

# THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL. 51, No. 11.

Registered by Australia Post-Publication No. VBH 1001

NOVEMBER 1987.

Australia and New Zealand Edition. Published in Melbourne and Auckland.

## THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING WORLD MEETS AT THE 'NEW TIMES' DINNER

England, Ireland, Canada, New Zealand and the United States of America were all well represented at the forty-first annual dinner of the New Times in Melbourne on October 2nd.

Every seat was taken in the hall at the Y.W.C.A. building in Elizabeth Street, which was beautifully decorated with branches of "Eucalyptus globulus" and Australia's golden wattle. As well as the big contingents of overseas visitors, every Mainland State in Australia was represented. State flags were on display alongside the flags of the old Commonwealth nations. Despite the distances travelled by those attending, it was a close and joyous family occasion.

Following grace, by Mr. Horton Davies, the large assembly stood silently for one minute's tribute to those who had passed on during the year — notably, the outstanding and deeply loved Lady Cilento in her 94th year, the late patron of the Heritage Society.

Bringing messages to those assembled was Mr. Ron Gostick, the Canadian National Director of the League, with his wife Wanda. Mr. Gostick had his audience laughing in saying that just as Canada had a bilingual problem with French and English, so Australia had a similar problem with English and Australian! He wondered how a 'down-under' country which drove on the left side of the road, and walked on the left side of the 'side-walk', could ever expect to have a right-wing government. In serious vein he stressed that the League was not just an anti-movement, but stood for strong values — a belief in a Christian society, loyalty to one's country and to free and stable families.

Mr. Dennis McKenna, Assistant National Director in New Zealand, brought an inspiring message on behalf of Mr. Bill Daly. He echoed Ron Gostick in stressing that, despite the growing crisis, the League's family bonds were strengthening. He pointed to the similarity between Australia and New Zealand, where the same Fabian pressures were being applied. The I.D. Card was an issue in both countries. In New Zealand, over 300 Acts of Parliament had been passed in the last year -the majority increasing the power of the State. But, he added, there were signs of regeneration throughout New Zealand.

The Loyal Toast was movingly proposed by Mrs. Caroline Hicks, from the United Kingdom. Caroline, who is god-daughter to Marjorie Douglas, C.H. Douglas's daughter, told of the many Australians who had "beaten a path to her door" through the years, and how important the feeling of family in the various League organisations was to the battle we are engaged in. She stressed this family bond was symbolised in the monarchy and the example of the Queen, who had many pressures on her, and who needed the help and loyalty of her people.

The Toast to the New Times was moved by the youngest supporter ever to do so — Mr. John Lane, son of veteran League supporters in West Australia. John was brilliantly supported by seconder Roger Foreman of

South Australia, whose moving message challenged all those at the dinner.



*Mrs. Carolina Hicks, from the United Kingdom, moves the Loyal Toast,*

Responding, chairman Jeremy Lee said he had seldom remembered two more moving toasts — an indication of the high calibre of new supporters constantly being attracted to the League's work. He said 1987 had been a year of enormous pressure, but rewarding results. There were heartening signs of awakening and regeneration everywhere. League speakers had addressed many church audiences, and there was an encouraging awakening in sections of the Christian church now beginning to re-think the theology of dispensational prophecy which had neutralised so many Christians in times past.

He pointed out that there were two movements in the world which published journals called the "NEW TIMES". One was the international Communist movement, the other the movement for practical Christianity as represented by the League. Both believed in a "new time". But whereas Communism saw its realisation

through the New International Economic Order, the League saw its vision in the fulfillment of Christ's purpose on earth, with peace and goodwill amongst men through Christian love and compliance with the dynamic of the Logos. The unfolding battle was between these two fundamentally opposed concepts.



