

THE NEW TIMES

"Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" - John 8:31

VOL.61, No 1

Registered by Australia Post - Publication PP481667 100259

JANUARY 1997

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

NAVIGATING THE RAPIDS

by Eric D. Butler

The guns had barely stopped smoking from the First World War, the first great tragedy of an increasingly violent century, when a relatively unknown Clifford Hugh Douglas emerged to state categorically that unless there was a basic change to the manner in which the conventional finance-economic system was being operated, this requiring continuous injections of debt finance, Western Civilisation was doomed to be destroyed by one convulsion after another. Depressions and further major military conflicts were inevitable. Douglas was not only a consulting engineer with an international reputation, a mathematician and a scholar, but a product of traditional Western philosophy.

Unlike the famous Roman statesman and philosopher, Cicero, who had attempted to warn his fellow Romans of the collapse of the great Roman Civilisation, Douglas was the first not only to warn of the disintegration of a Civilisation, but to analyse the basic cause of that disintegration and to propose constructive policies which would prevent the threat of disintegration. It was a tragedy that relatively few Christian leaders grasped the awesome significance of what Douglas was saying. One of these was a distinguished Irish Catholic Priest, Father P. Coffey, D.Ph., who was to complain that his support for the Douglas revelation had been suppressed. Writing in *The Fig Tree*, a Douglas Social Credit Quarterly Review, of December, 1936, Father Coffey, made the following comments: *It is now generally admitted that the World War of 1914-18 was, in its immediate causation, mainly economic - a war for markets. Also that it failed, and that post-war politics have likewise, so far failed, to lessen the likelihood of a still more disastrous repetition of the calamity.*" Father Coffey said that he was attempting to heed the appeal of Pope Pius that every effort be made to influence Christian "men of influence in Church and in State" to not only proclaim but to apply in every department of human life and affairs, "those Christian social principles which alone can save our very sick social order". Father Coffey went on to point out that these principles could not be applied under a finance-economic policy, which results in "an ever-widening chasm between the community's purchasing power as consumers, and the total of accounted prices (which is the total money owing to the banking system) for the wealth which the community has produced. Hence forced exports and competitive struggles of nations for foreign markets; hence piling up of international debts; hence economic conflicts leading to wars; hence the progressive mortgaging of the whole industrial plant and capital; and wealth-sources of society to the world monopoly of banking".

A DEEPENING CRISIS

Subsequent events have confirmed what a handful of Christian leaders like Father Coffey warned about. The evidence of the disintegration of Western civilisation is now clear to see.

Every industrialised nation is now experiencing growing social disintegration. Unemployment with all its explosive consequences remains high. A recent report states that at least one in every four Australians is now on social welfare of some kind. A new type of underclass is being developed with mounting crime and violence. Robbed of any understanding of their heritage by a subverted educational system, it is not surprising that young Australians generally have become despondent about the future. The high suicide rate among the young reflects the harsh reality of what is being imposed.

Racial tensions mount in every Western nation where the large armies of unemployed are inflamed as they see foreign workers moving in as the god of economic rationalism dominates. In Australia Independent M.P. Pauline Hanson is abused

OUR POLICY

To promote service to the Christian revelation of God, loyalty to the Australian Constitutional Monarchy, and maximum cooperation between subjects of the Crown Commonwealth of Nations.

To defend the free Society and its institutions - private property, consumer control of production through genuine competitive enterprise, and limited decentralised government.

To promote financial policies, which will reduce taxation, eliminate debt, and make possible material security for all with greater leisure time for cultural activities.

To oppose all forms of monopoly, either described as public or private.

To encourage all electors always to record a responsible vote in all elections.

To support all policies genuinely concerned with conserving and protecting natural resources, including the soil, and an environment reflecting natural (God's) laws, against policies of rape and waste.

To oppose all policies eroding national sovereignty, and to promote a closer relationship between the peoples of the Crown Common-wealth and those of the United States of America, who share a common heritage.

for drawing attention to basic problems. Pauline Hanson is not responsible for the problems. It is a case of those guilty for what is happening attempting to blame the messenger who has highlighted the bad news. It is as certain as the sunrise that that news is going to become progressively worse throughout the coming year. The campaign to persuade Australians that they can solve their problems in Asia is a major delusion. Events will progressively confirm this truth.

As the famous Chinese sage said, it is folly to run even harder on the wrong road. Regretfully there are no signs as yet that John Howard and his colleagues are aware that they are on the wrong road, one which can only lead to increasing economic and social disasters. This is not a message of gloom, but one of reality. Salvation depends upon facing reality honestly.

EXPERT NAVIGATION REQUIRED

Writing in the chapter "The Critical Moment", in *Social Credit* (1924), C.H. Douglas said that any possibility of avoiding a painful journey "down the Rapids and over the Falls" requires definite exertion by mankind. "And if the cataract must be run, safe arrival on the waters of the placid lake which may lie beyond, is surely conditional on some sort of expert navigation."

Since those words were written, mankind has been swept along in a raging torrent of revolution. It is now too late to move against the current. The role of the Social Creditor is to provide whatever navigation is possible and to prepare for the reconstruction that will be necessary for those who survive through the Rapids and over the Falls.

GEOFFREY DOBBS

Because of the vast scope of Geoffrey Dobbs' life's work as a distinguished Social Creditor, we are holding over a comprehensive obituary. We can report that steps are being taken for the publication of his last major work - an extension of his work, *On Planning The Earth*.

THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

If it were not for the fact that the U.S.A., specially under the Clinton Administration, is completely dominated by Zionist Jews, the continuing crisis in the Middle East, which periodically explodes into violence, could be immediately resolved by the U.S.A. insisting that there will be no further financial and economic aid from the U.S.A. until Israel implements a number of U.N.O. resolutions which have been passed but ignored by Israel over the years. When the U.N.O. condemned Israel for its last major invasion of Lebanon, with over 100 refugees killed in what was supposed to be a U.N. safety centre, the U.S.A. was the only member of the U.N.O., which refused to support the resolution.

The basic cause of the current crisis, which will not be resolved even if the Israelis agree to a withdrawal from the West Bank town of Hebron, cannot be understood without going back to the basic cause of the crisis, the dispossession of the Palestinians of their homeland by Zionist aggression. The beginning of the problem was the imposition of the Balfour Agreement upon a British Government, which desperately needed American economic and military aid during the First World War. The Palestinians and the relatively small number of Jews had lived together harmoniously until the poisoned thorn of Zionism was driven into the Middle East. All discussions, which ignore the basic causes of the continuing Middle East crisis, with its widespread international implications, are irrelevant. The mass media of the world, almost unanimously reflecting the propaganda of the Zionist Jewish power groups, has until now managed to distort the truth. Courageous anti-Zionist Jews like the distinguished American authority on the Middle East, are given the silent treatment. Western politicians, who have attempted to speak out on behalf of the dispossessed Palestinians, are smeared as "anti-Semites". This smear overlooks the fact that the overwhelming majority of Zionists are of non-Semitic background. Only the Palestinians can claim such a background. Anyone doubting this should read Arthur Koestler's classic, *The Thirteenth Tribe*.

BIG STEP FORWARD FOR "HERITAGE"

The latest issue of *Heritage*, the quarterly magazine of the Australian Heritage Society, provides inspiring evidence that after 20 years of continuous publication, the journal is about "to take off". There is a striking colour cover, appropriately displaying an excellent photograph of Independent M.P. Pauline Hanson, who emerged as the major Australian political figure of 1996. The magazine has been extended making it possible to increase the coverage of all aspects of the national heritage.

A division of the Australian League of Rights, the Australian Heritage Society, focuses attention on what C.H. Douglas described as the real cleavage in society, the cultural. The current issue of *Heritage* contains another chapter of the memoirs of Eric D. Butler; a fascinating word picture of a most distinguished South Australian, Dr. Walter Henderson, whom Eric Butler admits that he rather irreverently described as Mr. Pickwick - behind his back! - because of his size. New and revealing material is provided of Dr. Henderson's role in the Rhodesian drama.

There are two pages of photographs of some of the prominent personalities at the 50th Anniversary Dinner of the *New Times* on October 4th, 1996. A fascinating article by well-known civil libertarian John Bennett, on "The Scottish in Australia". The journal is packed with items of most absorbing interest. American correspondent Randall J. Dicks produces detailed figures to show how countries like Australia, which retain the Constitutional Monarchy as a major feature of their constitutional systems, pay practically nothing towards the upkeep of the Monarchy. Randall

Dicks, an American citizen, provides some striking figures concerning the financial cost of the American Presidency compared with the cost of the Monarchy. Randall Hicks urged that the facts he has summarised should be circulated far and wide. We agree.

The "new look" *Heritage* is to be used as a major tool of expansion by the League during the coming year. But it is imperative that all actionists take advantage of *Heritage* as a major feature of an expansion campaign. All *New Times* readers are urged not only to become regular subscribers to *Heritage*, but to donate gift subscriptions to friends and relatives on appropriate occasions such as birthdays. One thousand new subscriptions to *Heritage* would provide a financial base from which a really major national offensive could be launched.

Single issues of *Heritage* can be obtained for \$6.00 posted. Invest this relatively small amount on the "new look" *Heritage* and see for yourself what is now possible. Discounts can be offered for those willing to take bulk supplies for promotional purposes.

GRAEME CAMPBELL AUSTRALIA DAY RALLY

Australia Day, 1996, saw the Heidelberg Town Hall packed to hear Independent West Australian M.P. Graeme Campbell signal the start of a new political movement in Australia. Even the mass media sat up and took notice. Since then the Keating Government has been swept from office, but with the sensational election of Pauline Hanson, rejected by the Liberal Party, which had previously endorsed her, as an Independent, Graeme Campbell increased his majority as an Independent for Kalgoorlie. The amazing development of the Hanson Factor has tended to take Graeme Campbell out of the national spotlight. But he has, with the aid of what is clearly a most competent team of supporters, steadily moved around Australia helping to establish his Australia First Movement. A growing number of branches has been established, the biggest number being in Queensland. In a news release the Australia First Movement announces that on this year's Australia Day Graeme Campbell will be returning to Heidelberg to give a major address announcing new initiatives concerning major issues, such as the economy and unemployment. The Rally will be in the Heidelberg Town Hall, where the doors will be open from 2.00 p.m. onwards. The Rally will be chaired by well-known anti-immigration activist Denis McCormack. Graeme Campbell will be the only major speaker. There will be suitable entertainment for the occasion. In a media release concerning the Heidelberg Rally, the convenors state that "since the 1996 Australia Day Rally Graeme Campbell and his supporters have systematically laid the foundations for a new type of political movement which will enable all Australian nationalists to unite to shift Australia off the present disaster course. A number of prominent Australians, including Pauline Hanson, have been invited to associate themselves with the Heidelberg Rally, even with only a short message. While the Australia First Movement seeks to have members elected to parliament, this is not seen as an end in itself, but a means to an end. The election of a growing number of Australia First members, pledged only to support the core policies of Australia First, one of these being the introduction of a system of Citizens' Initiative and Referendum, would start to exert pressure on present party members, tending to divide nationalists from the internationalists. One result of this would be a major reform of parliament itself, making it more representative of the Australian people".

