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“Heritage” Expands Again

In December 1976 we announced that “Heritage” would increase from 16 to 20 pages. Response over the past twelve months has been such that we proudly announce another increase from 20 to 24 pages. We also confidently predict that subscription rates will be unaltered. The enthusiastic response to “Heritage” by Australians everywhere confirms our view that this journal is filling the gap as a source of expression to those who would otherwise be unheard.

Our major achievement for 1977 was undoubtedly the Royal Tour campaign which firmly put the Australian Heritage Society on the map as the most active organisation supporting the Monarchy. “A Queen Speaks to Her People” proved a best-seller from the moment it was released. On page two is a report on the tremendous success of this unique publication.

New Governor-General

Sir John Kerr will long be remembered as Australia’s most discussed Governor-General. On December 8th he steps from his post as Australia’s eighteenth Governor-General. Sir Zelman Cowen will take his place and The Australian Heritage Society trusts he will faithfully carry out his duties as Her Majesty’s Australian representative.

No one could deny that Sir John Kerr has faced up magnificently to the highly organised disruptive forces which the press would have us believe represent the majority of Australians. There is one question these demonstrators have yet to answer satisfactorily:

Were they demonstrating against Sir John Kerr as an individual or was it against the office of Governor-General? If it be the latter then can we expect their protestations to continue every time Sir Zelman Cowen appears publicly?

Sir John stands out as a Man of principle unlike the childish demonstrators who call themselves republicans.

“Heritage” Discount for Students

The growing demand for “Heritage” from schools and individual students is such that we are now offering a yearly subscription at a special reduced rate of $4.50 per year (a saving of $1.50).

Sadly, many Australian students are cut-off from the past by an education system which places more emphasis on the study of foreign countries, mainly on a political level, than on the spiritual, cultural and constitutional growth of our own land.

Therefore, it is necessary that the message contained in “Heritage” is placed into as many young hands as possible. It is for this reason that a special student subscription rate is offered.

Schools wishing to purchase bulk supplies of “Heritage” may do so at the current bulk price (see page 1).
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“Her Majesty Delighted” — Buckingham Palace

“QUEEN SPEAKS” A FIRST

With an unprecedented demand for its latest publication the Australian Heritage Society can look upon “A Queen Speaks to Her People” as its most successful publishing venture since its launching in 1971. As we go to press it appears that the first edition will have sold out by Christmas necessitating the printing of a second edition early in 1978.

The moment the book came off the press a copy was airmailed direct to Her Majesty at Buckingham Palace. A suitable message of loyalty on behalf of Heritage Society members was also enclosed. Within five days the Queen’s personal secretary had acknowledged receipt of the book with the following message:

BUCKINGHAM PALACE
7th October 1977

I am commanded by The Queen to thank you for your letter of 4th October and for sending a copy of your publication “A Queen Speaks to Her People”. Her Majesty was most interested to see this and was delighted to see the texts of her Christmas broadcasts brought together in this way.

Her Majesty is quite sure that The Prince of Wales will much enjoy this forthcoming visit and sends her thanks to the Society for their message of loyalty which she much appreciates. If it were possible for you to send to me another four or five copies of the publication for use in the Private Secretary’s Office it would be very much appreciated.

FIRST STOCKS GO

First sales of this outstanding publication in mid September at the Perth Conservative Speakers’ Club where limited stocks were depleted in one evening. Later that month at the “New Times” annual dinner in Melbourne an inscribed copy was presented to Lady Phyllis Cilento, wife of the Heritage Society’s patron Sir Raphael Cilento. Enthusiastic buying also marked the book’s introduction to eastern Australia.

Several days later the Adelaide Conservative Speakers’ Club reported heavy sales at their monthly meeting. The guest speaker was former parliamentarian Sir Keith Wilson. “Heritage” editor, Mr. Murray Jorgensen was also present and spoke briefly of the Heritage Society’s activities.
DISTRIBUTION

In Western Australia complimentary copies were sent to the Governor, Premier and numerous royalist and patriotic organisations. This type of distribution will take place in other states resulting in increased interest as well as sales. Each State Premier also received a complimentary copy but as yet, probably due to the Federal elections, few acknowledgements have been received.

SIR ROBERT MENZIES

After receiving one of the first copies former Prime Minister Sir Robert Menzies wrote that he was interested to read this book form of Her Majesty’s Christmas messages and passed on his very best wishes to all the members of The Australian Heritage Society.

SCHOOL LIBRARIES

Members wishing to promote this unique publication are urged to obtain a small supply with a view to presenting them to various school libraries. This experiment, according to reports, has proved to be highly successful and is an excellent way of introducing young people to the Heritage Society.

YOUR REPORTS PLEASE

You can help to promote this book in a number of ways, either by personal distribution among friends or by bringing it to the attention of your local newsagent or bookshop. We would be grateful to hear of any success you have. We will also gladly welcome any views you hold on how we might further promote sales.

Since the birth of the Commonwealth in 1901 Australians have been entertained in many and varied ways. The performing arts have been through a continuing cycle since early days. Once a performer had only his or her talents to rely on. One false move on a quaver in the voice would spell disaster and possibly the end of a promising career. The advent of electronic gadgetry changed most of that. Television and cinema entertainment have moved ahead in leaps and bounds. But surely there is a limit. The renewed interest in live theatre throughout Australia is a sign that people are seeking out that closeness and warmth that only live performance can give.

What do you remember of Australia’s pioneers in entertainment? Concert performers like Dame Nellie Melba, Gladys Moncrieff, Peter Dawson, Nellie Stewart? Australia had its vaudeville too - Mo probably being the most famous. Radio saw such figures as Jack Davey and Bob Dyer. What of the future?

LET’S HEAR YOUR VIEWS

What did these entertainers have that young Australians are missing today? Could today's Australians be thoroughly entertained by yesterdays entertainers?

HUNT OUT YOUR SCRAPBOOKS - DELVE INTO YOUR DUSTY CUPBOARDS - BRING THESE FAMOUS AUSTRALIANS TO LIFE - Share their lives, their acts, their talent, their humour. Other readers, especially the young will be eager to share these memories with you.

PHOTOGRAPHS

Being worth a thousand words your old photographs of Australia’s early performers will be most welcome. Be assured we will take care of anything received and will return all material if requested.

Address all contributions to:
“Australia’s Yesterday”
The Australian Heritage Society
Box 16, Inglewood
Western Australia, 6052.

(see page 11)
WHITHER AUSTRALIA
MONARCHY
OR REPUBLIC?

by ROY STUCKEY, O.B.E.

When I was first approached to participate in the 11th Annual Seminar of the Queensland Division of the Australian League of Rights and to deliver an appropriate paper, and, realising that this Seminar was based primarily on our Heritage, I chose the title “Whither Australia-Monarchy or Republic” as not only being important but particularly appropriate and relevant to the present stage of our every day life as Australians. I must also admit that I was prompted by a number of important factors such as:

(a) The recent visits to Australia by Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II — our Queen.
(b) The more recent upsurge by a small but extremely vocal section of the community with its parrot-like cry of “No Queen – Independence now!!”
(c) The unfortunate and completely unjustified political use made of the dismissal of an Australian Prime Minister by the Governor-General, Her Majesty’s Representative in Australia, and the attempt made to involve Her Majesty in the controversy.

I also admit as a second generation Australian, my great love for the Crown and all it stands for and my belief in the maintenance of our present monarchical system of government and maintenance of our ties with Britain.

1975 DISMISSAL

It is well known and I believe accepted, that a small section of the Australian community has, for many years, held the view that Australia should abandon its constitutional monarchical system of government and become a republic, but I do seriously suggest that not many people were inclined to take very seriously the periodic outbursts and writings of these limited few. However, since the dismissal of the Prime Minister by the Governor-General in 1975 and the totally wrong and unfair action, in my opinion, of some people attempting to involve our Queen in this purely political controversy, there has been, undoubtedly, considerably more public agitation and re-action, encouraged and given undue publicity by at least a substantial proportion of the media and some politicians and plenty of noise from an organised but very small minority of young people calling for an Australian Republic. The recent Visit to Australia of Her Majesty — and what a triumph it was — has provided a golden opportunity for these people and some politicians to organise demonstrations, despite the emphatic answer given by the Australian Electorate in the December 1975, election which was brought about by a double dissolution of Parliament. Personally, I feel quite certain that many of those people more recently supporting the cry for an Australian Republic, including a few academics, have been prompted by political feelings engendered by the Whitlam-Governor-General controversy rather than any particularly violent or personal opposition to our Queen or any lasting feelings for the establishment of a republic.

