

Wikileaks Party

2014 WA By-Election Party Survey Responses



3. Environmental Sustainability

7. Would you support increasing Australia's emissions reductions target to at least 19% by 2020, as recommended by the Climate Change Authority earlier this year?

Yes

Comments: Emissions reduction should be upped to such an extent as to fully cap emissions and hence we arise in genuine expectations and measures to cap these emissions and address climate change imbalances. Coal based emissions need to be limited to less than 550 gigatons by 2050 in order to stay within the prospect of a two degree rise in temperature estimates end of the century, however we have a current surplus of 3000 gigatons, so unless legislation arises to address emissions from all sources then the myriad impacts will arise with devastating effects. 19 per cent is nowhere near a required target. We need to impart the facts and the science to the Australian nation and then procure the reductions to biologically safe levels.

8. Would you support a price and limit on greenhouse gas emissions for the biggest polluters?

Yes

Comments: The limit/cap is the mechanism that will exact change agency and that cap has to be one to meet reduction in gross measures of particles per thousand and in terms of gigatons of emissions. When we settle for less we are often left with less. We need to impart the facts and the science to the Australian nation and then deliver limits that will reduce emissions to biologically safe levels.

9. Would you support Australia committing to immediate ratification of the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol?

Yes

Comments: It is the very least we can do by committing to the second part so we can raise the expectations and significantly reduce emissions, however we need to go well beyond the Kyoto Protocol and reduce emissions in correlation to biological and environmental safe levels despite most of the European nations having 'walked away from the first commitment.

Text

10. Would you support policies that prepare Australia for the impacts of between 2 and 4 degrees of global warming scenarios, by establishing and disclosing a national plan of action?

Yes

Comments: We should support policies that prepare Australia for such prevalence, and in the public interest be transparent with a full public record, however we should be supporting policies at this time to reduce emissions in accordance with the science that correlates emission rises with global warming, we need to reduce gigatons of emissions by five-sixths the current rate to reduce what will be the otherwise looming impacts. Deforestation is another cause of negative impacts and this needs to be included in ways forward

11. Would you support policies that rule out cuts to the current 2020 Renewable Energy Target (of 41,000 GWh)?

Yes

Comments: There should be no cuts to the as it is very minimalist 2020 Renewable Energy Target of 41,000 GWh, indeed we should be raising significantly and with the public interest in mind the renewable energy target.

12. Would you support strengthening the Renewable Energy Target to at least 50% by 2030?

Yes

Comments: We would support raising it to 100 per cent by 2030 and we would support increasing transition to renewables within all layers of the Australian at speed for the sake of both humanity and the planet as we know both.

13. Would you support Australia's commitment to a target of 100% renewable energy by 2050?

Yes

Comments: Yes. We would support this commitment for much sooner, for effectively now, as the science demonstrates each day delayed hence the logarithmic and exponential rise of impacts. Renewable energy transitions should be the nation's prioritised agenda and underwrite future economies for the sake of humanity and the planet. We believe every household should have renewable energy and should not be connected to the grid.

14. Would you support continued funding for large-scale renewable energy and energy efficiency technology through the Clean Energy Finance Corporation (CEFC)?

Yes

Comments: This is imperative in realising the transition to renewable energy for the Australian nation and in setting an example of other nations to follow. However we need to put people first and ensure every household in Australia has been transitioned to renewable energy.

15. Would you support policies that prevent unconventional gas mining in drinking water catchments?

Yes

Comments: It is anathema that we would procure irrecoverable impacts and irreparable damage, this needs to be highlighted and for stances to be taken against those who mine in water catchments. We must prescribe appropriate legislation to protect drinking water catchments.

16. Would you support policies that prevent unconventional gas mining in residential areas?

Yes

Comments: It would be once again anathema to put at risk the biological and environmental health of any residential area wherever within the Australian nation. Legislation must be prescribed and enabled to protect the Australian nation.

17. Would you support policies that give farmers and other landowners the right to say no to mining on their own property?

Yes

Comments: Natural rights are myriad and some of these rights should ensure rights to ones land. Miners should not have unfettered access nor override the rights, property and otherwise, of other. Property owners should have the right to veto mining on land acquired by them or on which they reside on. Farmers may live and thrive livelihood from agribusiness and should not be usurped by the demands of others. We need to protect our farmers who are the heart of the nation's food security.

18. Would you support a moratorium on coal seam gas and shale gas mining until a scientific consensus on the environmental and health impacts is reached?

Yes

Comments: The effects of coal seam gas and shale gas are now widely documented and their effects lead to the irreparable, fracturing the bedrock of the land and the sea - and with the profit motive rife at this time from mining shale gas, till consensus arises from a science basis as to the environmentally safe approaches to mining shale gas and sourcing coal seam gas, for the sake of biological safety and environmental safety a moratorium is a must-do.

19. Would you oppose funding cuts for public broadcasters, including the ABC and SBS?

Yes

Comments: There should be no cuts to funding, and there should be an increase, and similarly so to community broadcasters around the nations, however the funding should be enshrined in legislation as to protect the broadcasters and the public interest from threats of funding cuts in the event of Governments upset by freedom of speech. The ABC and SBS are not foolproof from cultures of favour dispensation and do fail to secure funding commitments if they do not respond favourably to backroom assaults on them. Our media is not a free press, we rank only 26th in the world according to Reporters Without Borders Free Press Index. Legislation is imperative to protect funding quotients, rights and the free press.

