

# THE NEW TIMES

Registered at the G.P.O., Melbourne, for transmission by Post as a Newspaper.

*"Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free"*

Volume 28, No. 17

Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne. Phone 63-9749

September 21, 1962

## REVITALIZE AND REBUILD THE COMMONWEALTH

### D. J. KILLEN, M.P. SPEAKS WITH "DRAMATIC ELOQUENCE"

In a moving and powerful speech at Canberra on August 30, described by the following speaker as one of "dramatic eloquence", Mr. D. J. Killen, Queensland Liberal M.P., appealed for the revitalizing and rebuilding of the British Commonwealth as an answer to the Common Market.

He exposed much of the fallacious reasoning concerning the Common Market, even criticising his own Parliamentary colleagues, and demonstrated beyond argument that he is a master of the subject. Mr. Killen clearly had a big impact upon some Opposition Members in what was described as "the address of the session".

The daily press generally ignored Mr. Killen's address. We are pleased to make the complete address available for the thoughtful reading of all thinking Australians. Mr. Killen said:

Mr. Speaker, I hope that nobody in the House will be either disappointed or upset if I speak with frankness. The house is a debating chamber, and the subject under discussion is a great issue, which should be approached in a reasoned way and in a way, which will not lend itself to the interpretation that any member of this House is trying to score a political advantage. It must be quite obvious to any outsider, or to any person who has sat in on this debate, that there are certain differences of opinion on both sides of the House about Britain's entry into the European Common Market. This is precisely the circumstance in the United Kingdom. There the Conservative Party is literally ripped to pieces. The Labour Party officially is sitting on the fence although it has for its next conference some 52 resolutions dealing with the European Common Market. Of these, 46 resolutions are uncompromisingly opposed to the United Kingdom going into the Common Market. Five of the resolutions are heavily qualified and one is for the move. The Liberal Party in the United Kingdom officially is in favour of going into the Common Market, but there again; many of its members are completely opposed to such a move and repudiate quite plainly the general concept of the European Economic Community.

#### THE LANGUAGE OF THE TREATIES

Without being offensive to any honorable members who have taken part in this debate, I recognize and concede that they have read the Treaty of Rome, the Euratom Treaty and the treaty setting up the European Steel and Coal Community. I make that recognition. Some people may be a little startled by it; but I imagine it would be acceptable to this House because it puts one in the position of being able to discuss with people who have bothered themselves to discipline their minds, what the three treaties hold within them.

But I am bound to say that I am disturbed—and mightily disturbed—at the reluctance—one could say the wicked, willful reluctance—of some people to give to the

language of the treaties its ordinary every day meaning. I do not believe that anyone is at liberty to look at one of these treaties and say of its language, "This does not mean what it says". It surprises me to find that that characteristic has largely been displayed by those upon who rest academic laurels. I want to say to those people, not in any offensive way but in a frank way, that if their stubbornness to concede and recognise facts—for example to recognise that a triangle contains 180 degrees—had been in previous years of the quality it is today, they would still be heavily engaged in doing supplementary examinations and would have no laurels resting upon them.

#### THE INEVITABILITY MYTH

The first of the great myths on this issue that should be put at rest is the inevitability of the United Kingdom going into the European Economic Community. I believe that some lines of G. K. Chesterton seem to put the circumstances very well—

Smile at us, pay us, pass us

But do not quite forget

For we are the people of England

Who never have spoken yet.

I believe that when the people of England do speak, they will consign to oblivion any government that takes them into the Common Market. Any person who fails to recognize that fact is hopelessly out of touch with reality.

When the matter of the inevitability of the United Kingdom's joining the Common Market is raised, you are confronted with the argument: What alternative is there for the United Kingdom? I was always under the impression that if you regarded your economic circumstances as impelling you towards a particular form of behaviour, that was economic determinism, and it surprises me—indeed it dismays me—to find some people being motivated by economic determinism when economic determinism is at the very heart and soul of Marxist philosophy.

It is also impossible to get from anyone in the United

Kingdom any list of the advantages or any list of the disadvantages of going into the European Common Market. I would have thought that, when the future of 50,000,000 people in the United Kingdom was at stake and when the future of the Commonwealth could well be regarded as being at stake, someone would heed the discipline and say what are the pluses and minuses. It is impossible to get such a list. However, the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Reginald Maudling, in an address to the Primrose League in May this year, referred to the matter of inevitability. I earnestly commend the speech to every member of this Parliament and to every person who believes the United Kingdom's entry into the Common Market can be regarded as a foregone conclusion. He said—

Although the case for going into Europe is immensely strong, it is not absolutely essential. He went on—

Some people, I think exaggerate . . . Some people suggest that by staying outside Europe we will starve.

