



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

Registered for posting as a Publication —
Category "B"

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance—

Vol. 18 No. 32

August 21st., 1981

Thought for the Week: "However, there are some differences between the Communists and the humanists. Communists blatantly admit that they are atheistic and use the word without apology. Humanists are more subtle. They refer to themselves as 'non-theists', and the word 'humanist' does not grate on the nerves of the dupes they are deceiving. It is true that many Communists have infiltrated our schools, churches, and government agencies, but the average, card-carrying Communist lives a very frugal life. He puts in every possible hour working for the good of the party, and lives on as little as possible, turning most of his income over to the party. With the humanist it is different. He lives like a leech; drawing a fat salary off the system that he seeks to destroy".

- Homer Duncan, in Secular Humanism (1979)

QUEENSLAND PREMIER WARNS ON ABORIGINAL LAND RIGHTS TRAP: "Mr. Bjelke-Petersen said it 'just too bad if the black nations decided not to attend the (Brisbane) games because of a World Council of Churches report which accused the Queensland Government of racism'".

- The Sun (Melbourne) August 12th.

After pointing out, in his press conference, that Aborigines had advantages and benefits that white Australians did not, the Queensland Premier pinpointed the ominous implications for Australia in the mounting campaign for Aboriginal land rights:

"Aboriginal claims to land rights were a ruse to secure majority rule and an independent Aboriginal nation within Australia."

We remember giving this warning some twenty, or more, years ago.

We are sure that this warning by the Premier was lost on the hearties of the print media who were present. Our experience of media people in general is that they are rather superficial in their examination and understanding of current issues; and also are victims of the delusion that they are of incredible importance in the scheme of things. But there are a handful of columnists who are head and shoulders above the norm, and we respect their analyses and comments.

We have known for over thirty years that a Black State within Australia was one vital goal of the subversives within our ranks: we have not known a politician to draw attention to it before. What are the

"ON TARGET"

August 21st, 1981

Page 1 (121)

implications? Quite simply, subversion. An "independent" Black State of Australia would open this continent up to the Communist world, and the Third World, as never before. All manner of pacts and deals would ensue, mostly with dire consequences for Australia. Russian submarine base in Arnhem Land! A "Cuban" missile complex on the Gulf of Carpentaria! Quite on the cards if we allow a Black State to develop. It's not crazy at all, but probable rather than just possible. To drive home his point the Queensland Premier stated that: "Aboriginals had neutralised half of the Northern Territory with claims for land, mineral, and other rights."

WHAT PRICE POLITICIANS? The following letter from Jeremy Lee, National Secretary of the Institute of Economic Democracy, was published in The Land (July 16th):

"It was often claimed a few years ago that we could only get good men into Parliament by paying them enough. I was one of a minority which felt that, if financial inducement was made the inducement for parliamentary service, we would get the wrong sort of representative. We now pay a modest back-bencher a base salary of \$36,000 annually. He receives a tax-free allowance of between \$12,600 and \$18,400, depending on the size of his electorate.

He gets \$10,000 for a personal secretary, and a like sum for a 'research officer'.

He receives also unlimited free travel, first class by road, rail, or air, within Australia. He gets two free telephones, and unlimited free postage. He can take his wife from his home to Canberra and back, free first class, six times a year. If he survives three years in Parliament he is eligible for a free round-the-world ticket, first-class of course, and from there on - a similar one every term of Parliament.

How does this compare with overseas politicians?

A 1976 Oxford survey showed Australia's M.P.s second only to the United States and Holland, and when the electoral allowance is added, second only to the U.S. congressmen.

These huge salaries might be justified - if we were getting the sort of fearless, open, honest government we got many years ago. We have just seen the conclusion of a 60-day Parliamentary session where 189 Parliamentary bills were churned through like a sausage machine.

Doubtless, they had all studiously read and studied the Bill which recently increased their salaries.

One can only wonder whether there was the slightest twinge of conscience from those brave souls who have been urging the rest of us to practise 'wage restraint' and 'moderation' in the national interest?"

AUSTRALIAN CONSTITUTION AGAIN UNDER ATTACK: "A new Constitution could be in force by the bicentenary in 1988, with sweeping changes to the role of the Governor-General and reforms to the power of the Senate and the relations between the Commonwealth and the States."

- The Australian, August 11th.

Senator Gareth Evans seems to be leading the wolf-pack which is

"ON TARGET"

August 21st, 1981

Page 2 (122)

howling for the "reform" of the Australian Constitution. He and his fellows do not want Communists who would rip up our Constitution to turn us into the Australian "People's Democracy".

