



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance —

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.29, No.40

October 15th, 1993

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "...I speak here tonight as an independent with no connection with your organisation. I speak as an individual and address each of you as individual Australians. I defy the smearers who will attempt to misrepresent my motives and politics. I want to emphasise that there is a Member of Parliament with an integrated set of policies which address our problems. Even though a corporate state is developing in Australia, there is hope in working through the democratic system."

- Mr. Graeme Campbell, M.H.R., in address to League of Rights National Seminar, October 2nd, 1993.

THE BUDGET AND THE CONSTITUTION: Those who have taken the trouble to read the Australian Constitution know that the Commonwealth Parliament consists of the House of Representatives, the Senate and the Crown. The powers of the Senate are clearly outlined. It has the power to seek to veto or to modify any legislation passed by the House of Representatives. But judging by the wild accusations being made by Prime Minister Keating and his associates, the Senate is acting, if not unconstitutionally, then "irresponsibly", to quote Senator Gareth Evans. The Government has made it clear that its proposed increases in taxation are designed primarily to reduce the deficit over a four year period. Senators opposing the Government's proposals are being subjected to dire warnings about what will happen to Australia's "international credit rating". One commentator has said that unless the Senate does as demanded by Prime Minister Keating international investors might not lend Australia any more money! In our opinion, this would be a good thing; it might even force the Federal politicians to consider using their constitutional powers to provide adequate new money for required Australian activities.

As the controversy rages about what the Senators are doing, it is instructive to note that both the Government and the Coalition are quoting what has happened in the past to justify their current stance. What emerges is that all governments, including the Menzies Government, chaffed under the restraints imposed upon them by a Senate they did not control. Back in 1981 Senator Gareth Evans and Finance Minister Willis opposed the Fraser Government's Sales Tax measures, claiming they were "regressive" and lacked electoral mandate. Faced

with these statements, and others, the best that Prime Minister Keating and his colleagues could weakly say was that "the circumstances were different". Instead of using colourful language like "economic vandalism", the Keating Government should face the reality that the Senate is a part of the constitutional government of Australia, and that it has as much claim to represent the Australian people as does the Government.

We hasten to say that the Senators blocking some of the Keating Government's tax proposals have offered little constructive material concerning alternative financial policies. But Australians should be grateful that they have a Constitution which ensures that there is some division of power. This Constitution must be protected at all costs.

RHODESIA, SOUTH AFRICA ... AUSTRALIA by David Thompson:

It is ironic to reflect that Mr. Keating's acute political pain over his serious mishandling of the Mabo/Aboriginal issue has been intensified by the existence of 'international obligations' entered into by the Commonwealth, reflected in such legislation as the Racial Discrimination Act 1975. It is this Act that prevents him from modifying some of the worst aspects of the High Court's Mabo decision; even Mr. Coss is demanding that the Racial Discrimination Act be temporarily suspended to deal with the issue of Native Title. It has been extremely embarrassing to Keating, and a source of enormous tension within the A.L.P., that the Prime Minister finds himself in such a dilemma, where he is forced to concede Premier Richard Court's point that as much as 80 percent of W.A. might be open to claims.

The most astute, articulate and determined Aboriginal leader yet to emerge, Mr. Noel Pearson of the Cape York Land Council, has seized upon Keating's dilemma, and is effectively using the Racial Discrimination Act as a stick with which to beat Keating, the Government, and European Australia. Pearson made a highly sophisticated appeal to the A.L.P. to honour "international obligations", citing former Attorney-General and former Justice of the High Court, Lionel Murphy, who originated the anti-discrimination law in support of Aborigines.

A REVOLUTIONARY FORCE: Many within the A.L.P. feel wounded that the "Aborigines" seem ungrateful for all that Keating and Labor have tried to do on their behalf. Even Keating himself seems genuinely puzzled at the inflexibility of the "Aboriginal" demands. It appears that nothing has been learned from the lessons of Rhodesia and South Africa, where each European concession to extreme demands was met with further demands, until Rhodesia was destroyed. South Africa is on the brink of a similar condition, with civil war beginning to seem inevitable.

The truth is that the do-gooders and liberals involved in the whole negotiating process have not yet realised that they are not really dealing with "the Aborigines" but with a dedicated revolutionary force, which does not appear to have the genuine interests of the Aboriginal people at heart. Rather, this force seeks to isolate the Aboriginal

people, and set them apart as a separate, distinct entity, with whom Australia must negotiate for reconciliation.

