remains without the substance. The ideological differences which once existed between the parties are now almost non-existent. Elections have become mere competitions to rule. We no longer have the New South Wales Government or the Australian Government. Instead we have the Carr Government and the Howard Government. These men, as several before them, are often heard to say, "My government". We are, in fact, electing kings for a season. In a democracy, "governments should be of laws, rather than of men" (Jaycees Creed).

Very few people have any representation in government. Instead, the political parties stand candidates in electorates. They don't represent the people of that electorate. They represent the party in that electorate. When a voter gives his vote to a party, he is giving it to them to do with as they please, and they may use it against the voter. A vote along party lines usually achieves this. Add to this the withdrawal of government agencies from the country to the cities and the consequential drift of private resources and people from the west to the coast, if not to the cities, taking their votes with them, is it any wonder that those who have the guts to remain are left feeling powerless. We produce the greatest proportion of wealth for the state and for the nation, but we have no say in how it is spent. We are

robbed continually. The government does not govern **for** us, it governs **against** us. I would remind you once again that this is the historical result of governments who seek to govern the people, rather than to govern for the people. The servant has risen up to rule, and King Solomon of Israel, who is said to be the wisest man who ever lived, had this to say, "Woe unto that land where the servant rises up to rule". Woe, indeed!

The public service which were once there to facilitate our wishes has become the government service to hinder the will of the people. They have all become policemen who are intent on finding fault with us in order to raise revenue.

When a person pays money for a property, they are purchasing the right to exercise their will upon it. Nothing more. Land without that right is worthless. The way the law stands, farmers who have paid good money for a property's potential are robbed of their investment, and are denied even the right to maintain it. It is outrageous! At the very time of earth's history, when, already knowing, still we are being told that we must learn to be flexible, farmers are placed in a straightjacket so as not to be able to be flexible. It is a recipe for disaster. They have been set up for a fall by the very ones who are supposed to serve them.

When SEPP 46 was introduced, it downgraded every land title in the state without any compensation. It confiscated unrestricted freehold title. It now exists in name only. This left the government open to massive compensation claims. It amazes me to this day that no claims have yet been made. The poor old taxpayer would have to cough up once again, and if one reasons from cause to effect, only those in primary industry pay taxes. Everybody else just appear to. It is just another game of charades.

I would suggest that democratic government is one which consults with an industry regarding the concerns of other groups within the society it represents, to make known those concerns to that industry. The government may even express a will of the majority to that industry, but it should not impose that will. If the industry does not wish to co-operate at that time, or can't, it should not be coerced into compliance. Only that industry can know if it could be viable under the suggested laws. Democracy does not always deliver the best outcomes, but it does deliver the best outcomes which can be agreed upon without stepping on the rights of a minority. Democracy is not majority rule where the will of the majority is imposed upon minorities. That is a dictatorship of the majority, and can only be tyrannical, and results in minorities being exiled or destroyed.

There are some very good reasons for the problems above. As I have indicated, they are philosophical. There are but two philosophies in this world. Under one or the other can be categorized every thought and action. We all, knowingly, or unknowingly, subscribe to one or the other. Some even attempt to borrow elements of each, but it always ends in confusion and/or inconsistency, for while these two philosophies appear to share some common elements, they are mutually exclusive.

## Philosophy 1:

That mankind was created in the image of God, was given dominion over the created order, and because he was created in the image of God, he had a caring regard and respect (love) for his fellow man and for the created order.

This philosophy has given rise to three great religions; namely, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, all of which are monotheistic.

## Philosophy 2:

That mankind is just another animal, and is therefore a part of the environment.

This philosophy has given rise to all the other religions and belief systems in this world; that is, heathen (by definition), all of which are polytheistic.

