



# ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

*The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance —*

Registered By Australia Post — Publication No. VBH 0999

Vol.28, No.46

December 4th, 1992

**THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK:** "With the abandonment of this (Christian) religion and of this attitude by scientists, and the increasing pursuit of knowledge for the sake of power which it gives to control and to dominate other beings ... Science is plunging back into the morass of witchcraft and superstition, providing clever-clever techniques for outsmarting the common herd with meretricious goods and false explanations while deploying its brainpower to develop the techniques of control over humanity. These include how to... control the mechanism of life and heredity so as to produce the insane ideal of the power manic, the test-tube baby, separated at last from its cultural inheritance and all natural influences."

- Dr. Geoffrey Dobbs

**CAN WE BELIEVE ALL WE SEE AND HEAR?** by Eric D. Butler:

As the gutter media "goes in for the kill" against the Monarchy, with new "revelations" nearly every day, it is an appropriate time to raise the question of how reliable is the media. And to what depths is it prepared to sink? Let us consider, for example, the recent Sunday night Royal Special: Charles: A Portrait promotion on TV 7. The viewers were told that they would be presented with the latest on the Royal drama, with references to the Prince's long standing friendship with Mrs. Camilla Parker-Bowles. There have been all kinds of allegations in the tabloids, but Channel 7 had what appeared to be a major sensational scoop, with Prince Charles appearing to boast of his relationship with Mrs. Parker-Bowles. There he is stating quite clearly that "I keep coming back for more". Prince Charles certainly said this, but he said it four years ago in his brilliant address at the Bicentenary celebrations in Sydney.

In his Sydney address Prince Charles said, "Part of my own education took place here in Australia. Quite frankly, it was by far the best part. While I was here, I had the Pommie bits knocked off me, like chips off an old block. The results are only too obvious. I keep

coming back for more, and it's always a special pleasure." Channel 7 deliberately spliced a section of this statement into its promotion of Charles: A Portrait with viewers misled into believing that the Prince was candidly admitting what the tabloids were alleging. This disgraceful episode is, however, typical of what sections of the media do. The late Malcolm Muggeridge said that television had reached such a low level that he had to consider whether it was moral to appear on it.

Over a lifetime of being involved with the media, I have personally experienced what can be done. During the national controversy back in 1984 concerning Aboriginal land rights, I debated Dr. Ken Coghill, a Minister in the Victorian Cain Labor Government, in the St. Arnaud Town Hall, Victoria. The debate was covered by the ABC. In answer to a trick question by a member of the audience who for some strange reason the ABC cameras were not able to identify, I was given a major round of applause. But when presented by the ABC, the applause was given to the unidentified man who asked the trick question!

Listening to an ABC interview he had given, the late Sir Raphael Cilento was amazed to hear what he was saying; the taped interview had been spliced with the result that Sir Raphael's answers were not related to what he had been asked in the interview! When the Rhodesian Government declared independence in November 1965, a photo was shown on television all around the world, of Africans lying allegedly dead in what was known as Cecil Square. The caption had it that they had all been machinegunned down when they rose up in protest against the declaration of independence. One caption read, "The Rhodesians do not even bother to bury their dead." I arrived in Rhodesia shortly afterwards and noted that the Africans were still lying in Cecil Square, resting in the shade of the jacaranda trees, as they did every sunny day!

As the battle concerning the future of the Constitutional Monarchy increases, it is essential that the treacherous role of sections of the media is carefully analysed and exposed.

#### **TAXING THE CROWN'S INDEPENDENCE** by D. Thompson:

The proposal from the Queen that she submit herself to the payment of taxation can only be regarded as a further retreat for the Monarchy, and ultimately for those who look to the Crown as a source of stability and continuity. From a constitutional point of view, such a suggestion would appear to be strongly questionable. If this suggestion is accepted by the British Parliament, it will mean that the Queen, along with all the rest of her subjects, must open her bank accounts to the Inland Revenue and the Treasury for scrutiny. This, of course, immediately demeans both the monarchy and monarch. But

from a constitutional point of view, where may this lead? If there is ever any dispute with taxation bureaucrats, which must be regarded as inevitable, this surely places the Queen in an impossible position. Such a dispute can only be resolved in the courts. The courts being a function of the Crown, it is plainly ridiculous to suggest that the Queen should submit herself to the judgements of her own courts!

