

INVESTIGATE

new zealand's best current affairs magazine

BREAKING NEWS

MARCH 2001

AIR NEW ZEALAND

EXCLUSIVE: questions are raised over Air New Zealand's approach to passenger and flight safety, after news of a major incident is leaked to INVESTIGATE, as IAN WISHART reports

A JAB IN THE DARK

SIMON JONES reports on a new medical study that claims the MMR vaccine should never have been released on the market, amid growing concern that it causes Autism in children

THE BORDER COPS

Why are more and more police deserting the force to join other agencies or the private sector? We profile the MAF Investigation Unit - a team of former police now tracking animal smugglers

END OF EMPIRE

IAN WISHART's essay on the constitution: why the Treaty of Waitangi and Parliament are two dinosaurs long past their use-by dates

THE BONE PEOPLE

A chopped down tree and a stone axe found *under* a 30,000 year old Auckland lava flow suggest New Zealand's first residents were much older than first thought

NZ'S MINDHUNTER

SIMON JONES interviews New Zealand's "Mindhunter", a criminal profiler who helps police recognise sex offenders and psychopaths at a glance



EDITORIAL & OPINION

2 **FOCAL POINT**

Will someone rid us of our turbulent PM?

4 **VOX-POPULI**

firing on all cylinders

12 **CHRIS CARTER**

Should we lynch child killers?

14 **TALKING POINT**

Laura Wilson on babies

18 **WEST WING**

Dan Rather on fathers

20 **MARIANNE MEANS**

Bush family values

22 **SHORT CIRCUITS**

things you never wanted to know



vive la revolution

If you needed proof of why Helen Clark, the colonial Government in Wellington and the Crown must go, look no further than the abuse of power taking place over New Zealand's relationship with Australia and the scrapping of the New Zealand airforce.

At the stroke of our Prime Minister's pen, she has signed away the right enjoyed by New Zealanders for 160 years to automatic permanent residency in Australia.

Even President Bush does not have the power to simply sign away the rights of US citizens just like that.

Only in a backward, colonial, forelock-tugging, peasant-ridden, you-deserve-the-government-you-get kind of hell-hole like New Zealand do you have a situation where Parliament rules the roost like an obscenely obese parasitic chicken gobbling its own young.

Think I'm going too far? I haven't even begun.

Helen Clark and her merry band of bottom-dwellers and trough-slurpers enjoy more power than King Charles I had when the peasants revolted and chopped off his head. Under the New Zealand Constitution Act of 1986, the New Zealand Parliament has a "divine" right to rule, unhindered by any interference from the people.

Facing a King who also claimed a divine right to rule, Cromwell said two things. Firstly: "You have sat too long here for any good you have been doing. Depart, I say, and let us have done with you. In the name of God, go!"

Secondly, in the face of resistance from corrupt Crown loyalists who protested loudly about "the rule of law" being

more important than the will of the people, Cromwell later justified his actions in bloody revolution by stating "Necessity hath no law."

That is a comment Attorney-General Margaret Wilson and her boss would do well to bear close attention to in light of her own recent bizarre and arrogant statements about the Mark Middleton protests.

In that case, thousands of New Zealanders chose to stand in silent vigil outside courthouses around the country as a warning to Parliament about its failure to listen to the mood of the people on tougher sentencing for violent crime.

Wilson, showing what an ivory-tower academic she is, instantly warned that public protests outside courthouses were outrageous, and that the public must respect "the rule of law".

Funny isn't it that tyrants clinging to power are usually the first to uphold "the rule of law"? That's because they know how tenuous their real power is. Regardless of the New Zealand Constitution Act, Clark's & Shipley's mobs rule ultimately only through the good grace of the people.

If they push things to the point of a civil rebellion in New Zealand, they'll have only themselves to blame. And I can see it coming. It is a far-off light in a railway tunnel right now, but the public mood is getting darker and darker as successive colonial governments strip them of their rights.

But back to the abuses of Crown power that I began with. With a written constitution, never again would a Prime Minister have the authority to sign away the rights of New Zea-

INVESTIGATE Volume 2, No. 11 ISSN 1175-1290			Investigate Magazine +64 9 3733 676 Tel PO Box 302-188 +64 9 3733 667 Fax North Harbour Auckland 1310 Australia: 1-800 123 983 Tel/Fax NEW ZEALAND Email editorial@investigatemagazine.com Email sales@investigatemagazine.com www.investigatemagazine.com		
Chief Executive Officers Ian Wishart, Heidi Wishart Editor Ian Wishart Assistant Editor Simon Jones Customer Services Debbie Marcroft Advertising Manager Heidi Wishart					
Contributing Writers Alma Hromic Anamika Vasil Bernard Conlon Ben Vidgen Aileen Nakhle Bernard Moran Clare Swinney Neil Frank John Flannery			Columnists & Reviewers Chris Carter Jeffrey Hart Carl Rowan Neil Prentice Michael Morrissey Marianne Means Dan Rather Sean Creighton Mat Savory Peter Hensley Benedict Reid Bob Marriott Tony Hitchcock Catriona Maclennan		
We take no responsibility for unsolicited material sent to us. Please enclose a stamped, SAE envelope. Inquiries in the first instance should be made via email or fax. Subscriptions should be sent to the address above or ordered via our website using our secure credit card facility. The rates are NZ\$42 for six months, NZ\$84 for one year; A\$60 for six months, A\$120 for one year; US\$40 for six months, US\$80 for one year; UK£25 for six months, UK£50 for one year.			All content in this magazine is copyright, and may not be reproduced in any form without the written permission of the publisher. The opinions of advertisers or contributors are not necessarily those of the magazine, and no liability is accepted. Investigate magazine is published by HATM Magazines Ltd		

landers under international treaties or agreements. After all, do we as New Zealanders elect our Governments every three years merely to give them carte blanche to destroy our country?

We do under the current system.

So Helen Clark could personally dismantle the entire mechanisms of state over her three year term and nobody could interfere. Not even the Governor-General who, under the 1986 Act, is now required to act on the advice of his Ministers unless it can be shown that a majority in Parliament no longer has confidence in Cabinet.

But how much power can Parliament legitimately exercise without calling a public referendum to gain a specific mandate? The position has never been tested in New Zealand because successive Parliaments have always assumed the power, and we the people have failed to take to the streets en masse and prevent them from putting their plans into action.

Is it legitimate, for example, for Prime Minister Clark to arbitrarily decide to abolish the combat wing of the Royal New Zealand Airforce?

The defence of the country is something that we the people entrust to Governments to administer on our behalf. By paying taxes each year we contribute to the upkeep of a standing army, so that we as individuals don't have to take on the responsibility ourselves.

