

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. 20

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

November 2, 1962

"INFLUENTIAL GROUP.. . INTENT ON UNDERMINING THE PRIME MINISTER"

D. J. Killen, M.P., Exposes Double Talk on Common Market

In a dramatic address in the Federal Parliament on October 18 Liberal M.P., D. J. Killen, criticised the Federal Treasurer Mr. Harold Holt, and included his Parliamentary colleague, Mr. L. Bury, former International Monetary Fund official, amongst those who have not deemed it necessary to explain why they are now supporting what they previously opposed.

Mr. Killen's charge that there is a group seeking to undermine the Prime Minister for purposes of political advancement has caused widespread speculation. Apart from "The Sydney Morning Herald", the daily press of Australia ignored Mr. Killen's devastating address. We are therefore publishing it in full:

Towards the end of his speech the Treasurer (Mr. Harold Holt) said—

If I were an Englishman I would be found amongst those in Great Britain willing to take the plunge.

My right honorable friend is entitled to his opinion, and I believe I am entitled to mine. I want to say in the plainest possible language to this House and to the country that the sentiments expressed by the Treasurer I do not share, and I would be ashamed to think that any person nurtured in the British tradition would be prepared for one moment to contemplate embracing this bureaucratic mechanism. I have never disguised my resentment at the proposal that the United Kingdom should join the European Economic Community. My resentment has not been solely on commercial grounds. It has been on both political and economic grounds.

I do not want to recapitulate the arguments that I have advanced already other than to say that I still find myself utterly stunned with amazement that people in this Parliament and outside should say, "Well, if the United Kingdom gets into the community she will be able to lead it." That statement has within it the proposition that the person who makes it either has not read the treaty or does not understand the treaty. The dichotomy is not a false one. The treaty says it and so does all the material distributed by the community. The commission has a peculiar singular independent status, and the council, comprising Ministers representing the member countries, cannot act—I repeat, cannot act—other than on a proposal of the completely independent commission. But be that as it may.

I want to put on the records of this Parliament, among other things, a collection of statements made by some of those who have played leading roles in the Economic Community controversy in this country and outside. Conversion to a cause frequently happens with great suddenness. That is not to be questioned. But none of us should burke the point of challenging the genuineness of a conversion, more particularly when there has been no explana-

tion or admission of the conversion. Simply because a person changes his mind is no reason why he should be condemned, but what invites the lash of both pen and tongue is the action of an individual who, under the guise of mere flexibility, deserts a cause while pretending he still supports it. That curious feature of behaviour unhappily is part of our present circumstances. Those against whom I believe that charge fairly rests cannot seek pardon by claiming that their minds are not cluttered with foolish and trifling inconsistencies and by adopting the style of superior beings treating all others with scant respect. When the time comes for the history of these turbulent days to be written, it will seem surprising if the remarkable attitudes of some of the protagonists of British entry into Europe do not warrant a secure place. Whether it will be a respected place is as much a matter of opinion as a matter of conjecture.

I begin this brief survey by referring to one of the most ardent "Europeans" in all England, Mr. Peter Thorneycroft, who, as co-author of a publication, "Design for Europe", wrote—

No government dependent upon a democratic vote could possibly agree in advance to the sacrifices, which any adequate plan must involve. The people must be led slowly and unconsciously into the abandonment of their traditional economic defences.

Whatever may be thought of that striking piece of totalitarian philosophy, it has at least the quality of candour. However, what is staggering is the fact that Mr. Thorneycroft, and those who think as he does, came within an ace of being successful. The British people and those who have affection for the British cause should not think too unkindly of Mr. Thorneycroft. At least he had the courage to state his views on the matter. That cannot be said of others.

In the last few days the British Prime Minister has invited the British people to accept the challenge of a Britain in Europe. Mr. Macmillan has not always been enthusiastic for such an end and more sharply, he has not,

to my knowledge, ventured to give the slightest explanation of his conversion to a Britain in Europe. Speaking in 1956, on the question of Britain joining Europe, Mr. Macmillan made certain statements, which I shall read. These statements, like the others, which I shall recite tonight, are not taken out of context. He said —

I do not believe that this House would ever agree to our entering arrangements which, as a matter of principle, would prevent our treating the great range of imports from the Commonwealth at least as favourably as those from the European countries. So this objection, even if there were no other would be quite fatal to any proposal that the United Kingdom should seek to take part in a European Common Market by joining a customs union.