If the dismissal of a Prime Minister had not taken place, I feel certain that very little would have been heard from those who desire a Republic and already the tumult and the shouting has died to a whisper. However, this by no means can be taken to indicate that the danger has disappeared as I am sure there are
dedicated republicans in our midst sided and abetted, of course, by our friends the communists, and they will continue to campaign.

JUSTIFICATION

Incidentally, it does seem somewhat strange that, having lived under our present system of Government since Federation in 1901 and being an entirely and completely independent Country under the Statute of Westminster, we should find those advocating a Republic, in effect, expecting us to justify our present system. One would expect that as they are the ones wanting the change, surely they should supply us with clear cut, logical and tenable reasons for such a change rather than merely chant "Independence Now" which we surely do possess under the aforementioned Statute and the equally quaint or silly chant "No Queen", despite the fact that the Crown, as part of our monarchical system, has been accepted and endorsed by all of our elected Political Parties over the 76 years existence of our Federal Constitutional Government.

As a matter of interest, on the day Her Majesty attended Divine Service at St. Andrew’s Cathedral in Sydney and was welcomed by thousands of cheering Australians waving our flag, I made it my business to mingle with the small pocket of people espousing a Republic and waving their “Eureka” Flags. I also made it my business to try to talk to a number of these people to ascertain just what was prompting their demonstration and the only replies were “Money should not be spent on the Queen” and “We want our independence from Britain”. Extreme rnedness formed the basis of most replies! I leave you, my audience, to place a valuation on those statements, if you can!

WHY A REPUBLIC?

In searching for reasons prompting the small pro-republican minority in our community note the most recently published “Public Opinion Polls” in the Sydney Morning Herald, over 71% of people opposed a Republic – over 76% want to retain our British ties. We should endeavour to discover why this feeling has developed in our country, leaving aside for the moment, the more recent political implications, as mention earlier in this address.

Why is this call coming, in the main, from the younger section of our community for the establishment of a republic, more especially when we consider the extra-ordinary replies received by me from some of the demonstrators? Obviously they are being influenced by the Marxist section and the several Communist parties and the unions they control and what could be called the radical academic Intelligentsia – see “News Weekly” of 23rd March 1977.

We know, of course, of the well laid plans of the Communists and Socialists to achieve their objectives by the “divide and conquer” method, by destroying or taking away from the community at large their sheet anchor of National Heritage, background and history, the destroying of family life and family ties, the deletion in most schools of practically all reference to our heritage and the monarchy, the inference that “Patriotism” is a dirty word and that love of country has no real meaning or purpose. In this way much of our youth has become, is becoming, or will become, an easy prey to the ideals and aspirations of Communism which, of course, will obviously embrace Republicanism and I am very much afraid, of course, will obviously embrace Republicanism and I am very much afraid. In this way much of our youth has become, is becoming, or will become, an easy prey to the ideals and aspirations of Communism which, of course, will obviously embrace Republicanism and I am very much afraid.
and, in the course of this address, I hope to present some of them.

Once again, may I repeat - it is the coming and rising generations which require our undivided attention.

WHY THE MONARCHICAL SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT

Those of us who have been privileged to live for many years under our monarchical system of Government accept the present position as a natural outcome of our British heritage and birthright and, as a consequence, find no difficulty in offering many and varied reasons why the present system should be continued.

I readily recall, as far back as 1967, the year in which the great Canadian Exposition was held, when I was approached by the Australian Broadcasting Commission and invited, as the then President of the N.S.W. Branch of the Royal Commonwealth Society to record a tape for transmission to Canada, supporting our Monarchical form of Constitutional Government in reply and in opposition to a French-Canadian lawyer who had recorded a tape in which he supported the call for a Canadian Republic. This, I readily agreed to do and, looking back on the incident, I feel I could not do better than quote to you some of the extracts from my recording as being of particular importance today. Amongst other things I said:

"As president of the Royal Commonwealth Society in N.S.W. and as an Australian born of Australian parents, I stand whole-heartedly for the Monarchy and maintaining and strengthening the Commonwealth of Nations. Deprive Australia of either or both and we will be the poorer as a Nation.

"I recognise that we live in a rapidly changing world where many people seem to be so busy trying to destroy those things we value and are offering poor substitutes in return.

"Why should we dispense with the Monarchy and create a Republic? We live in a democracy where Parliament, elected by the people is supreme. Every country must have a nominal head and in our case it is the Queen - in a Republic a President. Either in the ultimate is subject to the will of the people. Elect a President yes, and such election is subject to all the prejudices, passions and manoeuvrings of Party Politics. Our Queen is above that, thank God.

"Some claim that with the influx of so many migrants who are not of British extraction having the Queen as our Head creates problems. Why? All countries and States must have a head, but it is the Parliament, elected by those same people, which wields the power.

"Others claim the upkeep of the Monarchy is costly. What about the upkeep of the President. Presidential Palaces and all the trappings that go with them?

PARTY POLITICIANS

"Then there is the contrast between our Queen and party politicians. Some of the latter all too often virtually bribe their way into office, and spend four years tickling their vanity and filling their pockets - knowing that they may have only one term to "make it". Such circumstances hardly encourage a sense of honour, of history, of heritage, and of responsibility to future generations.

"But with the Queen, she was prepared for high office and responsibility by birth and training. She holds office today and will not be turned out next month or next year. And when she does move off the stage, her eldest son will accept her high office and responsibilities - and she wants to pass on to him a heritage untarnished, as pure and bright as she herself received it from her father."

"And so, with the monarch the repository of honour and the soul of the nation-spanning time, rooted in the past but so intimately associated with the future - we have a responsibility stability and continuity lacking in the republican state."

"Yes there is much to be said for the Monarchy!" (Ron Gostick)

And if what I have quoted is not enough, let me once again quote, this time from an article in the Readers' Digest titled "Presenting His Royal Highness Prince Charles". This particular reference is only part of the whole of an interview with H.R.H. Prince Charles but is, in my opinion, well worth quoting:

"ON CEREMONY"

"Throughout history there have been monarchies and dynasties which haven't succeeded in adapting and have withered
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and died away. But as a result of the British monarchy's adapting to all sorts of unusual circumstances, of being forced sometimes to give way and retreat, a novel, unique and sometimes eccentric system has grown up. And I think its strength has been its ability to compromise between two extremes and another, to always find the middle of the road. The monarchy, I believe, represents continuity in a world of changing change - change which a lot of people find difficult to adapt to. It is this continuity which people particularly admire about the monarchy. It represents stability.

Is the ritual, the ceremony, and pomp and circumstance relevant to modern existence? Is it essential? To me, ceremony and ritual is most important. It does have a role to play and always has. If you study the early history of man's development as a social animal, you know the emphasis he put on ritual and ceremony as somehow symbolizing something important, and one of the aspects of ownership is its symbolic function. Man needs ritual and ceremony to heighten that symbolism. It adds some colour to men's lives in a rather drab and increasingly dull world.

Let me just add that pomp and ceremony is part of our everyday life, even in this changed world we live in, and would be the poorer without it. Note that with our Mayors, Judges, Ministers of Religion, Professors and Academies, to quote only a few examples, still gladly and proudly wear their symbols and regalia of offices, even in this present so material world.

I think it will be conceded that my democratic country must have at least two important symbols: a Head of State and a Flag. If such be the case, then surely so long as the people are permitted to govern their Country, as we do, per medium of the ballot box, it is far, far better to have the nominal Head of State, who must be either a Monarch or President, removed from the area of Party Politics of all kinds, as does really happen under our present system. Most of the Republies developed or created in the world in recent years, and there are so many of them, have failed or become dictatorships of the worst kind and even some of the much older ones, such as Italy, France and possibly Germany, are not doing too well.

