

Transcript of a Meeting Between Senator Bob Brown and Representatives of the Exclusive Brethren

It was reported on 6 June 2006 (see <http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1P3-1051086081.html>) that Australian Greens Leader Bob Brown had a 1 ½ hour meeting with three representatives of the Exclusive Brethren sect at Parliament House in Canberra. The Melbourne men argued against Senator Brown's proposal for a Senate inquiry into the Exclusive Brethren's social and political activities.

Here is a transcript of the meeting retrieved from the now-vanished peebs.net. It provides a historical record of the views and concerns of Bob Brown and the Brethren at the time. The numbers that appear every so often in square brackets presumably represent minutes and seconds from the start of the recording.

The discussion concentrated on same-sex marriage, Brethren-funded political campaigns, break-up of families, and whether there were grounds for the proposed Senate inquiry. Also mentioned were tax breaks, social justice, and the question of whether we should try to make the world a better place.

Some of the discussion is very revealing, but comments on it will be given in a separate paper.

The Brethren representatives were David Thomas, David McAlpin and Richard Garrett.

Start of Transcript.

Bob Brown: Save us taking notes. You fired up?

David Thomas: yeah. We got delayed in Melbourne. We got here in time though.

BB: Did you?

DT: Yeah. Melbourne airport was closed.

BB: Was it?

DT: For about three hours or so

BB: What, was there fog?

DT: Yeah. We didn't get out till 11

BB: Because usually the problem is fog at Canberra airport.

Well, um, thanks for coming up. I got your letter, as you know, on the weekend and responded to you. You are, of course, responding to my move for a Senate inquiry into the Exclusive Brethren, you've got the terms of reference there. I'll just, if I may, tell you why that's come about.

I have become very much aware of the EB entry into politics in recent years, not least in the recent

Tasmanian elections where tens of thousands of dollars were spent on advertising against the Greens. And some of that advertising was not truthful. I don't mind, at all, we're in an open and free democracy and I don't mind anyone at all – in fact I welcome entry into politics – but I think with that comes the responsibility to say why that's occurring and to be, to honestly portray those people who are courageous enough to be standing for politics.

I'm also aware of the Pro-Howard government advertising and campaigning that occurred in the last federal election and the anti-green campaigning in Tasmania and elsewhere. The same in New Zealand with the Exclusive Brethren, you'd be aware that several of your colleagues actually held a press conference in the week running to the election there and admitted to the involvement on behalf of the Nationals there and nationwide letterbox drops against both the Greens and the Labor party. And estimates of up to 1.2 million dollars having been spent more recently following the electoral commissions inquiries in New Zealand.

Now that's one side of it, the other side – because of this, that alerted my attention to the Exclusive Brethren – I've become very concerned about the breakup of families and mental trauma that's occurred as a result of the belief system that the EB has. I have a Christian background myself, and I find it very difficult to accommodate that within the loving rubric of Christianity, which is one of being able to accommodate people's different beliefs and their different behaviour. In fact since this was drawn to my attention I've had a lot of contact with people who have been members of the EB, who have gone through enormous trauma because they've left and I think that each of you gentleman I might ask you about this. You will know that your families have been involved in people leaving and being excommunicated, having lost contact. I'm aware of Mr and Mrs Kidd's estrangement from the EB and their children.

Richard Garret [4:22]: How did you become aware of that?

BB: Well it was in the newspapers Richard, 30 or 40 years ago. And I don't know whether you've seen your grandparents in that period of time, but ah, maybe you could tell me whether you have?

RG: They're not alive now. And I'm interested in what you say, perhaps if I could just go back to your comments about the notice of motion.

BB: I'll just ask you one, if I may, one thing at the outset because this is very important for me to establish. With the campaign that recently occurred in Tasmania with your colleagues from Scottsdale, there was no reference to their involvement on behalf of the Exclusive Brethren. And I'm aware that the Elect Vessel, Bruce Hales, is consulted on such important matters and I'd like to ask you at the outset if he's aware of and authorised your visit here today?

[Pause]

DT [5:32]: We're concerned that what's been stated in Parliament and what's on the internet partly untrue.

BB: Yes, but what I've just asked David is whether you've been talking about it with Bruce Hales.

DT: I haven't spoken to who you are speaking to.

BB: Or any of you have...

DT[interrupting]: I haven't spoken directly to...

BB: Or whether he has authorised your visit here today.

RG: Well I haven't spoken to him either. My visit here today, Mr Brown...

BB [interrupting]: Just before I get to you, my question is, and it's a simple one, is whether Bruce Hales authorised, or indeed requested you to make this visit?

DT: What's that got to do with anything?

BB [6:16]: Well it's important that I know that involvement goes right to the top as far as you gentlemen are concerned.

DT: I could not honestly say that he has told, that he hasn't, I've got no direction that he told me to come.

BB: No, but you will know sir, David, whether he has been instrumental in having you come to visit me today and has authorised, and indeed instigated the visit here, by you today.

RG: Well the visit was instigated by myself. I mean I came into possession of this notice of motion...

BB: Just before we move off there though, pursuing you on whether or not Bruce Hales is aware that you are here.

RG: Well there'd be certainly members of the Brethren who'd be aware we were here.

BB: Is he?

RG: I'm sure he might be. I mean I have not spoken to him about this matter.

BB: yes I know, but..

DT: I don't see that I can answer you, but if you are going to keep at that I don't think we need to continue. I'd like you to put that question aside, because I'm not prepared to answer it.

BB: OK.

RG: I mean our concern Mr Brown, what instigated us coming here is this notice of motion which it doesn't appear like you've had contact with members of the Brethren to ascertain whether it was correct or accurate. I mean these points, we regard [7:53] these matters that are being raised as very serious questions, allegations maybe. And we are concerned, I mean I think you indicated earlier that you had been speaking to members, ex-members of Brethren. We are concerned really about where you have got you information from.

BB: Well look, let me just go back on this again. It's not coming out of the blue as far as I am concerned. It's come because the Exclusive Brethren as a Christian church has become involved in campaigning against the Greens.

DT: That's not the truth

BB: Well it is the truth sir.

David McAlpin: No it's not the truth

BB: So...

DM: No it's not the truth

BB: So...

DM: Please, it is not the truth.

DT: The Church has never discussed, it never enters into discussion in the church about politics.

BB: Well what do you say...[interrupted]

RG [8:51]: That is exactly right. I didn't even know when those advertisements were placed in Tasmania. I mean I wasn't aware of what was going on until after it had happened. It's got nothing to do with the church. It is concerned individuals, I mean they are exercising their democratic right.