THE DEMISE OF THE AUSTRALIAN LABOR PARTY

A survey conducted by the Monash University, Melbourne, confirms what most objective political observers had been saying for years: Federal Labor Governments from Bob Hawke onwards were progressively alienating themselves from their working class roots. In his historic 1983 Fabian address, Bob Hawke spelt out clearly what Fabianism meant. While constantly protesting that they were not pro-Communist, the Fabian ideologues reflected the core Marxist philosophy concerning the "inevitability of gradualness". Originally the Labor Party was a nationalist movement, but after World War I the Marxist virus started to make itself felt. However, this was offset by the innate conservatism of the Australian working man, whose general objective was a "fair go". He wanted to own his own home and perhaps grow a few vegetables in the backyard. He barracked for his local football or other sporting team. He hoped that his family would be able to improve their lot. Relatively few spent their time attending Fabian or Communist meetings to plan how to subvert their society and its institutions. They took it for granted that the industries in which they worked, and from which they were paid their incomes, should be adequately protected against cheap foreign imports. Support for the "White Australia" immigration policy was rarely questioned.

As pointed out by Whittaker Chambers, the American who exposed Alger Hess, top Soviet agent inside the U.S.A. bureaucracy, relatively few people became Communists as a result of studying Karl Marx's *Das Capital*. They were moved to join the Communists as a result of a great historical crisis. It was the international crisis resulting from the Great Depression of the thirties, which brought thousands into the ranks of Communism. And the overwhelming majority of these were academics of varying kinds. The working class was regarded by these types as little more than cannon fodder to serve their ends. The most prominent of the Western traitors were from middle and upper class families, indoctrinated as University students.

In Australia, as in other British Commonwealth nations, it was the Communists who were the most vehement in their opposition to the challenge of the Social Credit movement, drawing most of its support from conservative rural and middle class Australians, who more readily grasped that Social Credit financial proposals offered a constructive alternative to the depression conditions imposed by debt finance. A combination of factors during the Second World War, including the forced entry of the Soviet Union into the conflict by its former ally Nazi Germany, and an international propaganda campaign which turned Stalin into an amiable "Uncle Joe" who now was allegedly a bastion in the defence of freedom against the

totalitarian threat of Nazi Germany, enabled the Australian Communists to make major increases inside the Labor Party. The Communists and their allies dominated Dr. H.V. Evatt's bid for centralised power at the 1944 Referendum. Through their domination of powerful sections of the Trade Union movement, the Communists moved towards dominating the Australian economy. Nationalists in the Labor movement sought to defeat Communist influence through the anti-Communist industrial groups. Evatt initially accepted the support of the Industrial Groups but turned against them when he narrowly lost the 1954 Federal Elections. Evatt was a close friend of the notorious Marxist theoretician, Professor Harold Laski of the London School of Economics. After meeting with Stalin at the end of the Second World War, Laski made the historically significant statement that while Stalin and the Fabians were travelling on separate roads, they were striving to reach the same objective with both inspired by the same programme outlined by Marx in his famous Communist Manifesto of 1848. It is a matter of history how Evatt badly split the Labor movement and enabled Sir Robert Menzies to govern for a record number of years. The second preferences of the anti-Communist Democratic Labor Party were a major factor in maintaining the Liberal Country Party Coalition in office. The eventual collapse of the Democratic Labor Party marked the end of what was left of

any political representation of traditional Labor values. D.L.P. supporters voted in increasing numbers for the Coalition Parties. The resignation of Sir Robert Menzies, followed by the election of Harold Holt as Prime Minister, also marked the end of an era. The tragic death of Holt followed by the ineptitude of the Gorton and McMahon Governments permitted Gough Whitlam and his dedicated fellow Fabians to lead a "reformed" Labor Party to office in 1972. Headed by media baron Rupert Murdoch, the internationalists emerged to back Whitlam. The shape of things to come was graphically indicated when the few remaining traditional Labor Members, men like Dr. Rex Patterson, who had outlined a most constructive financial programme for re-generating rural Australia, and Shadow Minister for Immigration Fred Daly, were axed by Whitlam. Daly, for example, was replaced as Minister for Immigration by Mr. Al "Flash" Grassby.

The naked betrayal of traditional hard-core Labor voters started with Whitlam. The growing internationalist programme fostered by Whitlam, and the progressive dismantling of the traditional restricted immigration policy and protection of Australian industries, was carried on through the disastrous years of the Fraser Government. Fabian Bob Hawke was being groomed to take over. Slowly but surely Australia was being taken down the internationalist road. Buzz terms like "multiculturalism" and "economic rationalism" were increasingly used. Unemployment rose and an increasing number of old Australian industries were absorbed into the "international economy". Traditional Labor supporters were dismayed when Federal Treasurer Paul Keating announced the "depression that we had to have". The high interest rates and taxes were allegedly necessary to ensure that the economy did not "overheat". Workers were told that they must practise "restraint" for the sake of the "national interest". A desperate Labor Party eventually decided that the defeat of Bob Hawke and the election of Paul Keating was essential to avoid threatened electoral defeat.