If that is the constitutional pact, does the Prime Minister have a mandate from the people to break it?

In a word, no. Prime Minister Helen Clark is a traitor. She is the latest in a long line of treasonous individuals who have infested the Beehive in recent years. I have no opinion on Helen Clark the person because when I worked as a Cabinet press secretary in the last Labour Government I had few dealings with her.

But as a Prime Minister, in my opinion she is a traitor in every sense of the word.

It was the last Labour Government that got on the wrong side of the military when Lange described its leaders as "a bunch of geriatric generals" - this in response to defence gripes about the abolition of the ANZUS Treaty.

A decade and a half later, Clark is playing a much more dangerous game. Back in 1985 Lange did have a public mandate to support the anti-nuclear issue. In 2001, however, Clark has not been given a public mandate to turn our defence forces into Dad's Army.

It is one thing to oppose the purchase of F-16 fighter jets. It is entirely another to not only scrap that purchase, but then scrap the airforce as well.

Clark may genuinely believe she is doing the right thing, but like Neville Chamberlain and other great cretins of history before her, she may be making a terrible mistake that is not hers to make.

At a time when the Government is giving its Ministers and MP's unlimited snout-dips through living expense allowances, and self-drive vehicles for MP's teenagers and



Photo: Flight Sergeant Paul Stein, RNZAF

the like, it is stripping our military of its equipment and its morale, and it is stripping police of their cellphones and other tools of the trade.

Although a military coup in New Zealand is unthinkable, and not something I believe will happen, there are very angry words being spoken in mess halls and police bars around the country.

Clark may have pushed her luck far enough that if ordinary New Zealanders decide to take matters into their own hands and peaceably remove this Parliament from power forever, that the military and the police might just stand by and let it happen, choosing to look the other way.

Of course, that's the way it should be in a constitutional democracy. In other countries the military and law enforcement agencies pledge allegiance to the Constitution and the people, but in New Zealand they pledge allegiance to Parliament.

So how long are you prepared to let successive Governments destroy the country you and your family have built over generations?

It is time to show Parliament who's boss. Support the Constitution Referendum Petition. It's time to make a stand.



IAN & HEIDI WISHART

one mother's woe

Thank for such an informative magazine, I have been purchasing it since your first issue.

Regarding your feature on suspensions by Jonathan Marshall. The only comment that came close to the truth was the one made by Peter Field. We here in New Zealand (education officials and teachers) have not been listening to many parents, who right from the beginning have known that their children have special needs which need addressing.

Instead of trying to find a way to cater for these forgotten children, they have entrenched themselves in our penal system, or become our major drug/alcohol abusers, and also perhaps feature in our very high suicide rate statistics. Clearly there is a very big injustice dished out to the children of this country.

I know this from personal experience with my youngest son, who was ignored by many teachers and wouldn't listen to me when I told him that he was different.

He is one of five children, but I was told by professionals that I, the mother, was the problem. His hyperactive behaviour became so bad over a period of nine years that I was at the stage where not only did I want rid of this child, but I was on the verge of killing him.

As time went on, and the state of the behaviour got worse, I had him removed so that I wouldn't hurt him. We also went through many agencies (Rape Crisis, Child and Family, Learning and Educational unit...) but none of them helped.

I actually thought that all these people were right and that it was my fault that my son was the way he was. Finally after a formal diagnoses from a qualified pediatrician, I was told that there was something wrong with him and it wasn't my fault. What a relief!

Following help at last, all was going well until he reached the School C year when he suddenly become suicidal.

The college wasn't equipped for any kind of assessment, so it was suggested by a third party that I seek out an educational psychologist to do an educational assessment. The final conclusion was that he was also dyslexic in six out of eight areas. Thankfully the changes we have made have improved his life and I am now able to stand back and realise that these problems haven't just happened to my child here. In this country we don't have the skills, resources or people who are willing to listen. We look for the easy way out, there are no mentors for these children anymore. No-one to look up to. How do you think this makes the parents feel?

name withheld by request, via email



toxic waste dumping

We are enjoying your informative magazine, keep it up. We are particularly interested in the IWD issue. Did you know that there is a support group in Taranaki for parents of children born with defects.

Taranaki has the highest number of defect births in the Southern Hemisphere (according to a member of this group). Also, my father remembers IWD dumping waste at what is now our local refuse dump.

In the area being used at that time there is now a pine plantation. A small stream runs through there and just downstream there are always dead fish being found and a local tanalith plant is assumed to be the culprit. The question is, what is to be the future use of timber grown in this contaminated ground? I don't think I would like to be the one burning it or living in a house constructed with it.

Lyn Spanninga
Taranaki

a ridiculous question

Is something really finally going to be done about our Vietnam legacy?

Dow is across my back fence and I daily watch deadly chemicals burned off, all from containers labelled France/Germany/EU/USA, and wonder why with ozone problem would the world send garbage to my backyard to burn? Is it not allowed back home?

I have stated firmly before my belief that there's an element in the Taranaki Regional Council that belongs in jail for murder.

New Zealand is the only country to not compensate Vietnam vets and we now no why. Will somebody please do something!

D Sarten
New Plymouth

agent orange

The information supplied by the former IWD official in your Jan/Feb issue, whilst enlightening in its exposure of Agent Orange manufacture by IWD, was also disturbing.

Your investigations to date suggest high concentrations

of dioxin underneath parts of the New Plymouth suburb Paritutu. Disposal of excess Agent Orange alone is an insufficient explanation for this contamination.

It is true that at the time Agent Orange was being manufactured, neither Dow scientists nor the US Army Preventative Medicine Division had any definitive toxicological data on the product.

In later years when other scientists were challenging 2,4,5-T and its contaminate, it was more common for Dow to refute such studies.

But by 1970, after the publication of the US studies on the teratogenic effects of 2,4,5-T which Dow claimed had abnormal dioxin contamination, IWD was recycling during manufacture to substantially reduce the amount of dioxin in the finished product.

Having removed the contamination from the product, one would expect it would have required disposal. Your investigations suggest the IWD incineration facility had yet to be built.

The 1970s claims by IWD management that non-hazardous products only were buried should be treated with scepticism until proven otherwise.

**Noel Benefield
Waiuku**



the answer is no...

Have just read the article The Poisoning of New Zealand. Had me thinking - in particular page 26 last column: "While reviewing documents obtained from Monsanto, it was held in court that during the early studies, scientists omitted five deaths..."

My query: isn't Monsanto tied up with genetic engineering? If so, should we believe their rhetoric?