Philosophy 2 is a natural philosophy. It has to do with the senses, the feelings, the emotions, the intuitions, the the lusts, and the desires. Its emphasis is physical. Animals are egocentric. They see only their own point of view. The world exists for them. Their societies are hierarchical. The dominant animal rules, ie., he/she imposes his/her will upon their subjects. All power and privilege is invested in him/her. Their government is coercive. Their economy is based on their subjects, not upon anything which is produced. The dominant animal owns his/her subjects and anything which they may possess, including their lives. Their justice system is one of payback and revenge, and the dominant animal deputises his authority to his lackeys to keep the rest in line. They are his government servants and they are servile to him in order to keep their privileged positions, and intolerant of, and savage to those beneath them. They are territorial. They are superstitious. They are intolerant of anything and anyone who would stand in the way of them achieving their objectives, and they are obsessive in the execution of their aims. They are sensate .... truth is ascertained by a consensus of the senses. Their existence is a very physical one .... cognitive thought is employed in scheming to manipulate others, and events, for one's own physical advantage, and spirit refers to the feelings, emotions, intuitions, et cetera; all of which are a part of the physical being. The dominant animal is feared and worshiped as god for his prowess and ruthlessness in fighting his way into his position. If he rules savagely, there will be attempts to depose and destroy him. If he rules benevolently, it is unlikely that a challenge to his position will succeed, because his subjects will come to his aid against the contender, to kill him. The challenger cannot merely be exiled. Their society is a savage one. They have no caring regard for each other, because each is for himself. Liasons are formed for common goals. To paraphrase Leon Uris, their mod operandi is, I against my brother, my brother and I against our father, and all of us against the world". This is a system based upon suspicion and hatred. One's existence consists of seeking to minimize the pain inflicted from those above one in the "pecking order, and to maximise the pain inflicted on those beneath. The most satisfactory relational outcome which can be achieved is a trade-off such as , If you don't hurt me, I won't hurt you (Do unto others as you would have them do to you). Animals *destroy themselves*. Their societies and dynasties never last for

long. These are just a few of the marks of the beast.

These are the principles upon which every kingdom and empire were built. People were subjects, not citizens. They were owned by the monarch or the emperor and their lives were literally in his hands. The king or the emperor paid for nothing. All was his, so he would just take it. The people lived in abject poverty and misery and worked long hard hours for the landlord who payed taxes to the king for the privilege of using his subjects. Children from a young age worked from as young an age as they were able. Weak and infirm were destroyed. These staves of the king or emperor and his lackeys were provided with never enough to keep them in proper health, or to keep them warm , or to keep them sheltered. It didn't matter, because they bred their own replacements. Their only hope of escape to a slightly better life was to join the king's army where one would have the privilege of dying for one's monarch in one of the many wars which occurred in those times. Life had little value if you were not a nobleman. These subjects had no personal rights and owned no personal property. They existed, they didn't live. This is how the world was run for millenia. It was an economy based on the slavery of the people. Depending upon where one lived upon the earth, the average age was 26 to 29.

Then just a few hundred years ago, a change occurred. The Protestant reformation had rediscovered the truth that mankind was created in the image of God. It gave value to humanity, and it broke the yoke of slavery which had been on the backs of the poor. They rose up and threw most of the kings and emperors of this world off their thrones, and the ensuing Industrial Revolution gave ordinary men rights and freedoms, personal property and wealth for the first time in history. Previous to the Industrial Revolution the earth's population had never reached even half a billion. There were times when it got close, but it just could not sustain more than about 460,000,000 with the technology of the times. There were times when the earth's population got as low as 140,000,000 because of wars, pestilences, and diseases which meant that mankind was so scattered that it was difficult for people to find a suitable mate. The industrialization of the world soon changed all of that. New methods of farming were employed which enabled higher productivity, much of the heavy manual work was taken over by machines and the minds of men were actively engaged in improving every aspect of life. The Great Enlightenment played its part in improving the lot of humanity. It was secular and humanistic. These were all ideas which would not have been countenanced just a few years before. The United States of America broke away from the bonds of old Europe and established an agrarian economy with the rights and freedoms of all enshrined in its constitution. It prospered like no other nation before it. it was a nation under God. Instead of a monarch's head upon its currency, were written the words, "In God we trust", in order to remind its citizens that, "It is the Lord who gives thee power to get wealth". The oligarchs of Europe hated it because it set an example to the world, and they plotted to destroy it from within. It all continued until 1968, when Prince Phillip declared that the Industrial Revolution was over, and that now was the age of Information Technology. The age of Pisces (I think it was) had made way for the Age of Aquarius. There was even a popular song to reinforce the concept.