MASSIVE SLUMP IN LABOR VOTE

Much to the amazement of most political commentators, Paul Keating survived as Labor Prime Minister primarily because of the Goods and Services Tax proposed by the Hewson-led Coalition. Keating's arrogance knew no bounds as a demoralised Coalition sought for new leaders. New boy Alexander Downer paid the price for his cowardly behaviour concerning the League of Rights. The best that the Liberals could do was to recycle John Howard. But irrespective of who led the Coalition, he would have won the 1996 Federal Elections. There was a nationwide disenchantment with the philosophy of internationalism so arrogantly promoted by Paul Keating. Labor's vote slumped to the lowest level for 60 years. Unless the Labor Party can turn its back on the philosophy and programmes of the Whitlam, Hawke and Keating Governments, it is doomed as a political force in Australia.

But the tragedy is that John Howard and his colleagues offer nothing but an extension of what Labor Governments have imposed. Both John Howard and Labor leader Beazley have said that there are no basic differences in their economic policies. Unless those policies are quickly, and dramatically, altered, Australians are faced with an increasingly bleak future over the next few years. The Howard "honeymoon" may continue for a period, but only because an electorate, which feels that it was so badly betrayed by recent Labor Governments, that never again will they trust Labor politicians. Eventually, however, patience with a Howard Government, which can offer no relief, will be strained past breaking point. The Pauline Hanson phenomenon is a reflection of the deep and growing concern throughout the Australian community. Pauline Hanson is correct when he says that there could be civil violence unless constructive action can be taken. Time is now running out for the lucky country. The demise of the Labor Party, or any other political party, is of little consequence compared with the threatened demise of Australia as a stable nation.

A NOTE CONCERNING "TRIUMPH OF THE PAST"

In the special 50th Anniversary edition of *The New Times* we inadvertently described Mr. Michael Lane's new U.S.A. Social Credit publication, *Triumph of the Past* as a quarterly. It is in fact a monthly. Several North American subscribers have requested Michael Lane's address. It is Box 29535, Columbus, OH, 43229, U.S.A. We suggest that any of our subscribers, irrespective of which country they live in, deal directly with Michael Lane concerning subscriptions or other matters. Michael Lane has forwarded us a small supply of the December issue of *Triumph of the Past*, for promotional purposes. The high quality of the journal is maintained, fulfilling the promise of the initial edition. The following basic question is posed:

"It is not difficult for a civilised society to produce a surplus. Medieval Europe produced a surplus but experienced periodic famine due to inability to get the surplus quickly to where it was needed. An industrial society easily produces more wealth than the people it employs can possibly consume at their most prodigal and more than the whole nation can consume short of consumption by war.

"Now: a question so simple and yet so immense that our entire civilisation hangs on the answer and whether we are to continue to enjoy and enhance the estate husbanded for us by countless generations or descend into a frightening Dark Age. Here is the question: Is the whole of history of civilisation, from the point of view of its production of wealth, to be understood as an immense cost - a net loss that we must continue to labor to make up - or, on the contrary, an immense inherited credit earning us, even before any labor on our part, a dividend?"

A sample copy of *Triumph of the Past* is available on request. Send a stamped and self-addressed envelope.

BASIC FUND PASSES \$51,000

There was the normal slow down in support for the League of Rights' Basic Fund over the holiday period. But over \$1,000 was contributed, taking the total to \$51,350. In its forward planning for the year, the League always allows for possible expenses, which, hopefully, will not occur. For many years the League has managed to keep Advisory National Director Eric Butler mobile with a 1964 Crown Toyota. The mileage has been astronomical. It had been hoped to keep this vehicle running a little longer. But late last year what might be termed "the end of the road" was reached and a decision had to be made for a replacement vehicle. This has cost the League approximately \$8,000. If the Basic Fund "target" of \$65,000 is reached, it is estimated that with a little "juggling" the \$8,000 can be met. However, supporters wishing to ensure that the Advisory National Director has reliable transport may care to contribute a little extra. The League starts the New Year with an appeal to all supporters who have not yet contributed, to make an immediate effort to make good the current deficiency of approximately \$13,000.

All donations to Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001.

THE CANADIAN "HUMAN RIGHTS" GESTAPO

Like Australia, Canada is a Constitutional Monarchy with a Common Law legal system. But developments in Canada, where Human Rights Commissions have been directly involved in attacks on freedom of speech, are a warning concerning what could happen in Australia if legislation advocated by Zionist-Jewish groups can be introduced. The following section of an article by Mr. Ron Gostick, National Director of The Canadian League of Rights, in the November issue of *"The Canadian Intelligence Service"*, is compulsory reading for Australian freedom lovers. Last year Y.W.C.A. (Young Women's Christian Association) both in Melbourne and Brisbane suddenly cancelled meetings sponsored by the Australian League of Rights. The League had used without trouble Melbourne and Brisbane Y.W.C.A. facilities for many years. Ron Gostick's article reads:

THE ESCALATING ATTACK AGAINST FREEDOM OF SPEECH

"Those who deny freedom of speech to others deserve it not for themselves" - Abraham Lincoln

WHAT DOES OUR CONSTITUTION SAY?

The CONSTITUTION ACT, 1982, Part I, Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, states:

"The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees the rights and freedoms set out in it subject only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society."