**Gladys Zanders
Palmerston North**

the cat got their tongues

On the 24th of December 2000 the Vietnam Veteran's Association of New Zealand requested that the Prime Minister, the Attorney-General and the Minister of Police investigate the allegation by a former Ivon Watkins Dow official that Agent Orange was manufactured in New Plymouth and shipped to Vietnam via Mexico.

At a Select Committee hearing at Parliament in 1990 investigating the matter a company official stated during proceedings that "Agent Orange was not made at that site". None of the committee members asked the obvious question question, viz, at what site was it made then?

If what the witness says is correct then it means that a Select Committee hearing may have been misled.

On a more serious note, the NZ Government signed a Geneva Protocol in the late 1950s which agreed not to supply agricultural chemicals for use in a military mode. The possibility thus arises that the Crown in New Zealand may have been involved technically in a crime against humanity.

The fact that the 2,3,7,8 TCDD (Dioxin) isomer was not removed from the 2,4,5-T component of Agent Orange in line with international safety specifications changes the nature of the chemical from that of defoliant to a biological/chemical weapon.

Whether the two components of Agent Orange [2,4,5-T and 2,4-D] were shipped from New Zealand mixed or unmixed is irrelevant. The pivotal matter is what happened to the Dioxin component.

It is also pointed out that the Agent Orange formula described as a Scrub Dessicant was used in New Zealand until at least 1987 where it is listed in the NZ Agrichem handbook.

At the 1990 Select Committee of Inquiry our Association made a detailed submission on the then known effects of dioxin exposure along with very clear evidence of medical and scientific fraud in regard to scientific papers which stated that there was no cause and effect in relation to exposure except for the skin condition known as chloracne.

The very same fraudulent science was used recently as part of supporting evidence in the Reeves Inquiry which was examining the health status of the children of Operation Grapple and Vietnam Veterans.

This matter was pointed out to both the former Prime Minister, Jenny Shipley and latterly the current Prime Minister, Helen Clark, whose Government accepted the Reeves report at the change of Government.

Our Association alleges that both the National and Labour Governments have upheld medical and scientific fraud for a political purpose, and this to the detriment of former Servicemen and their children. A complaint lodged with the Speaker of the House last year has not led to any denial of our assertion.

As at the 28th of January 2001 no communication has been received by our Association from either the Prime Minister or Attorney-General's office.

As we have brought to the attention of the Prime Minister the possibility of a breach of the Geneva Protocol she is obliged under international law to investigate the matter thoroughly and with some urgency.

In respect of the plight of the residents of New Plymouth whose houses are allegedly sited on toxic waste dumps then it is our view that the Health Department should immediately set up a task force and investigate the matter in a robust and transparent way.

Anecdotal evidence at this time suggests incidences of serious illness and disease associated with high levels of dioxin exposure are well above the norm. If the Government does not act in this matter it would be our view that the orchestrated litany of lies has continued with the connivance of the body politic since at least 1982.

That situation would demand, at the very least, a Royal Commission of Inquiry.

John Moller
President, Vietnam Veterans Assn

don't tell 'em it's healthy...

Your article in the December issue, The Poisoning of NZ II, contains many factual errors. Your first paragraph states "2,4-D a highly toxic fertiliser." This is wrong. 2,4-D is a herbicide not a fertiliser and it is not highly toxic. It is less toxic (as is 2,4,5-T) than Panadol.

Your third paragraph states "deadly 2,4-D pesticide". 2,4-D is not a pesticide either, it is a herbicide and when it is less toxic than Panadol it is incorrect to describe it as "deadly".

Your article states "esters of 2,4-D contain 2,3,7,8-TCDD." I presume you mean 2,3,7,8-TCDD (Dioxin).

2,3,7,8-TCDD (Dioxin) can be produced as a contaminant in 2,4,5-T manufacture, not 2,4-D.

On page 30 your article states "We already know the effects 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T had on Vietnam vets who were exposed to Agent Orange."

I agree, people exposed to Agent Orange in Vietnam have very serious health problems, but they are not due to 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T, they are due to other chemicals and contaminants in the spray as they were manufactured at the time, ie, dioxin.

Dioxin is an extremely toxic chemical whereas 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T are relatively non-toxic.

When an article in your magazine contains so many factual errors I wonder about the accuracy of other articles in your magazine.

Richard Arthur
via email

When a non-toxic chemical like 2,4,5-T contains so many impurities in it that it kills people, we wonder about the accuracy of the scientists who made it. For the record, the New Zealand Government's own Occupational and Health Service, OSH, is the entity that now alleges 2,4-D exposure has caused Parkinsonism in a former MAF scientist. He will no doubt be relieved by your assurance that the substance is not harmful and, by the time you read this, have already slapped a hundred bucks on the bar at his local with the cheery words "the drinks are on me!"

Also for the record, Government legislation records that the herbicides 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T are pesticides, for the sake of legal definition.

A Pesticides Board report issued last September noted that scientists had only recently discovered that 2,3,7,8-TCDD (Dioxin) is a byproduct of 2,4-D - shattering previous illusions.

You are entirely correct that 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T are not fertilisers, although I understand the confusion for our journalist arose from the fact that the herbicides are sometimes combined with fertilisers for aerial spraying.

In an ideal world, 2,4,5-T is not toxic. In the real world, because of dioxin contamination, it is deadly.

-Editor

less toxic than panadol, not

I have been reading your article about the poisons. About 16 years ago my stepson had a baby daughter. At first this child cried with sound, but later she was left without sound and is now a very intelligent dumb child.

Her father was working spraying weed killer in the forest near Dargaville.

He used to come home from work and pick the baby up and she would suck his overalls.

I have always believed that this was the cause of the problem. When we questioned my husband's sons we were told the spray came in plain tins and the ones with labels on were dumped.

Another child I knew was born with deformed genitals, and I have since learned that doctors in the area have treated many similar cases.

Name withheld
Northland

the secret of my success

I have followed the fortunes of Fay Richwhite from the early eighties. One aspect may be of interest to you:

In 1990 when Capital Markets was merging with Fay Richwhite (goodwill just happened to equate with minority shareholders funds) a document was produced by an accounting firm in association with Fay Richwhite.

As I recall, the document stressed that an advantage to Capital Markets shareholders was the "hands on" management by Michael Fay and David Richwhite, and made a very strong point that both Michael and David were totally familiar with all the schemes going. It also made particular reference to "tax advantage schemes" and left the reader in no doubt that the schemes were their speciality.

Now I am a bit puzzled that the Serious Fraud Office is putting out the notion that both David Richwhite and Michael Fay were not individually all that involved with the schemes and relied on their lawyers.