Comments last week by Mr. Galarrwuy Yunupingu, of the Northern Land Council, are very significant. He said Aborigines were politically superior to white people because they were owners of the land. He believes that the 1967 referendum formalising Aboriginal citizenship had been a great mistake, and had been forced upon the "Aboriginal nation". "Aboriginal people would have been much better off today, in the light of the Mabo decision, if that referendum had not happened," he said (The Australian, 7/10/93). "Aboriginal people have never wanted to be equal with the white people of Australia." Yunupingu claimed that Aborigines were really a separate nation, living under a temporary and foreign common law. He sees the Mabo decision as confirming that Aborigines are the "landlords and the sovereign power of Australia".

"RECONCILIATION" IMPOSSIBLE: Mr. Paul Keating has found, to his cost, that the conditions placed upon 'reconciliation' by the "Aboriginal" leaders are continually expanded. What is the 'bottom line'? It is nothing less than separate sovereign national status for Aborigines. The whole Aboriginal issue has changed subtly but dramatically, with the emergence of such leaders as Mr. Noel Pearson. It is no longer an attempt to provide assistance to disadvantaged Australians, but has developed into what Mr. Graeme Campbell calls an "Aboriginal industry". The truth is that those with whom Keating has been negotiating are a genuine revolutionary force, and as one Aboriginal lawyer has claimed, do not represent the wider "Aboriginal community". Ms. Lorraine Liddle asks of the Aboriginal "leaders", "who says they talk on behalf of anybody?" Even Aboriginal rights activist Rosalie Kunoth-Monks says the majority of Aborigines "would prefer to have three square meals a day and have their traditional land handed back to them, not so much treaties, separate governments and sovereignty ...". Perhaps even within the Aboriginal industry the determination of the radicals to use the Aboriginal people as cannon fodder for a revolutionary coup is having an unsettling effect.

If "leaders" such as Yunupingu prevail, the Aborigines will be kept out of mainstream Australia, and used as a political weapon to destroy the whole nation. Apartheid is the Africaner word for "separate development". Noel Pearson clarifies the programme, when he says Aboriginal people would use "whatever means are available to them at the time to assert their basic human rights", including Olympic protests, if the Racial Discrimination Act is infringed.

ABORIGINAL HERITAGE: It has become politically correct to emphasise any aspect of Aboriginal heritage as an article of faith. Evonne Goolagong Cawley, who enchanted millions around the world with her tennis skills, has now embarked upon a search of her Aboriginal heritage. Mrs. Cawley has been an excellent ambassador for Australia, and is entitled to a full appreciation of her heritage, but it is

reliably reported that three-quarters of her own heritage is European. While Aboriginal heritage is being emphasised, the European heritage, which provided previously undreamed of opportunities for Aboriginal people and part Aboriginal people like Mrs. Cawley, is rapidly being dismantled. If heritage is important, then all heritage is important, including that of the vast majority of Australians; a heritage of security, stability an opportunity that is the legacy of common law and the Westminster system. "Aboriginal" activists should be reminded about this, as they campaign to destroy the basis for social and political stability in a once-free Australia. The lessons of Africa loom larger every day.

COLLEEN McCULLOUGH DERIDES AUSTRALIAN REPUBLICANISM: In The Australian (October 11th), Australian best-selling writer, Colleen McCullough, is reported as stating that the Westminster system of government has served Australia well, and the high cost of republicanism not justified. She added that there is widespread ignorance of the nature of republics and most certainly Paul Keating shares this ignorance.

Colleen McCullough has published three Roman novels, and she expresses a view which has more than once crossed our own minds; viz... "One would have to say, as a cynical political onlooker, the whole object of the (republican) exercise is that Mr. Keating wants to be the first president"...

Would Paul Keating like to go down in (Australian) history as the "father of the Australian republic"..... What do you think?

Colleen McCullough deplores (and rightly so) the divisive quality the "debate" is taking: the revival of Irish against English/Catholics v. Protestants. This should be dying.

BASIC FUND INSPIRATION: The Basic Fund has moved to nearly \$22,000. Once again we must say how inspired we are by the support coming from the hard pressed rural community. It is this community which offers real hope for a regenerated Australia. The target is \$60,000 and there is a long way to go. Watch for announcements concerning exciting new projects in the near future.

"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