BB: Certainly, but we have to also exercise our democratic right in having Senate inquiries into matters of public concern. And let me ask you this, if the church is not involved, what about Stephen Hales authorisation of advertisements supporting the Prime Minister in the seat of Bennelong at the last election? Now he's the brother of the Elect Vessel. Are you putting to me that that has nothing to do with the Exclusive Brethren?

RG [9:43]: Well Stephen, Stephen I believe lives in the electorate of Bennelong.

BB: He does.

RG: He does, he was very concerned about false reports against the Prime Minister in the lead up to the last election. And of his own accord and own initiative, he paid for that advertisement himself. He ran that advertisement in the newspaper. That's my understanding of the matter.

BB: And you can tell me that's he's received no gift.

DT: Yep, he paid for it all and if you want receipts he could give it to you [10:16]

BB: Yeah, well I'd be very pleased if you could furnish me with those receipts.

RG: See this comes back to this point here, donations to political parties and other political entities. In the Brethren the church have never, the church has never donated money to the political parties.

BB: But very senior members like Stephen Hales, and very active members, have donated by placing extensive advertising here and elsewhere overseas in the media in the run to elections. And you know, let me just point you to the advertising in Tasmania at the recent state election with my picture on the front. Done in green with a question mark, so that people might think that this is a Green brochure and authorised by Trevor Christian of Scottsdale, who's a member of your church. Now this has, amongst other things, 'environmental veneer question mark – vote against this deception'. And one of the assertions here is that the Greens want to introduce the regulated use of cannabis. Now actually, the policy is the regulated use of cannabis for medical purposes, that is to alleviate people, who might be dying of cancer for example, from pain that is otherwise not alleviated by other drugs.

DT: Wasn't that taken direct off the net?

BB [12:00]: Well, what was happened was it was taken off the net 'introduce the regulated use of cannabis for medical purposes' and the 'for medical purposes' was removed. So that the voter who read this, read 'introduce the regulated use of cannabis', that is the distribution to the population of cannabis, rather than qualifier 'for medical purposes' and so it was a lie that was put to the Tasmanian electorate, by Trevor Christian from the Exclusive Brethren in a very, very expensive advertising campaign. And I'm sure you gentlemen will understand why I'm aggrieved by that happening. And that's after I'd written, that is after I'd written to Mr Christian, through my lawyers, about a previous advertisement in which he'd used old policy which he knew 'cause he said he'd looked and it had been removed from the net and been replaced by a new policy. So this is really important in politics that voters on their way to the ballot box are not misled and I'm sure you gentlemen will agree the scriptures say you must not bear false witness against your neighbour.

DT: Did you advertise all that in your campaign?

BB: David our policies were on the net. It was a state campaign and this is national policy, but I'll just explain to you, what happened was – the national policy, pieces were lifted from it and in that case, very clearly misrepresented in these advertisements from Trevor Christian.

DT: Well that's Trevor Christian. There's no authorise, see the charge you've made in Parliament is against Exclusive Brethren, it's not against Trevor Christian. The Exclusive Brethren have nothing whatever to do with that as a church.

BB [14:02]: Well I ask you about, I'm sure you've seen it because it was pictured in the Australian on the Monday after the Tasmanian election, pictures of men in masks with an anti-green trailer slogan called – crossed out the Green triangle with 'dangerous and extreme' written on it in Salamanca place, authorised by Mr Urquart from Burnie who's a member of the Exclusive Brethren.

DT: Did that have it as a member of the Exclusive Brethren?

BB: Well the problem David, it didn't have that. But what I see...

DT [14:38]: The charge is that your, sorry, the charge is the Exclusive Brethren and we cannot let Exclusive Brethren in the eyes of the Parliament are now, the Senators have been unrested over it and we cannot let that, we cannot – it's not right. Because it's based on untruths.

BB: Well, we've got a – I mean this is very important because we need to come to a mutual understanding about how this can arise. What I see is in repeated elections a pattern of senior members, elders of the Exclusive Brethren, spending large amounts of money directed on campaigns either for Mr Howard or against me and our respective parties. Using information that is not confined to those individual members. Let me, for example, cite the brochure which was used against my fellow Senator Christine Milne at her election 2 years ago, authorised by a member of the Exclusive Brethren and in fact printed in a printery in Launceston owned by a member of the Exclusive Brethren. Now the exact same template as that brochure was used in the campaign against the Greens in New Zealand. So it's not individual members of the Exclusive Brethren. There's an interconnection going on here and a flow of information here which is much more organised than you would have me believe.

RG: So what concerns us very much Mr Brown is that in the Tasmanian election, there was others, a

group of businesses I believe I read about in the newspapers who campaigned heavily against the Greens as well, obviously spent a lot of money, but you haven't raised a notice of motion against them in the Senate. I mean, we have persons exercising their democratic right in taking out advertisements in election time. Concerned persons about certain policies of political parties, policies we don't hesitate to say are wrong. And yet we have this notice of motion, which I really see as religious vilification.

BB [17:12]: Well the notice of motion is setting up an inquiry to ascertain the facts and of course it would mean that you would be able to come before the Senate Inquiry and put the record right if you thought it were wrong. And to explain exactly much more, for example, than the points you will be able to put to me today.

RG: I mean, I don't understand the jurisprudence or law before a Senate inquiry, as I say again I believe it amounts to religious vilification and it concerns me very, very much.

BB: I'm very content to debate you on that matter publicly, I don't believe it is religious vilification, but if it is I'll be discovered as vilifying your religion. I don't believe so see this is a reaction to a very organised pattern of attack on the Greens, and selective at that, and misleading attack on the Greens and our policies by members of the Exclusive Brethren. And with it has come information about the trauma and hurt that so many people have endured who have been excommunicated from the Exclusive Brethren and I'm a person who responds to that. I don't like to see families who are broken up. I don't like to see mothers and fathers who never see their children or vice versa. I don't like to see people who are not told about the funerals of their loved ones until after that's occurred.

RG: Mr Brown, it's sin that breaks up families. That's what breaks families up.

BB: Well is it not a sin then to exclude families from seeing each other as the Exclusive Brethren does?

RG: It's sin that breaks up families. I mean you refer here to family break down and attributing that to the Exclusive brethren. Exclusive Brethren are very family orientated, the sanctity of marriage and the family is very, very important, it's precious and we do everything to uphold it. And I say again, it is sin that breaks up families. You can see everywhere, you read about it in the paper, you know, prominent sportsmen.

BB: Then what do you say about your mother's parents?