20. Would you oppose the partial or full privatisation of the ABC and/or SBS?

Yes

Comments: Independent media cannot arise from within privatisation. We would oppose it vehemently and without respite. Any semblance of free media can only arise from outside private ownership.

21. Would you rule out policies that would increase regulation of Australia's free press?

Yes

Comments: Australia does not have a free press and any further restraints would diminish what little prospect we have in the future of a free press. Australia ranks lowly on the world's free press rankings, Reporters Without Borders ranks Australia 26th with countries such as Costa Rica ahead of Australia. We need to also introduce genuine whistleblower laws, we need to introduce legislation to check litigation which is abused by those who can afford it to reduce the public interest and to destroy the public record. We must work towards a free press and not the debacle that Australia endures now with just about all its media.

22. Oppose the removal and killing of sharks from designated "safe zones" in WA?

Yes

Comments: We need to listen to the science and the research and we need to remove ourselves from induced hysteria. Shark attacks are few and far between. Some of the culling methods are destroying sea habitats, marine life. We opposed the killing of sharks for unwarranted media driven hysteria. In Western Australia, Premier Colin Barnett has mishandled the hysteria and delivered knee jerk reaction as policy. This is impropriety and poor Government.

23. Would you support greater transparency around global trade deals, like the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement?

Yes

Comments: The TPP is multi-faced, and proposes various larceny for multinational robber barons, by reducing checks and balances, working in the interests of the few over the many. The whole TPP must come before a full blown Senate led Commission so as to fully broach checks and balances. It must be done urgently in light of transnational business on a large scale rise, and especially in light of sovereign revenues that Australia maybe cheated from. The TPP is a dangerous mechanism slated in the interest of the multinationals and is without any adequate transparency and accountability protocols.

24. Would you oppose the inclusion of Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) clauses in global trade deals like the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement?

Yes

Comments: The ISDS is about sovereign corporates and not about sovereign nations, it is a charade to arbitrate in the interests of the corporates, the multinationals. It is not transparent and the World Bank which may oversee arbitration is not to be trusted without checks and balances that protect Australian sovereignty. Checks and balances should include Australian legislation, not the assumption of 'international' public law, to protect Australian sovereignty, and rights which may include impacts to the nation and the nation's interests, from multinationals who through international mechanisms can then formally cheat the Australian nation, as is common practice throughout the world. Anti-corruption checks should be legislated, and nothing should be arbitrated ever in secrecy, the public record must at all times be available and without delay.

25. Would you oppose any industrial-scale dredging or dumping of dredge spoil within the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area?

Yes

Comments: World Heritage areas, and other areas not protected but that should be, should not be dredged or mined under any circumstance. The Great Barrier Reef is fragile and vulnerable and has not had any chance to recover from impacts from myriad assaults in recent years. The Great Barrier Reef, the Dampier Peninsula, James Price Point, amid others should be preserved and protected in entirety.

26. Would you support implementing the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee to avoid the Great Barrier Reef being listed as 'in danger' by UNESCO?

Yes

Comments: The Great Barrier Reef is already in danger, this is scientific consensus, biodiversity has been reduced, marine life damaged, the reef itself, the very coral, vulnerable. It is a must-do that the Great Barrier

Reef should be listed as in danger by UNESCO.

27. Would you prevent any new port development along the Great Barrier Reef coastline?

Yes

Comments: Any new port development would mean dredging and dumping and myriad negative impacts. The Great Barrier Reef, according to scientific consensus, is in danger and indeed should be protected. To protect the reef the coastline must be protected.

28. Would you support keeping the Federal Government's power to approve or reject any major developments that affect the Great Barrier Reef?

No

Comments: Legislation should prohibit any major developments that would affect the Great Barrier Reef.

29. Would you support an end to mandatory offshore detention for asylum seekers who arrive in Australia by boat?

Yes

Comments: Mandatory detention now costs the Australian nation more than the Corrective Services budget. Mandatory detention is in breach of international protocols and agreements the Australian Government is party to and which it has ratified. The Australian Government's moral ground is askew and the Government has with toxicity poisoned and divided the Australian people with ugly racism that should be outdated. There is no need for mandatory detention. Asylum Seekers have every right to reach Australia and apply for Asylum, and for their applications to be justly, and with bona fide oversight and transparency, considered. Australia should process applications with expediency. Australia should set a positive example and also raise its resettlement quota - bringing in also more refugees from overseas camps - Australia should raise its resettlement quota to no less than 50,000. This is about people, and people must come first.

30. Do you support the closure of the Manus Island offshore detention centre?

Yes

Comments: We support the closure of all offshore and onshore detention centres, they are inhumane, unjust, a stain on our collective national consciousness.

31. Do you think children should be removed from indefinite detention?

Yes

Comments: Everyone should be removed from indefinite detention. Children should never be in such deplorable environments where their form and content, their very development is being harmed.

32. Would you support maintaining penalty rates for Australian workers?

Yes

Comments: The majority of Australian workers are still in labour intensive occupations, and the majority work purely to keep food on the table and a roof over their family's heads. People must be remunerated accordingly. Removing penalty rates is the equivalent of giving rise to wage slavery and various exploitation. The employer must not be put into the unenviable position to decide this, legislation should be retained for penalty rates and employers accommodate this. People's time must be compensated, it is imperative in terms of social well being and conducive to workplace morale.

33. Would you oppose any attempt to get rid of the Unfair Dismissal laws

Yes

Comments: We have the barest of unfair dismissal laws as it is, by reducing or removing what checks and balances we have it's open slather for employers versus the employee. Job security must remain a natural

right.