



# ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

*The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance—*

Vol. II No. 41

October 24th, 1975

Thought for the Week: "The Communist ideology is out to destroy your society. This has been their aim for one hundred and twenty-five years and has never changed; only their methods have changed a little. When there is detente, peaceful co-existence, and trade, they will still insist: the ideological war will continue! And what is ideological war? It is a focus of hatred, a continued repetition of the oath to destroy the Western world".

- Alexander Solzhenitsyn, in an address to the A.F.L.-C.I.O., Aug. '75

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT: The Prime Minister, Mr. Gough Whitlam stated in a press statement, published on October 18th, in reference to the current "Constitutional crisis", that "This is the first Senate in Australian history which has rejected a money Bill".

Ex - D.L.P. Senator Frank McManus still Federal Leader of the Democratic Labor Party, wrote a hard-hitting letter to the Editor of The Sun (Melbourne), which was published on October 21st. To set the record straight, and thereby dispel some of the carefully contrived confusion which the Labor forces, and their cohorts, have conjured up; we can do no better than re-print ex-Senator Frank McManus's letter, which runs, in part:-

"The President of the Australian Labor Party, Mr. Hawke, supported Mr. Whitlam. (on the assertion above). He said it had not happened once in 75 years. The statements are blatantly untrue.

"I know, because I voted in the divisions when Money Bills were rejected. Voting with me were Labor Ministers, Senator Murphy, Senator Douglas McClelland, Senator Cavanagh, and the full A.L.P. Senate team.

"I recall the Senate majority (Labor and D.L.P.) defeating among others: \*The Income Tax Bill (1965); a money Bill. \*The Bill to increase Post and Telegraph rates (1967); May 19th, 1967. \*The State Receipts Duty Bill (1970); June 1970.

"Mr. Whitlam must have known that the Senate had rejected the money Bill in 1965. He was Deputy Leader.

"Why does he now say that it has never happened?

"In 1970 Mr. Whitlam was Leader of the Australian Labor Party when the State Receipts Duty Bill was rejected by the Senate.

"Why did he deny it ever happened? Why did he not discipline Senator Murphy (then Labor Leader in the Senate)?

"Instead, he showed his admiration for him as a constitutional lawyer by putting him on the High Court.

"In the Senate, Senator Murphy, on a number of occasions, insisted that there was no Labor tradition against opposing money Bills, and he incorporated in Hansard several hundred cases where the Labor Party opposed money Bills, Finance Bills, and Appropriation Bills".

SENATOR FIELD RAISES SOME HOME TRUTHS: We were pleased to quote some apt comments, which Senator Field made to some of our supporters in Queensland, in last week's On Target. We have been reading much of the disparaging comment which the Labor forces have been making upon the recent remarks of the Governor of Queensland, Sir Colin Hannah. Senator Field, in a letter to the Editor of The Age (Melbourne), published on October 21st, points out that Gough Whitlam, and his cronies, are not averse to "using" the Queen when it suits them. His letter runs: -

"I am amazed at the Labor Party wanting to go to the Queen over the statement by the Governor of Queensland (Sir Colin Hannah). It's funny to think of them running to Britain - when they're so determined to take the Queen out of Queensland, abolish our rights of appeal to the Privy Council, break all our traditional ties with the United Kingdom, etc. As for Sir Colin setting a precedent - what about when Sir Phillip Game removed Jack Lang, Premier of New South Wales from office? Wasn't that expressing an opinion?"

WHO'S SUPPLYING FRETELIN?: "Indonesia is investigating reports that Vietnamese communist military advisers are working with the Leftist Fretelin Party in Portuguese Timor".

- Sydney Morning Herald, October 13th.

The question of the possession by Fretelin forces of modern military hardware has not been answered satisfactorily. Where did an insurgent body like Fretelin gain possession of rockets, mortars, howitzers, heavy machine guns? How did they get there? Did Indonesia supply them? The Indonesians aren't fools! Did Portugal supply them? Many of the pieces of military hardware would have been supplied before the Caetano regime fell. The new pro-Communist regime in Portugal has no basic argument with Fretelin forces: but how would Portugal get the military hardware? Did Australia supply them? Not as ridiculous as the former two possibilities, that is, under the Whitlam pro-Communist Government, but highly unlikely. Anyway, the Indonesians would know where the armaments were manufactured, but have not yet disclosed this publicly.

An Indonesian general Lieutenant-General Murtopo, states that it is most likely that North Vietnamese military instructors have been in Dili, instructing Fretelin forces.

General Murtopo says that Fretelin forces can last out a few months before being "resupplied" from abroad. The inference is that they (the Fretelin forces) have been supplied from abroad. Again, how? Russian submarines? Chinese submarines? A long, relatively uninhabited coastline: not difficult! It would all smack of a B-Grade Hollywood movie; if the joke weren't on us!

JACK LANG AND COMMUNISM: We have before us, through the courtesy of a close Sydney supporter, the Federal Constitution and Policy of the "Lang Labor Party", which was Jack Lang. He was in Federal Parliament for a short period in the post-World War 2 years. Gough Whitlam, and others of the A.L.P. paid tribute to Jack Lang, when he died recently - but certainly not to Jack Lang's policies, which are in part: "Legislation to deal with the Communist Party as an illegal organization..." "All premises

occupied by the Communist Party to be declared illegal premises...assets liquidated...funds confiscated..  
"All newspaper licences of the Communist Party...to be withdrawn immediately". "Maintenance of a  
White Australia Policy..." "Withdrawal from the World Bank and International Monetary Fund..."  
How times have changed!

THE CENTRAL ISSUE IN THE NATIONAL CRISIS: by Eric D. Butler.