Then, in the next paragraph, under the caption *"Fundamental Freedoms"*, the Act continues:

"Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms:

- (a) freedom of conscience and religion;
- (b) freedom of thought, belief, opinion and expression, including freedom of the press and other media of communication;
- (c) freedom of peaceful assembly; and
- (d) freedom of association."

Clear enough! Freedom of speech is a *fundamental right* of every Canadian citizen, guaranteed by our Constitution. Then in Part VII of the Charter, Section 52(1), states:

"The Constitution of Canada is the supreme law of Canada, and any law that is inconsistent with the provisions of the Constitution is, to the extent of the inconsistency, of no force or effect." Not too difficult to understand - unless you happen to be a 'human rights' commissioner.

Our Constitution sounds great. The only trouble seems to be that, as with Section 92 (areas of "exclusive" provincial jurisdiction), our governments pay little attention to its provisions.

EDMONTON'S COAST TERRACE INN CANCELS THIRD OPTION' SEMINAR

The Edmonton Coast Terrace Inn was booked over seven months ago to host the Third Option' Annual Weekend Seminar and Banquet; then, just a month prior to the scheduled Weekend, cancelled the booking without notice. Following are a few of the details:

- In March of this year, details were worked out with the Coast Terrace to host our October 18-19 Weekend; and on March 26th the Inn faxed us acceptance of our booking, with a signed contract to this effect. On April 11th the Coast Terrace wrote to us, expressing its delight in hosting our Weekend, and requesting a \$240 deposit, which was immediately sent. After all, it had hosted our Weekend last year, and had provided us with excellent facilities for the production of our Video #2 on no less than three weekends this past spring and summer. Coast Terrace management was most accommodating and obviously appreciative of our business, and we were very happy with its service.
- Then, on Sept. 19, the Coast Terrace wrote to Wanda Gostick (our Weekend coordinator), saying, in part: *"We have been informed*

that the purpose of your seminar and meetings is to promote anti-Semitism and other discriminatory topics which we have been told are contrary to the law. Had we been advised of the purpose for your meetings at the time you applied to book rooms, we would not have accepted the booking. As a result, I must advise you that The Coast Terrace Inn is cancelling your bookings."

Of course, there is not a shred of truth in the Coast Terrace's remarks concerning the purpose of our seminar - which was focussed totally on constitutional and national unity issues and the question of financial reform to ensure a healthy economy and prosperity.

However, it is now clear that:

* Professor David Lethbridge of Salmon Arm, B.C., a self-avowed Communist involved in Marxist activities for years, had apparently learned of our Coast Terrace October booking, and sent the hotel a file of defamatory material respecting the Third Option' Committee and Eileen Pressler and myself, who were slated to address our seminar, and, according to reports, about our 'racist' and 'anti-Semitic' activities - hoping that this would cause the hotel to cancel our booking. This professor, under the auspices of a so-called 'anti-racist' front, has been cancelling anti-Communist, pro-Christian and pro-Canadian meetings and conferences, wherever possible, for years in B.C. Such activities, we have learned, are usually subsidized by government grants -that's right, by taxpayers' dollars!

* Upon receipt of this defamatory material, the Coast Terrace contacted the Alberta Human Rights and Citizenship Commission concerning these Lethbridge allegations. "Some weeks later," says a *Western Report* article, the Human Rights chairman, Charlack Mackintosh, confirmed that there "was a link to racism" and "the possibility of confrontation or violence".

* Mr. Mackintosh, in a 'guest column' in the October 29th *Calgary Herald*, attempting to exonerate himself for his role in effecting the denial of our fundamental constitutional right of freedom of assembly and speech, admits that he advised the Coast Terrace that two individuals participating in the 'Third Option' seminar - obviously Mrs. Pressler and myself - are "well-known promoters of racism and anti-Semitism". This, of course, was merely a repetition of the language and outrageous allegations of Prof. Lethbridge in his 'file' of smear material sent in the first place to the Coast Terrace.

DOUG COLLINS SPEAKS OUT

Doug Collins, the widely read courageous writer for the *North Shore News* of Vancouver, captioned his October 2nd column: *"Rights councils are stifling our freedoms"*. Here it is, in full:

"IT had to come. The Human Rights Gestapo has now got around to telling hotels what meetings may or may not be held on their premises.

"In Edmonton, a group calling itself The Third Option was to

have held a conference Oct. 18, 19 and 20 on the future of Canada. Constitution reform was to have been on the agenda, plus national unity...

"But leftists and pressure groups disapproved of some of the speakers and the Alberta Human Rights Commission 'advised' the Coast Terrace Inn to cancel. Which it did.

"Here we see the war on words being conducted once again by David Lethbridge, the Okanagan College instructor who is a self-proclaimed communist and founder or head of the Salmon Arm Coalition Against Racism.

"Lethbridge wrote a 10-page letter to the hotel management denouncing some of the speakers as 'racists and anti-Semites'.

"They had not yet spoken so no one knew what was going to be said or how constitutional reform could assume sinister properties.

"It was enough, however, that the wrong people were speaking. In this case, Lethbridge stated that The Third Option is a 'sub-branch' of the Canadian League of Rights, which is headed by Ron Gostick, who fights for traditional Canada and has broken no laws.

"In 1992 Lethbridge showed his intellectual capacities by 'mooning' a Gostick meeting in Salmon Arm at a demonstration he had persuaded simple-minded students to attend.