RG: Well I believe that's a private family matter and I'm quite restful and settled about that. I'm committed Mr Brown, to a pathway of separation as the basis of our fellowship. We can't change the world, we're not trying to, we can't do that, but I believe it's our responsibility. God has provided the means of our salvation, the cleanse us of our sins and he doesn't need is to sink back into the degradation of this world. So there's a way of escape and Peter the first epistle speaks of those who escaped the corruption in the world and that's the pathway of believers [20:45] That's the pathway I'm committed to and it is sin that breaks up families.

I just referred to prominent sportsmen, unfaithful to his wife and you know family, marriage blown apart. His wife affected. We're committed, I mean, I'm married, I've got a family, we're happy amongst the Brethren. You think of the problems out there in the world, drugs juvenile delinquency, I mean I could go on and on and on.

BB: Feel free to because it's really important for us to have an understanding of what it is that's troubling...

RG [21:30]: It's not among the Brethren

BB: The brethren about the world. But I have a, and I know this affects all you gentlemen. I have had brought to me time and again, the break-ups that occurred. You say that's sin, sin that separates families, but when somebody steps outside the Brethren and is excommunicated, that breach of communication between father and children, father and mother, husband and wife, is something that's of human creation. Something that a decision is made for within the Exclusive Brethren to keep that separation of which you talk about.

DT: The history of fellowship is that something has been violated in the scriptures, there's various scriptures we could go over, Corinthians 1 through 5. There's acts where persons are excommunicated, but the intention always is to get them back. And they're immediately, even though they've had to be broken the immediate intent is to get them restored. Now if they don't respond to that, if they want to go and dissent as some have, that's who you're getting your information from. But that is totally a decision that they've made. That is not the... our genuine care of souls in the Exclusive Brethren is to keep everyone in the fellowship. Our intent is to, we have got a calling, there's been allegations made that brethren are the only ones that can be saved. That's far from the truth the biggest majority that's going to be in the Church finally when the Lord comes and I don't know, I just hope you'll be there Mr Brown, but I don't know whether you would.

BB: I understand that. [23:34]

DT: The majority would possibly be in the Catholic Church, or somewhere, there's a lot of believers that will be caught up at the end and it's very, very close. That's why we're very, very strong that such an accusation of undoing, or putting in – we've got nothing to hide, but is it right that Parliament should be exposed to something that's got, that's no, I mean – you haven't even given us the opportunity to, you've introduced it in the Parliament and given us no opportunity to even talk about it.

BB: Just let me respond to that by saying that I was given, and my colleagues, were given no opportunity by your colleagues when this quite massive advertising against us and misrepresentation of the Greens occurred. Nobody came and sought my opinion on that, nobody came and asked me if this was true or not, nobody came and asked about our policies for social justice, for protecting the planet, for caring for people who are in trouble.

DT: Wasn't it on the internet?

BB: Yes, I think you would take umbrage perhaps if I said, 'well I've gained my information about you off the internet'. Your just saying to me that I should come to you and spoken with you – I didn't even know who it was that was advertising. I've had to spend a lot of time with my colleagues and with other people in the community finding out that there is a pattern here, a very clear pattern of political activity by members of the Exclusive Brethren all going from the same cue card and I wasn't asked about that, we weren't asked to explain this. It was dumped in an election campaign to influence people against us, with no reference to it.

DT [25:47]: OK, take all that aside, take all that on board. If you could lay a charge with what you've put into Parliament that it was the Exclusive Brethren, yes. But there's no attachment of the Exclusive Brethren to advertising politically. If Mr Howard suddenly come up with policies that are

exactly what you've got, we would do, we would be no question, as far as I'm concerned personally, I would do anything to alert people publicly. We want, we pray for government, we pray for the office of the Senate.

BB: I'm aware of that

DT: and everyone. Now I just feel, and Richard could explain it better than me as to our recognition of government.

RG: Yes, I mean I haven't had anything to do with government for nearly 20 years, Labor ministers, democrats, Liberal and I have the opportunity to speak to you today. Personally, I am very, very concerned with the Greens' policies. I mean I wasn't aware of them too much, the last couple of days I've got nine pages off the internet. *The Gay and Lesbian policy and the support of same sex marriage. Now I was honestly shocked. That will destroy society, that's against God.*

BB: Well I have to tell you there as you probably know I'm gay and I have a same sex partner and that's a loving relationship.

DT: But that's against, that's against – we repel it because it's against God's word.

BB: Well...

DT: Sorry, it is.

BB: ...God is love you know. It may be against a written scripture but you know there is a lot in the scripture that would be horrified if it were brought into reality and were carried out in its literal word.

DT: We don't want to debate it, I'm just saying my reaction. I'm just saying my reaction to it is when you read Romans 1, I mean it's what happens. People get themselves so perverted and they just can't think morally.

BB: I think that's a position I may have been, my thinking may have been like that many, many years ago. But I've realised that God has created a very diverse world in which love is a big key to it and hate is a very big foe. But we get ourselves into trouble where we think we can define where the boundaries are where love should be cut short. [28:30]

And that's something I would love to debate with you, it's a key here.

RG [28:39]: We've gotta discern, we're mixing up love and lust. Now you referred to yourself personally, it certainly wasn't my, I mean I didn't intend to bring it up at all. You're happy to, I appreciate that. My concern is when policies like that, same sex marriages, are being put forward as it's becoming law. Government making provision for same sex marriages, now that is completely and utterly wrong. It's against God.

BB: But you see...

RG: It's against God.

BB: My view is that it is completely and utterly right and it's part of God's creation.

RG: Its not. It's not.

BB: We have a differing point of view here

David McAlpin: God's judgement comes in on that in Romans 1. God hates that.

BB: Well I know that you are Pauline descendants if you like. That St Paul has great sway in your thinking. But I think that St Paul had a great deal of shortcomings, for example in his description of women. I think he was a misogynist.

DM: Well we reject that.

BB: Well of course you would. I accept that you will, but I have to say this is a very good argument, discussion that we should be having.

DT: See you went through a critical point in your younger life and you didn't find Christ. If you'd found Christ, you'd have found the answer to everything. Instead of that you sort of threw everything away.

BB: Well I think I've found exactly what Christ advocated and that is love, a path to peace and an ability... look Christ took Mary Magdalene.

DT: Look I don't want to listen to that.

BB: OK, well I'm just telling you he took her into his consideration and was comfortable with keeping his friendship with Mary Magdalene. He didn't reject her and condemn her to damnation.

RG: Well she was a saved sinner, out of who he cast seven demons. That's the power of Christ. The thing of Mary Magdalene's seven, she was full of demons and He cast them out. That's what Christ can do.

BB: Well there's hope for us all isn't there.