Let us keep our eye on the ball. The Opposition majority in the Senate has the lawful right to attempt to force the Whitlam Government to face the electors. But Mr. Fraser says that he will require a full three-year term of office to clean up the mess created by the Whitlam Government, thus indicating that he has at present no constructive policy for reversing inflation. Should Mr. Fraser and his colleagues be successful in forcing an election in which the Whitlam Government was defeated by an anti-Labor electoral back-lash, and then fail to free the economy from the destructive financial policies which have been eroding it for a long period of time, they will set the match to the explosive situation which has been generated over many years.

More than constitutional government is at stake in the current crisis. The very future of the Commonwealth of Australia as a civilised society is going to be decided by what happens in the immediate future.

The Whitlam strategy in the exploding national crisis is clear: to attempt to confuse the central issue to the point where electors are more concerned about effects than causes. Fundamental truths are being ignored or drowned out by false propaganda. The very people who are keenly anticipating violence are those warning that Mr. Malcolm Fraser and his colleagues will be responsible. We are witnessing the use of dialectics, such as used by Dr. Jim Cairns during the anti-Vietnam demonstrations. While Dr. Cairns verbally deplored the use of violence, he helped to create situations which always ended with violence.

In a breath-taking display of hypocrisy and double-talk, Prime Minister Whitlam tells Australians of how the very fabric of parliamentary democracy will be **destroyed** if the Senate uses its powers to deny him sufficient funds to continue governing; to force him to face the electors. This is the same Mr. Whitlam who, as leader of the Opposition, supported the same Senate policy being adopted by Mr. Malcolm Fraser and the Opposition parties. And he was strongly supported by Senator Lionel Murphy, who argued that the Labor Party had a right to use a Senate majority to attempt to force an election for the House of Representatives. This is a matter of record, not of opinion.

The Prime Minister who now displays such a touching concern for traditions has spent three years in office brutally trampling upon traditions. The list of outrages is a long one, including the imposition of his own National Anthem without consulting the Australian people, and the appointment of Senator Murphy to the High Court where he now votes consistently in favour of all legislation designed to further the process of centralising all power at Canberra.

It is being asserted, however, that the sin's of the Whitlam Government are no excuse for Mr. Fraser "tearing up" a convention which has been accepted for 75 years of Federation. Mr. Fraser is charged with attacking the Constitution. The constant reference to some "convention" as if it were sacred, and a part of the Constitution, must be effectively challenged if the central issue in the current crisis is to be understood by the Australian people.

The law of the Commonwealth of Australia is the written Constitution. This document outlines the rules

under which the people of the separate Australian States agreed to live when they accepted the establishment of a Federation of States. What does the law state? Chapter 1 Part 1 of the Constitution reads: "The legislative power of the Commonwealth shall be vested in a Federal Parliament, which shall consist of the Queen, a Senate, and a House of Representatives, and which is hereinafter called 'The Parliament' or 'The Parliament of the Commonwealth'".

The meaning of the above is quite clear: the Senate, originally conceived as an upper House representing the States, designed to protect them against the processes of centralism, shares legislative power with the House of Representatives. Section 53 of the Constitution reads: "Except as provided in this section, the Senate shall have equal power with the House of Representatives in respect of all proposed laws". The Senate is excluded from originating money bills, but it is lawful for the Senate to refuse to pass money bills if it so desires, forcing the House of Representatives either to amend the legislation to meet the Senate's requirements, or to ask the electors for a decision at an election. Mr. Whitlam parrots the charge that the "people's house" is being thwarted by the "un-democratic Senate". It is true that non-Labor parties have also been guilty of attempts to make the Senate a mere rubber stamp for the House of Representatives. They have also used the same type of argument about "convention" now being advanced by Mr. Whitlam. But this "convention" was merely a device which suited the political parties. Mr. Fraser and his colleagues have, no doubt unwittingly, done Australians a service by demonstrating that the Senate has the lawful power to take action designed to insist that a Government face the electors. What could be more democratic than the electors having a say concerning a Government which has taken Australia from one disaster to the next?

If one studies the rash of opinions being offered by academics, one cannot help but note that they do not, because they cannot, challenge the Senate with acting unconstitutionally - i.e. unlawfully. As one of the academics put it, if it becomes accepted that the Senate can block money bills, this could lead to a Government wishing to take "unpopular" steps in the "common interest" being forced to keep "looking over its shoulder". This would be a much improved state of affairs! There would be some check on government. Genuine democracy does not mean that once a set of politicians have obtained office, irrespective of the tactics used, they should then be free to do as they like for a given number of years. There must be checks. The Senate was originated to help provide a check. That check is now being used. In stressing this fundamental truth, it is not suggested that Mr. Fraser will do much better than Mr. Whitlam if elected as a result of an election. But if the electors are provided with the opportunity of electing a Liberal-Country Party Coalition, they will then have the responsibility either of first insisting upon firm policy decisions which will reverse the centralist drive, or of living with the frightful consequences of their failure to insist upon such policies.

As yet the Opposition parties have come up with no constructive policy for reversing inflation. They have rejected the anti-inflation policy of Premier J. Bjelke-Petersen. For this reason the League of Rights cannot in any way recommend any type of blank cheque for Mr. Fraser and his colleagues. But it is clear that Mr. Fraser and his colleagues are acting in a lawful manner in an attempt to have an immediate election for the House of Representatives. It is the League's view that when Mr. Fraser does come to office, the real battle for the future of Australia will open. Mr. Fraser will either have to constructively reverse inflation or preside over a revolutionary situation. Australians cannot say that they have not been warned.

---

"On Target" is published by The Australian League of Rights, G.P.O. Box 1052J, MELBOURNE. 3001  
Subscription rate: \$5.00 per annum. \$9.00 for two years. W. & J. Barr (Printers) Pty. Ltd.,