Most of those who want Constitution "reforms" continually speak of the "Constitutional Crisis" on November 1975, when the then Governor-General, Sir John Kerr, sacked the Whitlam Government because it would not call an election to resolve the "political crisis" brought on by the then Senate's refusal to pass Supply, denial of which meant that the Whitlam Government was unable to govern. But it was, quite definitely, a political crisis, not a Constitutional crisis, because the Australian Constitution laid down specific guidelines for such an eventuality, viz. the intervention of the Governor-General.

This is precisely what he did: the rest is history. The Australian people gave their verdict as never before. We can understand the fury of the Labor Party at the Governor-General's intervention. We can understand the doubts expressed from non-Labor quarters; but the Governor-General did act constitutionally to resolve a political crisis. We believe that this was all that he could do, under the circumstances: it was the political parties of the day which put him in that position.

Naturally, Senator Gareth Evans, as Labor Shadow Attorney-General, does not want these sets of circumstances to ever arise again and is really calling for the curtailing of the powers of the Governor-General; the abolition of the right of the Senate to block money bills; lengthier parliamentary terms. We have commented in these pages recently on the great drive for a 4-year parliamentary term, and we won't go into that again. Naturally we do not want any weakening of the powers of the Governor-General (Crown) as our traditional Parliament, developed most painfully over centuries is Tripartite-Crown, Upper House, Lower House: a division of power. To those who have a proper understanding of the deeper issues, this accords with the Trinitarian nature of Reality. That our traditional parliamentary system is under attack by organised subversion, and the dupes of subversion, is really only to be expected. A recent political party conference brought forward a resolution that the Governor-General should be politically elected, as are many presidents of republics overseas. We are not enthusiastic about this concept, as the history of the stability of republics do not demonstrate the stability of our monarchy. Furthermore, an elected Head of State cannot be as free of political party affiliations and sympathies as a distinguished person appointed by the Crown, or the Crown itself. We notice that Mr. Paul Rodan, Politics Lecturer at the Caulfield Institute of Technology, in a very good full-page article in The Sun (Melbourne) August 12th draws attention to the fact that the Constitution is difficult to change: there must be strong support for an amendment to have it carried. He highlights the Simultaneous Elections proposal put to Australian electors in 1977: 37.8% of voters opposed the proposal, but because majorities in three "small" States voted "No", the proposal was defeated. We recall that Mr. Malcolm Fraser was furious

according to a political roundsman of the day, that his Simultaneous Elections proposal was defeated. The Australian League of Rights campaigned heavily for its defeat, because its passage would have quite definitely weakened the power of the Senate by placing Senators in the position that they could be forced to the polls at any strategic time by the Lower House (Government of the day) if they refused passage to any "important" Government bill (important to the Government: not necessarily to Australians). None of the media current affairs/political commentators of the day brought out these implications inherent in the Simultaneous Elections proposal: maybe they didn't understand what it was all about, but we did. We can safely say that we were largely instrumental in the defeat of it. But the essential point in all this is that the Constitution should be difficult to change, because there should be the certainty that a real majority of Australian voters do grasp all the implications of any proposal, Mr. Rodan rightly draws attention in his article to another aspect of Constitutional change which many people do not understand. We quote from his article:

"While formal constitutional change has been minimal, it should be remembered that the Constitution has been effectively changed through the rulings of the High Court". This is known as "judicial review", and is expansion in the role of the Federal Government Mr. Rodan adds "which the founders (of the Constitution) could not have envisaged." This is an area in which the centralists may make thrusts. We do not oppose amendments to the Constitution lightly: we can think of amendments which we would support. We will oppose amendments which favour Big Brother.

BRIEF COMMENT: Commonwealth Secretary-General, Sir Shridath Ramphal, makes some incredible assertions in an article of his, published in The Age (Melbourne) August 14th.

He begins by describing Harold Macmillan (Britain), Lester Pearson (Canada), and Nehru (India) as "great statesmen". As subjects of the Anglo-Saxon part of the Commonwealth we regard Harold Macmillan and Lester Pearson more as disasters than "great statesmen". As for Nehru - that is for history and for Indians to decide.

Writing of arms sales to South Africa (denial of), "the unhappy Rhodesian chapter", and Commonwealth membership for South Africa (squeezed out) - he asserts that the Commonwealth was right, and furthermore the Commonwealth grew stronger. The Southern African saga hasn't been fully written yet, merely the opening chapters. How does he know that ~~the~~ "Commonwealth" was right? We know that the "Commonwealth" was wrong, and that, by turning against South Africa, and Rhodesia, it played the game of International Communism's global strategy - thus weakening the Western world. The Kremlin is delighted.

ON TARGET is published and printed by the Australian League of Rights, 273 Little Collins St., Melbourne. Subscription rate \$12 p.a. posted.