*British historian David Irving during his stirring message to the New Times dinner.*

In introducing the noted British historian, Mr. David Irving — the guest of honour - Mr. Bill Manifold, D.F.C. and Bar, wartime member of the famous "Pathfinders" presented Mr. Irving with a painting by Mr. John Paine, also a wartime R.A.F. flier who was shot down, but survived to become a successful grazier in Victoria's western district.

In a brilliant half-hour address David Irving had his appreciative audience both laughing and gasping, as he recounted some of the pressures involved in publishing an original historical work on a figure such as Sir Winston Churchill. He stressed that publishers who had sold literally hundreds of thousands of his earlier works had expressed no doubt at all with the accuracy of his enormous research, but had shrunk in fear at the implications of publishing new and controversial material on



*Mr. Ron Gostick, National Director, Canadian League of Rights, giving a dinner message from Canada.*

what had become an artificial and contrived analysis of war-time events and personalities. He poured scorn on the shallowness of what so often passed for historical research, where comfortably padded quasi-historians had foregone the rigours and expense of original research in the archives, quoting each other's misconceptions and inaccuracies 'ad nauseam'.

"Quoting one book only is of course plagiarism," he quipped. "Quoting two, these days, is called 'research'".

He described some of the reactions his work had generated — from physical attacks on his home and publishers, to the co-ordinated and quite vicious attacks on his reputation, by those who were quite unable to refute his material. Such attacks, he added, were becoming less and less effective, judging by the incredible sales his book on Churchill had already achieved, and the growing number of inquiries from overseas.

The final address, by National Director of the Australian League of Rights, Mr. Eric Butler, was a fitting finale to a glittering occasion. Mr. Butler spoke movingly of Mr. Irving's important work, saying it epitomised the fact that individual initiative was the one thing feared by totalitarians. He reminded his audience that David Irving was the latest among many distinguished people who had been the guest of honour at the New Times Dinner, including both Sir Raphael and Lady Cilento, and former judge and Australian diplomat Sir Reginald Sholl. He noted wryly that he had been part of the bucket tipped on David Irving by the "bucket brigade" in the media, who seemed totally unequipped to ask objective questions or conduct an impartial interview. He said this sort of pathetic media "knee-jerk" was quickly detected by most Australians, and was increasingly counter-productive.

He concluded by saying the spirit and quality of the growing League family in so many areas was inspiring, and encouraging at a time of obvious national crisis.

Many of those attending said there was an atmosphere at the dinner they would remember all their lives.

From Mr. Rob Sinclair.  
Vancouver, Canada,

My warmest regards to all of you on this very special occasion! Our continued support and involvement with the League is very important, for the League is instrumental in increasing the awareness and understanding of those priceless values so necessary for the Spiritual Progress of Mankind — a progress not in great evidence at this time but, never the less, continues despite all schemes to the contrary. Such is our strength.

The potential exists within everyone to render the forces of darkness powerless by expressing only beauty, truth and love toward our fellow man.

Without losing our perspective of the challenge that confronts us, let us continue to strive toward making our lives more perfectly reflect the Christian ideals we profess; let us more clearly define and apply these ideals with each passing day. Others will respond to our kindness, and Happiness is very infectious!

# Constitutional reformists called into question

The following article on the findings of the Constitutional Commission by veteran journalist Mr. Bart Marney appeared in *The Chronicle* (Toowoomba) on November 7, 1987.

The more I study the mass of material being distributed by the Constitutional Commission, the more suspicious I become about the purpose behind these proposed moves to change the Constitution.

Layman though I am, I cannot help but feel that the wording of some of the material is, to put the best face on it, inexcusably loose, bearing in mind the seriousness of the subject matter.

For example, let's consider the copy of the Constitution, which is being made freely available by the Constitutional Commission to anyone who requests it.

The booklet containing this copy has a two-page preface, which purports to say what the Constitution is "all about."

And, in the section explaining the Executive Government, we are told the Constitution says, "The Governor-General shall be advised by the Federal Executive Council (section 62)."

I contend this is not so, but I leave you, my readers, to judge for yourselves.

