



A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.37, No.42

November 2nd, 2001

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "The point I want to impress upon you... is that we are having a policy imposed upon us, and that policy is the cause of our troubles. Any discussion as to how that policy shall be administered, whether by a dictatorship, so-called democracy, Fascism, Bolshevism, Nazi-ism, or otherwise, is merely irrelevant.

This policy, which is practically identical everywhere... is the gospel of work... I propose to bring as forcibly as possible to your attention that it is not the prime object of existence to find employment. I have no intention of being dogmatic as to what is the prime object of existence, but I am entirely confident that it is not comprised in the endless pursuit of turning this originally very beautiful world into slag-heaps, blast furnaces, guns and battleships...

Employment as an end in itself is a concerted policy to be found in practically every country. It is an international policy, and it proceeds from the great international power in the world - the power of finance. It is conscious, and it is sustained by every argument and force at the disposal of that great international power, because it is the means by which mankind is kept in continual, if concealed slavery."

– C.H. Douglas, Security: Institutional and Personal 1937

THE PHONY, CHOICELESS, DISHONEST ELECTION by Jeremy Lee:

Prime Minister Howard has been forced to turn his attention away from the 'khaki' election (where Beazley's policies are identical to his) to domestic issues (where Beazley's policies are virtually identical, with minor variations as to where the bribes should be directed).

As far as the major parties are concerned, this is a choice between 'cheese' and 'cheese'. Both are advocates of the discredited globalist agenda. Both are advocates of the GST (Labor pretends it isn't, but is not going to abolish it). Both are insistent they can manage the present disastrous situation in Australia better than the other. Both worship at the shrine of the great god Budget Surplus, which means they should not spend all the tax they rip out of the Australian pocket, but keep some to make the books "look better".

The 'Great Debate' was a misnomer – little more than an egotistical clash of personalities which did little to enlighten the electorate, or provide a really genuine change of direction.

IN THIS ISSUE: • *The Phony, Choiceless, Dishonest Election* • *Real Policies Needed* • *The Price of Compulsory Competition* • *The One Unanswered Question* • *Hendy Cowan, National Party, Sledges One Nation*

"ON TARGET"

November 2nd, 2001

Page 1 (165)

What is the best we can hope for? Mainly, that whoever ends up 'controlling' the House of Representatives will not 'control' the Senate. Indeed, that is to say that any idea of 'controlling' either House is a denial of the freedom for Members and Senators to say and vote as they think in the Parliament in a way which should reflect the desires of the Australian electors. We have slipped so far from the democratic ideal, safeguarded by a revered constitution, that we are in danger of accepting the premises on which our tattered system now hang.

As if personalities are the only issue in this election, the ABC this time is producing its own "Australian Story" on the personal lives of Howard, Beazley and their respective families. Who really sees any significance in whether Howard's family come into the house in "mucky" shoes?

The Opinion Polls, already varying widely from each other, are given much more attention than the voters in each electorate. The most they tell us is which political nag has its nose in front, and where, if you see this as a betting opportunity, you should put your money. If Liberals or Labor put a horse up for election in a safe seat – as the Romans did in days of old – it would probably get in. So far no horse has been identified, but plenty of donkeys.

As far as I'm aware, not one candidate has campaigned on the promise to run regular polls in his or her electorate, with the promise to vote in parliament according to the wishes expressed. Even those independents I have heard from have firm agendas of their own which they intend to pursue if elected.

But that is not what they're there for! They are to be called 'representatives' – which means they are to 're-present' what the voters in their electorate desire.

Peter Andren, currently the only independent in the Lower House, in an interview reported in *The Bulletin* (30/10/01) expressed an attitude shared by many ordinary voters:

".... The parties are becoming more and more distant from the grassroots. I'm absolutely passionate about people getting proper representation. But the first loyalty for members is party solidarity. You talk to the likes of [the ALP's] Daryl Melham. He's just horrified at his party's position on refugees but he's not allowed to debate any of this...."

Not only does he advocate true representation, but Andren has been hammering away at the absurdly hedonistic financial benefits that keep the consciences of party members well hidden from view:

".... Andren has launched an attack on the holy of holies: the Parliamentary Superannuation Scheme.... As he said in the House: 'MPs receive an effective employer contribution of 69% of salary. That compares with 8% for the wider community. It's a double standard that's indefensible and more than any other single issue, it's what is disconnecting the parliament from the people. It's also a system that rewards failure'"

Peter Andren has done more than talk about it. He's put forward his own private member's bill, seeking to peg back outrageous politicians' benefits. It was, naturally, defeated by the combined votes of all parties (funny how they can get together when they need to!) but his efforts have at least been an indicator to voters which may bear fruit later.

REAL POLICIES NEEDED: The real issues are being carefully screened from public view. For example, should a Prime Minister be able to commit Australian troops to an overseas war without a full debate in Parliament? Or, better still, a national referendum?

Should there be a mandatory declaration be all contestants of the percentage limit of the National Disposable Income to be taken in direct and indirect taxation?

Should there be a limit to the number of people employed in the Public Service?

Should government policies that run counter to the constitution be declared null and void by a non-political watchdog set up to carry out such a policy?

