

ADDRESS TO ALOR – ADELAIDE OCTOBER 31, 2015

I last spoke to this national conference some 13 years ago and whilst we are today different people and, indeed, in many ways different organisations, I find that our purpose and our values remain the same.

In 2002, the Australian Monarchist League was still somewhat fresh out from the 1999 referendum and was still grappling with the aftermath of that event as we saw our politicians whittling down what should have been a reinstatement of our monarchical values following the people's will that they wanted to retain our safe and secure system of constitutional monarchy.

In those days we faced political interference and were in many ways viewed as outcasts because we did not conform to the politically correct standards required by politicians of us. Because we did not conform, we were attacked viciously. People openly said their purpose was to destroy us. BUT we persevered. We stood firm to our values and we grew. The thousands of members we lost through natural attrition, we gained in new members. We adjusted to new and modern technology. We moved more online and were helped in this regard by some of those present here today for which we will always be extraordinarily grateful. Today we have in excess of 22,000 members online and our reach through the Internet is at times more than 50,000.

Because we have been consistent in standing up for our Australian values under the Crown for over 20 years, we are viewed as a conservative organisation, but we are not. We are more a traditionalist organisation seeking to maintain those things that have made this country great and virulently opposing anyone who seeks to demean and to denigrate these values.

Today, many politicians give us a grudging respect, not because they like us and definitely not because most agree with us, but because they view us with some concern as they do not know how far our influence extends, particularly through the ranks of young people and young Liberals.

Once our new website comes online we intend to increase our membership and to increase our Internet reach to several hundred thousand people. In this way we hope to combat the new rise of republicanism and send those perpetrators against our democracy back to the rebellious quagmire from whence they came.

As I mentioned to a dinner in this very room last week I said that earlier this month, Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull in addressing terrorism concerns in the wake of the Parramatta shooting said: "*It is not compulsory to live in Australia. If you find Australian values, you know, unpalatable, then there's a big wide world out there and people have got freedom of movement.*" (News.com 10/10/2015)

These are words that patriotic Australians would applaud. In fact these are similar words to those uttered by Pauline Hanson for which she was vilified.

These are words that republican politicians, including Mr Turnbull, a former head of the Australian Republican Movement, should bear in mind when they seek to remove the Queen and the Crown. If they don't like our current constitutional system under the Crown, a system they swore or affirmed to: "...be faithful and bear true allegiance to ..." then, to quote Mr Turnbull's own words: "*It is not compulsory to live in Australia. If you find Australian values, you know, unpalatable, then there's a big wide world out there and people have got freedom of movement.*"

All those years ago when I last spoke, I quoted from Psalm 5 to describe those politicians who had betrayed their oath or affirmation of allegiance to the Queen. I said: "*Not a word from their mouth can be trusted: their heart is filled with destruction. Their throat is an open grave, with their tongues they speak deceit!*"

THE THREAT OF TERRORISM

As long as republican politicians continue to demean our system of governance, a system they were elected to represent and protect, and defy the allegiance they must constitutionally give to the Queen, it is obvious that a result of this will be that new Australians will take little pride in their new country.

MAIN TALK – 2

For over 200 years people have been migrating to this country. Indeed, we have members who are descended from the First Fleet, but other than the truly indigenous people, we are all migrants and none of us should abuse the privilege of being Australian.

Being accepted into this country, whether as a refugee or as a skilled or migrant worker, is a privilege and it is about time that the leaders of ethnic communities said the same sort of thing as the chairman of the Parramatta Mosque, Neil El-Kadomi, is reported to have stated: "*I said you waited long time to come to this country. You should not abuse the privilege you are Australian, which is very important. Get out. We do not need scumbags in the community.*" (SBS News 9/10/15)

We hear so much talk about radicalisation of young people of Islamic and possibly other faiths, and the need for community centres to combat this. But, the problem lies much deeper within the entire Australian community.