RG: Well there is and I noticed this the other night, you appeared on the ABC report about industrial relations, just a comment you referred to 'the rest of us worldlies are beyond redemption'. See that's not the position of the Brethren. We preach the gospel, the glad tidings everywhere where the Brethren live they go and preach the gospel on the streets in the public. I want all men to be saved. Our position, we present salvation, the blood of Jesus, his redemptive word. It's available to all men to take advantage of.

BB [31:43]: The difficulty is that, where people who for decades acknowledge that preaching and decided that living within that they wanted to separate from the strictures of the Exclusive brethren, they've been condemned, excommunicated and the judgement hasn't come from God. That judgement has been made by men in the Exclusive Brethren and it's caused extraordinary damage to those people who are involved

RG: Well, we go by the scriptures. That's the word of God. And I can refer to a scripture 1 Corinthians 5 which says 'put the wicked person out of your midst'.

BB: But that's Paul again judging who the wicked person is. Isn't it?

DM: No it's the congregation.

Richard: Well Paul...

BB: Well that's saying to the congregation then that you can judge who is wicked or who is not and following on, that was an age in which adulterers were stoned to death and we still see that in some parts of the world, but do you accept that? That adulterers should be stoned to death?

RG: Not in this dispensation. This is a dispensation of grace. This is a dispensation of salvation, that's what I was trying to say. The glad tidings is available. See we can't, I said earlier, we're not trying to change the world. We can't. This world is ripe for judgement. It's rushing on to judgement. But our obligation, according to the scripture and the word of God is to walk a pathway of separation, that's separation from evil. Now we're not taking the higher ground, it's not a haughty approach. The pathway of separation is what we're pursuing.

BB [33:40]: But Richard, the problem comes when – you say it's not a haughty approach, but the problem comes firstly, when you do enter into politics and your members enter into politics and not only that put enormous resources into it. That's an entry into the secular world which is countermanded by your belief that people should not vote.

Richard G: We don't participate in politics, voting as you rightly say. We have a conscience about that. God raises up men, puts them into government. The Government's of God. I think it's a very important distinction, government is not of the world. Persons in government are drawn from the world, so to speak, but government is of God. Now that's why the Brethren have a keen intense interest in government. And it's our responsibility to ensure that government doesn't enact or pass wrong legislation that is against God and his laws.

BB: What would you say, then, to nuclear power?

RG: Well to be quite honest I haven't thought about it. But personally I don't have a difficulty with nuclear power.

BB: But isn't that interfering with God's order of the way in which we were brought onto this earth? Isn't that developing a technology which ends in nuclear weapons, which we know can create massive destruction of human beings?

DT: [inaudible] We can't answer some of these technical questions, we're just concerned that the accusations against the Exclusive Brethren and we cannot let it, we cannot let it get into Parliament for public debate.

BB [35:41]: I'll just follow up on that, what's your feeling about women and children being locked up for years behind razor wire, while they're in the Australian desert by the Howard government? How does that fit with the scriptures?

RG: Well I don't think we've, I don't think it's got anything to do with the discussion.

BB: Well of course it has. You're elders and senior members have advocated for that for the Howard government while that was occurring.

RG: Well we support, I personally support good governments.

BB: Yes, but is that good government though?

RG: and I don't, you know, I am very thankful for the current government we have in Australia. I mean in my lifetime we haven't had a better government. We haven't had a better government economically, whatever way you look at it we have an excellent government in Australia.

BB: What about to those women and children who've been psychiatrically scarred for life, by that experience of years left in the desert in extraordinary circumstances.

RG [36:47]: Well I can't comment, I honestly am not aware of the detail and you've obviously got concerns.

DT: That's what government is for.

Richard: See the government has to grapple with these difficult issues, difficult matters and that's government's job, but we're particularly concerned about these policies that are against God.

BB: Well what about the policy of \$6 billion tax break to the already rich in our country when pensioners have got nothing? Isn't there a scriptural reference to the chance of a rich person, a rich man that is, getting to into heaven being akin to a camel getting through the eye of a needle?

DT: I don't think we, we don't get involved in politics to the taxation department or anything like that. That's what comes out with Mr Costello, when it comes out well if it's helpful you're thankful for it, if it's not well you've still gotta pay your taxes.

BB: But if you're making the rich richer in a society like ours, where there's massive poverty and children starving on the planet, against God's word?

DT [38:05]: That's again why we've gotta have government, but that's not for us.

RG: It's not against their cultures. What we're talking about, the sanctity of marriage, is the backbone of society. And if that's reversed, you know

BB: Is that the central concern you have with the Greens?

Richard: Well it's a very real concern because it's come up overseas.

BB: You say yes to that David?

David M: It's one of them yes.

BB: What's the others?

David T: If you kept to the Greens policy of protecting the environment, we'd have no difficulty. I got, we got, nothing against that. Nothing at all.

It's the way it conflicts with God's law, that's what we're against.

BB: yeah, and I understand that. But what's led us to this position of discussing the Senate inquiry is that members of your church and forgive me if I'm making a false assumption here, with the full knowledge of the elect vessel Bruce Hales have campaigned against the Greens and Labor party selectively in a number of countries, but including this one. A large amount of money's gone into

that and that's in the secular domain. And you've made a choice to do that.

David T: That's individual persons that have made that decision. It's not the church.

Richard: There's been no directive whatever from the Church.

BB: No, but Bruce Hales is aware that has happened.

David T: I guess if he heard it

BB: And he is the custodian of it in that situation. [39:51]

DavidM : He may be, but he may not be. That's not a clear statement.

BB: Well his brother has authorised...

David M: As an individual, there's a lot of concern as individuals. And that is their right. See paying for an advertisement is not a donation and I think you've made that connection before.

BB: David, but what happens there is, it's not a donation to the party, but Australian electoral law requires that it be registered and publicly divulged. And I've asked the electoral office to look at whether or not, where the Exclusive Brethren have been involved in very large election expenses, there has been a fulfilment of the requirement of the law that that be notified to the electoral office. Now there is no account from the Exclusive Brethren as such, what will yet to be determined is whether Mr Hales and the other people who've been involved in this, advertising in Adelaide, in Sydney, right around the country, have in fact abided by the law and notified the electoral office of their advertising to influence the election campaign. That's the law in this country.

Richard: Well as I say again, individual persons [41:41] who have exercised their democratic right because of their concern about the policies of persons seeking election. It's a very important matter if someone puts themselves forward to election to government. It's a very critical matter.

BB: It certainly is

Richard: And I am very concerned, you know I read nine pages of the Greens policy on Gay and Lesbians, I'm alarmed. It will destroy society.

BB: And you have every right to come out and say that.

Richard: Yes and I'm saying it.

