

THE WATER CON JOB

This was accepted as a "letter to editor" of the Redcliffe Herald, but some of the most important sections were removed.

On Sunday 25-7-2010 I attended the water protest meeting that was held at Kallangur CWA hall. The turnout was around sixty-five people plus the Council panel and a Unitywater spokesman. Conspicuously absent were any Qld. Government representatives to answer questions re the concerns over the hefty new water costs. The Councillors and Unitywater spokesman were left to defend themselves against irate rate -payers. All the panel could do was to pass the buck back to the State Government as they couldn't answer many of the relevant questions. While I am highly critical of the new water arrangements, it was rather unfortunate that the Councillors were left to bare the brunt of the public anger.

What was apparent through the dialogue was that few people had much understanding of the events over the last eighteen years that have led us to this disastrous situation. We the rate and taxpayers have now lost control over the marketing of our most basic and necessary commodity - water. For me it is a double irony. As a researcher, I was aware in 2002 that the moves against our water would soon begin and in March 2003 I approached an acquaintance who was the Mayor of a shire in the S.E.Qld. Area and warned him that the State Government would probably try to take the water off the Council.

"No no no" he said,

"Every shire from Noosa to the Gold Coast owns its own water, the State Gov't. can't touch it."

The rest is history. I have been trying to warn people for the last eight years about where we have now arrived but few regarded the issue. It is now of course a different story. The outline of the systematic strategy which was used to prise our water from us is as follows.

In 1992 the United Nations held a conference in Ireland which was dubbed *"The Dublin Statement"*. It is evident that the conference conclusions were the precursor to, and were developed to become what is known as *"The World Bank Water Plan"* (WBWP) which was released by The World Bank in 1993.

Note the following sentence taken from "The Dublin Statement" -

The participatory approach involves raising awareness of the importance of water among policy-makers and the general public. It means that decisions are taken at the lowest appropriate level, **with full public consultation and involvement of users in the planning and implementation of water projects.** (Emphasis added)

What consultation and involvement were extended to *"we the people"* other than to be dictated to as to how much (**little**) we could use and how much **more** it would cost us! Note also it was not too long after this that water meters came into usage.

The WBWP prioritizes water into three categories:

1. The most important usage for water is irrigating the wetlands, ecosystems etc.
2. Domestic & Industrial use.
3. Agriculture -the least important!

To quote Dr. Stanley Monteith who did a critique of the WBWP - "In order to save water for the wetlands, the World Bank suggests that people drink processed toilet and sewer water. The World

Bank euphemistically refers to this activity as "water reuse in various economic activities."

Does this sound familiar folks? There are suggestions that the Qld. government has a 66% policy where 66% of the water that leaves the Wivenhoe dam goes straight down the Brisbane River! Considering the river is below the level of the wetlands, how much do you think would get to the wetlands? A little transparency would go a long way.

In 1998 a world conference on the subject of privatizing the world's fresh water resources was held in Paris, France. This conference was primarily concerned with turning the world's fresh water resources into a tradeable commodity on the stock exchange. Note the following clause from "The Dublin Statement" -

In the framework of the follow-up procedures developed by UNCED for [Agenda 21 \(www.un.org/esa/dsd/agenda21/res_agenda21_00.shtml\)](http://www.un.org/esa/dsd/agenda21/res_agenda21_00.shtml), all Governments should initiate periodic assessments of progress. At the international level, United Nations institutions concerned with water should be strengthened to undertake the assessment and follow-up process. In addition, **to involve private institutions**, regional and non-governmental organizations along with all interested governments in the assessment and follow-up, the Conference proposes, for consideration by UNCED, a world water forum or council to which all such groups could adhere. (Emphasis added)

The simple fact is that 75% of the world's fresh water supplies are now owned by three Corporations -

1. **VEOLIA** OF FRANCE.
2. **HALLIBURTON** OF THE USA.
3. **THAMES WATER**.

Considering our farmers are no longer permitted to build or repair dams, it can only be concluded that the ordinary citizen is being systematically isolated from fresh water, except that which will only be available through Corporations, in collaboration with the U.N. and other globalist bodies using our Governments as police forces, at their asking price. The WBWP is also advocating a reduction of water usage to a figure of 40 litres per person per day. The Canadian made documentary about water privatization called "*Dead in the Water*", also floating around as "***Water - Who Owns It?***" documents the disastrous effects that countries have experienced after their water supplies were privatized.

As it is Almighty God who freely gives all the resources for life, it gives you a very poor impression of certain human beings who are prepared to corner the market of that which all life on earth is dependent. The above information is a small portion of the information that is available, particularly on the internet.

Lawrence Addison,
Rothwell.