It is a lack of patriotism to our nation led by politicians who, over the past thirty odd years, have continually attacked our system of governance under the Crown and in so doing have demeaned what it means to be an Australian.

In both the First and Second world wars, Australia's young men readily volunteered to fight for King and country. They were the Patriots.

However, today we see politicians swear to bear true and faithful allegiance to the Queen, our Sovereign head of state, and immediately thereafter talk about getting rid of Her Majesty and bringing on a republic.

For twenty-five years we have had serious debates on a republic. Sixteen years ago we had a referendum which rejected a republic but even today the media has continued its attack on the monarchy.

With this sort of message that is sent to the people and particularly the young and impressionable, how can one expect the youth of the nation to have any sort of patriotism when our leaders continually decry what we are.

We must have in place a proper civics education which explains the role of the Crown not just within our Constitution but the manner in which it protects our daily lives.

New citizens must be taught why Australia is a constitutional monarchy and how the Crown keeps politicians from total and absolute power and authority thus creating a Parliamentary democracy which few other countries enjoy.

Whilst ethnic leaders have a responsibility to ensure that their youth do not become isolated from the community at large which is said to be responsible for leading to their radicalisation, successive governments must also be blamed for young people rejecting Australian traditional values.

Little wonder these people question "*what has the Queen to do with us?*" Little wonder they agree with politicians when they (often purposefully) erroneously say we have to be free of England.

THE AUSTRALIAN MONARCHIST LEAGUE

When we faced the move towards constitutional change in 1999 we were a rather disparate group of people and were totally reliant upon the support of active and vigilant organisations, such as the League of Rights and I would like to thank you today for the enormous support that you gave to us at that time.

We are particularly grateful because, as many of you would be aware, the Australian Monarchist League was shut out of the NO committee and had no share of the seven and a half million dollars allocated to them. Our candidates for the Committee included Brigadier Alf Garland, former National President of the RSL and Dr. David Mitchell, the noted constitutional lawyer, now sadly unwell, but all were rejected because we would never compromise on the Crown and would never join with direct-election republicans who took their places on the NO Committee, led by the Australians for Constitutional Monarchy – the very organisation which promotes Australia's system of constitutional monarchy as a 'crowned republic'!

I believe that verbally liquefying our monarchy into a republic is wrong. You cannot have the Crown being a part of a republic. Either we are the one or we are the other.

Furthermore, for a monarchist to tell people that we are already a republic, albeit a 'crowned' one, and that the Queen is not our sovereign head of state and that the Governor-General is absolute head of state is undoubtedly playing into the hands of republicans leading them to say: *"well, okay, if that's the case we'll keep the Governor-General and remove the Queen."*

Make no mistake. The Governor-General exists only as the representative of the Queen and the Queen exists only because we have a constitution established under the Crown. Our system is totally different from that of a republic. Our constitutional monarchy works. Republics don't.

I think it can be worn as a badge of honour that the League has always refused to compromise its stand on the role of the Crown within our constitution and **has** never ever received government funding nor have we received any support whatsoever from big business. The bulk of our support has always come from those organisations who believe in us, from individual members and what may be termed to be 'widow's mites'.

In 1999 many of our people were elderly. We had people in their seventies and eighties who stood at their post at their polling booths all day, literally dropping where they stood, so important was it to them that we not become a republic. Of course the retired veterans and their generation believed implicitly in putting their duty to their country first before self. Something that is sadly missing in succeeding generations.

Whereas until recently a lot of our active members used to favour attending social occasions, the majority of our current membership today, we know only through interaction via social media. Most of our members today are under forty years of age and many of our office bearers are in their twenties. It is a far different world than before, but it is one that we have embraced, otherwise we will fast be left behind.

LOBBY GROUP

Therefore, unlike your usual Loyalist-type organisation holding functions and the like we have become a pro-active lobby group.