Should the GST, which we have now experienced for well over a year, be abolished?

Should the Australian people be allowed some say in the racial make-up of the country? Or do we continue to allow a small and unrepresentative group of social engineers to hog the agenda?

Should the people who pay taxes be allowed a more direct say in the areas their taxes are spent?

Should ballot papers contain a square for those who do not feel that existing candidates adequately represent their wishes? And should this vote be published in poll results?

Should voting be voluntary? Or compulsory? Likewise, should preferential voting be voluntary?

Should pensions no longer be subject to a means test?

Should the right of the people to veto unwanted legislation be included in the constitution?

Should interest rates for borrowers be variable at the whim of lenders?

Should there be a limit to the number of laws and regulations passed?

One can think of dozens of questions and issues on which electors should have a say that will have no place in the current election. And the parties intend to keep it that way.

THE PRICE OF COMPULSORY COMPETITION: A small article in *The Bulletin* (30/10/01) said it all: *"Deregulation of the dairy industry in NSW has led to lower prices for farmers and higher prices for consumers, a study has found. The research by the Dairy Deregulation Impact and Assessment Committee, set up by the NSW government and the dairy industry, found that the number of dairy farmers in NSW had dropped by 16% in 2000-01. The price paid to farmers fell from 53c. to 28c. per litre as the consumer price rose from \$1.16 to \$1.50."*

In other words, farmers pay almost a gallon of milk for a litre of petrol! This, naturally, has provided those political warriors the National Party with the issue they've been looking for all this time. They intend to "stand or fall" on the future of Australia's remaining family farms! Oh yeah?

THE ONE UNANSWERED QUESTION: As we have noted, the election has been dumbed down to a competition in bribes from the major parties as to where they will allocate the choice crumbs remaining from the tax-table. The choices are determined solely by where the most votes can be won, rather than by any justice or equity.

But this is only part of the equation. What about Australia's money supply? It was Meyer Rothschild who is reputed to have said, *"Permit me to issue a nation's money and I care not who makes its laws."*

In the three years since the last election, Australia's money supply has increased from \$335 billion (April 1998, Reserve Bank Bulletin for June 1998 – M3 figures) to \$430 billion (April 2001, Reserve Bank Bulletin for June 2001 – M3 figures).

Of these totals, the actual cash component – notes and coins – was \$21 billion in 1998, and 26 billion in 2001, approximately 5% of the total in each year.

Averaged out over the three year period, the Australian Money Supply (Cash and Credit) has increased by an average \$87 million per day!

All of which is lent into the system, at interest, by the banking system – in the form of millions of loans to public and private sectors alike: mortgages, business loans, loans for public works, car loans etc.

Isn't it time we had some sort of debate in Australia as to whether this is the best way of doing things? Who should create "new" money? What is the formula for deciding how much? Should it be credited into the economy, or continue as an ever-increasing interest-bearing debt? Does this way of doing things mean that Australia's internal debts are always bigger than the amount of money available for repayment of loans?

During the Great 1930s Depression we had a Royal Commission into this question. The final report confirmed that the Government had the power to issue money without interest, or even without the need for repayment. (Section 504)

The powers for this function are contained in Section 51 of the Constitution.

Isn't it possible that a re-arrangement of our money-creating process just might get Australia out of its poverty-and-debt cycle?

And why, in the never-ending analysis of taxation and election bribes, which clog our current affairs programmes, do we never get an intelligent discussion of this all-important start to the argument?

It couldn't be, could it, that there's some sort of vested interest in keeping it off the agenda?

HENDY COWAN, NATIONAL PARTY, SLEDGES ONE NATION by Betty Luks:

National Party WA Senate candidate Hendy Cowan would do well to reconsider the tactics he is using to drum up votes in the coming federal election. He has used an event "attended by 120 people from Chinese, Vietnamese, Taiwanese, Indian and Sri Lankan backgrounds" to sledge One Nation describing it as "the most divisive force on the social and political landscape

It seems his "main reason for running for the Senate was to deny it (One Nation) a voice in Canberra" – *The West Australian*, 25/10/01. I would have expected a candidate for the Senate would want to represent the interests of the whole State from whence he comes. Isn't his stand divisive?

It will not go down well with many West Australian voters to learn Mr. Cowan's Senate campaign is being backed by leading members of the Chinese Chamber of Commerce whilst at the same time he is publicly sledging One Nation candidates for being patriotic, wanting a say in the nation's politics and wanting an independent and sovereign nation.

In case Mr. Cowan hasn't noticed, many Australians have had enough of politicians sneering at and criticising them when they protest at their country being divided by political parties, United Nations treaties and the multicultural industry.

Mr. Cowan has obviously not been listening to the talk-back programmes where Australians have been having their say on these issues. What about the polling on the illegal refugees? Can't he understand the people are saying "enough is enough"?

Election comment authorised by Betty Luks, 145 Russell Street, Melbourne, 3000.

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights, 145 Russell St., Melbourne.

Postal Address: GPO Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001. Telephone: (03) 9650 9749, Fax: (03) 9650 9368.

Subscription \$40.00 p.a.