That is not the impression gained from reading the document supporting the merger of Fay Richwhite and Capital Markets. The document came in a yellow folder and the accountant was supposedly independent.

Peter M
via email

rich, white

Thanks for a much-needed magazine. The couple of pages that dealt with Fay Richwhite's involvement in fundraising for the Labour Party were alone justification for buying this issue.

What that article points up though is the need for political parties, particularly Labour and National, to provide information as to where their funding is coming from.

A beginning would be to get them to state their policies on receiving donations; whether they limit the contribution that can be made; whether contributions are accepted anonymously; whether they have any policy on accepting offshore money and whether the money donated is established as being from the person offering or merely money being funnelled through a local person.

You could also look at such things as whether donation source information is available to all the members of the party or restricted to just some of the executive.

Mervyn Barrett
Wellington

raewyn's got a gun...

Thank you for the recent articles relating to firearms which help to bring some real information to the large numbers of the New Zealand public who are largely uninformed about these issues.

It is important, however, to highlight that there are significant differences between us and the American situation. The important issue here is that proposed changes to the firearms laws will restrict or forbid the use of an essential work tool for many people, as well as take away people's rights to participate in the sport of their choice.

All for no public benefit.

Rugby has a significant cost in its high degree of secondary violence and fighting sports are even worse - it is acceptable to endeavour to deliberately commit greivous bodily harm to another person in the name of sport. Yet very few would suggest that our right to indulge in or support these activities should be

questioned, and society would not take such suggestions seriously.

Why, then, should participants in a sport which has a perfect safety record and promotes admirable qualities such as self-control and calm participation, have to stand by and watch their sport be effectively banned, their valuable possessions become worthless, at a cost of millions of wasted public dollars?

Already the Government has reneged on its contract with its people by reducing the lifetime firearms licence into a ten year one. Just like drivers' licences.

When is our Government - regardless of who is actually in power - going to be held to its contracts with its people and to be made accountable for public expenditure?

Raewyn Adams
Tauranga

CLARIFICATION: In the Jan/Feb issue we reported that part of the New Plymouth suburb at the centre of the dioxin poisoning scare had been developed by Broadbank Corporation, which was managed at the time by Don Brash. We've now established that it was Broadlands Properties, an affiliate company of Broadbank but not under Brash's control, that assumed responsibility for the project. Don Brash says he was not aware of it.





11 secret herbs and spices

New Zealand is clean and green - or is it? What about the meat?

Butchers or supermarkets buy a \$50,000 machine which injects the meat with "water". The customer gets more for his money - meat *and* water!

The butcher gets more money in the long run because the machine pumps a No.4 chicken up to a No.6, for instance.

What is in the liquid the meat is pumped up with? It is soy protein, minerals and artificial flavours.

Is the soy protein content GE free? You guess. Will you be allergic to the additives? It's not the meat you can't digest. It's what has been sneaked into it.

The cook wonders why the meat shrinks when he cooks it. It didn't used to shrink so much. A bit of fat used to come out when it shrank, but not now. It is the extra water evaporating that makes it smaller. The meat is cheaper because you are buying less meat and more water.

As a customer, how can you avoid being taken in like this? Look for meat with lots of little needlemarks in it and avoid it. Look for bacon, as the butcher on TV said, that is wet, and don't buy it. Get dry-looking bacon.

Why do the cutters and packers of meat do this? One man in the industry said he wanted to get one of these machines but couldn't afford it. He said the Government is "making cheats and liars out of us all". What he sells is all meat so far, but he can't afford to do that for much longer and may have to buy a machine to compete.

In the old days New Zealand meat was always as you saw it - genuine. Maybe a bit of water in the mince but nothin more, not in other cuts.

And our cows haven't been given growth hormones yet, although they have been offered to us twice. But now...

What can the customer do about the meat? Go to a

small butcher near you and ask him if he has one of these machines. If he hasn't, you will be pleased to meet him, and he will be pleased to meet you.

**Gayle McFeat,
Otago**

the telegraph road

A retiring public service head recently spoke of "closing the gaps" and the success of 1950s full employment, but didn't say why.

At the end of WWII, resources were redirected to civilian life and the "Mighty leap forward". Tunnels were drilled, coffer dams blocked rivers, thick walls of concrete built, turbine halls constructed, transformers positioned, thick wire strung on Meccano-like towers - all to produce pulsing energy.

Roads and communications expanded, land cleared, fenced, developed, infrastructured, farmed. Homes, schools, suburbs, facilities were built.

The price? Cost, plus 10%.

Many New Zealanders responded by being self-educated. The job market catered for two strata - those who were manually-endowed but not necessarily language-skilled, and those with the attributes of a literate language/skills culture.

For centuries, Western civilisation had the presence of the latter, but when that culture created a machine to make machines, the manually-endowed citizen had a terminal life expectancy.

When the ditch-digger replaced the manual component, a re-education in literate language/skills become paramount.

As 50% of New Zealanders are below the average, rather than closing the gaps shouldn't we be trying to lift the average?

**Michael Lincoln
Nelson**

touched by an angel

I had the most fortunate opportunity of obtaining some *Investigate* magazines from a friend who had purchased these.

What an *excellent* magazine if you don't mind me saying so!

Until yesterday I had not even heard of your magazine let alone read it - your mag is now definitely the best.

I'd like to draw your attention to an article I read in the November issue on "Digital Angel". While this electronic implant device has explosive potential for "good" in the USA, I have these alarm bells ringing.

These Digital Angel implants also have tremendous potential for abuse by the powers that be. New Zealand is

already a highly surveillant society and if our government were to adopt these implants I shudder to think how this could be abused. It is very, very frightening indeed.

This device has apparently been adopted from electronic microchips for dogs and will allow humans who've been implanted to be tracked by global positioning satellites anywhere on the planet. If this is not getting us ready for a one-world government, I don't know what is.

P L Shannon
Morrinsville

terribly disappointed

I bought your magazine for the first time simply because a heading on the cover caught my eye: "how to spot a sex offender". I have to say, as a senior journalist, I was terribly disappointed in the article and found its lightweight description had no bearing on the title it was given.

Where were facts and figures? Such as, it may well be that only three or four out of 20 abusers go on to be abusers - but Te Piritea's sexual offenders course research shows that more than 60% of offenders that do this rehabilitation course were abused themselves as youngsters.

Why was it not mentioned anywhere that New Zealand's victims groups are flourishing like mushrooms, yet programmes for offenders are so woefully inadequate that many cities don't have any other than those provided for a limited number of paroled sex offenders. Or that any CIB head in the country will tell you that roughly only 10% of offences are reported, let alone solved.