Whilst some have accused us of being an international royalist organisation as though this would be somehow offensive. However, let me assure you that the Australian Monarchist League is a totally Australian entity. One which actively opposes any attempt to remove the Crown from the Australian Constitution and fights unceasingly against those who seek to demean the monarchy or denigrate the Queen.

When we started off, we attracted the old establishment and retired military whose very ideals now seem to lie trodden under the jackboot of socialist ideology - the sort of King and Country people who also never put aside their Oath to the Queen as politicians seem to do so cavalierly nowadays. I took an Oath of Allegiance to the Queen aged 17 and have never forsaken that Oath.

The bulk of our membership were real conservatives including traditional Labor as opposed to politicians and lawyers and the 'blue rinse - North Shore' set as well as yuppie-type semi-republican Liberals who formed the bulk of Australians for Constitutional Monarchy.

We, on the other hand, worked amongst the outer suburban Labor and National Party country electorates because we knew that traditional Labor and country Nationals would vote against a republic and for the Queen because these were the areas most of our members came from. As we know the yuppie-type Liberal electorates voted for a republic.

Following the 1999 referendum we faced a continuous campaign of republicanism by stealth with governments dumbing down the monarchy, and removing monarchical symbols and with companies making fun of the Queen.

We embarked upon a pro-active campaign against anyone who sought to demean the Crown and the Queen and we were extremely successful.

As far back as 1994, when the Keating Government stopped distributing prints of The Queen, at our own cost we reproduced and distributed the renowned portrait of Her Majesty in the Australian Wattle Dress painted by a League Patron Sir William Dargie.

MAIN TALK – 4

Also in 1994 the League sponsored the establishment of The Foundation for Australian Constitutional Research and Studies which covered all junior & senior High Schools. Unfortunately ‘crowned republicans’ persuaded [our Foundation](#) chairman and secretary to go across to them and then used their organisation to enter into a joint venture with republicans. Whereas we operated on a totally voluntary basis, huge salaries are now paid to its officials.

We have blocked governments from changing the Oath of Allegiance and have successfully lobbied for Civics Education into schools. The only problem was that Howard appointed a republican to chair the Civics Committee.

We were active in the NSW Government House campaign and established the ‘Friends of Government House’. We motivated people to attend a public protest outside Parliament House, including paying for buses and we later met with Governor Samuels and established an understanding over the use of Government House. We later successfully lobbied for the Governor to be returned to Government House. However, credit for the entirety of these campaigns is now wrongly claimed by ‘crowned republicans’.

When multi-national companies like Nashua and Toyota both ridiculed the Queen in their advertising we conducted extensive campaigns against them resulting in the withdrawal of their advertising. Toyota had taken our protests so seriously that they sacked their advertising agents, Satchi & Satchi.

We have been successful in lobbying for the continuation of the Queen’s image on the \$5 note, but under the current regime are keeping a close watch on the situation, particularly with the impending issue of the new tactile note,

We lobbied Australia Post to properly publicise the Queen’s stamps and we now work closely with them on the production and sales of their Royal stamps.

I could go on about our many campaigns, such as getting the Commonwealth Bank to rename its new marketing initiative “*Republic Customer Relationship Marketing System*” but my time is limited and there are some other things I have to say.

PROTECTING THE CONSTITUTION

This brings me onto the current battle we face [now](#) that the former head of the Australian Republican Movement is Prime Minister and the current head is the media celebrity Peter Fitzsimons. These people can wield enormous power. Not only do they have access to media, but also big business and they can raise large tranches of money for their cause whereas we remain an impecunious and struggling organisation.

Earlier this month we saw an announcements that Christopher Pyne, Bill Shorten, and Will Hodgman (Tasmanian Premier) have joined the Australian Republican Movement. Peter FitzSimons, the current head of the republicans says that around 200 businesspersons have joined his group, including people like Alan Joyce, the CEO of our former national icon, Qantas and Sam Mostyn, the appointed Chair of Citibank.

