



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance—

Registered by Australia Post — Publication No. VBH 0999

Vol. 23 No. 31

August 15th, 1986.

Thought for the Week: "Politicians have found that, if you erode civil liberties and human rights in the name of defending them, you will not only get away with it, but even be allowed to boast about it!"

— Professor Laughlan Chipman, writing on the Bill of Rights

WHO WILL OWN AUSTRALIA'S FARMS? (Jeremy Lee comments):

The Federal Member for Groome, Mr. Tom McVeigh, has issued a warning on overseas ownership. The Chronicle, (Toowoomba, Aug. 4, 1986) reported: "...Mr. McVeigh has warned that the future of our prospective farmers is at risk after the recent decision to relax investment controls over foreign ownership of rural land by the Government. Treasurer Paul Keating announced last week rural properties worth less than \$3 million can now be bought by a foreign investor as long as the buyer spends one-third of the price of the land developing the property ... "This move seriously jeopardises the family farm because it will keep land prices out of the reach of the ordinary Australian farmer's son," Mr. McVeigh said ... "Foreign investors will simply take the profits back to their country and leave the average Australian battler landless. Press reports have confirmed my worst fears stating there should be no difficulty selling farming properties because of the under-valued Australian dollar and the attractive low price, by international standards, of our rural land. In other words, foreign investors will be buying our land at discounted rates," Mr. McVeigh said. "I make a plea to all farmers considering the prospect of a quick profit to seriously keep in mind that Australian farms should be kept in Australian hands ..."

Timely though Mr. McVeigh's warning is, his last plea makes a nonsense of his point. The majority of farmers currently have no choice. The industry is, by and large, bankrupt. Average debt across Australia's 170,000 farms is \$60,000 per farm. Average interest payments is \$11,000, or \$211 per week.

We have warned consistently that the Fabian plan to bankrupt Australia's family farms will be followed by a takeover of farm-lands by banks and foreign corporations.

Already a number of large-scale investment bodies have been formed, with access to foreign capital, and are already moving into the debt-stricken rural areas. The Bulletin (June 3) reported the executive director of one:

"... Bruce McDougall, executive director of Agricultural Investments Australia, says a change in ownership structure of farm land is vital.

"Think of the people who borrowed money in 1980 - half their capital has been wiped out," he says. "They would have been much better in a tenancy situation..."

Agricultural Investments already has between \$30 and \$40 million invested in Australian agriculture - and it is only one of a number of such companies.

Mr. McVeigh's warning is made even more confusing by the fact that the official policy of the Opposition parties is to seek more foreign investment. Is he, therefore, warning against the official policy of his own Party? Only a proper use of Australia's own banking system offers any alternative - but that may be too hot an issue for Mr. McVeigh and the Nationals.

ISRAELI EXTRADITION WITHOUT EVIDENCE (from Chas. Pinwill)

The Australian of July 15, 1986 reported:-

"Negotiations have started to update the (extradition) treaty with the United States and preliminary talks have been held with Israel."

"Under these, (so called 'Fully Modern Treaties') evidentiary requirements have been reduced and the establishment of a prima facie case against a suspect will no longer be necessary."

Over the last few months there have been a series of articles in the "Sun" newspaper in Brisbane, quoting Dr. Weisenthal and others as saying that there are over 5,000 war criminals in Queensland alone. No evidence against any individual in Queensland was given.

However, under these "fully modern" treaties of extradition, substantial evidence is clearly unnecessary.

This state of affairs has been made possible by an amending Bill to our extradition legislation which was introduced into Federal Parliament in March, 1983, and subsequently passed. The Attorney General, Mr. Lionel Bowen, is apparently personally committed to "updating" our extradition arrangements.

The amending legislation was passed through Parliament in the wake of the Trimbole affair, and with the understandable and commendable concern that those guilty of drug inflicted murders be prosecuted.

However on our present information, all persons of European background in Australia are now threatened with Israeli extradition for war crimes, all evidence to the contrary notwithstanding.

Letters to the Attorney General requesting copies of the relevant legislation, treaties and other information are urgently needed to establish what the situation is, and what it is about to become.

There is also the prospect of Communist countries in the future,

being able to extradite former nationals on a similar basis.

WHITHER THE BILL OF RIGHTS? The Bill of Rights before the Australian Senate is the third attempt by a Labor government to give Australians a Bill of Rights. The Examiner (Launceston) July 31st.

This particular article on the Bill of Rights was written by Professor Lauchlan Chipman, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Wollongong (N.S.W.)