BB: And we have every right to defend that as we would defend and seek your support for the environmental policies you spoke about and the economic policies where we have stronger policies for overcoming poverty and the grinding cruelty of poverty in this country, for example amongst indigenous people than any of the other parties. But I haven't heard your support, or your members support for those, much more.

David T: Well we couldn't go putting support for that when you hold these anti-Christian principles, we couldn't. There's no way. You can't have both.

BB: But David you

David [inaudible] all we do is pray that men will be alerted against the decline.

BB: But David, your colleague at the last federal election advertised against my colleague standing for election by saying amongst other things that the Greens were going to increase company tax from 30% to 49%. Now, that was a lie. There is nowhere, nor has there ever been anywhere such a policy. That's not on the environment, that's not to do with Gay and Lesbian. This is an attack on tax policy. So how do you justify that misrepresentation to people going to the ballot box? In an election campaign, both a falsehood and nothing to do with gay and lesbian policy. If you don't want to debate other issues, surely you would have drawn the line at getting into a debate on taxation.

Richard [44:21]: Well our concern today, it wasn't economics or taxation Mr Brown, is really and centrally what's contained in this notice of motion that we say without hesitation, I mean these points you raise are wrong. They're a complete misrepresentation of the position. And I feel, I feel, that it's really religious vilification. The Exclusive brethren are a small, you might say fundamentalist Christian group, committed to what's right, as I said, to the sanctity of marriage, maintenance of the family. That's precious to us. That's precious to us, the sanctity of marriage and the maintenance of families. And all we can simply do is walk a pathway of separation in the world. And that's what we're committed to, but we do have a responsibility towards government. We pray for government, we support government right governments and that's where we stand.

BB: Right government you mean by government on the right.

Richard: No, right government would be government that govern according to God's law. Now over recent years there has been terrible decline. You go back ten years ago and the idea of a government legislating for same sex marriage would have been unheard of in the greater community, unheard of.

It would have been howled down. And now in various countries the Greens' policy has been put forward.

BB: Yes, there's support for it across a wide spectrum of the community.

Richard: That shows the decline. That shows where this world is heading.

And as I said before, you know, the destruction, or the doing away with the sanctity, the preciousness of right and normal married relationships will destroy society and it's against God.

BB: But what I see and hear from so many people contacting me, is that the sanctity of their marriage has been destroyed by the Exclusive Brethren.

Richard [46:42]: No. Sin destroys marriages. I'm aware of many situations where one of the, the husband or the wife, mainly it's the husband has been unfaithful and gone off. Sometime they've just walked away and abandoned their wife and children and gone off with another woman. And yes the marriage has broken up and even divorce has come in. Thankfully it's very, very rare, very rare. But it's sin that breaks up marriages.

BB: Well I'm aware of repeated cases, including an axe murder in Britain, and suicide by other people because a spouse was separated from him or her husband or wife and refused access.

David T: Have you got information apart from the internet or have you got that from contacts with

other dissident people.

BB: Well they're not dissident people. They seem to me to be very decent people that I'm talking to [47:44] who have been literally been to hell and back because of their experience with former adherence to Exclusive Brethren principles and leaving that and having to go through enormous, and I think unjustified trauma as a result of that. And as I say all you gentlemen know of members of your own families who have been in that predicament.

David T [48:17]: have you done a search on us have you?

BB: No, I'm simply told.

David T: Who told you that?

BB: By former members

David T: That's not on the internet is it?

BB: Of the Exclusive Brethren

David T: Who are they?

BB: I have to tell you that probably like you gentlemen I don't use the internet. But I'm given this information by former members of the Exclusive Brethren.

David T: You're not prepared to say who they are?

BB: No, well I would be very happy to, but you know what I think at an inquiry, these men and women will come forward. And if they don't have a case to put, you have nothing to be concerned about.

Richard: Well we are concerned that this notice of motion is religious vilification.

BB: I don't believe it does

Richard: I mean no other church group has been brought before the Senate. I mean there's scores of people there, come election time, I see all sorts of groups and bodies, societies, you know people with certain interests run, I've seen full page newspaper advertisements.

Hundreds of names, you know they certainly haven't been put forward for a Senate inquiry. That's what concerns me so much. [49:33]

BB: Let me just tell you, I haven't done this lightly, the Exclusive Brethren's entry into politics in this country, after 140 years or so of not being involved in secular politics, has caused a very big change. And it is appropriate that the failure of that to be flagged. And let me be direct about this, it is very clear to me that there is a lot of interconnection in the campaigns against the Greens that has arisen – not just between members of the Exclusive Brethren, both within and outside this country – but with members of government of this country and conservative parties elsewhere.

Richard [50:25]: See, the Brethren have always ??? testimony of government. You say it didn't happen 100 years ago, well we go right back to Scripture. The apostle Paul says that the Lord

himself, he witnessed the good confession before Pontius Pilate. That's Christ himself before the Governor that Paul appeared before ???. He was King, he preached the glad tidings to him, I think he said, "I wouldst thou become a Christian" such as I also am.

DT: Daniel did as well.

RG: Daniel the same. But I have been, I'm not very old but I can go back at least 20 years and I've had meetings with Labor ministers, many many times I've been into this Parliament, I've sat in the Senate. I take an interest in what's proceeding and I feel I have a responsibility to render testimony as to what is right. That's our position.

BB: But I'm offering you an opportunity to render that testimony in Parliament and you're objecting to it.

Richard: We certainly are.

David T: Because your inquiry into the activities of the Brethren and its false information, false statements you're making.

BB: No, because what I've presented there is a list of matters that should be inquired into, nothing false about that sir. That is simply a list of parameters for an inquiry.

David: But it's from the angle of someone who's against the Brethren. You're not taking this up for the Brethren.

BB: I wouldn't be here and I wouldn't be taking this up had it not been for the Brethren taking up against the Greens and our policies.

David T: The Brethren have not made an attack on the Greens.

BB: Well that is something we need to discover, because I don't believe you are being truthful there. You know...

David: The Brethren have never discussed it in public as a church, never. There's never been funds from the church, there's never been any funds from the schools into what's political, there's nothing. Absolutely everything is clear. We couldn't look you in the face and say these things because we stand before God. We stand before Government. We've gotta pay...

BB: Yeah but I'm logical about this. There is a very concerted, coordinated cross-melding of information and action within your church by senior members of your church to be involved in political campaigning.

Richard: Well that's not surprising. you say New Zealand or somewhere over – somewhere else in the world, similar ideas. Well yes there is Brethren there and they think similarly.

DT: We've all got the same Bible.

BB: And one of them described the trajectory as flying below the radar. Now we're in a democracy where we have to be accountable and fly in the radar, so people can see who you are, why you're motivated.