And he concluded—

That, of course, is nonsense.

Then, Sir, we are bound to consider, on the count of inevitability, the fact that between 1950 and 1960 the United Kingdom's exports to the Commonwealth of Nations went up by £440,000,000 and her exports to The Six went up by £285,000,000. Frankly, I do not understand the form of thinking that suggests that £440,000,000 is a figure that should be despised while £285,000,000—the increase of trade to The Six—should be regarded as being the open door and the persuader to enter the European Economic Community.

### THE POLITICS

I move now to the politics of this scheme which is at the heart of it and should be recognised—trade economics. That is the trivia of it. I hope by now that it is well understood that this is not merely a case of entering one community—the European Economic Community. It is a case of entering three communities—the Euratom Agreement, the European Steel and Coal Community, the so-called parliament which I regard as a caricature of parliament. The convention signed at the same time as the Treaty of Rome brings together the Euratom Community the European Steel and Coal Community and the European Economic Community by providing for these three communities a common so-called parliament, a common court of justice and a common economic and social committee.

Looking at these institutions and the three treaties, we find, *mutatis mutandis*, that they are in substantially similar terms throughout and so I will direct my remarks to the European Economic Community. These three communities represent a thorough going piece of totalitarianism and that should be stated in the plainest possible terms. What is the power of the parliament? What power? Article 44 of the European Economic Community agreement gives to the parliament one power and one power alone. If two-thirds of its members resolve to

sanction a commission, the commission must resign as a body. That is the sole power that the European parliament has. To illustrate the pitfall plight of intellectual dishonesty and confusion to which the Conservative Party in the United Kingdom is now reduced, I mention that it brought out a pamphlet, which, at page 2, dealing with sovereignty in the European Economic Community said -

Democratic control is exercised through a parliament.

And at page 3—

The parliament has no power to legislate.

I put it to the House and to the country: what sort of a mind is it that can write a pamphlet of that description and let such a startling conflict of ideas remain in it?

I am told that if the United Kingdom goes into the European Economic Community, she will be able to lead it. Quite apart from the utter arrogance that that proposition represents, it reveals an abysmal ignorance of the way in which the Community functions, because no member country has any power whatsoever. Article 157 of the Treaty of Rome states in most explicit language that the commission, in carrying out its function, shall not take any notice of any one, of any government or of any member country. The Council of Ministers cannot act on any substantive problem or any substantive matter unless there is a proposal from the commission. The commission is not elected; it is appointed.

### THE DEMOLITION OF PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT

I put to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and to the House that if a Minister came here, be he from the Labour side of politics or from the Government side, with a resolution in his hand proposing to the House that the powers of this Parliament should be handed over to nine people—not elected, not under any control other than by subjecting themselves to a two-thirds vote of the House—and the House was then asked to give its reply to such a proposal, it would give an angry, a defiant and a derisive "No". I invite any person in this House to go to the country and to say in plain terms, "I believe that parliamentary government is finished". I ask any honorary member who supports that view to please put up their hand so that I will know where he stands on this issue. What has been advocated and supported time and time again in this House, in many newspapers in this country and in newspapers in other countries of the world, is the complete demolition of parliamentary government. The European Economic Community agreement makes that quite plain. The Council cannot act unless a proposal comes to it from the commission. Similarly with the European Coal and Steel Community. The Council of Ministers cannot act unless a proposal comes to it from the high authority of the Coal and Steel Community.

Then there is the Court of Justice. I believe it is legitimate to ask: Why should we be concerned? Is this not primarily a decision for the United Kingdom? I respect that argument, but I disagree with it because I believe the United Kingdom is still the centre of the British Com-

monwealth. Whatever imperfections the Commonwealth of Nations may have, at least it is far more successful as an arrangement of countries trying to get some peace, sanity and stability into this world than is any other body. It would be a singular stroke of vandalism if the country which is the mother of parliaments surrendered her sovereignty—no, I go further—destroyed her sovereignty and handed over nine people with a totalitarian concept all her great powers.