I was also stunned at Latta's blase comment on why sex offenders do what they do: "They want the sex and they think they can get away with it". Dear heaven, has he worked with the justice system too long? That's like lumping all sex offences and offenders under one umbrella on a number crunching basis.

I find it appalling that a psychologist is made to seem like he believes that this type of offending is about sex. For most offenders, according to many researchers, it is about power, not sex.

The justice system is at fault. As a court journalist at times I've been appalled at the blinkered non-differentiation between (as an example) a 29 year old man being jailed for 18 months for having a consensual affair with a 15 year old (she said so in court!) and another man who was given three years for raping repeatedly his eight year old daughter. But both, according to the law, are sex offenders. The system can't tell the difference between breaking the laws of Man, and breaking the laws of Nature. One man was in it for sex, of course he was - the other; no way. It was about power.

This story could have been handled so much better than it was and it was a very real disappointment.

Other than that, a good magazine which I enjoyed.

Heather Skelton
Papamoa

terribly not disappointed

As a new reader of your excellent mag Investigate may I congratulate you on filling a void in the market that was once only ever partly filled by a few other mags.

Keep up the good work. Always interesting to have Chris Carter's opinion. I don't know anybody that admits to listening to ZB since he has gone.

John Lagan
Mosgiel

a taxing question

It is with interest that I read your article on closing your tax number down. I wonder what happens to a person if they do this and have a major operation - do we end up paying for the operation?

Does free education for our children apply to us?

It would seem to me that the Government have us over a barrel when it comes to paying our taxes, as even if we did not pay tax some of us could not afford to have health insurance and the cost of operations is not cheap.

I would dearly love to say that I do not want to pay tax any more but I do wonder what the catch is?

I think your magazine is a good read. You do a good job, keep it up!

Maria Colligan-Haggart
via email

The IRD have, as a result of publicity on closing down tax numbers and publication of some of their own letters on the issue, taken a position of refusing to close down tax numbers in the first instance unless you can prove you are either dead, bankrupt, or no longer living in New Zealand.

They have so far been unable to find any legislative authority that justifies refusing to close a tax file number on request, so we will continue to hammer them on this point.

However, in response to the substance of your question, the solution is this:

A bill is currently before the US Congress seeking to abolish income tax in America. In its place will appear a flat rate terminal sales tax of 20 or 25% on all goods and services sold in the US, except for food, clothing and housing.

The exemption on the latter three categories means low income families will effectively pay no tax at all.

Income tax is believed to be illegal and unconstitutional as it interferes in the right of citizens to sell their labour freely, which is a common law right that has never been rescinded in either the US or New Zealand.

-Ed

Letters to the editor can be emailed to us, faxed or posted. They should not exceed 200 words, and we reserve the right to edit for space or clarity. All correspondence will be presumed for publication unless it is clearly marked to the contrary.

question of the day:

Scandal over bank cash

...PARLIAMENT, March 19, 1991...

Mr Max Bradford (Tarawera):

to the Prime Minister: When and how was he advised that the Government would have to put \$620 million of extra capital into the Bank of New Zealand?

Hon. J.B. Bolger (Prime Minister):

I was asked to agree to meet Treasury officials in my office in Parliament on the Sunday afternoon after the election. At that meeting they told me of the very serious position faced by the Bank of New Zealand, and the need for an urgent decision to inject \$620 million in new capital into the Bank of New Zealand and would show the bank to be in a parlous position without the new capital.

Mr Max Bradford: Was the Prime Minister told the true state of the Bank of New Zealand before the election?

Hon. J.B. Bolger: No, to the contrary; throughout the election campaign the former Prime Minister and the former Minister of Finance assured every audience that the Labour government had balanced the books and the government's accounts were in surplus. It is clear that the information was deliberately misleading, as the Labour government and the Labour cabinet had known for months before the election that the Government would have to rescue the Bank of New Zealand at a cost of more than \$600million, and therefore, that there was no surplus.

Rt. Hon. Mike Moore: Act like a Prime Minister. The member's not in opposition now.

Hon. J.B. Bolger: The former Prime Minister consistently misled the public on the matter.

Rt. Hon. Mike Moore: Turn the page - or is it all off the top of the Prime Minister's head?

Hon. Richard Prebble (Auckland Central): to the Minister of Transport: In light of the claim that Qantas has agreements that enable it to exercise voting rights over 50 per cent of the shares in Air New Zealand, what steps, if any, is the government going to take to ensure our national airline is restored to New Zealand ownership?

Hon. Rob Storey: There is no evidence beyond comments made by the chairman of Qantas than an agreement of the kind referred to in the question does exist. If it is established that Qantas does have an agreement on voting rights, the government will take whatever legal steps are necessary to enforce the terms of the Kiwi share.

question:

Misuse of telephones?

...PARLIAMENT, March 20, 1990...

Trevor Mallard (Hamilton West): to the Minister for State-owned Enterprises: What policy, if any, does Telecom have relating to the use of private phone numbers for misleading purposes?

Hon. Richard Prebble (Minister of State-owned Enterprises): Subsection (2) of section 8 of the Telecommunications Act states that every person commits an offence by using the telephone for the purpose of disturbing or irritating any person, whether by calling up without speech or wantonly or maliciously transmitting communications or sound.

Trevor Mallard: Has Telecom referred to the Minister a recent newspaper advertisement that stated: "Fans of the member for Tauranga, angry at indistinguishable party policies, interested in forming a movement to back Peters telephone....?"

Hon. Richard Prebble: No



— Have you got enough stashed away to fight your son's drugs charge?



All it takes is being in the wrong place at the wrong time.

A party gets raided. Someone drops their stash in your son's pocket. Suddenly he's in court and you're facing up to \$100,000 plus in legal fees just to prove his innocence.

Now you can protect yourself and your family.

Self Defence™ Legal Aid is a new insurance policy from HIH insurance that protects against unexpected legal action just like health insurance protects you against unexpected medical emergencies.

From as little as \$5.50 a week, HIH Self Defence™ insures you and your family against the costs of defendable criminal charges, traffic offences or even civil action.

Call 0800 800 LEGAL AID (0800 800 534) 24 hours a day, visit www.legal-aid.co.nz or talk to your insurance advisor, to find out about conditions that apply and how you can get immediate cover.

Because anything that goes on record, can be for life.

CALL 0800 800 LEGAL AID TO INSURE YOU AND YOUR FAMILY AGAINST UNEXPECTED LEGAL COSTS



HIH Self Defence™ is a product and service provided by HIH Insurance Liability Division, Quay Tower, Auckland. Ph 09 379 7697; Fax 09 379 7777. www.hih.co.nz

HIH Insurance is Australia's largest general insurer with total assets of \$8 billion. In New Zealand the company, which acquired CMG in 1997, FAI in 1998 and established Workable Accident Insurance in 1999, specialises in Liability, Marine, Trade Credit, Workplace Accident, Property, Travel, Household and Motor Vehicle insurance.