Section 62 states: "There shall be a Federal Executive Council to advise the Governor-General in the government of the Commonwealth, and the members of the Council shall be chosen and summoned by the Governor-General and sworn as Executive Councillors, and shall hold office during his pleasure."

Thanks to the admirably simple language (instead of bewildering legalese) of the authors of our Constitution, I am enabled to understand this section, and I understand it to mean that the Governor-General will choose and appoint Executive Councillors to advise him on matters concerning the government of the Commonwealth.

But there is nothing in that simple wording which could reasonably be inferred to mean that the Governor-General is obliged to accept that advice.

## EXPLANATION

Yet this seems to be the implication in the "explanation" I am complaining about.

This is not an isolated instance of misleading wording regarding aspects of the Constitution dealing with the powers of the Queen, or her agent the Governor-General, in the executive government of the Commonwealth.

Indeed, I now suspect that this latest essay in attempts to materially change our Constitution has its genesis in the events of late 1975 when the then Governor-General dismissed Prime Minister Whitlam and his Government.

Since then, Mr. Whitlam and other Laborites particularly have been working towards the elimination of the constitutional powers of the Queen and the Governor-General and, ultimately, to the declaration of Australia as a republic.

For my part, I have always seen the dismissal of the Whitlam Government and the consequent general election a few weeks later as representing the peak of democratic government.

Mr. Whitlam and others of his ilk, including many

news media commentators, frequently rail against what they like to portray as, the overthrow of an elected majority Government.

But always . . . they fail to refer to the quickly subsequent election at which the Australian people overwhelmingly threw out the Whitlam Government!

Yet, surely, that must be the cardinal point of those series of events; that, thanks to the existence of our constitutional monarchy, the people were enabled to rid themselves of a very unpopular Government — by the peaceful process of ballots, not bullets.

In the long, world history of national government, I do not think there will ever be a more heart-warming demonstration of democratic dealing.

These events of 1975 are cited in the Constitutional Commission's "Time to Update" publication as a strong argument for depriving the Senate of its constitutional power to block Supply.

The commission's Executive Government advisory committee is reported as saying the exercise of that Senate power "can threaten the social, economic and political fabric of the nation, as it arguably did in 1975."

Of course, the nation's fabric came unscathed through those events and, as a result of the precedent established, would be even less vulnerable to such "arguable" damage, should history ever be repeated.

But that advisory committee is recommending that the Senate's power to block Supply be limited to thirty days.

## MEANINGLESS

That would be meaningless and would be tantamount to having no such power.

Incomprehensibly, some members of the committee are reported to believe that the important role of the Senate as a house of review is impaired by its power to block Supply.

I just can't work out that line of argument at all!

As it has also suggested in regard to the Queen, the committee is reported as saying that, "according to Australia's constitutional tradition," all of the Governor-General's powers are exercisable only in accordance with ministerial advice.

That is patently not true because the Constitution includes no such requirement of either the Governor-General or the Queen.

It is true that, in the workaday exercise of his powers, the Governor-General generally follows the advice of his Ministers. But that is a matter of day-to-day practice and is vastly different from this mythical "constitutional tradition."

In fact, any constitutional tradition, which may evolve in this area, will have been conceived by those events in 1975 when the Governor-General established the precedent by not acting in accordance with the advice of his Ministers.

In a move, which seems aimed ultimately at divesting Australia of the monarchy, the committee is recommending that Section 61 of the Constitution be

## "CHURCHILL'S WAR"

by David Irving

We regret that many of our readers missed out in obtaining this historical blockbuster at the discounted price. Sales have been massive but supplies are still available — but at the normal price set by the publishers: Hardback edition with dustcover, \$57.50 posted. Strictly limited deluxe edition of 1000 only, in brown imitation leather, with embossed gold lettering, and enclosed in a presentation slipcase, each book numbered and personally autographed, \$153.00 posted.

Order from Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, and all State League bookshops.

amended by deleting the reference to the Queen's "executive power of the Commonwealth" and vesting this power solely in the Governor-General.