As well as protecting the Crown, the Queen and our monarchical symbols and traditions, the League has as its motto: “*protecting the Australian Constitution*” and we have been active in so doing.

In recent times we have organised opposition to proposals to amend the Constitution. Recently, we were the largest online presence opposing the constitutional recognition of local government and our submission influenced both the Victorian Liberal party and the Queensland LNP government to oppose the proposals.

This was the first time that we opposed Tony Abbott, whom we had always considered to be a friend and a leading traditional conservative.

Following Tony Abbott’s call for monarchists to support recognition, the Select Committee asked us to make a submission. Whilst we said that we were not opposed to recognising the indigenous people as being here before the raising of the British flag on Australian soil, we also stated that we would oppose any move to empower anyone over other Australians.

When the Department of Immigration and Border Protection called for submissions, we said that Australia is facing a crisis of identity because successive governments have dumbed down - or republicanised - our system

of governance in favour of a multicultural approach to such an extent that the ideologies of new Australians become superior to an acceptance of the Australian way of life.

I might mention that when one views the tragedy that Europe is facing with waves of migrants trekking their way to Germany, one's hearts cannot but go out to them until, that is, one realises that once a country has given them sanctuary they will then turn on the people of that country demanding that their religion and their way of life take precedence. We have seen this happening in Australia with demands even to remove Christmas trees from shopping centres, let alone attacks on Christian prayers in schools because, as they say as it offends their religion. But these sorts of insults to our values continue only because our governments themselves now dumb-down our Christian culture and pussyfoot around those who seek to destabilise our way of life.

We also saw Tony Abbott recently talking about a referendum on same-sex marriage. This caused us to publicly oppose a referendum being held because the issue of marriage is one that the Constitution places into the hands of the Parliament. It is not an issue for a referendum and it is dangerous to use the constitution as a political football.

So, as you can see, the Australian Monarchist League has become very active in standing up for issues that are outside defending the actual monarchy itself. But, if we allow our constitution to be wrongly amended, are we not failing in our duty to the integrity that the Crown brings to it? Surely, amending the Constitution by just one word can open the doorway for a different interpretation of what exists thereby tying up the law courts for decades to come.

OUR SYSTEM OF CONSTITUTIONAL MONARCHY

Last evening I talked about Magna Carta and how it was symbolic in implanting into English law the old Saxon laws which, of course, was what made England different from Europe which continued to follow Roman law.

Magna Carta was a defining stage in the evolution of modern democracy, which we term Westminster democracy, and which is now followed in various forms by most countries in the world today in that countries are governed, whether in fact or supposition, by a parliament.

According to the Museum of Australian Democracy, Australia is a liberal democracy which is based on four main principles:

- A belief in the individual
- A belief in reason and progress
- A belief in a society that is consensual
- A belief in shared power

These beliefs are very similar to and are essentially taken the rudimentary tribal laws of the Saxons which evolved into the Witan, or Council. It was the Witan which selected the king and even the Norman, William the Conqueror, sought the approval of the Witan to take the Crown.

In the 9th century A.D. Alfred the Great established a constitution for England. That constitution was the 10 Commandments verbatim. Winston Churchill in his 'History of the English Speaking Peoples' wrote of this time: "*We are witnessing the birth of a nation.*" It was a birth which commenced the long pathway towards constitutional government up until today when all who are under the Crown are entitled, with few exceptions, to vote whatever their religion, race or background.

From the time of Alfred, the Ten Commandments have formed the basis not only of the British constitution but of all constitutions that have emanated therefrom, including that of Australia. We should not forget that our Constitution begins with the words: "*humbly relying upon the blessing of Almighty God...*"

The Westminster system of government we inherited means that we elect a parliament from which a government is chosen comprising the political party that is able to muster the largest number of votes in the lower house of the Parliament.