Insurance that works

© Copyright HIH Group & Service Members NZ Ltd

The Inspire Partnership Ltd (2011) Ltd



put the law in the dock - not mark middleton

From time to time I really begin to wonder whether or not our legal system, rather than being a reflection of a truly well balanced and caring society, is in fact more of an example of advanced perversity mirroring a society that has truly lost its way.

Mark Middleton, by all accounts a 'good bloke', a stepfather to a kidnapped, tortured teenager, and convicted of threatening to kill the perpetrator, Paul Joseph Dally. Bail was refused, in jail awaiting sentence for having had the temerity to exhibit precisely the very same human feelings than any true Kiwi would surely have if they found themselves in similar circumstances.

Perhaps we should examine, almost as a case study, why it is that increasingly New Zealanders are discovering to their cost that the law, far from providing any satisfaction to all to the army of victims in our midst, has now become little other than an expression of a warped, socialist-driven philosophy that somehow the number of psychopaths in our midst require protection from their victims.

Which of course is where we come to Mark Middleton, who somehow having escaped the limp-wristed social engineering that should have had him accepting the fate of his stepdaughter, has left this man with the view that the law is an ass.

To expect from the law some small indication that young Karla was a person of some worth...and that, when the chips are down, is what this really is all about. If he had been charged separately with kidnapping, torture, murder, and anything else that could have been thought of at the time, and if the maximum *cumulative* sen-

tence had been applied, the chances are this sub-human would have spent the rest of his life behind bars. That he wasn't and therefore will happily be out and about in little more than a decade is precisely why Mr Middleton, quite rightly in my view, made the threats that he most plainly did make.

That the law, eager as always to cover its total ineptitude, chose to come down on Mr Middleton like a ton of bricks, instead of perhaps more humanely, trying to understand the reasons as to why this would happen, is more an indictment of the law

“

If Dally had been charged separately with kidnapping, torture, and murder, and the maximum cumulative sentence applied, this sub-human would have spent the rest of his life behind bars.

”

itself than of the supposed wrong doings of the recently accused. But then again, what would anyone of us really expect from an institution that for years has actively encouraged, by its cupidity and its inaction, the very animals whose violent depredations, they so clearly have come to

recognise, are very necessary components for the legal industry to grow and prosper.

The victims? Who gives a toss about them Carruthers...their needs are secondary to our needs. Justice? Hell, this is New Zealand where form must always overrule substance and indeed, have not our political masters raised two rude fingers to the uneducated peasantry who gave them the Norm Withers referendum such amazing support: sharply increased sentencing for violent offenders? Who they these people think they are?

The likelihood of such a conversation having taken place is perhaps open to question, but if we are to examine the continuing and completely arrogant ignoring of clearly expressed public opinion, then most certainly there is a very real likelihood of more threats to kill by aggrieved victims. Indeed, surely this will escalate to the actual murders being committed without prior warning.

Desperate times lead to desperate measures someone once said, and that a red-blooded but otherwise completely normal man, Mark Middleton, was driven by circumstance to clearly break the law in sheer frustration, simply says to me that the wrong person has been charged and convicted.

Much better that several Cabinet Ministers past and present, along with a number of Judges, were placed in the dock so that they might explain why it is that they have some special, self-appointed privilege, whereby they can completely ignore the very people who pay their wages and employ them.

Indeed, we may very well ask, has

our legal system finally fallen into the hands of the terminally stupid, in that for several years now, anyone with even a modicum of normal intelligence would have been quite easily that the people of this country want increased sentences.

That this plainly has not happened, nor by the looks of it, is likely to happen in the near future either, is reason enough for it to be recognised that the true disease is in fact our legal system.

In other words, there is little point in threatening a mere symptom...we should instead be attacking the disease itself (be very careful here Carter or you'll find yourself in an adjoining cell to Mr Middleton).

Perhaps there is a very important question we should be asking ourselves though – why is it that the law, has in essence, become a law unto itself rather than perhaps being a true reflection of the wants and need of the very people who set up the system in the first place.

When was it, for instance, that New Zealanders suddenly decided to allow theorists, barrow-pusher – people apparently with a very muddled idea on what is right and wrong – to capture the very system that is meant to protect our society from those who choose to attack it.

Similarly, as I remember quite vividly from a couple of weeks back, how come we put up with arrant bullshit from our own politicians in this regard as well? Like our so-called Minister for Police, for instance, George Hawkins, indulging himself in an orgy of self-congratulation re a slight drop off in burglary statistics...happy in the knowledge that our tired old journo

would be most unlikely to point out that the public have now invested millions in mortice locks and electronic alarms and that the clearance rate for burglaries is just as bad as it has ever been.

But I digress, because it is after all violent crime, especially attacks on our kids, our women and of course



As for Paul Josphe Dally, when you next see the light of day, be very, very afraid because not everyone who would do you harm will necessarily telegraph the fact.



murder itself, that worries the public at large. It's here that we have ever reason to be worried as hell, simply because the official sanctions for having committed such offences are just a sick and very sorry joke. Think about it, in a fit of rage, decide by whatever means I choose, to do away with one of you, it will be deemed that you are worth between ten and 12 years of my time.

It apparently matters not a jot whether I should just plain shoot you and painfully torture you to death over some period of time. Because apparently no matter what I, the cosseted

perpetrator of this animalistic behaviour, choose to do, I shall remain safe in the knowledge that the time for the crime will remain the same.

So whoopy do, lets really go full out and indulge all of our hidden perversions, because quite plainly, the legal system doesn't give a single toss as to what it is that you've actually done, simply that the form of the system is observed, the substance of the crime itself, and the anguish of the true victims who are left behind to remain as no official concern.

In short, Mr Middleton has provided each and everyone of us with an example. It was technically against the law of course, but then again, if anyone challenges a corrupt and inept system, then they are likely to fall foul of that very same system.

That Mr Middleton felt sufficiently enraged, and yes, very powerless as he contemplated the imminent release of the scumbag who tortured then murdered his step-daughter, and that he was moved to his probably unwise comments, simply shows Mr Middleton in a very good light.

He is indeed an example of what a real Kiwi Bloke once used to be all about...that he was pursued at great length by the authorities, instead of having his personal pain recognised for what it was and the minor transgressions overlooked, simply says to me that he is a guy I would be proud to have a beer with at anytime.