Prince Phillip set up his Worldwide Fund for Nature, and it spawned the conservation movement worldwide. In Australia, we have the Australian

Conservation Foundation. The hippies turned their backs on the modern world and went back to nature, living a life of subsistence. In the beginning, most of them came from wealthy families who could afford to give them a university education. On university campuses around the world, it became fashionable to be associated with one or another of the Eastern religions such as Buddhism, Ba'Hai, Hinduism, et cetera. Their grandparents had been Godfearing, churchgoing people, but after going to a war or two, their parents had lost their faith, so ceased to believe, but they held to most of the morals held by the grandparents. It was a cultural thing. They saw it as being important to hold the culture and the fabric of society together. These children challenged their parents on their reasons for holding to their morals and could not get satisfactory answers. Their parents had the form of Godliness, but denied its power, and so could not give a reason for what they believed. These children had grown up believing in nothing, and found some answers in the humanism of the East. The new conservation movement was in tune with these philosophies, and the youth of the time accepted them enthusiastically. The pill became available to anyone and the sexual revolution was born. There were songs to go with the times. The music, too, had changed. Instruments were no longer in the background; musicians now vied with the singer for prominence. There was a heavy bass which drove home the words into the subconscious. The rockbands of the time, as now, became the new evangelists for a new religion. The songs were didactic. It was no longer music which one listened to, it was music you felt ... physically. It was so loud that its physical impact could affect your heartbeat, and a few lost their lives because of the effect. Instead of appealing to the intellect, it appealed to the emotions. I remember some of the words of one, " If it feels good, do it, if it hurts just let it lie. There's no mystery to it, if it feels good, do it!" It summed up the modus operandi of the times. It was a whole new ethic. "Do your own thing. Never mind about anybody else!" "Truth is not objective, it is subjective. You have to find your own truth." "There are no absolutes!" "Whatever you believe becomes true for you." "You have to respect everybody's truth...." Never mind that truth, by definition, is objective, unchangeable fact; or that the statement that there are no absolutes is an absolute statement, and therefore, nonsense. How you felt was what was important. The use of transcendental meditation was encouraged as a tool for tuning in to the great forces of nature. A whole new spirituality was embraced, which culminated in the New-Age movement. Drugs were recommended as a shortcut to these altered states of consciousness, and so the drug culture began.

Before Gough Whitlarn made tertiary education available to all, academics were few by today's numbers. They mostly came from well-to-do families who could afford to send them to university, and they were often those who were not suited to manual trades. They served an important role in society in that they would offer possible theoretical solutions to practical problems. But it was left to the practitioner to decide which ones showed merit. There would often then be collaborative work until working solutions were found. The academic would publish and the information would get into general usage. Academics were on small stipends usually, and publishing was a chance to make a better living. Perhaps patents could be applied for for a similar result. But mostly they depended upon their families' wealth if they wished to live it up a bit. Because these people grew up in powerful families, they were used to power and knew how to apply it. There was another class of academic. Those from families who could not afford to send them

to university, but were enabled to go because of a scholarship. These people were intelligent enough to work it out that the proof of having power was in not using it, unless there was an emergency, when one was expected to exercise it fully.

When access to a free education was given to all, many from working-class families who had for generations done nothing to better themselves except complain loudly about the injustices of not being paid enough to both get ahead and have a good time, saw this as their opportunity to put things right. They saw a tertiary education as their ticket to wielding the power their class deserved but were never given the opportunity to exercise. Here we had powerless people lusting after power.

When they had completed their educations many of them headed for the public service which the government of the day was rapidly expanding, where they were determined to make some changes, and where they mistakenly believed that their years of study would be rewarded amply. They were horrified to discover that their remuneration packages weren't much different than if they had done a trade of similar duration. If they had taken any notice of the rest of the world around them instead of being so egocentric, they would have noticed that if he was frugal, a public servant would manage to pay off his forty year house loan about the time he retired, and that his superannuation would buy him a medium quality car which would "see him out", and perhaps a trip overseas or a modest beach house, or something of similar value, and he would spend the rest of his days on the pension like everybody else.

By the end of the seventies the nation almost ground to a halt with months of public service strikes. These previously powerless people who believed that it was no good having power if you didn't use it, had grasped the sceptre of power with both hands and began to wield it. Public servants became public masters and paid themselves accordingly.

Those that had an interest in the environmental movement went into organizations such as The National Parks and Wildlife Service, and into the organizations which later were to make up the Department of Land and Water Conservation. They would succeed in turning those bodies into the two arms of "The Anti-Productivity Commission".