Richard: I've been to this Parliament many times, many times. The state Parliament of Victoria I couldn't count how many times I've gone in there and sat in the public gallery. No secret, gone in there, I've sat here for days. The state parliament of Victoria I've sat there for days on end, that's my interest in government. My interest in right government, government that will govern and uphold God's laws. And you speak of renewed activity in recent years and that's because these wrong laws, when you go back ten or twenty years, I mean, such things were unheard of. Now suddenly come election campaign and people say they are going to try and get a seat in Parliament and they want to, as we said earlier make provision in law as we said for same-sex, gay marriages, things like that. We must take a stand against it.

David T: And when you try to bring it into schools, into younger, junior schools that gay and lesbians are normal we couldn't, it's just, we'd be totally, God would hold us very responsible if we don't declare ourselves as to the way that is so much against God's law.

BB [54:50]: Look I understand that, and we disagree, but I understand that. But what I'm hearing from you David is, and this is the point, 'we' that is you and the Exclusive Brethren are becoming involved in a political campaign on that basis and I'm simply saying well, declare this to the world. If you are going to go into the world and campaign in this fashion, declare it to the world. And the resources that are put into it. That's what's the important thing.

Richard: [55:20] Well we've done that, we've done that. We've made representations as I said at all levels of government, local government, state government, federal government. I've sat in the Parliaments. I've got nothing to hide, I've got nothing to parade. But as I said it concerns me very much this notice of motion.

BB: Why didn't you come and see me?
[pause]

David T: Because you're here.

Richard: Well we have, today.

BB: No after the event. I mean you didn't come and see me when you became aware of these policies that they're troubling you.

David T: Well when did you get them?

Richard: Well I got this gay and lesbian policy 2 days ago. Since I'd made an appointment I thought, well look...

BB: Were you aware of it before that?

Richard: Vaguely, but not in detail.

BB: Of course you were.

David T: Well that was taken from your website.

Richard: See I haven't been involved in an election campaign.

David T: I haven't

Richard: And I haven't placed advertisements, so I suppose I haven't had a reason to knock on your door exactly. But this, to introduce, you say ok we've become involved in political advertising, but then to turn around this notice of motion I think is outrageous. You know, to refer to the Senate, the matter of ex-communication. I mean ex-communication is practised by many Christian faiths. It's been practised by the Catholics for centuries. And yet, we have a notice of motion referring to the matter of excommunication to a Senate inquiry.

BB: We could go into the depths of this. I mean there's a very big difference [57:14] there though. One is excommunication from the church and frankly the Catholics very rarely excommunicate anybody anymore. But excommunication from family and break up of family on this earth in our time is a very, very different matter. And that's something I don't know of occurring in any other religious sect or grouping or community organisation.

David T: It's simply because they don't uphold the Scriptures. I mean there have been many families over the years that have drifted off and they haven't caused any trouble. They've gone they've left the church they've gone they wanted to go an easier way. Then you get the ones where something has happened. I mean there's cases, where I assume you're getting your information from, where the person has left because of some sin coming in. They've gone then they make out they're in a very tough set of conditions and yet they've been unfaithful to their wife.

BB: How do you judge that?

David M: adultery, facts, facts.

BB: How do you judge it?

David T: By the Scripture

BB: Whose facts? Do you have a court? Do you have a court and ask people to appear before it?

David T: We go by Scripture

Richard: Paul gives us direction, as I said, in 1 Corinthians 5

BB: Well I come again to Paul if you like.

Richard: yeah, well I feel very, Paul stands out, next to Christ, Paul's the greatest man. And you're rejecting Paul, basically you're rejecting the Scripture, you know, lock, stock and barrel.

BB: What I'm saying is, like you, I'm selective about the Scriptures.

Richard: We go by scripture. The Brethren go by everything in Scripture.

BB: You're selective about it too

Richard [59:18]: No I don't agree. We go by the Scripture

BB: Well you just Sir, talked about a special dispensation in adultery. Come on.

David T: Well that man in 1 Corinthians 5 [59:32] was living with his mother. His father's wife. And

Paul was immediately out to get him back into fellowship. And he was, it was only a matter of weeks.

Richard: He was restored, he wasn't scarred.

David T: You remove a wicked man

BB: But what about those who weren't?

David T: But I'm saying that's the intent of discipline. Look, I don't know whether we're getting anywhere.

BB: I don't think probably we are.

David T: The thing is you're accusing a very special company of persons, the Exclusive Brethren. They're very, very special. God's got a very great interest in them and you're making, you're belittling them down in trying to...

BB: Let me tell you why again, because you haven't heard me David.

It's because senior colleagues of yours, and I don't believe independently at all, have made accusations in public about me and my colleagues which are false and destructive. I didn't begin this process, you did.

David T: Say again.

BB: I didn't begin this process, you did. That is your colleagues did

David T: I don't know what you are talking about.

BB: Well I've just showed you.

David T: Yeah, but what was behind that? That is a policy that if persons weren't aware of it...

BB: Thou shalt not bear false witness. What I'm saying is if you are going to enter into a political campaign you do so honestly. But that hasn't been the case. And it's a little bit rich for you to come to me and say I'm making accusation through a Senate inquiry, a set of parameters in which we say, well let's have a public test of this when you afforded none of that, right to reply, discussion to the Greens at all.

David T: OK, you cannot. That is wrong. That's the person who put it in's responsibility, not the Exclusive Brethren

BB: Well I put it to you again that none of that would have gone ahead without the authorisation of Bruce Hales.

Richard [1:01:56]: That was done on an individual basis. That person's name was on the bottom, I don't know who he is. You've got a difficulty with it. It's got nothing to do with the Exclusive Brethren.

BB: That was authorised by Bruce Hales, it would not have occurred had he said you must not be involved in such activities.

Richard: So what you've done. Persons are exercising their democratic right, like millions of others do come election time. Now what we see is religious vilification. I regard this very, very seriously. To put forward a Senate motion like this against a small group...

BB: So do I

Richard: [1:02:35] Christian group

BB: Which has become a player in State and National politics.

David T: It's affecting the Greens and the reason is that there's immoral policies. And that's why we just have to make a stand.

Our responsibility, we pray for government, they're ordained of God. It says to pray for kings and those in dignitaries [1:03:04] make supplications, prayers and Timothy speaks of it, Paul says to Timothy as to it, and that's what we do. And God. We just feel the responsibility that government is aware of right policies, now if members are trying to get in our democratic system that aren't holding right policies we feel a sense of responsibility and I don't see that as an individual, when I say we, I, me, if I feel, if I've got grandchildren I've got 25 grandchildren and if I want them subjected to all this garbage. I'm not standing for it.