"What matters here is not nincompoopery and censorship dressed up as political morality, but the role of taxpayer-supported thought police in the field of public discussion.

"Nazi Germany had it. Soviet Russia had it. And now we've got it. In lesser form, it is true. So far.

"The story hit the *Edmonton Journal* on Sept. 21 and is a sample of how twisted the words 'human rights' have become.

"Commission chair Charlack Mackintosh said he advised hotel manager Werner Simm to cancel the booking because of some of the speakers involved.

"He said he didn't know who else would be attending and said he had no information about planned racists activities.'

"Read that again. He didn't know and he had no information, but he 'advised' anyway. Some speakers weren't of the right ilk, you see.

"It shouldn't have mattered if he did know. We used to have something called free speech; we also accepted that people were innocent until they are proved guilty. But the human rights mob thinks otherwise.

"Mackintosh said he had been informed there was 'the possibility of demonstrations which might easily lead to violence'.

"Who informed him? Those who didn't want the meeting? and since when has violence been the responsibility of our misnamed Human Rights Commissions?

"And who would organize the violence? The people at the conference? Of course not. It would be the same kind of leftist rabble who have rioted in Toronto. But the last time I looked, the regular police were supposed to ensure that public meetings are held without interference.

"It used to be that peaceable assembly was a Canadian right. The Alberta Human Rights Commission disagrees. "The manager of the hotel underlined the role of the Commission.

"In a letter to Paul Fromm of the Toronto-based Canadian Association for Free Expression he *claimed* that the cancellation was due 'not to David Lethbridge but to the information provided by the Alberta Human Rights Commission after their investigation'. He had sent Lethbridge's letter to them, however.

"A University of Alberta philosophy professor, Roger Shiner, had the grace to say that 'even bigots have a right to meet and discuss constitutional reform'. Watch it, Shiner.

"Prior restraint is not allowed, he went on. 'You can't say this is what these people are going to say even before they say it, and so we're going to haul them into court and stop them saying it.'

"Don't be so sure. That's the way things are going. Here in B.C. a bigger and better Human Rights Council gets into action Jan. 1 with a mandate to initiate complaints on behalf of people who have made no complaints. And to walk into offices looking for incriminating material. Meanwhile, if I go to Edmonton remind me not to stay at the Coast Terrace Inn."

RIGHTS COMMISSION WRONG

Ezra Levant, the brilliant young Edmonton legal student who from time to time writes a column for the *Calgary Sun*, intimated in one of his columns a few weeks ago concerning the cancelling of the Third Option' conference, that there is likely cause for legal action.

The following column by Mr. Levant, under the above caption, was published in the Nov. 1 issue of the *Calgary Sun*:

"Alberta's human rights cops are out of control.

"Over the past month, these politically correct bureaucrats - who run the innocuously named 'Alberta Human Rights and Citizenship Commission' - have systematically violated every precept of civil liberties they were sworn to uphold.

"Let's start from the beginning. In the year 1215, there was a little scrap of paper called the Magna Carta. I know that's all boring 'dead-white-male' stuff to the folks over at the Commission, so they probably don't think it applies to them.

"But the Magna Carta stood for a basic principle: Rule of law, not rule of man. It meant that all of a sudden, even the king was bound by the law.

"Even politicians had to answer to somebody. And a whole lot of other rules too.

"Rules that say if you're charged with an offence, you have the right to trial before being sentenced. And that the judge should be impartial.

"Simple stuff that the Commission is ignoring.

"Fast forward to September 1996. A group of Canadians wanted to hold a conference on national unity. They called themselves the 'Third Option' committee and their proposed plan was to bring back the old British North America Act to replace Canada's liberal Constitution. Again, boring stuff to the folks over at the Commission.

"The Third Option people booked themselves into an Edmonton hotel, and planned on having a conference.

"But then a leftist activist from B.C. heard about the conference, and he called up the hotel.

"This activist - a self-professed communist - told the hotel the organizers of the Third Option were racist, and should be kicked out.

"But everything was legal: Here were law-abiding citizens, renting a hotel for a conference, to talk about national unity. The hotel was confused by this rumor. So they called the Human Rights Commission to ask for advice.

"Let's be clear here. The organizer of the conference has never been charged with any crime. He's never been convicted of anything. He's a free citizen, like you and me. And he had a signed contract with a hotel.

"But the Commission had heard of him before. Again, no charges, no convictions, nothing. But they had heard some gossip.

"And remember. They don't care much for the Magna Carta over at the Commission.

"Charlack Mackintosh, the chief of the Commission, responded immediately.

"The Commission was able to confirm for the hotel that the organizer and main speaker for this conference were well-known promoters of racism and anti-Semitism. 'We also informed the hotel that demonstrations, possibly violent ones, could erupt,' he wrote.

"Hang on a second. Spreading hatred against an identifiable group is a crime in Canada. And the organizer had never been charged with this.

"So how could the Commissioner get away with defaming him in this way? And how on earth could he say that violence was predictable? On what basis was such a prediction rendered? JoJo's Psychic Alliance?

"Based on the Commission's gossip, the hotel 'decided to cancel the booking - a decision for which it should be commended,' wrote Mackintosh.

"Let's get this straight: There was no investigation. There was no hearing. The organizers of the conference were never allowed to defend themselves against any charge. But the Commissioner felt free to smear them, and induce the hotel to break its legal contract with them, based on unproven whispers.

"Is the Commission - originally created as a shield against unfairness - now a sword, to be used whimsically by the Chief?