UNITED STATES

The exception, of course, is our powerful neighbour and ally, the United States of America, established so many long years ago. Yet, even that great country, possessing a wonderful constitution, ruled by a President and elected Government, is subjected every four years to the bitterness and strife of Party Political Elections and their equally difficult and sometimes bitter aftermath, particularly in respect of the Election of President.

We in Australia, certainly have our share, or more, of that same bitterness and strife when it comes to the election of a National Government and Prime Minister every three years but, thank God, it does not involve our Head of State, Her Majesty The Queen, and, please God, it never will.

I sometimes wonder if we realise just how fortunate we are to have as Head of State - a person such as Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, so well known, loved and respected the whole world throughout, by all responsible people. Is there any Head of State in the whole world, and include the President of the U.S.A., if you so desire, who can and does travel to the far ends of the earth, touching almost every Country, with so little in the way of safeguards in the form of armed guards, bulletproof cars and the like?

In all the wellest, hustle and bustle of our everyday life in such a rapidly changing world, where so many of our cherished ideals and principles have been thrown overboard, our Queen has been the one person who, we have been able to rally our people and Country in times of crisis or stress, to present some kind of united front to the world. Her name and standing is, and always has been, a rallying call to the Nation and, surely, this is something to be valued and to be thankful for.

HERITAGE SOCIETY

In the brochure prepared and issued by the Australian Heritage Society in 1974, the following paragraph appears and I think it well worth repeating: "The hereditary Monarchy fosters national unity and social stability. Immediately the Monarch dies, the eldest member of the family, trained and educated for the task of destiny, ascends the Throne and claims immediate allegiance. ("The King is dead, long live the King."). There is no power struggle, no friction, but a sense of continuity. The Monarch has no political past and no party followers to reward, and has no party opponents who detest the Monarch.

"There is no need for spectacular triumphs or gimmicks to win popular support. The history of the British Crown has been one of personifying continuity with sensible change. The Duke of Windsor wrote in "A King's Story" that "I had no notion of tinkering with the fundamental rules of the Monarchy... My modest ambition was to broaden the base of the Monarchy a little more; to make it a little more responsive to the changed circumstances of my time." Queen Elizabeth has continued that process while providing in her domestic life an example of constancy. Parliament should represent the popular will but the continuing Crown represents nationhood, unity and ancestry."

Perhaps one could be excused for repeating the words of Sir Mark Oliphant, a previous Governor of the State of South Australia, when he said recently: ""The Monarchy serves us well. It is noticeable that those who most vociferously demand a Republican structure for our Governments, State and Federal, are singularly devoid of tolerance, decency and care for the individual, as taught by the founder of Christianity.""

Of course, the scoffers will probably laugh at any sentimental thoughts or actions prompted by the Queen - people relationship. However, in my humble opinion, a Country composed of people without pride in tradition and history and incapable of sentiment and affection in every day life and living, is undoubtedly a Country without soul and will attract very little interest or respect from the rest of the world.

OUR BRITISH HERITAGE

Before the commencement of World War I in the year 1914, the population of Australia was approximately 99% British descent. At this time, some 63 years later, the proportion of British descent would be about 75% or even
less. This has been brought about, despite the arrival of huge numbers of British migrants, by the influx since 1946 of very large numbers of migrants from almost every country in the world. These migrants, with due respect and good feeling, have been generally referred to over the years as "New Australians", and have brought many changes and customs to our Australian way of life. A substantial proportion of them are Naturalised Australian Citizens and have, or are being, absorbed into the Australian way of life. Understandingly, there are also many who are hesitant about such a complete change in their lives, but I personally consider it only fair and reasonable that, having chosen to settle permanently in our Country, they should endeavour to learn our language and become a real part of our life as soon as possible.

Part of our way of life is the acceptance of our form of Government and our Head of State: The Queen, and it is really wonderful the way so many of them have accepted our system and so warmly support it. As the person who had the final handling of the Silver Anniversary Loyalty Pledges for Her Majesty, as organised by the Australian Heritage Society, I can assure you that the great number of signatures with foreign names was most gratifying, as is also the financial support being received.

In the case of those who have not felt able to yet fully accept our monarchical form of Government, one might ask, with respect, why? It is especially noticeable that when any controversy arises over the monarchy, some sections of the media go to great lengths to emphasise or allege that New Australians do not accept the Queen. If this be correct, we should look at the position very carefully and ask ourselves a few pertinent questions, such as:

(i) Is it because we have not made enough effort as a Nation to teach them our English language and to fully explain to them the meaning of our monarchical system of Government with Her Majesty, The Queen, as Head of State, but with the power to elect Parliament and make all laws in the hands of the electors themselves?

(ii) Is it because we have failed, in general terms, to take sufficient interest in our newly arrived migrants from foreign countries and to extend the hand of friendship to them?

(iii) Have we maintained sufficient personal interest and warmth in our Naturalisation Ceremonies which, in the earlier days, were so impressive and have we explained to them the real meaning of the oath of Allegiance?

Unless we, as a people, including our "older New Australians", are prepared to do these things and see that our Governments play their part, how can we expect our newer arrivals to understand or accept our system of Government and way of life?

We older Australians, who are descendants of the people of the British Isles are, or should be, well aware of the traditions and history we have inherited from Britain and the part she played in helping to create and build the Australian Nation. Sometimes I wonder if a lot of us, including many of our Politicians, have forgotten this!! Remember also that this small country created the World's largest Empire - one quarter of the world's land-surface and one fifth of its population. It subsequently, by invitation, transformed this Empire to a Commonwealth of Nations. All other Empires in the history of the world were destroyed by warfare or moral decay.

After living in our inherited British traditions for so many years, we are now in process of developing our own history and traditions and it behoves every one of us to play our part in this, never forgetting the debt we, and the rest of the world, owe to Britain, extending back over a long period of years. I wonder if, in company with the rest of the world, we have forgotten the year 1940 when Britain stood alone and saved the world.

WHAT OF THE FUTURE?

In discussing the future of our country and, in particular, the tasks confronting people like ourselves who so strongly desire to retain our present form of Government, may I first of all lay very strong emphasis on two matters I have already referred to at some length in this address. They are concentration on educating the youth of our Country by the distribution of appropriate material and taking a more active interest in the many thousands of foreign migrants constantly arriving in this country to make them more fully aware of our system of Government and the need for development of the one unified Australian Nation.

Over more recent years the Australian Heritage Society, as an arm of the Australian League of Rights, has greatly distinguished itself by the campaigns inaugurated, financed and brought to such successful conclusions in respect of "Defence of the Crown", the National Anthem, our "Flag" and the "Defence of Sir John Kerr".

More recently the Society completed a most successful Australia-wide campaign which invited citizens' signatures on Certificates of Loyalty to Her Majesty on the celebration of Her Silver Jubilee and Her Visit to Australia. Certificates bearing many thousands of signatures were handed to Her by His Excellency The Governor-General before she left as "HERITAGE" DEC. 77 - FEB. 78.
Australia and a huge balance of signed Certificates will be delivered personally to Canberra in due course for transmission to Her Majesty. In all, well over 20,000 signatures were secured in what almost was a whirlwind Campaign.

Whatever happens, enthusiasm for our cause must not be allowed to die and we must continue to give the lead to our fellow Australians. This prompts the question, what next? We can be assured that the proponents of an Australian Republic will not give up, even though they have gone to ground for the moment, and they are bound to continue their organising and agitation.

The following suggestions, amongst others, might receive careful consideration:

(a) The development of a membership drive by the Heritage Society and the production of a monthly in lieu of a quarterly magazine.

(b) A massive fund-raising effort, the money raised to be used mainly for the printing of leaflets and brochures and for advertising.

(c) Careful production of propaganda leaflets and appropriate advertising – this, in my opinion, is so very important and it is costly.

(d) A campaign to reach our young people and involve them in working for Australia and our present form of Government. Particular attention to be given to senior school scholars.

(e) The organisation in all States of groups of persons to ensure a regular flow of appropriate letters to the Press, and Politicians upholding our cause and combating the effects of Communists, Republicans and the like.