BB: That's very sure I agree with that.

Richard [1:03:50]: And that's what these people have done in Tasmania. Exercised their democratic right.

BB: And I'm exercising my democratic right, as a Senator, for an inquiry into the pattern of projection in the political arena of that, of your methods and let me say to you, you described the Greens' policies as immoral. I find the outcome of family break ups and so on, I've been given witness of, itself immoral. There we have a difficulty and in an open and free democracy we should be able to discuss that and be open about where we're coming from when we do that.

Richard: The divorce rate in Australia is getting close to 40% I believe. 38% or something like that. Among the Brethren, it is minute, miniscule, tiny.

David T: point 8

Richard: Point 8! How can you then set up a committee and say the Brethren breakup families, it's so far from the truth. So far from the truth Mr Brown

BB: Well, I'm told differently and not just by one or two people but by a lot of people. And I look into the history of it, now let's test this.

If it's wrong it'll be found to be wrong. If it's right it'll be found to be right. You have nothing to fear from an honest public inquiry.

Richard: We've got these points here are all incorrect.

BB: Well they're not points sir, they're parameters for investigation.

Richard: All I can say again is that I feel it's religious vilification. And I'm very, very concerned about it.

BB: I don't agree with you. I believe if religion intrudes into politics, then politics has to be able to, the debate has to be opened from there.

David T: See you're distinguishing politics as in a democracy as over and against government of God. Now there's a big difference. It is a very weak system. We're thankful for government as it is, but there's a weakness in it.

BB: But you've entered into a democratic process and once you've entered into it you embrace it all. You can't take part in it and say well we just want to restrict ourselves to this part. But not be bothered by that part.

David T: Not the Exclusive Brethren.

Richard: We've got nothing to hide. We've got nothing to hide and nothing to parade. This notice of motion, I find extraordinary. No other Christian groups have been subjected to this.

BB: Well I have to say sir no other Christian group has campaigned like the Exclusive Brethren in recent elections. Nor have I come across a group of any persuasion that's got such a harrowing series of stories about family break ups coming with it. Now that, let us test that. I feel very concerned for those people.

Richard: The Exclusive Brethren involvement, you say, I mean we can only say it again and I can't say it anymore – it is individuals. It is not Exclusive Brethren as a body or church. It is concerned individuals who have taken the initiative, yes.

BB: I think that's a feint. And I think you know very well, just from talking to you gentlemen today, it's very clear that there is an embedded disagreement with the policies of the Greens. I think you'll find you have disagreement with the policies of the other political parties as well.

Richard: Well I mean that's understandable, if they're against Scripture, it they're against God, any member of the Exclusive Brethren will have difficulty with it. That is understandable.

BB: Like, locking up aboriginal children for stealing loaves of bread or like having children and parents locked in deserts simply because they wanted to come to this beautiful country of ours. These things are against the Scriptures. Crossing to the other side of the road when there are people in abject poverty in the world, who with a little bit of our largesse could be given a decent life is not Christian.

Richard: We're not against government, I mean that's government's responsibility to care for these people in difficulty.

BB [1:08:32]: It's all our responsibility

Richard: Yes, OK I'm not against that.

David M: That's why we pay our taxes.

BB: Well no it goes beyond that because our taxes you see, we've got a government that I believe

quite immorally doesn't divert those taxes in a responsible fashion to people who are have-nots.

David M: They're God's ministers. They're God's ministers for good

BB: Well no, they're secular ministers.

DavidM: They're God's ministers for good.

Richard: The Government's of God.

BB: Well then I'm God's Senator for good as well, you see.

David M: God is placing persons in government, we've been over that before. That's his manner.

BB: Then God's placed me here, sir.

David T: Well he's got you in as a Senate place

Richard: As your office we respect your office. We must do that, but I personally Mr Brown feel sorry for you. I feel very sorry for you.

BB: Don't waste your sorrow let me tell you.

Richard: No I mean it, you've told me some of your personal matters and I said we preach the glad tidings in the street. We preach salvation for all men.

BB: Was that glad tidings for me? Because I've never felt gladder or in better tidings than my whole life.

Richard: We hand out, on the street we hand out gospel tracts. I've bought three along I think you'd be interested to look at them.

BB: Thank you very much.

David T: What's the thing on the taxation? Business inquiry you had on...

Richard: Special arrangements?

David T: Taxation special arrangements, what's behind that?

BB: Sorry what is the...?

Richard: Taxation and other special arrangements

BB: Oh in the Senate inquiry. Well there are special tax exemptions for religious groups in Australia and that's a matter for reasonable public inquiry.

David T: Such as?

BB: Such as in a Senate inquiry.

David: No what type of tax exemptions are available for churches?

BB: Well there's exemptions for a whole range of activities. I mean you should look at the tax laws on that matter.

David T: You're raising questions about the tax laws?

BB:[1:11:11] Well I'm raising, what I'm simply saying there, is to see what tax advantages the Exclusive Brethren gets from taxpayers from paying taxes under the current laws, I don't know what that is but I would like to know.

Richard: Well I'm not, certainly not aware of any, certainly not aware of it.

BB: Right, then there's no worry with that. There'll be no worry with that parameter.

David T: Well who gave you that thought? But why would you think a thing like that?

BB: Well I'll just explain, because there are tax exemptions for religious organisations in Australia and it's important that we know about that when a religious organisation becomes involved in the political arena, advantaging one potential government party against another.

David T: You got anything particular? You must have something specific to raise that question.

BB: Well sir, we'll see when the inquiry comes down the line.

David T [1:12:06]: You're not prepared to say?

BB: At this juncture? No. I'd be very happy though, for you to give me any information you have on the matter and I'll see it goes before the inquiry.

David T: Sorry it seems strange to put a motion in the Senate I would have thought a Senate inquiry is a very high inquiry and I would've thought you'd be prepared to say something about it.

BB: Well I just have. There is a range of exemptions available to religious organisations and that's a matter for legitimate public inquiry.

David T: You mean you're segregating the Brethren for that?

BB: This inquiry is about the Brethren.

David T: You mean...Would you bring in other churches? We get exactly the same concessions as any other churches if there is such.

BB: Then the inquiry will find that, if that's the case.

David T: There's nothing special because we're the Exclusive Brethren

BB: No, and I'll be interested in real estate matters and church ownership of real estate.

David T [1:13:12]: Yeah, you can have the whole thing bare. I can assure you that there is nothing that is done that is not 100 per cent upright.

BB: Then we can all relax about it.

David T: But it seems strange to bring it in.