On 2nd April 1958, Mr. Macmillan stated—

Our trading arrangements are governed by the Ottawa Agreements. It is, of course, true that these Agreements were reached at a time when the Commonwealth countries — apart from Britain—were not predominantly manufacturing countries. Times have changed. Some of the Commonwealth countries have now become great manufacturing countries. Difficulties have necessarily arisen from time to time; but these have always been solved by mutual agreement in the spirit of our Commonwealth partnership.

Where, I ask the House and every honest British person, is the spirit of Commonwealth co-operation flowing out of the Conservative Government in Britain today? Mr. Maudling, the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, has been no less frank. On 28th October 1958, he said—

The Commonwealth remains, of course, first priority in all our trade policies. Quite apart from political and sentimental ties, the Commonwealth in terms of hard trade takes between 40 percent and 50 percent of our trade. Within the Commonwealth there are great opportunities now for further expansion in trade with the Commonwealth territories as the territories themselves are recovering from the effects of the fall in commodity prices, which for so long undermined their reserves, so that many of them had to maintain restrictions on import programmes.

Then on 12th February, 1959, Mr. Maudling—remember that he is the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the United Kingdom today—had this to say—

I cannot conceive that any Government of this country would put forward a proposition, which would involve the abandonment of Commonwealth free entry. It would be wrong for us and for the whole free world to adopt a policy of new duties on foodstuffs and raw materials, many of which come from underdeveloped countries, at present entering a major market duty free.

Later in the same speech in Parliament Mr. Maudling observed—

We must recognise that, for us to sign the Treaty of Rome would be to accept as the ultimate political goal political federation in Europe, including ourselves. Does he still say that today? He added—

That, as I have said, does not seem to me to be a proposition, which, at the moment, commands majority support in this country.

After having spent four weeks among the British people I think that Mr. Maudling is right. Now the pro-market-eers have sought to present the British Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. R. A. Butler, as a devotee of European union. It is in no sense of malevolence that I remind them that Mr. Butler wrote in the *Times* of 29th September 1949—

It cannot be too clearly stated that any tendencies, however unlikely to be realised, expressed at Strasbourg which lead to constitutional change involving a formal cession of British sovereignty whether political or economic, will weaken British

relations with our own family. They would render the wider and grander aim of the full co-operation of all the free democracies less easy to achieve.

Would any one accuse the British Prime Minister of having pro-Communist views because he was opposed to British entry into Europe, and because he stated in clear and explicit language that for Britain to go into Europe would mean the end of the Commonwealth and would act as an inhibitor against a genuine and lasting peace being created in the world?

In a speech to the Conservative Party conference in 1960 the Lord Privy Seal, Mr. Heath, said among other things—

We want to see unity created. We want ourselves to be part of that unity. We are prepared to work for it by an association between the European Free Trade Association and the European Community.

I believe that the speech Mr. Heath made to the Conservative Party conference a few days ago differs from his statement of two years ago both in tenor and in character.

On the question of supra-national institutions no one, I hope, has any doubt as to their role in European Community affairs. If there should be any doubt, may I refer the doubters to a statement made by a Britisher at Strasbourg on 15th August, 1950, giving the reasons why the United Kingdom could not join the European Coal and Steel Community. I implore the House to mark carefully these words.

Our people will not hand over to any supra-national authority the right to close down our pits or our steel works. We will not allow any supra-national authority to put large numbers of our people out of work in Durham, or in the Midlands, or South Wales, or Scotland.

Who was it that said that? It was Mr. Harold Macmillan, the gentleman whose Government today has made formal application to join the European Coal and Steel Community.

Finally, on the matter of conversion, there is my friend and colleague, the honorable member for Wentworth (Mr. Bury). In a recent speech, he said that those who oppose British entry into Europe have one thing in common, that being an absence of fertility of ideas. I thought that language a little harsh and unkind, Sir, more particularly as, only last year, his views on the European Economic Community were such as to prompt Mr. Heath, the Lord Privy Seal in the United Kingdom Government and Minister in charge of British negotiations, to describe the honorable member for Wentworth as "one of the fiercest critics". I hope that the honorable member was not too badly wounded by Mr. Heath's description of him, just as I hope that he will not be too embarrassed if I remind him of several of the points that he made in what I regarded, and still regard, as an excellent speech. My friend said, among other things—

What happens a few years hence when political integration goes further? What is the position of the Crown?

The honorable member described that worry as "a very serious one". He said—

This presents a curious moment indeed to embark on far-reaching economic negotiations with the hardheaded gentlemen across the Channel.

I ask the honorable gentleman: Why does he think now that the time is propitious for the United Kingdom to embark on far-reaching economic negotiations with the hard-headed gentlemen across the Channel?