In Lord Beaverbrook's book "The Abdication of King Edward VIII", his editor, the historian A.J.P. Taylor, confirms that the King (or Queen) cannot be called to his own court. This immunity applies only to the King (or Queen). Any other member of the Royal Family can be summoned. It is plainly ludicrous to place the Queen in such a position.

**HISTORY OF THE CIVIL LIST:** In his autobiography, "A King's Story", Edward VIII provided the history of the civil list, from which the income of the Queen and Royal Family is drawn:

"The cost of this Establishment (Monarchy) is borne by moneys voted by Parliament under the Civil List Act... In early times the King's income was identical with the national revenues, except as regards defence: i.e. the King paid for the civil portion of the government as distinct from military expenditure. Hence the term Civil List. These expenses were defrayed from the revenues from Crown Lands and other hereditary sources.

"However, as the Government services increased with the growth of the population, the King's resources were subjected to an ever increasing strain; and the recurring deficits were covered by Parliamentary grants. Therefore, on the accession of George III in 1760, Parliament took a tighter grip than ever on the Royal purse. In return for a fixed Civil List of 800,000 pounds, the King surrendered his claim upon the revenues of Crown Lands in England and Wales, and later Ireland, while still holding the Crown Lands in Scotland. Finally, William IV had to part with most of the Scottish Crown Lands. By Queen Victoria's time the Crown had divested itself of responsibility for all Government services, and Parliament had instituted the practice of supporting the Monarchy by means of a fixed annual payment under the Civil List Act.

"In the constitutional sense the Civil List might be regarded as something of a bargain on Parliament's part in return for the relinquishment by the King of the hereditary revenues of Crown Lands. Indeed, one of my first acts after my succession in 1936 was to send a message to Parliament formally surrendering to the State these hereditary revenues, and placing myself, as the phrase goes, at the disposal of the House of Commons..."

**WEAKENING THE CROWN:** It appears that the Queen feels obliged to further place herself at the disposal of the Parliament by submitting to tax. But if the income from the Crown Lands, which must now be considerable, is a hereditary right, what might be Charles' position were he to succeed? Presumably he could claim the hereditary rights, but

a constitutional nightmare may result. Each additional impost on the independence of the Crown or Monarch is another hammer-blow to the stability of constitutional monarchy, and should be stoutly resisted. It is clearly unjust that any consideration be given to taxing the Queen.

**MEDIA RELEASE AND ACTION UPDATE FROM CONCERNED CITIZENS OF INVERELL, N.S.W.:**

"The recent High Court ruling upholds barrister George Turner's long stated assertions that a large number of politicians are sitting in Parliament illegally. The fact that he brought this matter to the attention of the Governor-General and the Federal Police some years ago and their refusal to act has ramifications that can only be guessed.

"The decision by the High Court is binding, not subject to appeal, and the Federal politicians must abide by it."

"Broadly speaking, most of the laws passed through the Parliament in the last few years could be found to be null and void.

"Covenants entered into with the United Nations that have brought in World Heritage nonsense, as well as a mess of other obnoxious laws, could be thrown out.

"This matter is the greatest opportunity the Freedom Movement has ever had to get sanity back into Australia.

"Contact your local Federal M.P., or Senator, and ask for the '1975 Common Informers Parliamentary Disqualification Act'.

"This Act was rushed through during the Senator Webster affair.

"If they stonewall you, and they will, be specific and quote the 'House of Representatives Hansard, 16th April, 1975, pages 1661-1662'.

"On page 10 of Weekend Australian 28th-29th November, 1992, Professor Blackshield says the public could use the 1975 law that allows them to sue people who sit in Parliament under false pretenses.

"Concerned Australians have been eating crow from their politicians for a long time.

"Point out these facts to your local Member, and demand to know what they personally are going to do about it - NOW."

"Time is very short. Hit them hard before they crawl away.

"A detailed legal assessment will follow as soon as it can be prepared.

"Spread this message far and wide. We can win this one."

Issued by Concerned Citizens of Inverell, N.S.W.

Further information from George Turner, (067) 25 6486.

---

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights, 145 Russell Street, Melbourne. Subscription \$30 p.a.  
Telephone: (03) 650 9749 Fax: (03) 650 9368