The environmental movement is based squarely on the philosophy that mankind is just another animal and is therefore a part of the environment. Like animals, they put nature on a pedestal and worship it and everything natural, both good and evil. They, therefore make mankind subject to nature, and like the subjects of the kings and emperors before them, they would make us slaves to the savagery of nature. They reject the tenet that mankind was given dominion over the created order, and they are determined to deprive him of that God-given responsibility. They deny that mankind was created at all, let alone in the image of God, and claim that he evolved along with everything else. Their argument fails down here. If they believe in the theory of evolution, and in the principle of survival of the fittest, why are they worried? Surely nature will get it right eventually. And surely they are wrong to meddle in the process! it may take a few billion years, but ... Ah, they are worried about the endangered species. Surely only those that prove fittest against all odds



deserve to live? They just aren't tough enough. Why should human behaviour be modified to accommodate their survival? Wouldn't that be unnatural and therefore blasphemy? I could go on for hours in this vein, but I think I have made my point.

When you look closely at their philosophy you will find that they have no caring regard for the environment as they like to call it. Like the egocentric animals they admit to being, they are but interested in saving their own hide. They are afraid that they won't survive if they don't ensure that other species survive because they are superstitious that their survival in a hostile world may depend on one of these, and, because they don't know what the future may hold, it is impossible to ascertain now just what may be beneficial when whatever catastrophe they anticipate comes.

A great catastrophe is coming, that is for sure, and the environmentalists will have caused it by their anti-productive policies. They want to take us all back to the bad old days of pre-Industrial Revolution, and enslave us once more to the monarchs and emperors of this world. They have already engineered our economic slavery. We groan under the pressures put upon us to survive. We no longer are able to live. Before the announcement of the Age of Aquarius, one income was sufficient to provide all the needs of a family. Today, two incomes are becoming inadequate, and again we are seeing children entering the workforce in order to maintain family living standards.

Animals survive. It is the will of God that we live, hence the "Tree of Life in the Garden of Eden, and the freedom of choice which was given to our first parents which represented His form of government. There was another tree in the Garden of Eden.... the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. It represented the Deceiver, and his form of government. He took the form of a beast, and although his sales pitch promised them that they would be as gods, being free to do as they pleased ... both good and evil, what he really was offering them was to become an animal which could talk. He successfully made a sale, and mankind who was created in the image of God became a beast which boasted that he was God! -- an animal which could talk, who was now good and evil. And history confirms it.

I find it very interesting that Prince Phillip is behind the environmental movement. He has turned it into a religion which has the possibility of converting the whole world. I also find it interesting that the number of people on this earth which he and his followers quote as being sustainable is 500,000,000. That is consistent with their stated aim of returning the earth to its pre-Industrial Revolution state. Just enough people to ensure that a select few could live as gods on the backs of the rest. Any more would be difficult to control. They might get the upper hand again. The kings and emperors evidently have decided that they have been in exile long enough. They are weary of having pomp without power. They wish once again to demonstrate, as have all the kings and emperors before them, that they sit in the place of God, pretending to be God, and showing us in no uncertain terms that they are indeed God. They represent the Beast and possess all the marks of the beast. The scripture calls this philosophy that mankind is just another animal, "The abomination which maketh desolate", and a desolate earth will be the result of the environmental movement and its affiliates- Prince Phillip and his lackeys' plan is largely in place. When unproductivity causes the economic collapse of all the

economies of the world, the world's population will go into freefall and it would be remarkable if it could be stopped. No wonder that Revelation asks the question of whether there will any flesh be saved. What about their endangered species then? I am of the opinion that Prince Phillip is the most dangerous man on the planet. He is as ruthless in the pursuit of his goals (of putting all the kings of Europe back on their thrones) as were his murderous predecessors. To plan the reduction of earth's population from presently over 6,000,000,000 to around 500,000,000 in a generation or so will necessitate the eradication of around 10,000,000,000 people. I'm not aware if there is yet a technical term for such a slaughter, but, murder and genocide would appear to be inadequate! He seeks to deceive the whole world back into the hands of the kings and emperors of this world, and is using the environment as a trojan horse. He, who represents those who have historically plundered the resources of the earth, including its peoples, for their own pride and glory, would now present himself as the saviour of the world!!!??? He is a deceiver and this is no wonder. He has publicly stated that he worships Gaia, the earthmother god of his ancestors (He is very pro-multicultural). Gaia, like most of the gods of the heathen, is known by a multiplicity of names including Apollo and Satan. We should not be surprized by this. The scripture tells us that Satan is the Prince of this world. The name of the game is "Control" and Satan needs the hands of men to aid him. These captains of Old Europe have succeeded in whiteanting the United States of America to the point where they have it where they want it. The lamb which once grew out of the earth now speaks as a dragon. It is becoming an empire, and as such is taking on the form of the beast. It has become like its european cousins, and will take its place alongside them in the new world order. The new generation has forgotten why 'In god we trust' is written on their currency, and assume that it is there because the currency is god. They have therefore put their trust in it.