In this speech, the honorable member for Wentworth continued—

Britain sends three times the volume of goods to Commonwealth countries than it does to the entire Common Market. Canada and Australia alone buy more from Britain than the entire European Economic Community. These things are birds in the hand . . . Admittedly Common Market momentum has been very impressive, but if serious frictions developed the potential economic gain will easily be lost in Governmental inefficiency. Currency disorders, differential labour and social policies and divergent fiscal and monetary policy would quickly swallow any economic benefits. It could, indeed, prove to be very rough waters on which Britain was casting her bread.

Why is it that the honorable member no longer believes that it could be very rough waters on which the United Kingdom is casting its bread? He went on—

Commonwealth countries naturally fear that the preference they now enjoy in the British Market will not only be lost but eventually turned into reverse against them in favour of European Countries. This may be an extreme and ill-founded fear, and far off but such a possibility will be bitterly resented and resisted.

Finally, Sir, the honorable member for Wentworth said—

. . . We hope, indeed, that our Leader 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.

All of what I have quoted of my honorable friend's speech -- or, more correctly, speeches -- can be found in the report of the proceedings of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference held in London in September last year. I am sure that the honorable member for Wentworth will not cavil at my stand when I say to him that, if the test of intellectual fertility is the accumulation of a hopelessly irreconcilable collection of principles, then I prefer the barren state.

Sir, I say to the House with the greatest of regret, but, nevertheless, with the clearest of determination, that there appears to be in existence an influential group of people who have been intent on undermining the Prime Minister (Mr. Menzies) and the Minister for Trade (Mr. McEwen) in their efforts to preserve legitimate Australian interests and those of the Commonwealth. But it would be to flatter them to say that their motives rest there. Their undermining, in my judgment, has been a springboard from which to further personal political ambitions. It would be completely wrong for any person to assume that retreat in a skirmish is the prelude to defeat. Retreat in politics, no less than in war, is frequently a manoeuvre to secure a planned and substantial victory.

Finally, the last example of conflict that I want to give is a strange one indeed. It deals with the basic objectives of the European Economic Community. I remind the House that Mr. Macmillan is the United Kingdom Prime Minister. Is his word to be heeded? On 2nd August, last year, he said in the House of Commons—

I must remind the House that the E.E.C. is an Economic Community, not a Defence Alliance or a Foreign Policy Community, or a Cultural Community.

On 22nd June this year, in an address to the Diplomatic Press Association, Professor Walter Hallstein, President of the European Economic Community Commission, said— Our Community is essentially political in its ends, in its structure and in its functions.

He continued—

. . . We heartily welcome the completion and perfecting in the fields of foreign, defence and cultural policy of the edifice built in common.

Putting the matter at its very lowest, Sir, it would be reasonable to say, on the basis of that evidence, that either Mr. Macmillan or Professor Hallstein does not understand what the European Economic Community is aiming at. The only alternative in existence is that one of them is being deceitful.

I admit that Great Britain's strength has waned as a consequence of her titanic efforts in two great wars. Yet it would be wrong to say that she is enfeebled. Great Britain survived against the forces of tyranny primarily because her people had the will to do so. I do not believe that the will of her people today has changed. They have the resolution of old and a ready earnestness to see that there is no corruption of the long-accepted axiom that an Englishman's word is his bond.

I can think of no finer note on which to finish than a passage from an editorial that appeared in the *Sunday Herald* of 3rd April, 1949. This was a Sydney newspaper and, though the name has changed slightly I believe that the controlling interests are still the same. The editorial is headed—

No Need to Apologise for the Empire.

It was written at a time when the British Empire was changing and the new, emergent Commonwealth was coming into being. The author of this editorial wrote—

The British Empire is said to have been acquired in a fit of absence of mind. Let it not be liquidated or enfeebled in a fit of self-abasement.

I know that one could say that the Commonwealth was acquired by hard work and great sacrifice. Let it not be enfeebled in a fit of self-abasement. I remain supremely confident that the people of the United Kingdom will survive the vagaries and the weaknesses that come from the utter confusion and the wretched duplicity that presently are inflicted upon her by one of the most tragic governments ever inflicted upon that great and historic land.

Mrs. GERTRUDE a'BECKETT

We record with deep regret the recent passing of Mrs. Gertrude a'Beckett, one of the pioneer supporters of "The New Times". Mrs. a'Beckett was a loyal and generous supporter in every possible way. Although she suffered indifferent health for many years, she still maintained her keen interest in "The New Times" and all associated activities. In spite of great physical suffering she attended the send-off to Mr. Eric Butler before he left for England, and was also present at the welcome-home meeting. She never ceased to write to people, or to send out pieces of literature to those she thought might be interested. Mrs. a'Beckett fought the good fight until the finish. We salute her passing and express our deep sympathy to all members of the a'Beckett family.