### "JUSTICE" IN ACTION

The Court of Justice in Europe, as has been shown by its judgments, is no academic matter. The West Germany Government wanted to subsidise railways near the Soviet zone for political purposes, to show the Soviet people that the West German Government was not collapsing. The high authority of the European Coal and Steel Community cited the West German Government before the Court of Justice, and the argument of the West German Government was declared to be irrelevant. Similarly with the Belgian Government, which was subsidising coalmines to provide employment. The high authority of the Coal and Steel Community sent a letter—not a public document—to the Belgian Government directing it to withdraw the subsidy. The Belgian Government withdrew the subsidy, and some of the industries, which were badly affected, challenged the right of the high authority to so direct the Belgian Government. The Court of Justice upheld, first, that the private letter to the Belgian Government was in fact a decision, and secondly, that the decision was enforceable. These are the massive considerations, which must confront every person who wants earnestly and honestly to come to some settled conclusion on this matter.

Do not think for one moment that I get any pleasure out of disagreeing with people in this place who have sat beside and around me for years. It gives me no pleasure to find myself in violent conflict with my honorable and very gallant friend, the honorable member for Chisholm (Sir Wilfrid Kent Hughes), who regards the European Economic Community as a defence against Communism. I say to my honorable friend that I believe he is incredibly wrong. It gives me no pleasure to say to him and to every other person who may share his view, "You will never defeat tyranny by surrendering those principles on which your independence stands". If you believe that by surrendering those principles to an authority over which you have no control you take one risk, I believe that you are in error. I believe that you take two risks. Not only do you risk your own principles, but also you risk setting an example which may lead future generations to believe that the state of free men was won with ease and that there is no demand for any exertion on their part.

I believe that the peace of this world either will be won by the entire world or will be lost by the entire world. Far from being a bulwark against Communism, I believe that the European Economic Community will promote Communism.

Consider the tariffs that it is proposing. The Six today are 108 percent self-sufficient in sugar and they are proposing to put a tariff of 80 percent on that commodity. The Six today are 101 percent self-sufficient in dairy products and they are proposing to put a tariff of 24 percent on them. Where will the under-developed countries go, not only economically and materially but also spiritually? Many of them will go to the wall. If they do not have access to markets for their goods, the present plight of their peoples will be entrenched and exacerbated time and time again.

### COMMUNIST TACTICS

You hear people say that because Mr. Khrushchev is opposed to the European Economic Community, it must be good. That is a false argument. I liken it to the Greeks bearing gifts. Unless the people are prepared to realize that the Communist theorists constantly oppose things merely for the sake of creating confusion and bewildering people, it is completely hopeless trying to deal with the circumstances and with the problems.

We have been asked what alternatives exist to Britain's entry. This is very much like saying to a man who proposes to shoot himself, "Instead of taking a gun why do you not take a razor and cut your throat?" I do not believe that there is a need for an alternative. Rather the positive case should be put. That may seem to be an Irishman's way of stating it, and possibly it is, but it is rather strange that eighteen months ago Ministers in the United Kingdom who today are pressing for entry into the Common Market were pointing out all the political and economic dangers of entry and were clamouring for the United Kingdom to stay out. The alternative I propose is a revitalizing and rebuilding of the Commonwealth. It strikes me as utter nonsense and humbug to think that six foreign countries can establish a balance-of-payments union and that the Commonwealth cannot. I believe that there is scope and a need for a Commonwealth development bank. I believe that this great crisis of our time will act, in a fortuitous sense, as a catalyst and will bring the Commonwealth to a realization that it must return to the time and the circumstance when it worked as one and when there was a common will and a common purpose.

We will not win peace for the world by harbouring the Messianic mood that blows out of Moscow. Neither will peace be won by the possibly well-meaning contentions that flow out of Washington. If people believe that there is no resentment in the United Kingdom at American influence trying to push it into the Community, they have misunderstood the mind and the temper of the British people. My quarrel is not against people but against causes and philosophies. In my judgment the whole of this philosophy is thoroughly rotten.

## **SEMINAR ON COMMUNISM AND COMMON MARKET SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 22**

Readers are again reminded of the annual League of Rights Seminar, to be held at the Empire Room, Federal Hotel, Melbourne, on Saturday next, September 22, starting at 1.45 p.m., when Rev. A. J. Richards, Anglican Priest from north-west N.S.W., will give the first address.