In this connection I would like to place particular emphasis on the need for as many of our Members as possible to be constantly on the alert to write to Members of Parliament when they say something worthwhile and in favour of our cause. Tell them of your appreciation and support because it is so important to them. When they have the courage to say something we believe in, more often than not, they are assailed by their, and our, opponents and, sometimes, the press and, if they can produce a spate of letters supporting their view, it gives their morale a lift and they are more likely to speak out more often. This is really important and we just cannot do enough of it. I have personally proved the point in recent months.

(f) Closer contact to be developed between the various State Branches of the Society.

(g) Consideration to be given to regular Social Functions, also Educational Seminars or Conferences.

**CONCLUSION**

In bringing to a close this paper on the Monarchy and Republic, may I hope that the views I have expressed and the opinions I have offered will find response in the hearts and minds of my audience and lead to more active and continued support for the monarchical system as opposed to that of a Republic. I repeat, please have the courage to stand up and fight for what you consider to be right and in the best interests of our country and, please, do not forget that your two primary objectives should be to concentrate on the education of our children and scholars, particularly the senior ones and to give more attention to our new migrants from foreign countries. As older and more experienced people we have ideals and objectives we should pass on to them and I cannot think of a better way to bring home this message than to quote the words of my favourite little poem.

---

**The Bridge Builder**

An old man going a lone highway
Came in the evening cold and grey
To a chasm deep and vast and wide.
The old man crossed in the twilight dim,
That sullen stream had no fear for him;
But he turned when safe on the other side
And built a bridge to span the tide.

Old man, said a fellow pilgrim near,
You’re wasting your strength in building here,
You never again will pass this way
Your journey will end with the ending day;
You’ve crossed the chasm deep and wide
Why build you this bridge at eventide?
The builder lifted his grey old head:
“Dear friend, in the path I have come,” he said

“There followeth after me today, a youth
Whose feet must also pass this way;
This yawning chasm which was nought to me
To that fair-headed youth may a pit-fall be;
He too must cross in the twilight dim.
Good friend, I have built this bridge for him.”
I was thrilled to see a photo of Her Majesty the Queen on the front page of the June–August "Heritage". In the Queen's hand was the posy my daughter had presented to the Queen.

My daughter Trudy-Marie (Riddle) was chosen to be one of the Brownies in The Guard of Honour for The Queen as she walked from Government House to the Plaza. This was a great honour and thrill for Trudy and her parents. The next day as The Queen walked down Rundle Mall Trudy was very thrilled to be able to present The Queen with a posy of 25 yellow everlasting daisies (one for each year of her reign) backed by a silver doiley holder.

Trudy was dressed in a long white frock and red sash and on the bodice was pinned a cloth badge with a photo of The Queen edged in red white and blue. This badge was given to my sister whilst still at school for the Queen's Coronation.

This day (March 23rd, 1977) will be remembered always and hope that we may see The Queen in the not too distant future. She is a very warm sincere person and shows great interest in children. Trudy received a most lovely smile from her as she accepted the posy.

No system is perfect – but I wholeheartedly support the Monarchy.

MRS. MARIE RIDDLE
Yorketown, South Australia.
HUMOUR OF OLD
TOTI DAL MONTE

Newspaper reporters of yesterday gave their readers a story thick with the best language and humour. One reader noticed the following story in "Australia's Yesterday" by Readers Digest. We reproduce it for your enjoyment.

TOTI DAL MONTE was a sensation of the 1924 Williamson-Malba Opera Company. She was a great singer and a pretty, if rotund, young woman with a sparkling personality. Australian audiences loved her. She sang 98 performances during that tour, returning for a concert tour two years later and again with the 1928 Melba-Williamson company. In 1928 she was idolised as much as ever. The Sydney Morning Herald said 'the men of Sydney were reduced to a hopeless state of adoration for Toti and were symbolically prostrate at her feet'.

When it was announced that Toti was to be married to the handsome young tenor Enzo de Muro Lomanto, Sydney-siders were so enthusiastic that 25,000 uninvited guests began arriving at daybreak, 'secreting themselves in corners of the Cathedral under the pretence of hearing early Mass', said the Herald. At 8 o'clock, hundreds were there and the policemen were worried: at 11.30 thousands crowded the streets and Hyde Park.

It was 'into a tempestuous, nightmare world of top hats, tattered toilettes, red faces, mutilated millinery, collapsing people, and vast, shrieking crowds' that the bride 'looking very small, and very white, and very nervous, and a million times more charming than ever, stepped from her car and searched for the steps of the Cathedral', wrote the Herald reporter.

'For one instant she glimpsed 25,000 heads, hats and handkerchiefs fluttering and swirling down upon her; then she fled up the narrow carpet. In an ecstasy of abandon, a man threw his bowler hat after her . . . . .

'Everyone was very emotional, especially the little stout man with the top hat from which the bottom had been knocked. He was the most emotional of all, particularly when the policeman refused to admit him to the Cathedral, and an old lady, exasperated by the extensive area of his back, hit him several times over the head with a shoe she had removed for the purpose'.

The bridegroom, looking 'as though . . . . . he had just been asked to sing an opera in Chinese', stood nervously as the crowds inside the cathedral fought for seats, trampling lustily over the attendants, their ties adrift, their collars twisted back to front, footmarks in the middle of their backs, and signs of a struggle in their coiffure.'

Outside, said the Herald, women fainted on top of one, stood up and fainted again. Men sat on the spikes of the fence and felt relieved that at last they discovered a comfortable retreat from the ordeal of fighting in that crowd.

After the ceremony, the couple managed to reach the street and their car. But Toti had not yet shaken off her admirers. 'They charged upon her in a colossal, screaming flood which whirled the policemen along like moths in a monsoon . . . . .' said the Herald. 'In an instant they had torn down all the beautiful flowers that trailed around the car, the ribbons and the decorations . . . . . The chauffeur hastily reversed into a mounted traffic policeman, who hastily reversed into the cavaliers, who hastily reversed into the crowd . . . . . It was just short of a riot.'

Sydney had never known a wedding reception to surpass that held later at Romano’s Cafe, said the Herald. 'There was an utter abandonment to the joy of the moment, such as only the Latin races can enjoy. There was no unseemly hilarity, but excitement was at its zenith. Men kissed each other on the cheeks, there were many handshakes, much clapping, and cries of “Bravo, Bravo”.'
There are women who have cultural contributions to make to society. There are women who battle for the right of women to have an honoured place in the community, not because they want the impossible — equality is men's special world — but for love of justice. The most socially useful of these fight to have expressed in public and preserved in privacy the predominantly feminine values. No peoples are really civilized unless the worth of the feminine values to society be recognized by them.

There is a by no means uncommon type of feminist who is as contemptuous of women as are men at their most arrogant. They make some exceptions. They approve women who have forsaken the woman's world and slavishly adopted the predominant values of man's world.

By woman's world is not meant the "children, kitchen and church" to which Wilhelm II of Germany consigned all females; though these things are relevant to it. After all, we cannot banish babies from the human scene nor do without kitchens of some kind so long as men and women are inveterate eaters; and the sociable gatherings and spiritual comfort which churches have afforded people, and women in particular, are healthy necessities. In speaking here of woman's world, however, the reference is to the psychological approach to experience and to the values revealed in such an approach.

There are two sides to human life—the private and the public. In balanced being and knowing, experience of both is needed by men and women for, although the two aspects are opposites, they are also complementary. Speaking very generally, for most men public life is the more important and is found by them in personal experience of community or organized activities; while to the usual woman private life comes first. Women are the natural guardians of individuals in their capacity of private persons.

The private person is the individual largely untram­melled by the laws and pressures of organized society and living his life as he independently shapes it to satisfy himself. Only in privacy is a person really free. The public political or social organization cannot confer freedom on any man. It can only refrain from interfering with a man's self-governed privacy and ensure that there shall be no unwarranted intrusion by individuals or groups upon any man's legitimate private life or into the place in which he guards his private living.

With regard to the relation between the social and private values: the primary necessity of a human, organized group is to stabilize itself and, in order to do that, it must be safeguarded from internal or external disruptive forces. That is to say that in the first stages of development the public values must weigh more than the private values. Men's public values must be the dominant ones. As the community becomes more secure the individual can be permitted to have more personal freedom. Then the woman's characteristic values of personal privacy are increasingly respected. The worth to
cultural development and the growth of civilization of the private family, the private home and the special private relation between individuals is recognized. With that, women gain a higher status than they have in backward communities.