Albert Venn Dicey in his 'Law of the Constitution' of 1885, distinguished Westminster democracy as:

- (1) The legislative supremacy of parliament.
- (2) The prevalence of the rule of law.

MAIN TALK – 6

(3) The dependence of the Constitution on the conventions.

In Australia, the evolution of democracy did not happen overnight. It was a lengthy process that commenced in seriousness some fifty years after white settlement began. In the declining years of the 19th century Australians held a number of state and national conferences all designed to bring together the turbulent and often [disparate](#) six colonies into one nation.

That the leaders of these conferences were able to resolve individual differences and through a process of discussions, deliberations and consensus, free from the influences of revolt and war, to join together in agreement culminating in independence in 1901 was nothing short of phenomenal.

The new constitution was put to a democratic vote of the electors in each of the six States and whilst, admittedly, not everyone was able to vote, the majority of people did and what they created was a system that eventually brought all Australians together with all citizens today entitled to vote on how each one wishes to be governed.

As our first Prime Minister, Sir Edmund Barton had earlier commented: *“For the first time in history, we have a nation for a continent and a continent for a nation”*.

The resultant Australian Constitution contained safeguards to protect the smaller colonies against the greater ones and the ordinary people against the powerful.

Of course, nothing is perfect and nothing will ever be perfect, but our system of constitutional monarchy established a good system of governance in which absolute power is denied to politicians and put into the hands of the people.

Not even the United Kingdom comes close to matching the democratic basis of our Constitution for instead of placing the power to change it into the hands of politicians as is the case almost everywhere, they instead placed that power into the hands of the Australian people.

Therefore, in Australia the people’s democracy can be said to be more absolute for it is the people who have the power to remove a government at election and they can remove the Monarchy at a referendum.

This is why we express concern at any attempt to change or to modify or to create outside influences, such as the Australia Acts, which can alter the way in which our Constitution is viewed by the courts and by our legislators.

However, the problem facing the Western world today is that governments, the media and educationalists are forcing a Marxist-type doctrine onto our society fuelled by the apathy of the people.

The fundamental principle of free speech seems to be rejected by those on the left in positions of authority and power but only against those who do not agree with them. We are seeing taxpayer-funded journalists literally berating politicians and others of non-socialist viewpoints.

Our schools and universities have become republican and socialist indoctrination centres. We have seen teachers and tutors actually lying to unwitting students about our monarchy and our system of governance in their bitterness against the British and their hatred of our Queen.

In this, the 800th anniversary of the signing of Magna Carta, it is time that the people of Australia took a stand against this Marxist type attack on our traditional and constitutional values. If we do not we will all face a bleak and indoctrinated future because it is these constitutional values which have made Australia the democratic nation it is.

When so many countries have overthrown the shackles of communism, why are our socialist politicians and our Marxist teachers taking us down this pathway?

In saying this, I am not in any way talking about party politics, but about what is happening in the real world today. Indeed, quite a number within the Australian Labor Party – as opposed to the Union-backed politicians - are monarchists and many are more conservative in their values than so many within the Liberal and National parties.

POLITICIANS STIFLING THE SYSTEM

Whilst the Australian Constitution has stood the test of time, I am afraid that the political system it espoused has not and that is because politicians control that system and have warped and moulded it to suit their own political ends.

However, our democracy is fast becoming subservient to the will of politicians because of democracy itself where because it becomes necessary to elect politicians, we face a three or four year cycle during which those politicians will do everything they can to ensure their re-election, bribing the electorate with untold promises regardless of the consequences to our economy, our nation and, above all, ultimately the people they are supposed to serve. As George Bernard Shaw wrote: *“A government which robs Peter to pay Paul can always depend on the support of Paul.”*

There are so many issues of great import for the future of this nation that could be more easily resolved by all politicians putting aside differences and sitting down and working things out.