Mr. Richards will be followed by Mr. D. J. Killen, M.P., who will deal with the political and constitutional implications of the Common Market.

The evening session of the Seminar will be devoted to an examination of the question whether the Common Market proposes a genuine barrier against the expansion of International Communism. The address will be given by Mr. Eric Butler.

Questions and discussions will follow each address. Supporters are urged not only to attend themselves, but also to encourage friends and associates to do likewise.

### **SEMINAR TAPES AVAILABLE**

Tapes of this year's Seminar addresses will be immediately available for all those who can make use of them. We suggest that supporters can help ensure that the speakers reach a nation-wide audience by making use of these tapes—either at house meetings or at club gatherings.

## **THE STRANGE CASE OF Mr. LESLIE BURY, M.P.**

Former Cabinet Minister, Mr. Leslie Bury, chose the first week of the critical Prime Minister's Conference in London to express some more pro-Common Market views. He also criticised indirectly the Menzies Government. Mr. Bury's first criticism, which resulted in the Prime Minister asking him for his resignation from the Cabinet, was also made at a most embarrassing time for the Australian Government.

It has been stated in defence of Mr. Bury that he is an honest man openly expressing his deeply held convictions. But what has not been publicised is the fact that only twelve months ago Mr. Bury was expressing views diametrically opposed to those he has been publicising in recent months. Why did this former official of the International Monetary Fund change his views so dramatically? Mr. Bury has not favoured the Australian public with an answer to this question. Perhaps he feels that very few people know that he was such a strong opponent of the European Common Market. We feel that it is important that Australians should know what Mr. Bury's original views were. It would be hard to find an example of a more dramatic change of attitude by a Federal politician on a basic issue, than that provided by Mr. Bury.

Mr. Bury attended the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference in London in September of last year. His views on the Common Market were so forthright that the British Common Market negotiator, Mr. Heath, described

him as "one of the fiercest critics". Mr. Bury was worried about the position of the British Crown "when political integration goes further". He said that the possibility of loss of preference to Commonwealth countries "will be bitterly resented and resisted". He described the timing of Britain's application to join the European Economic Community as "a curious moment indeed to embark on far reaching economic negotiations with the hard-headed gentlemen across the Channel." He asked that Great Britain "will make very sure of her new friends before loosening ties with the old, and take note of the conclusion reached at the recent Commonwealth Finance Ministers' Conference." This Conference was highly critical of the Common Market proposition.

It would indeed be most instructive to learn why, and when, Mr. Bury decided that he no longer "bitterly resented and resisted" Britain's proposed entry into the European Common Market.

## **ANTI-COMMON MARKET CAMPAIGN INTENSIFIED**

The Australian League of Rights reports a tremendous increase in the intensity of the campaign against the Common Market betrayal. It is working in close collaboration with groups right around the British Commonwealth. It thanks all supporters who have co-operated in the cable campaign to London; which it is confident has helped considerably in the strengthening of resistance by the Commonwealth Prime Ministers.

Mr. Eric Butler's campaign in West Australia finished with a big public meeting in Perth on Friday, September 7, when a resolution to be wired to Mr. Menzies was carried unanimously. Mr. Butler flew to Adelaide on Sunday, September 8, where he packed in two days of high-pressure activity.

On Monday evening, September 9, the R.S.L. hall was packed to hear Mr. Butler denounce the policy behind the Common Market as one designed to wreck the British Commonwealth. State President of the R.S.L., Brigadier T. Eastick, was in the Chair. A resolution to be cabled to London was carried unanimously. The S.A. Council of the League of Rights reports that it has an excellent tape recording of Mr. Butler's address. Mr. Butler fitted in a TV interview during Monday.

On Tuesday he had a non-stop programme from early in the morning until late at night. He did two radio interviews in the morning and an interview with a prominent business leader, gave a luncheon address to the Executive of the Chamber of Commerce, had a series of interviews with business and political representatives during the afternoon, the last interview finishing just in time to permit him to address South Australian supporters. He arrived back in Melbourne the following morning to start work for the Dinner and Seminar activities. He leaves for Sydney and Brisbane late this month.

---

*The New Times* is published by New Times Ltd., Third Floor, Pressgrave Building 273 Little Collins Street, Melbourne. Subscription: £2 per annum, post-free.