**BREAK-UP OF HOME LIFE ERODING CIVILIZATION**

It is widely known, though not publicly so widely acknowledged, that with the breaking up of home life and the decreasing opportunity for the individual person to live a fair amount of his life privately, there has been a related lowering of cultural standards and a partial withering of civilization. Consistently with that there is a lessening respect for women as a sex and a diminishing consideration for her as a private person. That is reversion to more backward stages of civilization.

When civilization has been attained, the importance of woman's guardianship of privacy and thus of the independence of the individual is recognized by men and women to be as great as is that of the still-persistent need for men's protection and ordering of the public organization. In civilization the two aspects of experience are brought into a proper balance.

Considering the pronouncements and assertions, the speeches and writings and the propaganda generally of the women-despising type of feminist, it cannot be missed that her efforts are directed towards the crushing of all genuine feminine influence and the construction of a society shaped almost entirely by men's view of the world of human beings and by the organized expression of the characteristic masculine values. Though one complement of human experience and activity can never be obliterated, there yet can be an imbalance in organizational and personal values that can be dangerous or positively detrimental or catastrophic.

**SOCIETY MIRRORS VALUES OF THOSE IN CONTROL**

As indicated, from the beginning of recorded history and, it can be safely surmised, even before then, men have, of natural necessity, imposed their own most cherished values upon the human organization. It is as well for cultural development that men need woman's special values to complement their own, as otherwise there would never be any but a physical meeting between the sexes. The composing of poetry and music, the creation of a rich and varied literature and the producing of great sculpture are the private and personal achievements of individuals free to determine what shall be their own occupation; and such private, individualistic creations have hitherto been the main work of men. The masculine source of such productions is shown in their being embodied, or their values being symbolized, in physical forms and, if true in intention and complete in success, being presented directly to the public to evoke its admiration and for its enjoyment.

On the other hand, a woman's supreme values are usually those of her personal relations with other individuals and not, except in sophisticated development, of her relation to the community at large. For all that, women need a balancing public life.

One way in which they come into contact with the world beyond the personal or domestic one is through meeting men's minds in the created, cultural world of complementary values. Women find something of themselves and something of men in music and pictures and books. Perhaps it is books more than anything else that take them into man's world; and it may be significant that many women can read a book written by a man for men with more sympathy and understanding than men, as a rule, can read a book written by a woman for women.

Besides that mental and emotional contact with man's cultural world, women normally enter into public or semipublic life when they seek pleasure and satisfaction in attending social functions outside the home. In a more serious mood, they explore the public world when they engage in charitable or church work. One might ask why attendance at social gatherings, especially if these be public enough and large enough to be more or less impersonal in nature, is often tolerated by the woman-despising feminist, while gatherings of small, charitable or church-aid groups inspire her with the patronizing scorn of one enjoying a feeling of superiority.

She can offer a number of reasons for this, and some of them not without a certain validity; but a close look shows that the social gatherings that she most approves are those of feminists or "advanced" intellectuals. Men's values rule these congregations. The meetings of women
to carry feminine values into the public world—that is, to engage in "good works"—seem to be despised because they are comprised of unpaid volunteers. That is too humbly feminine. Unpaid women charity workers are regarded as dull women fussing over trivial matters; but if women can get well-paid jobs as organizers or such of charities run on business lines, that meets with approval. It is represented as drudgery for a woman to look after her own children; but an honoured career for her to be paid to look after other women's children, provided it be outside the home in creches or nurseries. Housework, it is averred, deadens mind and soul by its monotony; but being paid to type matter, that has small or no interest to the woman, the live-long day, or to perform some near-mechanical repetitious task in a factory or workshop is declared to emancipate a female. Any paid work outside the home is, in the eyes of the anti-woman feminist, preferable to the labour performed for love of home and husband and children or even of fellow men.

AGAIN THE WILL TO DOMINATE

Such feminists do not conceal their glee when circumstances force the mothers of small children, even against their will, to hand their little ones over to career women while they, themselves, go out to earn the dollars needed for rent and clothes and food. After all, money is man's invention and a convenient symbol in the public world of economic organizing, and the passing of it for services rendered is a token of acceptance into that world.

A person should have the right to live the kind of life that best suits him. If some women prefer relations with the public world and occupation in it to the privacy of home life, there should be opportunities for them to fulfill themselves; but this freedom of choice is something which the egotistical feminist denies, or with contemptuous grudging allows, other women. To her, apparently, women different from herself have but a shadowy reality, and it outrages her feeling of reality if it be not herself who is reflected in them. They must think what she thinks, have the same emotional responses as her own, have the same scale of importances when discovering values as she has, and, in short, be images of herself objectively perceived by her. In her admiration of men's world and her vision of herself as a member of it, it is seemingly, unendurable to her that there should be values and realities other than hers, for the existence of these diminishes her and her own chosen set of values. Her avowed championship of women is really a championship of herself.

Certainly there are women who find their satisfaction in the public world, but who are not inspired by a conviction of the sole worth of that world nor envious of the males who inherit the world as men have made it. There are women who have cultural contributions to make to society. There are women who battle for the right of women to have an honoured place in the community, not because they want the impossible—equality in men's special world—but for love of justice. The most socially useful of these fight to have expressed in public and preserved in privacy the predominantly feminine values. No peoples are really civilized unless the worth of the feminine values to society be recognized by them.

WOMAN'S VALUES CAN FLOURISH ONLY IN A WOMAN'S WORLD

The subordinate tasks a woman performs in the public sphere and the money she there earns do not compensate her for the loss of importance she has as the centre about which the family revolves. Sexual permissiveness, which is really but physical indulgence without the love and tenderness that is more often than not engendered in the constancy of the private marital relation, but does not confer on her sexual freedom. It reduces her to being, sexually at least, once more man's chattel existing only for his physical pleasure.

The too overwhelming, too prolonged dominance of masculine values in an expanding man's world is producing a society which is self-devouring. Yes, admittedly women have rights, the chief of which is to be women and to be valued because they are women. Feminist lovers of man's world, believing that they have been emancipating women, have led them into a new thraldom. That goes a long way towards explaining the lowering of moral standards and the infantilism of much of the modern aesthetic output. It goes a long way, too, to explaining why a world of marvellous physical inventions is so spiritually and psychologically unsatisfying.
In the glow of a Queensland July evening in 1848 the explorer, Thomas Archer, the first white man to set foot on this land, astride a bay horse and leading a grey, rode up to a ridge commanding a view of the surrounding country and there he made camp.

Beyond his camp fire's crimsoned ring he saw the Burnett River winding towards him through the hills and coming into full view around a bend in a magnificent silver sweep, while on the Western bank the blue smoke of many fires curling softly in the still evening air told of a large camp of aborigines.

The aborigines had seen the arrival of the strange apparition of the four-legged monsters from another world and the flicker of the camp fires was soon doused and by morning the whole camp had vanished in fear.

On that morning and on that flat Thomas Archer formed Eidsvold Station and in partnership with his brother, Charles, stocked the land with sheep and worked it for some years.

In 1854 Thomas Archer married Miss Lindsay Morison of Perth and with his bride returned to live at Eidsvold.

A younger brother Colin Archer writing home to their parents in Norway described the now historic homestead which still stands: "The house is now as comfortable as circumstances will permit and quite snug enough for this climate and improvements are still being made. It will no doubt be one of the best bush houses in the neighbourhood before the winter is out".

THE PIANO EPISODE

The episode of the piano illustrates well in our time of electric light, refrigerator, wireless and T.V. the difference between station life then and now. Plans were made to purchase and bring a piano out from England and upon its arrival at the port of Brisbane by sailing ship, only the easiest part of its journey was over. The piano had then to be loaded on a bullock waggion and the long and hazardous trek to Eidsvold Station undertaken.