One of the greatest impediments to a true democracy is the media. No longer does it report news in an impartial and unbiased manner but generally slants whatever news there is to assist the political party it supports. As Mark Twain has been often quoted as saying: *“If you don't read the newspaper you are uninformed, if you do read the newspaper you are misinformed.”*

Indeed, as far as the subversion of our democracy is concerned, the media must bear the brunt of the blame. Its consistent 24 hour thirst for news, however erroneous or inept, gives politicians little time to carefully consider their actions. Government ministers should be governing not having to pander to the media every five minutes, particularly an avaricious media which pits politician against politician for the sake of feeding its news cycle.

WHAT IS THE ANSWER

Having said this, I don't know what the answer is, for we cannot have democracy without electing representatives to govern us. From my point of view I say thank goodness we exist under a constitutional monarchy where politicians cannot access total power and where there is a system in place to curb the avariciousness and the ambitions of those elected to govern us.

When our constitution was drafted the sort of people who were in the parliaments were generally men of honour. They were not paid to serve their country and received minimal expenses. Most retired in almost penury.

Sir Robert Menzies, who went into parliament a wealthy man, due to his pre-parliamentary position as a Queen's Counsel, had little money when he retired but he was fortunate that friends clubbed together to buy a house for him.

Since the Bill of Rights of 1688/9 right up until the middle of the twentieth century the majority members of Parliament were there because they felt they had something to offer.

Members of Parliament of the time were not paid. It was not until 1911 that an allowance of £400 Sterling per annum was voted upon for MPs in England largely due to pressure from the Labour Party. At the time, the average wage was around £150.

In Australia, a salary of £500 Australian was set in 1901 but today, Federal MPs take home nearly \$200,000 p.a. which is almost double that earned by British MPs.

A matter which concerns Australians is that over five hundred million dollars is now spent by members of the Australian parliament on entitlements. That is around two million dollars per member!

Entitlements not only include office, phone and printing, but first class 'study' overseas, tour flights and accommodation. MPs have no limits on business-class commercial flights and several business-class flights for family or nominees.

MAIN TALK – 8

And, on retirement, MPs qualify for the Life Gold Pass of free business or first class airline travel within Australia with their spouse if they have served for 20 years as a backbencher or six years as a minister or one year as PM.

MPs who do not qualify for the Life Gold Pass receive the severance travel package providing up to 50 flights (25 return trips a year) for between six months and five years after they have left Parliament depending on their length of time as an MP.

MPs who lose their seat get paid a resettlement allowance of 12-weeks' pay for involuntary retirement.

Until recent times, most MPs had jobs or other income to support them. However, it is no wonder that with the payment of a large salary and substantial entitlements, younger people now make politics their full-time career goal.

Regrettably, the preselection process of all main political parties virtually eliminates those of an independent mind and the party-political process controls those who are elected under a party banner. Politicians today refer to politics as a profession, not the vocational service to the people it should be.

A lot of politicians grumble that they have to be away from home and have undue pressures of work, but surely they knew what lay ahead of them when they fought for preselection? Arguably the pressures are no less than that of many who are in the public arena doing voluntary work – and without the chauffeur driven com-cars, personal staff and assisted travel?

CONSERVATISM

There are a lot of labels defining the political stance of people nowadays. We have Labor left and Labor right and we have small L liberals and conservatives. However, these labels rarely define the actual thinking of the individual so tagged. For instance many people that call themselves conservative are against traditionalism or even against almost everything that Menzies stood for.

As I mentioned earlier, I, myself, would not describe myself as a conservative but would rather classify myself as a traditionalist and definitely not the sort of namby-pamby conformist who won't say "*boo to a goose*" whilst socialists would willingly wring the *goose's* neck and serve it up for dinner.

To me a traditionalist is one who seeks to conserve those established institutions and practices which have a proven record of success. Phraseology which, I am afraid, no longer describes political conservatives.