"Is the hearing process - outlined in detail in the Commission's - now optional?

"What about justice?

"What about a trial?

"What about the Magna Carta?

"If this government really cares about human rights, it will fire Mackintosh, and shut down the out-of-control Commission."

COMMENT: So much for these two perceptive and penetrating straight-from-the-shoulder columns by Doug Collins and Ezra Levant. They 'tell it like it is', and in plain language.

In two world wars this century, we have sent our finest youth to fight and risk their lives on foreign soil in defence of Freedom. Meanwhile, at home, we seem to have been less successful in maintaining and defending our own age-old fundamental common-law rights and freedoms right here in Canada!

Perhaps our former Governor-General, Vincent Massey, put it best when he warned Canadians:

"Freedom always faces danger. A free people remains free only through daily acts of courage. A nation's bravery in war cannot atone for timidity in time of peace. We deny our freedom if we don't speak when there is something to be said."

One thing this Coast Terrace affair has powerfully confirmed the reality that today - as Shakespeare, Lincoln, and others down through history warned us - the most dangerous enemy of freedom is usually right in our midst - in our case, in "human rights" guise and unelected and unaccountable bureaucracies.

MALCOLM FRASER'S CONCERNS ABOUT THE LEAGUE OF RIGHTS

Former Australian Liberal Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser, who regularly is given space in Rupert Murdoch's *Australian* to write what are generally dull and boring articles, decided early in December that the Australian people should be warned about "extremists" like the Australian League of Rights. Malcolm Fraser offers advice on how the League of Rights should be dealt with. Fraser admits that there has emerged a Pauline Hanson factor on the Australian political scene, that "race is on the political agenda", "that it is doing Australia considerable harm internationally". This is the current line of all the internationalists. In Fraser's *Australian* article of December 18th, he presented an incredible scenario of the League of Rights exploiting a Pauline Hanson movement to gain control of the Australian Government.

This is a serious allegation for a former Australian Prime Minister to make in the nation's only national newspaper. One would have thought that *The Australian* would have at least made space available for the League of Rights to comment. But a letter to the editor by the Advisory National Director Eric Butler, refuting Malcolm Fraser's claim that Sir Robert Menzies had advised him as a young backbencher to have nothing to do with the League of Rights because it was an extreme right-wing group with attitudes on race similar to extreme right-wing parties in Europe, has never been published, although submitted twice. National Director David Thompson, encouraged by a discussion with the editor of *The Australian* that an article could be considered, submitted a contribution. It also has never been published.

The publication of the Fraser article, and the refusal to allow any League comment, suggests this is the manifestation of a definite anti-League of Rights policy by *The Australian*. The Fraser story concerning Menzies and the League of Rights has been taken up by others. It has been peddled by Gerard Henderson, who claims that Menzies insisted that the League of Rights was out of bounds to Liberal Ministers and Members. This is a most extraordinary story with no evidence to support it - except the word of Malcolm Fraser. The first time I heard the story was in an article by anti-League of "expert" David Greason. I dismissed the story as a figment of Greason's imagination. But clearly there has been a conscious strategy to spread the Menzies story.

I first met Malcolm Fraser for dinner in Hamilton shortly after he returned from Oxford, and was contesting Wannon. I was not over impressed with Fraser and during our initial meeting could see that he had absorbed the type of philosophical poison for which Oxford had become notorious. As the League of Rights held the same views as Menzies concerning Australia's immigration policies, there was no logical reason why he should be concerned about the League. No Minister in the Menzies Governments ever expressed to me the views being peddled by Fraser, and several of them I knew personally. Minister for Defence Athol Townley from Tasmania was an early subscriber to League of Rights publications, and always met with me when I went to Canberra. Sir Wilfrid Kent-Hughes was a personal friend. I often met with Deputy Prime Minister Arthur Fadden. Fadden's laudatory remarks in a vote of thanks he moved at a Brisbane public meeting I addressed are on record. Menzies did not find it necessary to warn Jim Killen about me before Killen accompanied me in 1962 to campaign in the United Kingdom on the Common Market issue. Killen had been responsible for ensuring that Menzies survived the 1961 Federal elections with a majority of one.

Fraser himself did not take the alleged Menzies warning too seriously, because in 1975 he met with me for lunch at a mutual friend's property in the Western District. Mrs. Tammy Fraser, a most charming person, was present as was my wife. Fraser at the time was preparing to take control of the Federal Liberal Party from Billy Snedden. Fraser sought my views on a number of matters. I sat down and typed a report of our long meeting immediately the Frasers left. There was subsequent correspondence concerning economic issues. I said after my Western District Luncheon meeting with Fraser that I had no confidence in him, while early in 1976 I wrote an article which I invited people to keep for the future. It stated that the Fraser Government was already on the road to disaster. This prophetically true statement lost me, temporarily, a number of friends.

When Malcolm Fraser next writes anything about Sir Robert Menzies, he might care to explain why Menzies after his retirement progressively lost faith in the Party he had established and eventually did not even vote for it. Can Malcolm Fraser quote one laudatory remark, which Menzies ever made concerning him or his Government?

THE PHONY "TOLERATION" DEBATE

On October 30th, 1996, the Commonwealth Parliament solemnly carried a resolution stating that Australia was a "tolerant" nation, which deplored all forms of "racism". When Pauline Hanson made her historic maiden speech, only a handful of Members attended - an attempted snub. The same Members who snubbed Pauline Hanson criticised her for not being in Parliament to hear the debate on "toleration". Pauline Hanson commented that now that the Members of Parliament had had their say, why not let the Australian people have a say via a national referendum? Independent Graeme Campbell made the following contribution to the debate.