The Burnett River alone had to be crossed and recrossed nine times without roads or cuttings, and on the ninth and final crossing six miles below the Station homestead, the waggion with the precious piano capsized. There was nothing he could do and the disconsolate waggion driver arrived at the Station, not with the long looked for piano, but with the dreadful tale.
However the Archer diaries record how the next morning at the piccaninny dawn, every hand on the station, men, women and children, stockmen, shepherds and shearsers went up to the scene and righted the waggon and piano, and by evening it was installed, "Lending a great air of culture and civilisation to the drawing room". And so the early pioneers lived, brave, bold, people with an acceptance of life as it was. Theirs was a contentment, and theirs was a rhythm unknown to us today.

By 1857, the Archers had made further explorations north and had formed a property Gracemere (which is still held by members of the Archer family) just outside Rockhampton and they decided to move their interests there. So they sold Eidsvold to two young Scotsmen Frank and Alec Ivory.

THE IVORYS

These two young Scotsmen were sons of the Lord Chief Justice of Scotland, and Frank had studied to be a barrister but he did not enjoy good health and, for this reason, it was decided that the two young men should go out to the sunshine of Australia. They arrived complete with a good library of books for the long evenings, shot guns for game, rods and tackle with which to fish the streams, and clubs for a round of golf.

The flat around the homestead was an ideal situation and they soon mapped out a rough links, so that Eidsvold Station has the distinction of being the first place in Queensland where golf was played.

Eidsvold Station also has another notable first, in that the first Eidsvold Jockey Club Race Meeting was held at Eidsvold Station in about the year 1888, on a course marked around the homestead. Later meetings were held on the present Racecourse Reserve.

Returning to the Ivory Brothers, alas it was not easy to lead the life of a Scottish laird on a newly won Australian Station. Game was almost too plentiful, but the fish in the streams did not rise to their flies, the mullet preferring moss from other streams, and the jew and cat fish clung closely to the murky bottoms of the water holes. Much of the year was too hot for golf and the tall grass, with its piercing seeds, dulled their pleasure. The days were warm and the nights were long and lonely, and after some time, a fine young coloured girl, Caroline, began to attract Frank.

It was not an uncommon sight to see her seated beside him in his buckboard with her white teeth flashing from behind the gaily coloured veils which she loved to wear. A child from this relationship, Frank, was educated at the Maryborough Grammar School and proved to be a brilliant athlete and cricketer. It was Caroline who ended their relationship for she could not bear having her children taken away from her to be educated, and when the time was drawing near for the same thing to happen to another child, Billy, she took the little boy and ran away.

During the time the Ivory Brothers held the station, the management was handed over to George Hallam whose descendents still live in the district. George Hallam had been in charge of the Boolgal section of Eidsvold for about nine years and then, in about 1883, he and his family moved into the head station and remained there until 1891 when the management was handed over to Percy Elliott. Percy Elliott managed the station for thirteen years, first for the Ivory brothers but after Frank's death in the 1890's, his brother Alec never having married, returned to Scotland to his people and the station was taken over by the Australian and New Zealand Mortgage Company and Elliott continued as a manager until 1905.

THE JOYCES COME TO EIDSVOLD

In February, 1905, Eidsvold consisting of the holdings known by the respective names of Eidsvold, Boolgal and Culcraigie, was purchased from the Australian and New Zealand Mortgage Company Limited by De Burgh Persse of Tabragalba who, with his son-in-law Fitzpierce Joyce, formed the partnership known as Persse and Joyce to hold this land.

Fitzpierce Joyce took over the management and with skill and energy began improving the stock and breeding a fine herd of beef cattle. Horse breeding became an important part of the economy of Eidsvold Station at this time as there was a keen demand for chain horses, charges and remounts for the Indian Army, and Fitzpierce's Irishman's love for a fine horse and instinctive knowledge of how to breed one, fitted well into this field and at one stage, five entries, each with a band of mares were running on the Station.

These were the golden days of living. There always seemed to be time for leisure and sport. It was possible to employ endless staff and Fitzpierce Joyce always kept two or three kangaroo dogs, and after splitting up the mustering team, while the stockmen mustered he would hunt from cattle-camp to cattle-camp followed by his ever-increasing family on their horses and ponies and generally some visiting relatives and friends.
At other times, the adjoining station owners would be asked to come along for a day’s duck shooting or mullet netting, and again, the children would drive the ducks to the visiting guns, or spend long, happy hours holding up the net to stop the mullet from leaping over the top and keeping the lead line close to the river bed to stop the fish escaping. They were days filled with sunshine, laughter and feasting.

These times ended with the collapse of the market in 1921 merging into the Depression of the early 30’s and by 1936 the Joyce children were grown and Fitzpierce Joyce was dead, and his eldest son, E.B. Joyce, was called home from the Argentine to take over the management.

THE STATION TODAY

Today, Eidsvold Station is one of Queensland’s foremost and best known Stations, and plantations of a mass of ornamental trees and shrubs and creepers surround the homestead, while each spring there is a riot of colour which enhances the picturesque setting selected by the Archers.

There is now a band of irrigated pasture providing a green oasis in the driest of times, and on these acres where once the aborigines hunted and corroboreed, roam big, red Santa Gertrudis cattle imported from U.S.A.

This progressive step to change to Santa Gertrudis was taken after a lot of thought and research in 1953 by the then partners of Joyce and Joyce, the late Mrs. R.E. Joyce, R.F. Joyce and E.B. Joyce and has proved to be an unqualified success.

This new breed of cattle evolved under very similar climatic conditions on the famous King Ranch Texas, U.S.A. and carrying 5/8th shorthorn and 3/8 Brahman blood, have proved themselves to be ideally adapted to Eidsvold Station and many parts of Australia.

His Royal Highness Prince Charles and His Royal Highness Prince Richard of Gloucester have been guests at Eidsvold Station, which continues to be a mecca for many other distinguished visiting celebrities. For beef research personnel, agricultural students, and rural youth clubs who wish to be abreast with current research in modern breeding practices a visit to Eidsvold Station is a "MUST".

The activities on the Station were recently selected by the Australian Broadcasting Commission for the making of four television documentary features, one of which covering the Quarter Horse has been given overseas rating and will be shown in many parts of the world. Eidsvold Station was also selected by the Courier-Mail to be featured in its 1968 Queensland Annual.
RENEWED ATTACK ON CONSTITUTION

The “Conference for a Democratic Constitution”, held in Melbourne on 24th September, was the first of a series of new attacks on the present Federal Constitution. The declared Republicans were there in force. The week-end conference was held in the Great Hall of the Exhibition Buildings, Melbourne, where the first Parliament sat in 1901. One of the “stars” of the conference was Mr. Don Chipp, who echoed the views of Mr. Bob Hawke, expressed some time ago at a Canberra press luncheon, that Australia should turn from the Westminster type of Government to that of the United States, where Ministers can be appointed who are not Members of Parliament. From a superficial viewpoint, Mr. Chipp’s comment appeared reasonable: “There are not enough successful people in the private or public sector who are prepared to risk all to be a back-bencher for three years and be part of the parliamentary ‘rubber stamp’ to the executive’s actions, or to be an unheard voice on the Opposition backbench.” Then Mr. Chipp went on to say that a new Minister, because of lack of experience in a particular field, or no administrative experience, was “at the mercy of, and more under the influence of his departmental head than good government demand.”

The Heritage Society is not aware that the American bureaucracy is less destructive than its Australian counterpart, even though they have non-elected Ministers. A Government is only at the mercy of the non-elected bureaucracy when it fails to indicate specifically what policies it requires to be carried out, and insists that the bureaucracy is there to serve the Government and the electors. Much of the problem mentioned by Mr. Chipp only arises because Government is too big and interfering in matters which are not the legitimate function of Government.

In his contribution to the Melbourne conference, Mr. Gough Whitlam predicted that in his lifetime there will be a “new people’s constitution”. A “democratic constitution would make it possible for the people’s will, freely and periodically expressed, to prevail.” Didn’t the people of Australia express their will in December 1975, when they indicated in no uncertain manner that they’d had enough of Mr. Whitlam riding rough-shod over Australia’s constitution?

NO DISCIPLINE IN EDUCATION

Permissive education is destroying standards throughout Australia, according to Sydney University’s controversial physicist, Professor Harry Messel.