As for Paul Josphe Dally, when you next see the light of day, be very, very afraid because not everyone who would do you harm will necessarily telegraph the fact.

Everyday it seems like we are bombarded with images of a world that is vastly over-populated: famine, destruction of rain forests, pollution, traffic jams and over-fishing. Yet **LAURA WILSON** believes many Kiwis are becoming brain-washed and argues the case against population control...

I meet a lot of New Zealanders of roughly my age (early 30s) who plan not to have children. It is surprising to me how often they give their reasons; the world is over populated, so why burden it further? I have also friends who have had their brood of approximately two children and then get surprisingly angry with couples who are selfish enough to keep breeding up to three, four or five offspring – any more being regarded as a compulsive disorder!

What intrigues me about this is the power of suggestion. Not one of these people directly experiences an over-populated world.

Some have never even left New Zealand. How is it that raising children in a sparsely-populated country such as this will add to the planetary burden?

Is it the fact that their children may grow up, drive a car and pollute the atmosphere? In 20 years time the use of fossil fuels as primary transport resource is likely to be history. Or is it the endless images of hungry African children imploring us through the television screen that makes us doubt our right to reproduce?

Are my friends so influenced that they are prepared to deny themselves children because lots of children on another continent are not adequately provided for? Yet those same people are very unlikely to travel to Africa who food parcels, or adopt a refugee baby, so what will not having a child of their own achieve? For most individuals who have made such a decision the reason is probably an accumulation of manifold impressions of global stress, very few of which have any relevance to New Zealand life.

We are so bombarded with messages that the whole overloaded system is riddled with fractures and soon to collapse with devastating consequences, that it becomes an intimate part of our lives.

“

Are my friends so influenced that they are prepared to deny themselves children because lots of children on another continent are not adequately provided for?

”

Many of my male friends love to use animal analogies to characterise our current crisis, like the population of rats who keep breeding in a confined area until they go mad from lack of space and begin devouring one another and their offspring.

Disputing this by saying there are significant ways in which we are different to rats, weevils, cockroaches and the like is insufficient to stop them applying this 'law' of nature to the human kingdom.

These widespread fears about a crisis of overpopulation form part of the cause of the late 20th century decline in the birth-rates of many Western countries. Some, such

“

The question of global natural resources being utilised faster that they can't be replaced seems unequivocal. The fish ARE being over-fished and the trees overlogged, but the automatic rationale that this is due to **too many humans** on the globe is questionable

”

as Italy, are breeding at a level below the replacement rate, so are effectively in decline. In other countries where the populace is not bombarded with daily messages of impending doom, the birth-rate proliferates. The future of this situation is obvious: angst-ridden Western nations write themselves out of evolution.

The question of global natural resources being utilised faster that they can't be replaced seems unequivocal. The fish ARE being over-fished and the trees overlogged, but the automatic rationale that this is due to too many humans on the globe is questionable. If we all ate rice and walked to work, the fish and the air would be just fine! It would be interesting to develop a computer model that examined how many humans could sustainably fit on the globe if our modes of living were altered substantially.

When I fly in an airplane over landmasses I am always amazed how vast and empty so much of the land looks. I know huge areas are considered uninhabitable for various reasons, but I bet that if we put our inventive brains to the task, we could inhabit almost any terrain. But instead, people all over the world are lured to magnetic cities and towns where we fight for space and share of the wealth that it circulates.

Imagine a global change in one facet of human life, such as diet. What stresses could be alleviated if we all agreed to live off plant and dairy products? Could the land provide enough wheat, rice, milk and cheese for everyone year-round?

We already know that certain nations stockpile due to over-supply. How much less land would be required to feed 1000 people for a year on plant products as opposed to meat?

The whole issue of competition for planetary resources needs to be looked at. The knee-jerk reaction is to blame numbers, but I think this is a scapegoat. We have no idea how many people could fit on this planet and live satisfying lives if nations co-operated, population was prop-

erly spread out and we learnt how to develop all the land and fairly distributed what was taken from it.

Co-operation is impossible, you say. I say it's a better thing to focus on than popular philosophies of impending doom. If you want to lessen the impact people have on the planet, then stop wasting stuff.

Eat everything you buy instead of letting one-third of it rot in the back of a fridge, and buy what you need in life rather than what you want.

Horrors! That doesn't sound as attractive as retreating into the opinion of others as if they are forgone conclusions. But I'm afraid that lessening your own consumption and misuse of resources will do more for the planet than not having a child, especially in a country that would welcome a few extra!



cbs anchor dan rather on violence in american schools

He comes from a good home, a 19-year-old whom one neighbour described as a “choir boy.” Others said that they assumed he would grow up to be an engineer. In high school, he was the editor of an

award-winning yearbook. In January, he was arrested by police, who suspect him of planning a Columbine-style massacre at De Anza College, the school he now attends in Northern California.

This young man’s name is Al



“

Even the young men who have fathers are sired by a popular culture that teaches them that violence and revenge are the paths to true manhood.

”

DeGuzman, but his story is becoming too familiar. It is the story of a boy-man lost in rage, and from our inner cities to our most prosperous suburbs, it can be the most dangerous story you can tell.

DeGuzman was arrested Jan. 30 after a suspicious photo-lab clerk saw pictures of him posing with what appeared to be various explosives. When police searched the San Jose, Calif., home where DeGuzman lives with his parents, they found an arsenal of guns, 30 pipe bombs and 20 Molotov cocktails, along with what is said to be a taped apology to friends and family for the massacre he had planned for reasons still unknown.

Here are two other headlines from

ONE OF THESE WAS NAMED "BEST CURRENT AFFAIRS MAGAZINE IN NZ" ON NATIONAL RADIO
THE OTHER ONE IS METRO



GET INFORMED. NOT ROGERED.

that same day: In New York City, five boys between the ages of 11 and 13 were arrested and charged with the rape of a 13-year-old girl outside a Coney Island housing project; and, mere miles from San Jose, a gun was found at San Francisco's McAteer High School for the second time in two weeks. This time the firearm was in the possession of a 16-year-old boy; last time it was a 15-year-old. News like this should disturb us — and clearly does. What is less clear, however, is just what is behind it and what can be done to address the problem of the boy-man growing up in today's world.

What we do know is that too many boys face the sensitive years between puberty and coming of legal age without a father or other strong male figure in their lives. Developing into full manhood, in this society and others, is a complicated, stressful process, carrying with it so many mysterious currents that are best navigated with the help of someone who has been there himself.

We know that even the young men who have fathers are too often sired by a popular culture that teaches them that violence and revenge are the paths to true manhood. Video games, television, rap, rock and big-budget movies shout this message, drowning out the meek, the infrequent and tentative words heard to the contrary.