Farmers mostly subscribe to the original philosophy, not the alternate one. They take their God-given dominion over the created order very seriously. It is a solemn obligation and injunction. When Man sinned he rebelled against God, and in turn, the created order rebelled against his dominion, He no longer has its co-operation. This makes it very difficult. As God promised in Genesis, "By the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread". This explains why different techniques have continually to be employed in the management of nature. Fences, culling, and castration, etcetera, have had to be employed upon animals, and weed controls have to be employed upon plants. For example, we have developed sprays, but because of the rebellion of the plant kingdom, they are never effective for long. New ones have to be developed. Nature is continually finding new ways do defy the dominion of man.

In the plant kingdom, as in the animal kingdom, the dominant species rides until it destroys itself. Nature subscribes to 'Competition Policy'. There can only ever be one winner in any competition. Competition L-ads to monopoly. Nature is full of examples of this. If left for long enough, there would only be one kind of plant species on the planet, and only one animal species. The competition would continue. The winner of the final competition would then destroy itself. The evolutionary theory of "survival of the fittest" (dominant animal rules) is not responsible for the great diversity of species upon this earth. This Satanic principle is having just the opposite effect. It is not man's interference which has caused the

loss of species, but the lack of it. It was the creative word of God that produced the great diversity of this world. It is the God-given responsibility of mankind to ensure that nature does not destroy itself. We must control trees and other plants from becoming so thick that none of them can reach their full potential, and we must ensure that they don't destroy the soil in which they grow. If we let, them go wild (animals and plants are naturally wild), as the environmental movement insists we should, they will destroy themselves, and us with them. Man must exercise his dominion over the created order for its own sake!

Despite the fact that equal numbers of males and females are produced by the animal kingdom, only a few males get to mate. This has the effect of diminishing the gene pool. Eventually, it becomes unviable, and this is the reason for the loss of species in the animal kingdom. It has very little to do with the so called loss of habitat. Once again, we find that the rebellion of nature to man's husbandry, or the lack of man exercising his dominion over these species, is the real cause of their decline.

Mankind is the most successful of all species on the planet. This can be attributed to marriage....The equal mating practises of the species, and the prohibition on incestual matings. This principle expands the gene pool. Hence the success. Lets look at the next most successful group of animals (and plants). Where do we find these? Under the management of mankind as pets and livestock! The evidence is there for those who will see. The willingly blind cannot be made to see.

As I said earlier, this is a philosophical issue. It is a matter of worship. Worship is not what one does in a certain place, at a certain time, on a certain day. It is how we live, every day, in every place, every moment. This is dictated by the philosophy to which we subscribe. We reveal which philosophy to which we subscribe by how we live. Either we worship the beast and his image, or we worship God. There is no middle ground. Jesus said, "Those who are not for me, are against me". For farmers to embrace the environmental movement and its demands, would be for them to turn their backs on the God of their fathers, and to worship gods their fathers knew not.

The environmental movement and the government are endeavouring to force a system of worship upon farmers and this is unconstitutional. Section 116 states, "The Commonwealth shall not make any law for establishing any religion, or for imposing any religious observance, or for prohibiting the free exercise of any religion, and no religious test shall be required as a qualification for any office or public trust under the Commonwealth". The Native Vegetation Act is clearly in breach of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia, and therefore must be repealed.

We recognize the rights of the heathen among us to worship as they see fit, but we object to their attempting to coerce us to join with them. It is particularly upsetting us that they would use the legislature to this end. They have deceived our legislators in this. Although it is contrary to their philosophy, I would encourage them to exercise religious liberty also. It is a constitutional requirement enjoined equally upon us all.