MR. CAMPBELL (Kalgoorlie) (4.42 p.m.) - In speaking to this debate, I must say there is very little that I would take issue with the Prime Minister (Mr. Howard) on, but not so with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Beazley). I believe his cant and hypocrisy was exceeded only by that of the shadow minister, Mr. Gareth Evans.

In listening to the debate, once the Prime Minister had spoken, we had a very quick decline from the facts. We had statements being made that are simply misleading. They will not stifle the debate. When you look at this motherhood statement, people in this chamber in their arrogance think that it is going to stifle the debate in the community. It will not. The truth is there has been a bipartisan policy all these years, and that is the problem. There has been no discussion on this issue.

Bob Hawke said that one of his great achievements was to liaise with the Liberal Party and the A.C.T.U. to keep immigration and multiculturalism off the agenda. The truth is that the Australian people have never had the chance to speak or had their opinions valued. Mr. Beazley said that he did not know what political correctness was if it was not what he described as the will of the people at the time. Of course it is not, and he knows it is not. That is hyperbole of the worst order. He knows that political correctness is the will of the elitists in society.

What you have here today is basically a battle between Australian nationalists and the internationalists. I would say that everyone who has spoken in this debate so far has been, without reservation, an internationalist. I stand as a proud Australian nationalist with outward looking nationalism. It does not threaten anyone, but it says that we in this country have the right to decide. I turn to this quote:

"I don't think it is wrong, racist, immoral or anything else for a country to say we will decide what the cultural identity and the cultural destiny of this country will be, and nobody else."

"Just about every self-respecting country does, and I find the most extraordinary argument the one that says by talking about these issues we are offending our friends in Asia. That is bunkum."

"Those countries will make judgments based on their own hard-headed interests. Has anybody asked an Australian coal exporter about the rights of an Australian to immigrate to Japan before we sign a coal deal with the Japanese? What absurd nonsense."

..... Those are not my words; they are the words of John Howard in 1988. It is interesting to see that Cheryl Kernot recently has been attacking the Prime Minister, just as the Labor Party has. Let us look at what Cheryl Kernot had to say in 1995. I will quote from the *Australian* of 23 February 1995:

Democrat Leader Cheryl Kernot yesterday defended John Howard's controversial 1988 remarks on Asian Immigration saying they "at least appeared to reflect a genuine concern" . . . Kernot also appeared to favour lower immigration for the sake of social cohesion . . . She said Mr. Howard's questioning of the levels of Asian immigration "(seemed) to make space for a more legitimate debate about the social and economic impact of immigration".

Oh hypocrisy, your name is Kernot! I might say that John Stuart Mill-

Mr. Gareth Evans- On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that imputations of that degree of disgracefulness are out of order in this or any other chamber.

Mr. Speaker -I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The member for Kalgoorlie will not impinge on the reputation of a member so directly.

MR. CAMPBELL - Thank you, Mr. Speaker. John Stuart Mill, I believe, is so beloved of that side of the House that the Liberal Party is setting up a John Stuart Mill Forum. John Stuart Mill said several things of interest. He said if a country doesn't have the right to decide with whom it shares its people it has no rights at all. I think that is very true. In his *Considerations on Representative Government* he said:

Free institutions are next to impossible in a country made up of different nationalities. Among a people without fellow feeling, especially if they speak different languages, the united public opinion necessary to the working of representative government cannot exist.

Mr. Hockey - That was in the 19th century.

MR. CAMPBELL - While that is from the last century and is a little out of date I think they are words of wisdom. You could of course use Professor Zubrzycki who is considered to be the architect of multiculturalism in Australia. Only about two years ago in the *Australian* an article about Professor Zubrzycki said he had grave reservations about his policy of multiculturalism; it wasn't working as he intended and it wasn't working because ethnic leaders put ethnic interests above Australia's national interests.....

I get sick to the back teeth of people talking about and deriding Australia. This is, by and large, the most tolerant society in the world, but it is a society that has to be consulted and which has not been consulted so far. You will not achieve anything by trying to screw down the lid. All you will show is that you in this parliament do not represent the people and that they are not having their voices heard through you. It is quite clear to me that politicians have failed this country. It is now up to the people to do something for themselves.

I want to make sure that we do address this problem and we do not have a situation created where anybody in this society runs in fear. It is not a one-way street. In the election before last, I was campaigning in Sydney and a New Zealand TV team asked me if they could tag along. The journalist, a very large Maori whom I would not have liked to tackle, said to me, *"We have been filming in Cabramatta and we could sense the hostility; we were frightened."* That is not the Australia I want, and it is not the Australia that I am encouraging. It is the Australia you will get if you go down this road of mindless bipartisan policy, which fails to address the real issues. If you fail to address those real issues, there will be trouble in this country. It will be on the heads of all you bipartisan frauds.

"SOME THOUGHTS ON EQUALITY"

A number of our readers have asked about the identity of the author of the article *"Some Thoughts on Equality and Future Directions*, by Glen Plausindaitis, in our December issue. We agree with the view of one of our readers with the background, which qualifies him to say, "This is one of the most brilliant and scholarly articles ever to appear in *The New Times*". The author is a most modest young University student of 21 - a most encouraging sign for the future.