Richard: Well we're not relaxed because, you know, we've got this thing on the public record, these parameters as you call it, that when you read through them they're a serious attack on the Exclusive Brethren

BB: Richard, David, David. Let me say again, this is a response to your attack, in the political arena, on a legitimate political party, with the most socially just and caring policies of any political party. Now you can't expect to be treated differently under those circumstances. It's a legitimate response to that. It is a legitimate thing that we're meeting here today and getting onto a better basis of information and I respect you for that, thank you very much. But I've heard nothing to justify the activities that we've been subject to so far, and the other information that's come because of those activities. Not being subject to a Senate inquiry and I intend to proceed with it.

Richard: Well as I said earlier, come election time there's all sorts of groups and my understanding I read in the newspaper about the Tasmanian election there were groups that mounted very strong opposition, I believe, against the Greens policies. Now have they been subjected to a Senate inquiry, or a notice of motion?

BB [1:14:47]: Well you see the Exclusive Brethren was right in the thick of that and had interconnections with those other groups in Tasmania. But unfortunately Tasmanian electoral laws are very lax and missing. So a lot of things can be done in Tasmania, including donations into political campaigning and misrepresenting the facts, which are not subject to a law because no such law exists. I'm a federal Senator and what I can influence is activities which are in public domain, with the emphasis being on the Senate's ability to inquire into those activities.

Richard: Why haven't other groups been made the subject of a notice of motion?

BB: I think if you think there are other groups which require investigation, you should approach a Member of Parliament

Richard; Well I don't believe there is, I'm not saying there is, but I feel very much that as we've said before we've got certain individuals [1:15:49] placing advertisements and now we have this, as I said I believe it's religious vilification, against a Christian group. And I feel very keenly about it.

BB: Well the vilification began with your colleagues sir. And you feel very keenly about it, but let me tell you everybody is subject to feeling vilification. I don't have a vilification, I don't feel vilification against the Exclusive Brethren. What I do feel is that there is a lot of covert behaviour, politically and otherwise, coming from the Exclusive Brethren and I think it requires the fresh air of public inquiry. You've moved into the public arena, you've made through your colleagues, very select and, at times, totally false accusations against the Greens. You mustn't complain when the same ability to inquire into your activities and make findings about it, comes out of the same arena.

David M: Well could I just say this. That you already know the Scriptures, you've read the Scriptures.

BB: Yes I have, it's a long while ago though, I must tell you.

David M: It was back in early NSW days was it?

BB [1:17:13]: That's right.

David M: You know in the beginning, in the dispensation after Christ had risen and ascended, the apostle Peter and a number of the other apostles were very active in the preaching and faced persecution amongst themselves and they were actually put in custody, you'll remember that.

BB: That's right

David M: And one of their members and man called Gamaliel, a very highly thought of man in the religious circles, he stood up and said to them, he said – he warned them 'you be careful' he said, lest you be found plotters against God. Do you remember that instance? He said if this work is of God you be careful, you'll be found on the wrong side. You'll be fighting against God. That's a serious thing isn't it?

BB: Yes, and that's the situation you find yourself in.

David M: Well that's what I'm saying to you today.

BB: You see that's the situation I think you find yourself in.

David M: No it's the situation you're in, I'm putting it to you.

BB: Yeah well I'm putting it to you that's the situations you find yourself

David M: The other thing is, time is very short isn't it?

BB: Absolutely

DM: I'm 66

BB: You're just ahead of me

DM: And you're?

BB: I'm sixty-one

DM: Well what Peter says, we've been quoting the apostle Paul, but what the apostle Peter says is time passes sufficiently to ... He says let's for the rest of our time, this is the gospel, be here for God's will. That's what's open to us, but there's very little time left. I mean what is a span – 70 years?

BB: That's right

DM: So I've got less than you have.

BB: Well, no

DM: Neither of us have got much and then what about Eternity?

BB: Well David, there is another very short but very strong injunction in the Bible which is judge not lest ye be judged. There second component to that, which is 'vengeance in mine sayeth the lord' and

I think you have to be very careful that you don't judge your fellow human beings according to your own precepts and get it wrong.

DM: We're saying what we're saying based on scripture. God warns us doesn't he? He warned me, He's warned me, he's warned you, he's warning all men.

Richard [1:19:49]: It's not the time of vengeance now, but there will be a day of vengeance, there will be a day of judgement. The present time is a day of salvation, persons can be saved through the work of Jesus. That's a wonderful matter. But there will be as you say, a time of judgement, a time of vengeance.

BB: Well I think you are judgemental and you must be very careful about it

Richard: I want to judge myself. That's the way I want to try to keep myself right

BB: And so must all of us Richard and I judge myself

Richard: And I fear God, I fear God.

BB: And I, like you, judge myself to do the best I can in this existence. And we can do no more than that, and no less than that with our God-given brain and our God-given wisdom of what's going on in this planet. And our God-given need to do what we can to bring about peace and a living future for all people.

Richard: See, this world is not getting better. We can't change this world.

BB [1:21:05]: Yes we can

Richard: No we can't. This world is rushing onto destruction. Look at the moral decline.

BB: You mustn't wash your hands of your responsibility

Richard: I'm not washing my hands. I preach the glad tidings on the street. I do it regularly, get out there and tell men about our saviour God, not willing that any should perish. That's what I do. Preach to men. See the most important issue is the question of our eternal salvation, our eternal destiny. See where am I, where are you going to spend eternity? That's the most important question and you've gotta settle it with god.

BB: I think to do that we all have to do the best we can in our own way and respect each other for doing so.

Richard: Well I pray for all men. I pray for all men. We're not unfeeling. I mean you think of the calamities, you think of the tragedies, we're not unfeeling. I pray for men, that's why I take an interest in government, right government – I pray for it and I'll continue to. And I'll continue to preach in the street, to present Jesus as a saviour.

BB: We're very, we've got similarity there in that I'm in politics to talk up greater consideration for people and greater consideration for those who come after us. We disagree in the, maybe, way that should be presented, but we can all only do the best we can with what we've got and I ask you to respect that and I'll do likewise.

David M: Well we have to do more than the best we can, that's not good enough. We've got to make certain as I was saying to you Senator before, seventy years is such a short span of time. It doesn't seem long ago since I was a boy.

BB: That's right isn't it?

David M: How quickly time goes, what's it compared to eternity? That's the message in the gospel and glad tidings, but we have to make certain, we can't risk...

BB: The best way of doing that, David is to do the best we can with the life we've got.

DM: Well it's only the blood of Jesus that will cleanse us of our sins and we've all sinned.

Richard: Read those tracts.

David T: I think we better get going.

Richard: And we're glad of the opportunity to say that to you.

BB: Thank you. [1:23:37]

End of transcript.