The lame reason put forward for this is that the present section is ambiguous and leads to uncertainty over the respective roles of the Queen and Governor-General.

What ambiguity is there in this wording? "The executive power of the Commonwealth is vested in the Queen *and is exercisable by the Governor-General as the Queen's representative*, and extends to the execution and maintenance of this Constitution, and of the laws of the Commonwealth."

I have italicized those words to show that the Governor-General clearly exercises his power only as the Queen's representative. Thus, if the Queen chooses to exercise her powers either from England or during a stay in Australia, then it would be her writ, which would prevail.

In regard to the question of monarchy or republic, the committee uses 25 words, in a single paragraph, to put the case for the monarchy, and 165 words in three paragraphs to put the case against.

That is hardly an impartial approach.

Nevertheless, recognising the strong public support for the monarchy, the committee recommends against holding a referendum at the present time on the question of whether Australia should become a republic. But it does say that any proposal to change to a republican form of government should be the subject of a referendum.

But, after that bit of fair dealing, there is its recommendation, without any attributed explanation, to repeal those provisions of the Constitution, which empower the Queen to reserve (i.e. hold back) or disallow legislation.

These are important elements in the monarch's powers, which are so very important in the safeguarding of the rights of the people against the unacceptable actions of Government.

As with all such powers exercised by an apolitical monarch, these have been placed in our Constitution for the benefit of the people not the Government and, therefore, must be preserved.

There are aspects of these suggested constitutional changes which merit mention and perhaps I shall refer to

some in a further article or articles.

Meanwhile, this may suffice to show why I am suspicious about the purpose of these changes.

## A PLEA FOR A REALISTIC POLICY

The following covering letter, together with a copy of *The Social Crediter* for July/August, has been sent to each of the diocesan bishops in England.

### CHRISTIAN CAMPAIGN FOR FREEDOM

Penrhyn Lodge,  
2 Park Village East,  
London, NW1 7PX.

10th July 1987.

My Lord,

### LIFE MORE ABUNDANT?

I venture to write to you at a time when, in spite of the unprecedented "war of words", vital questions have been left unasked. One question I would ask here is — when we pray the Lord's Prayer and say, "Give us this day our daily bread" are we asking for "full employment?"

You may well have observed how the General Election propaganda from all parties concentrated on issues posed almost exclusively *in financial terms*; for example, the financial costs of the Health and Education Services, possible cuts or increases in taxation, how much each party intended to borrow. But was any politician heard to say, "If it's physically possible, then it must be financially possible also?" Yet this is the only realistic approach to today's most urgent problems of poverty amidst plenty; of homelessness and urban dereliction while construction workers are idle, though needed; and of ever-increasing debt, personal, national and international.

Does not Christianity assert that institutions should serve Mankind, not enslave it? Social Credit reflects this truth. Our present financial system distorts reality, permits hunger and starvation while "surpluses" mount, produces sterile "unemployment" instead of potentially creative leisure, and converts what should be the mutually beneficial exchange of national surpluses into fierce international competition for a "favourable balance of trade" and eventual "trade war". Establish the principle that money should be servant, not master, and the necessary technical adjustments to the system can follow.

The enclosed issue of *The Social Crediter* pleads for a new realistic approach to these social and political problems which remain largely unaffected by the result of the General Election. Our particular plea is for your consideration of the true alternative policy, as briefly indicated on page 4, and it you are convinced of its truth, for your influence towards its implementation.

Yours sincerely,

Basil L. Steele  
(Dr B. L. Steele).

## "WE ARE WHAT WE EAT"

by Lady Cilento, M.B., B.S.

A most valuable introduction to the subject of nutrition and health. Packed with vital information concerning the role of vitamins and minerals. Price: \$2.00 from all League Bookshops.

Printed and Published by The Australian League of Rights,  
145 Russell Street, Melbourne, Victoria, 3000.