LEAGUE OF RIGHTS EXPANDS IN QUEENSLAND AND N.S.W.

Brisbane League of Rights supporters who attended the League's meeting on Friday, October 19, were heartened by the report of activities by Mr. A. Weekes on behalf of the Queensland Council. Mr. Weekes said that Mr. Eric Butler's visit had been most successful, and that the League was now firmly established for a big move forward.

Mr. Weekes said that Mr. Butler had been well received at all the meetings he had addressed. He had spoken to Liberal Party branches, Junior Chambers of Commerce, a Lions Club, and a students' group. One of the highlights of his Brisbane campaign had been the League's luncheon for leading business and professional men. Mr. Butler's hard-hitting address had been warmly received.

After Mr. Butler spoke on his recent overseas tour and outlined the current state of the Common Market battle in relationship to Australia's future, Mr. Don Martin reported on his visit to *The New Times* Dinner, the League's Annual Seminar, and the first National Conference of the League.

On Saturday, October 20, and Sunday, October 21, Mr. Butler and Mr. Weekes attended a Church of England Men's Conference. The Bishop of Singapore attended the Conference and said in answer to a question after his address, that the overwhelming majority of Asians had never heard of Australia's immigration policy. The picture of hordes of Asians "panting on the beaches" attempting to leave for Australia, was completely false.

Mr. Butler's address to the Conference, "Christianity and Freedom", made a tremendous impression. Several asked immediately if they could obtain a tape of Mr. Butler's address to use amongst groups in their own areas. Queensland supporters who can make use of this address by Mr. Butler may obtain a tape from the Queensland Council of the League, Box 3, Paddington Brisbane. The address takes approximately 40 minutes. Last week Mr. Butler spent in Sydney, where much more new ground was broken, and plans laid for further expansion. Apart from meeting individuals and groups, Mr. Butler addressed two successful meetings, the first on Thursday, October 25, being a public meeting, and the second on Friday, October 26, being a combined meeting of migrants. Mr. Butler returned to Melbourne on Saturday. When he addresses several Victorian country meetings, he will have concluded his lecturing programme for 1962.

RUSSIAN AIMS FOR INDONESIA

Recently we read that Indonesia has received further supplies of arms, particularly naval equipment from Soviet Russia. These include a new 19,000-ton missile-armed Russian-built cruiser and a division of Russian-built frigates. Newly acquired Indonesian air strength includes Russian-built heavy bombers, supersonic fighters, and U.S. Hercules transports.

Little publicity has been given to the fact that Indonesia has been using American dollars to pay for this equipment.

COMMON MARKET BATTLE NOT OVER

Contrary to the impression that it is now "inevitable" that Britain will join the European Economic Community, the truth is very different. In order to try to break opposition by fostering the view that nothing can halt the Macmillan Government, there has been deliberate lying and suppression of vital information.

Reports from Britain show conclusively that opposition to the E.E.C. is mounting strongly. The sacking of John Paul, anti-Common Market League Chairman, by the all-American oil company of which he was Executive Director, resulted in such support for the League that it was able to spend £30,000 on full-page advertisements in every British daily paper. The League has already had 20,000 letters from these advertisements.

The Australian League of Rights was warned before the recent British Conservative Party Conference that the strong stand by the Labor Party Conference made it certain that the Conservatives would insist that their Party delegates presented a united front. No significant vote on the Common Market issue could therefore be expected. Mr. John Paul said that even a few hundred votes for the mildly worded anti-Common Market amendment would be a major achievement. Press reports claimed that only a few delegates voted for the amendment. But in fact approximately 200 supported it.

Opposition continues to grow in Canada and New Zealand. In our next issue we will be providing a much fuller report, showing how the final phase of the Common Market battle is still to come. We will also report on the positive moves being made to defeat the policy of International Finance.

THE EQUALITY DOGMA LEADS TO COMMUNISM

By D. Watts

In this brilliant essay the author exposes the equality dogma as one of the most dangerous of the twentieth-century myths, and one, which is paving the way for International Communism. This essay is a closely reasoned reply to the claim that "all men are equal" and a demonstration of the truth that the organisation of human beings into masses destroys the individual.

Order from The Heritage Bookshop, Box 1052J,
G.P.O., Melbourne. Price 2/-, post-free.

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