He said the present education system was creating a nation of “undisciplined, selfish, guitar players”.

In a weekend speech to the annual graduates’ function at Sydney University Professor Messel lashed out at the “do your own thing” syndrome practised in so-called open schools.

“It is called ‘following the needs and interests of the child’, and it is supposed to aid the development of ‘the self’ in an untrammeled fashion,” Professor Messel said.

“Little Johnny loves scribbling on walls – so provide a wall for him to scribble on.

“Mary is not interested in anything but guitar playing – so provide a guitar for her.

“Billy is only interested in billiards – so a pool table is provided.”

Professor Messel said children should be made to master mathematics, science, reading, writing, music and art.

These skills were needed to give a child a proper range of options in his adult life.

Professor Messel criticised the dismantling of State examination systems which he said would cause formal university examinations to be dropped also.

“Misguided notions of equality and pressures for lower standards have finally spread the cancer to the examination system itself,” he said.

Professor Messel said educational standards had declined almost to the level of the 1950s when he began crusading for an integrated science course in all NSW schools.

Young people were being betrayed and their lives were being stunted rather than fulfilled, he said.
IRISH PRIEST ON MONARCHY

SIR – The British Monarchy has survived for over a thousand years. It is an outstanding example of stability in a world riven by dissent and the breakdown of accepted values.

It has established and maintained a noble tradition of which we in Australia are a very real part.

The essential soul of our nation is its character, culture and traditions. Australia is at heart a British nation, and our sovereign lady the Queen is the living embodiment of all that contributes to our greatness.

In her role as Queen, not just of England, but also of Australia, she is the symbol of our sovereignty and independence, the focal point of a strong and dynamic community embracing every race, colour and creed under one flag.

Our constitutional system, of which she is the very real guardian, is the envy of the free world.

Often taken for granted, it is something of which every man, woman and child should be justly proud.

At present, Her Majesty is in Australia. We the Catholic community of Taree, are taking this opportunity to demonstrate our appreciation of our heritage and our loyalty to the Crown.

We will do this with a Concelebrated Mass in our church in Albert Street on Thursday, March 10 at 7 p.m.

Local members of Parliament, representatives of the shire and municipal councils, and representatives of the RSL have been invited to attend, and all members of the public will be most welcome to join with us in prayer and worship for God’s blessing on our Queen and on our country.

As Edmund Burke said, “People will not look forward to posterity, who never look back to their ancestors.”

FATHER T.P. LYNAM.
Parish Priest, Taree.

Manning River Times (N.S.W.) Taree, N.S.W. 2430.
9th March 1977.

YOUR LETTERS

BILLY HUGHES REMEMBERED

Dear Sir,

This is to let you know that I have read Heritage Journal No. 6, with much interest. As one correspondent pointed out, we must stand up and be counted. For too long have we remained silent.

In these troublous times of political and economic turmoil and uncertainty, with deep misgivings for the future, we tend to look back to a time when this country had a more homogeneous and stable society.

Politicians, then, were not preoccupied with salaries, allowances and entourages. They did not have speech writers nor public relations staff. They did their own homework, and were still able to meet and talk with people. They did not abdicate their powers and responsibilities to statutory bodies. They did not genuflect to international bodies. They would not have inflicted upon mature, adult, citizens, the indignity of a Race Relations Law. They were tough, rough, independent Australians, drawn from a homogeneous society, but with vision.

Today, there are politicians, and others, intent on destroying our Constitution — the bulwark of the people. It is said by them that the Constitution is out of date, but we know that is not so! The Constitution was flexible enough for the emergencies of two world wars. It had been drafted by experienced legislators and leading lawyers, wise in the ways of politicians. We, whose roots are deep in the soil of this country, must fight to preserve it. The fight will be harder as time goes on and the population continues to be diluted with ever increasing numbers of migrants with different habits, outlooks and loyalties.

We still remember that great Australian statesman and prime minister, Mr. William Morris Hughes, who put Australia on the world map by winning over presidents and prime ministers with his forthright and fiery speeches, dealing with Australian territorial and strategic interests in the Pacific and New Guinea, at the Peace Conference in Europe in 1919. We also remember his outstanding Defence Minister, senator George Pearce — later Sir George.

Yours sincerely,
S.M. KELLOW
Mt. Lawley, W.A.
The Duke of Edinburgh has expressed concern at links between vandalism, mugging and alcoholism, and the environment in which people lived.

"There are altogether too many instances of social diseases such as vandalism, mugging and alcoholism which can be traced directly to the design of the built environment," he said.

Prince Philip was opening the biennial conference of the Australian Institute of Building at the Festival Centre Playhouse.

He said: "When you come down to it the ultimate purpose of any building, whether it is a factory or a bank or a housing development, is the convenience of those who come to use it.

"The fact is that the design of the development is going to have a very significant influence on the social behaviour and the outlook of the individual occupants.

"My impression is that in seeking technological excellence and economic viability the social consequences of building designs have not always been given the attention they deserve."

The Duke said the scale of modern developments was such that it was not only the well-being of individuals which was affected.

Design solutions had a significant influence on the health and way of life of complete communities.

There was a larger community still which was affected in a different way.

"What may be home, housing estate, office or factory to those who occupy them, becomes a visual structural part of the environment to everyone else," he said.

"Arguments about functional fitness which simply ignore the impact of buildings and developments on the human consciousness display a deplorable lack of understanding and sympathy.

"People do not switch on and switch off their sense of aesthetic values when they go in and out of art galleries or visit areas of natural beauty.

"There is really very little point in trying to encourage children to appreciate the beauties of nature or the talents of artists and then have those carefully implanted aesthetic values stunted or battered into insensitivity by the brutal functionalism of the built environment of their daily human existence.

"What is the point of providing every kind of cultural facility from concert halls to picture galleries and then condemning people to live and work in dismal and depressing surroundings?"

"Relationships with the community must include the quality of every detail of the whole of the built environment."

The Australian Institute of Building comprises people engaged in the building industry in an administrative capacity, in teaching the science and practice of building, or engaged in building research.


PRINCE CHARLES ON YOUTH

While Australia as a nation owes much to the past, the future will be built on the talents of the young and the service they are able to provide to their country. Some idea of the role to be played by them is to be found in the composition of the population. Nearly half of the total population of Australia is now under 25 years of age and more than a third is under 20 – which makes me feel incredibly old.

Extract from speech launching Jubilee Fund May 1977
MONARCHISTS URGED TO BE MORE FORCEFUL

In an address in the Queensland State Parliament on March 16, Liberal M.L.A. W.D. Hewitt offered some positive comments in defence of the institution of the Monarchy which deserve a much wider audience:

The occasion of the visit of the Queen has once again shown us the warmth and spontaneity that her presence in the Australian community generates. There is no discipline that forces people out into the streets to acknowledge her presence. They are motivated solely by a great warmth, a feeling of loyalty and an outpouring of empathy towards her. We saw that during her recent visit to this State. We are all most blessed that she has been able to occupy this role for 25 years. She has filled it with great distinction and honour.

Because she is with us once again her presence has stimulated discussion on the establishment of a republic in this nation and debate upon the advantages and disadvantages of a republic. There have been great rallies and many disputation, comments and columns of print in the newspapers. The culmination of it all was a rally in the Sydney Town Hall where one of the principal speakers was the journalist Donald Horne. I have no objection whatsoever to this activity. We live in an age where nothing is taken for granted and all things are brought under critical scrutiny and review. Indeed, it is part of the Liberal philosophy itself, which says that there will be discussion, argument and dispute so that all things can be considered and all points of view entertained. But having said that I have no objection to those rallies taking place, I argue strongly with the propositions that somehow or other the monarchy is now redundant, that it has no relevance or appeal and that it should be replaced with a presidential system. To suggest that it has no appeal is to close one’s eyes to the spontaneous response that the presence of the Monarch in our country brings about.