And we know that adulthood, to boys and girls alike, has become something more likely to be anticipated as the time when one can finally drive a car or drink legally than as a time when one can contribute by, say, voting or serving one's country in the armed forces or Peace Corps. Organised religion still addresses and celebrates the transition to adulthood and full membership in a congregation with, for example, the bar mitzvah and confirmation, ceremonies that stress responsibility and contemplation of what this important step means. But now you hear parents complain that these events have become more excuses for parties and gift-giving than occasions for sober reflection ... even as they capitulate to their own children's wishes so they won't feel "left out."

Ceremonies marking the ascent to manhood have existed in all societies since the dawn of civilization, and for good reasons. By ignoring them now, even if they are only to take the form of some hard, serious talks with our sons, we put America's boy-men — and ourselves — at risk.

charity begins at the white house

President Bush's initiative to provide federal funding for charitable works by church as well as secular organisations is adventuresome, ambitious and well-intentioned.

But the yellow caution light is flashing. To protect the constitutional barrier between government and religion, it will be essential to make haste slowly.

The Bush plan, a campaign promise that is still a work in progress, is a sophisticated extension of previous efforts by his father and former President Bill Clinton to stimulate volunteer service to meet community needs.

The senior Bush's "thousand points of light" program sought to encourage volunteerism by honouring individual activists, but it never had a high federal priority. Bush himself asked only \$7 million for it in his last budget, barely enough to keep the doors open. But after his 1992 defeat, he asked his successor, Clinton, to keep the program alive, and he did.

Clinton's version was a new national service agency, AmeriCorps, de-

signed as a domestic Peace Corps subsidising young people willing to spend a year or more working on worthy civic projects. Congressional Republicans, however, denounced the concept and repeatedly tried to

“

Massive financing of church groups with taxpayer dollars could be an assault on the Constitution if not carefully audited

”

kill its budget, forcing Clinton to fight for its survival every year.

George W. Bush is wisely keeping and folding both programs into his own initiative, while adding an emphasis on encouraging participation from religious groups. He also insists he will



simultaneously support secular alternatives to faith-based charities, although he offers no specifics.

But massive financing of church groups with taxpayer dollars could be an assault on the Constitution if not carefully audited and regulated to assure that practical services are provided, and not religious indoctrination.

Federal money already comes with

“

Bush is talking about eliminating **“the bureaucracy”** that he feels has discouraged churches from playing a larger role in providing social services.

”

strings attached for the secular groups currently getting it, as well as the church organisations that run Head Start or other education programs.

Even if taxpayers do not directly subsidise religious instruction, however, the federal money that goes to religious-based social programs can free up church funds for such instruction, thus giving it indirect government assistance.

Bush is talking about eliminating “the bureaucracy” that he feels has discouraged churches from playing a larger role in providing social services. But the “bureaucracy” is simply the government oversight officials who enforce policy rules, safety standards and budget guidelines. These officials are necessary to assure that taxpayers get what they are paying for.

States already have the option of giving welfare grant money to religious groups providing services to low-income families, so long as they are not screened for church preference or coerced into devotional activities. Religious

hospitals are eligible for Medicare and Medicaid money. Some AmeriCorps volunteers work through religious groups to do their community tasks.

But the Supreme Court has made it very clear that the Constitution bars the direct use of tax money for sectarian teaching. With that in mind, Congress is almost certain to defeat another Bush proposal that would shift federal funds from failing public classrooms to successful parochial schools.

Yet in ways large and small, many religious groups gently merge the celebration of their faith with their non-sectarian human responsibilities. Religious pictures hang on walls. Crosses hang around necks. Bibles are displayed and handed out. Conversation is sprinkled with theological language. Literature refers to the glory of God.

Working all this out will be awkward and difficult, but Bush deserves credit for giving it a shot. New forms of government partnership with local civic groups are increasingly popular, and faith-based organisations are a largely untapped resource of energy and compassion.

One aspect of Bush’s program that may be non-controversial would allow low and middle-income taxpayers who do not itemise on their income-tax forms to deduct donations to both religious and secular charities.

It seems like a good idea that can do no harm. Finally, however, there is no proof that a massive influx of religious groups would actually make the services to sober up the drunk, care for the homeless, reform the criminals or protect the battered better than those in the present inadequate, patchwork system.

We will not know what they can do until they have at it, operating with government approval but within our constitutional framework of religious pluralism. It is a challenge Bush wants to meet.

(Marianne Means’ email: means@hearstdc.com)

FREE SACHET FROM OUR WEBSITE

SYLKNZ.COM
Stanley Enterprises PO Box 34842 Birkbeck Auckland PH/FAX 09 4803327

Longer Lasting Lubricant.

strange but true

1. Most lipstick contains fish scales.
2. One ragweed plant can release as many as one billion grains of pollen.
3. The first product to have a bar code was Wrigley's gum.
4. No piece of square dry paper can be folded more than seven times in half.
5. A group of geese on the ground is a gaggle, a group of geese in the air is a skein.
6. Over 2,500 left handed people a year are killed from using products made for right handed people.
7. There are more than 10 million bricks in the Empire State Building.
8. If you counted 24 hours a day, it would take 31,688 years to reach one trillion.
9. Taphephobia is the fear of being buried alive.
10. A crocodile grows new teeth to replace old teeth.
11. The sun is 330,330 times larger than Earth.
12. A 'jiffy' is an actual unit of time for 1/100th of a second.
13. Porcupines float in water.
14. Pinocchio is Italian for "pine eye".
15. The sentence "The quick brown fox jumps over the lazy dog" uses every letter in the alphabet.
16. The only 15 letter word that can be spelled without repeating a letter is "uncopyrightable"
17. The longest recorded flight of a chicken is 13 seconds.
18. The world's termites outweigh humans by ten to one.
19. The electric chair was invented by a dentist.
20. Windmills always turn counter clockwise - except for windmills in Ireland.
21. A mole can dig a tunnel 300 feet long in one night.
22. Ancient Egyptians slept on pillows made of stone.
23. A hummingbird weighs less than a five cent coin.
24. A cockroach can live several weeks with its head cut off...until it dies of starvation.
25. Every time you lick a stamp you're consuming one tenth of a calorie.

rocks:

1. **Kiwi golf players**
2. **TV3's John Campbell - but only if he slows down during bulletins**
3. **Petrol price wars on Saturdays**
4. **Holmes' new look**

doesn't:

1. **Cricket**
2. **The Crown listening in to Vodafone calls**
3. **Clark's Waitangi Day bleating**
4. **MPs' expense accounts**