There is little in it of which we were already not well aware; his comment given as our "Thought for the Week" is poignant; as we are, indeed, in the era of Orwellian "Newspeak", "Thoughtcrime", "Doublethink", and others. We have not yet listed "Facecrime" in our list of official offences. From our memory of reading George Orwell's "1984", Facecrime is committing the offence of looking as though you don't love Big Brother! No, seriously, we do consider that there are a handful of crazed Socialist/Humanist ideologues at Canberra who would be sufficiently "off the planet" to consider "Facecrime".

There is little doubt in our minds that the Bill of Rights is now on the back burner. The name of the game now in "Labor" corridors of power; not only in Canberra, but in Sydney and Melbourne also - is survival. The Bill of Rights, to which all the ideologues are solidly committed, can wait. But the ideologues are still restless: they want their "Baby".

The Age (Melb.) August 11th, reports that the President of the United Nations Association (who else?!) Victorian Division, Mr. Michael Gorton, favours a "court-enforceable" bill of rights and thinks that laws inconsistent with the Bill should be struck down (on with democracy!)

A senior lecturer in law at the University of Melbourne said not only that Victoria (the Melbourne ideologues want a "Victorian" Bill of Rights now) was out of step with the rest of the world in its distrust of bill of rights (we must always defer to "world opinion", you know!) The Victorian Council of Civil Liberties wants the Bill of Rights (the Aaron Castan/Keon-Cohen led body), but the Australian Civil Liberties Union (led by John Bennett) opposes the Bill of Rights. In fact its annual publication - Your Rights (1986) has an up-to-date Section on "I.D. Cards and the Bill of Rights" (\$4.00 posted from Box 1052J-, GPO, MELB., VIC, 3001).

But here we go yet again. Dr. Cheryl Saunders, the Melbourne academic in law (above) mentioned countries with, or heading towards a bill of rights. The United States and Britain mentioned, of course. We wish these academics would consult with their fellow academics who are historians. It's the old story of a little learning being a dangerous thing. The expert in a sector of Law does not know that both the British and American Bills of Rights (she should read them!) were framed to impede, restrict, curb the powers

of governments over states and individuals. The New Zealand, Canadian, and Australian Bills of Rights do the opposite, and are both centralist and totalitarian. Mercifully, the Australian Bill of Rights isn't law, yet.

All this is enough to convince us that the Bill of Rights is still "on". The forces of subversion must get it into law in Australia as a preliminary to outrageous legislation back in the pipelines of subversion, fully intended to spew out over Oz in the short years ahead and paralyse action, muzzle protest by loyal Australians when Oz is receiving the South African "treatment".

Make no mistake, our first line of defence at present lies in South Africa. The race question there is but the excuse to bring that country down: capture control of its natural resources: occupy and use its strategic areas - for the benefit of the Communist world. We believe that Oz is intended to be brought down, also, by the "race question". Both "Red Over Black", by Geoff McDonald (\$8.00 posted) and "Land-Rights - Birth Rights", by Peter B. English (\$15.00 posted) deal with the dreadful dangers to our country, inherent in Land Rights legislation. Yes, there could, and possibly will come "sanctions" against Australia for its "abhorrent" treatment of its Aborigines, and an "outraged" international community (don't ask us where you'll find this monster!) will press hard on the government of the day, at Canberra.

So don't let us kid ourselves that, because of "Labor's" temporary electoral difficulties, the Bill of Rights threat has lessened. It hasn't. Only an amendment to the Australian Constitution, in our opinion, suitably framed by freedom-loving constitution law experts to protect, for all time, Australia's sovereignty from the rapacities of the United Nations - will be sufficient for our protection.

WHO'S KIDDING WHOM?: Wheat Sales to China: This letter was sent to the Editor of a Sydney daily recently. To the best of our knowledge it has not been published. The correspondent is a northern N.S.W. actionist who has travelled through China many times;

"The Chinese National Peoples Congress held in Beijing in March and April this year was addressed by Premier Thao Zijang on behalf of the State Council covering a report on their Five Year Plan.

"The report quoted China's output of grain for 1985 reached a total of 370 million tons, an increase of 58 million tons over previous years.

"He said that China is now more than self-sufficient in grain and has a surplus for export.

"So, who is kidding whom amongst our politicians regarding wheat sales to China?

"This information was from an official Chinese publication dated June 1986."

"ON TARGET" is published and printed by The Australian League of Rights, 145 Russell St., Melb. Subscription rate \$20 p.a. posted.