I am concerned that the republicans are expressing their viewpoint forcefully whereas those who support the monarchical system are not likewise supporting their viewpoint, and we are being beaten in the market-place. It is important that we get out in the market-place and defend the monarchical system not on the basis of sheer sentiment or pomp and pageantry, but on the very important place that it commands in the political fabric of this nation. In an increasingly materialistic and cynical world, in personal terms I value very much the tradition, the pageantry and the pomp which are part of the monarchical system. I have no objection to them whatsoever, and long may they be sustained. Indeed the Americans, in particular, look at our monarchical system with a sense of envy. All the things they produce when they install their head of State every four years in no sense can touch it, and in no sense can they touch the greater meaning of the monarchical system. But it is not good enough merely to defend the monarchy on the basis of sentiment, pomp, pageantry or tradition. If we go out into the market-place and defend it, we must do so on the basis of the very real value it is to us and the great safeguard it is to the many traditions that we adhere to very strongly. I would put it to the Assembly today that the strengths of the monarchy firstly are the reserve powers that are resident in it and, secondly, the ultimate powers that it denies to others. They are terribly important.

RESERVE POWERS

For hundreds of years great scholars have argued about and debated the reserve powers of the monarchy. Indeed, even in these advanced years of the 20th Century no clear definition has emerged. People are still uncertain about the extent of the reserve powers, and it is probably not a bad thing that an exact definition has not been laid down. And it probably should not be laid down.
One of the most eminent scholars from the Left, Dr. Evatt, in his book “The King and Dominion Governors” dwelt long and hard upon this very proposition. Dr. Evatt was the first to concede that the residual powers were very real and that the powers could in fact be invoked.

It is to the great credit of this nation that in 77 years of federation those powers have been invoked on two occasions only. We all hope that they may never have to be invoked, but we are strengthened in the knowledge that they are there. What are some of those reserve powers— if one might try to put them down in very simplistic terms?

The first is the power to intrude on behalf of the people. If the Monarch or her representative thinks that the people’s interest must be protected and if there are valid reasons why an intrusion must be made, that power is there.

The second is the power to question the actions of the Government. I suppose it is one of the niceties of government that when the Governor meets his advisers each week he does not automatically assent to everything that is presented to him. As the ultimate power in the State, he must be satisfied on the documents that he is being asked to attest.

Thirdly, the Monarch or her representative maintains the integrity of the Constitution itself.

POWERS RESIDING IN A MONARCHY AND PRESIDENT

Those who argue for a republic claim a presidential system is clearly superior. I suppose the best example they cite to strengthen their case is that of the United States of America, which by all tests that could be applied is a great democracy. No-one would suggest to the contrary. But even in the United States of America the powers that reside in the President alone are quite awesome. No-one would like to think that in our form of government such powers should reside in any one person. The Monarch shares the powers; and there reside within the Monarch certain powers of intrusion. She is in clear distinction from the President of the United States. Neither she nor any head of her Government commands the single awesome powers that the President of the United States commands.

If we want to look at other presidential systems, we should recall that a president is not removed from but is part of the political fabric. Surely to goodness the worst example we could cite is the recent episode in the sub-continent of India, where with the connivance of the President of the day constitutional processes were totally suspended and the constitution was pushed totally aside. That was made possible because the President was part of and indeed a creature of the political system. The Monarch, on the other hand, is not part of or a creature of the political system; she stands quite aside from it.

Let me relate some of the fundamental principles of our own domestic situation. We are governed by the provisions of the Constitution Act, which lays down the procedures of this House and determines the life of the Parliament itself. Suppose some autocratic Government decided that the life of the Parliament should be extended and that elections should not take place or should be delayed indefinitely. To whom would the people have recourse? The only person in this State to whom they could have recourse is the guardian of the State Constitution Act—the Governor, acting on behalf of the Queen. It is those powers, which are all-important, that justify the monarchical system.

3 YEAR TERM NOT GUARANTEED

There are those who labour under the false impression that Parliaments are elected for three years and that they should enjoy an unqualified guarantee that they will serve those three years. Nothing could be further from the truth. The only principle that the Australian Constitution or indeed our own Constitution Act lays down is that the maximum life of a Parliament will be three years. There is a world of difference between that and a guaranteed life of three years. For any number of reasons the life of a Parliament and a Government can be terminated. Labor theorists should look at the life of the Gair Government, which was elected in 1956 with a very healthy majority and only some 12 months later the assurance of three years meant nothing. About 12 months after its election that Government was defeated in this Chamber and despatched to oblivion. I remind the House that that happened 10 years ago this coming August; we approach our 20th anniversary.

With the Monarch on our shores it is timely to think well of these important considerations and recognise that the monarchy has never been an irrelevancy, certainly is not outdated or outmoded and commands an important part in the constitutional life of this nation. While those residual powers are there, and while she has the authority to exercise them, we all sleep a little sounder and we are all aware of the fact that no other person can take these powers away. I repeat that the great strengths of the monarchy are those powers that reside in her and those powers which, in consequence, are denied to others.

Queensland readers in particular should see that Mr. Hewitt’s observations are widely publicised. This refreshing viewpoint from a parliamentarian deserves at least a congratulatory letter to Mr. Hewitt. (Editor)
PRINCE CHARLES' VISIT

As we go to press mention must be made of the highly successful, but all too short Australian visit by H.R.H. Prince of Wales.

As expected the Prince was warmly greeted as he attended numerous functions. Although running to an extremely tight schedule which at times must have been exhausting, Prince Charles was obviously delighted with everything. Like his father, he displayed a witty sense of humour in the tradition of former royal visitors, notably The Duke of York in 1927.

POP STAR STATUS

Prominent in the crowds seeking a glimpse of the royal visitor were scores of teenage girls who desperately clambered to shake hands with the Prince or just stare at him with starry eyes. Whilst in Adelaide a radio announcer asked one such girl if she found Prince Charles "sexy". She answered, "Mmm mmm .... but I like Andrew better". The next day in Perth the Prince made mention of this with the remark that he may resign and send Andrew out here.

ROYAL VARIETY PERFORMANCE

One of the highlights of the Prince's visit must surely be the spectacular night of entertainment at Sydney's Opera House. This occasion was preceded by a dazzling display of colourful fireworks (made in Australia) which lit up the harbour and surrounds for miles.

NO POLITICS

Although it is only a short time since the Queen was in Australia this Royal Visit has been as successful as any other. With the thought of elections and all the falsity connected with it the concept of an impartial monarch is still the number one favourite of the majority of Australians.

"HERITAGE" DEC. 77 - FEB. 78
A 17th Century Nun's Prayer

**LORD** Thou knowest better than I know myself that I am growing older and will some day be old. Keep me from the fatal habit of thinking I must say something on every subject and on every occasion. Release me from craving to straighten out everybody's affairs. Make me thoughtful but not moody; helpful but not bossy. With my vast store of wisdom, it seems a pity not to use it all, but Thou knowest, Lord, that I want a few friends at the end. Keep my mind free from the recital of endless details; give me wings to get to the point. Seal my lips on my aches and pains. They are increasing and love of rehearsing them is becoming sweeter as the years go by. I dare not ask for grace enough to enjoy the tales of others' pains, but help me to endure them with patience. I dare not ask for improved memory, but for a growing humility and a lessening cocksureness when my memory seems to clash with the memories of others. Teach me the glorious lesson that occasionally I may be mistaken. Keep me reasonably sweet; I do not want to be a Saint—some of them are so hard to live with—but a sour old person is one of the crowning works of the Devil. Give me the ability to see good things in unexpected places, and talents in unexpected people. And give me, O Lord, the grace to tell them so.

**AMEN**
NEW PUBLICATION

“I commend the newest initiative of the Australian Heritage Society — “A Queen Speaks to Her People”.

It is a significant contribution to Her Majesty’s Silver Jubilee and is deserving of wide dissemination and substantial praise”.

J. Bjelke-Petersen

A Queen Speaks to her People

This latest publication by The Australian Heritage Society features all of the traditional Christmas messages to the Commonwealth by Queen Elizabeth.

As well as a valuable source of reference this publication is a fitting tribute to Her Majesty as the year of her Silver Jubilee draws to a close.

Orders are being taken now. We suggest that this book be in every library and recommend it as a suitable Christmas gift.

1 copy $1.20 posted
10 copies 10.50 posted
20 copies 17.50 posted

Printed and Published by The Australian Heritage Society.
1976 Prince Charles helps with a muster on Eldsvold Station during his second visit.