I believe that socialists, Marxist, Fabians, left-wingers-call them what you will- have been so successful, through their control of the media and the educational system from kindergarten through to graduate university status, that they have actually moved the pendulum far towards the left of politics. So much so that the Liberal Party of today is more like the Scullin Labor Party of yesteryear and the Curtin-Chifley governments could be said to be almost to the right of most Liberals.

This is why when most Coalition governments come into power they seem to carry on where the former Labor government left off. Adversarial politics are not adversarial on the grounds of differing political philosophy but rather just for the sake of opposing the other side.

We should not forget Malcolm Turnbull's first words on becoming Leader of the Liberal Party that he intended to lead a liberal government. Many commentators and viewers thought he made a mistake and should have said Coalition government, but Turnbull was talking about small 'l' liberalism in the socialistically ideological sense, not as a political party. However, he was pulled into line by the National Party and had to agree to many of the Abbott policies before the Nationals re-joined the Coalition.

Since his election, we have seen conservatives deserting the Liberal Party in droves thus enabling socialists to assume total control of what once was the bastion of Menzies conservative ideology.

However, I do believe that those who control the left-wing of the Liberal party are in for a great surprise when Gen-Y Young Liberals take their place in politics. This generation is generally more conservative and more outspoken than that of their parents. They are the antithesis to the baby-boomer generation. However, because

the pendulum has swung so far to the left, Gen-Y as a whole will find themselves on the right of a left wing base and will still be somewhere to the left of Chifley, let alone Menzies.

THE POWER OF THE MONARCH

I also believe that the pendulum between the power of the monarch and the power of the Parliament has swung too much away from the monarch.

Traditionally, the monarch exercises, or rather should exercise, the Royal prerogative to ensure that the freedoms and liberties of the people are never oppressed by the nobles, or in current day language, by the politicians. This does not occur today.

Over the past 50 years we have seen successive governments interfering in the day-to-day lives of the individual to an extent never before known before the enactment of the Bill of Rights over 300 years ago. The masses of government legislation and regulation extend the right into an individual's home on what they can do and what they cannot do. The onerous regulations of local councils are, in many ways, an affront to the liberty of man as are the many laws imposed by state governments over the use and even ownership of one's own land. Indeed, a man's home can no longer be said to be his castle.

At the same time, we have imposed from on high strictures on what we can say and what we cannot say, what we can do and what we cannot do and even what we should believe and what we should not believe. These are all retrograde steps and impose the authoritarian will, not of the monarch but of what had become the political classes, our new rulers.

However, one cannot blame the political parties alone. The people themselves must end their indifference and accept that they are a major part of the problem as they, themselves, have it within their power to hold their elected representatives to account. However, most remain uninterested, even apathetic, both in the actual electoral process and in not holding their members of Parliament accountable, preferring to get on with their day-to-day lives, caring little except about themselves.

As Mahatma Ghandi said: *"true democracy cannot be worked by twenty men sitting at the centre. It has to be worked from below by the people of every village."*

So long as people take our hard won democracy for granted, it will be subjugated to the will of others. Plato had said: *"The price of apathy towards public affairs is to be ruled by evil men"* and those who are able to manipulate the system for their own ends will succeed, but barred only by the fact that our constitution is 'under the Crown'.

Being 'under the Crown', provides us with checks and balances ensuring that politicians are not able to attain supreme power, for the Crown holds that power in trust for the people ensuring that the 'temporary' authority given by the people to a Government must return to the people at the designated times for election.

Her Majesty herself described our democratic system of government when in Canada in 1987. She said: *"Parliamentary democracy has fostered tolerance and flexibility - a good balance between individual rights and collective responsibilities. And this is because the constitutional monarchy has always placed the emphasis on people in community - as it were, a national family with the Sovereign as its head."*

The Queen is truly the guardian of our freedoms under the Crown, but democracy in Australia cannot survive by this alone. It will be subverted unless the people themselves stand up and fight for our freedoms and for our democracy.