



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.39, No.46

November 28th, 2003

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"In the last analysis there are but two possible forms of social order – there are these two opposite and contradictory conceptions of the sanction of social law. The sanction, the force of law, is either outside of mankind or it is within... The idea that the will of the people could be the source of social law was born into the world with great travail. It was for ages difficult, even impossible, to conceive such an idea... But Christianity is the discovery of the infinite depth of the human will... The Church of the Middle Ages stood as a provisional plan of such a social system. In the midst of a world-order based upon an opposite principle – the principle of the external law – the Church wrought into concrete forms and the solid structure of institutions the democratic ideal... The Church had poured out its vital store into the lap of the nations. It had breathed out its very soul of liberty in the breath of the modern spirit."* – Charles Ferguson in *"The Affirmative Intellect"*, 1901

JUSTICE FOR ALL, BUT AT A PRICE by Jeremy Lee:

The controversy over the jailing of Pauline Hanson continues. There is now an inquiry into the role of the Director of Public Prosecutions in Queensland. The politicians are pointing fingers at the judges, as can be expected. But it is the law itself, for which the politicians are responsible, that deserves scrutiny. We made the point in a recent *New Times Survey* that political parties have ganged up on the basic principles of elections, to safeguard their own positions, and make life difficult for minor parties and independents. The Electoral Commission and the judiciary have to make sense of the convoluted mess made by the politicians.

The following article by John Carter in the New South Wales rural paper *The Land* (13/11/03) deserves thought and attention:

"Most people will be relieved that Pauline Hanson and One Nation co-founder David Ettridge are out of jail in Queensland.

Most felt uncomfortable as they saw them as political prisoners.

The contrary judicial pronouncements associated with this case should shake any thinking person. Increasingly, justice is seen to be bought. When the independence and credibility of the judiciary is seen to be suspect, we are on the road to anarchy.

Ms. Hanson was hounded by Terry Sharple's challenges (reportedly made with promises of funding from some politicians) before five different magistrates.

All dismissed the charges but a sixth took it up. How could a vendetta like this be allowed to continue in a civilized society?

IN THIS ISSUE: • Thought for the Week • Justice For All, But At A Price • Longer Term Effects • We're All Fabians Now

She was then pursued under criminal law with claims that she and Mr. Ettridge (David Oldfield, the third One Nation Director was not charged) had defrauded the Queensland Electoral Commission.

After District Court Judge, Justice Patsy Wolf, handed down her sentence, an official from the office of the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP) was overheard saying, 'We should never have pursued this.'

Justice Wolf's sentencing makes extraordinary reading.. She spoke of sympathy for Pauline Hanson working hard to return the money (she put her little farm up as security).

The judge acknowledged that neither had received personal gain from 'the offence' and that the taxpayer lost nothing. She then sentenced both to three years jail without parole.

Queensland's Chief Justice, Paul de Jersey, ruled that One Nation was eligible yet the Queensland Electoral Commission is now saying that it won't pay the \$500,000 back to One Nation!

There is inconsistency between electoral commissions. The Australian Electoral Commission paid One Nation more than \$3 million of the \$33 million 'payout' to all parties but is still to announce the results of its inquiry into federal Coalition heavyweight, Tony Abbott, and his \$100,000 Honesty in Politics Fund.

Justice de Jersey and Justice Margaret McMurdo, president of the Queensland Court of Appeal, were critical of the QDPP and the calibre of defence that the pair could afford.

The Law Council president is quoted as saying that an outcome should be a commitment by governments to reach better legal and funding agreements.

Justice McMurdo launched a strong attack on political pressure on the judiciary, attacking everybody from the Prime Minister down. She was correct but omitted the chief culprit (Queensland Premier Peter Beattie).

There are calls for a Royal Commission and for compensation but what Government will move to help its enemy?

The late Bob Santamaria predicted that Pauline Hanson would change Australian politics for better or worse.

Her 1996 maiden speech woke up Australia. The Government has implemented much of its content.

A Bill was sneaked through Federal Parliament in June, 1998, changing our electoral procedure to one of compulsory preferential voting, making it almost impossible for a party to win a seat if the Libs and ALP combined against it.

Destiny may yet ensure that Pauline Hanson changes our judicial as well as our political procedure."

LONGER TERM EFFECTS: One woman has emerged as a strong, vibrant, clear-headed spokesperson for the enormous danger to Australia's future. Professor Fiona Stanley, Australian of the Year, has spoken fearlessly of the enormous damage being done to young Australians without a traditional, loving family upbringing, and deprived of opportunities in the Australia of tomorrow. Quoted in the same edition of *The Weekend Australian*, she pointed out that a huge surge in welfare-dependent young people was threatening any future budget stability. The number of young people on the dole had doubled in the last three decades.

The result of a dearth of opportunities for young people was producing a blowout in attitudinal, behavioural and learning problems.

Professor Fiona Stanley is right. This week we have "schoolies' week" on the Gold Coast, where thousands of young school leavers gather to celebrate the end of their school careers. Underneath the *joie de vivre*, there is a hint of desperation. How many will get employment and a secure long-term future? The implicit message they are receiving from the politicians and trade unionists of this world is that most cannot expect anything more than "work-for-the-dole".

No robust young person would accept such a proposal – as a life choice.

Refusal to tackle the debt system will carry us into an even bigger crisis than the present one. This is an abundant world. It doesn't need so many human producers. The technological world is replacing work forces. Instead of welcoming what is really a major achievement, we are morally, intellectually and physically starving those who can't get a job; even though there is enough for everyone, whether they are employed or not.

WE'RE ALL FABIANS NOW by Phillip D. Butler:

It has always been the rallying call of the Liberal and National parties – and it would usually strike just the right note of fear in the hearts of the 'straying' conservative voters: "Those godless Socialists (i.e., Fabian-Socialist Labor) want to centralise more and more power over you."

But, it would be better for 'Victoria' and 'democracy', if we centralise power further: But the Liberals' recent annual talkfest in Shepparton must have put paid to any lingering hope the voters might have had the Lib/Nats were going to save them from those godless power-hungry centralisers.

Liberal member for South-West Coastal in the House of Assembly – and former Opposition Leader – Dr. Denis Naphine called for the abolition of the Legislative Council, Victoria's Upper House. ***Sunday Herald Sun***, 9/11/03.

He said: "I argue quite strongly that it would be better for Victoria and democracy to abolish the Legislative Council than to pursue this proposal (i.e., proportional representation) to create an unrepresentative house dominated by political hacks (i.e., independents and minority parties) who will be fighting for the No.1 and No.2 ticket on the ballot paper (i.e., the preference deals which all political parties do to further their own chances in the numbers game we now dignify by describing as part of the democratic process)."

Who can forget the last Federal Election and the collusion between all major political parties to place all *One Nation* and *Australia First* candidates last on their own "How to Vote" tickets?

Denis Naphine continued: "If we look at the situation when the Upper House was established in the 1850s ...it was a different era. It is more than 100 years since Federation and since 1901 we have seen a continual shift of power and responsibility to the federal government."

Quite right Denis! But this policy was actively pursued by all mainline political parties IN THEIR OWN PURSUIT OF FURTHER POWER – IT WAS NOT WHAT THE ELECTORS WANTED!

Dr. Naphine then went on to say – and thereby exposed the fact (as if we didn't already know) that the real agenda for the Liberals is to FURTHER CENTRALISE power, "(the) sound case to abolish the Legislative Council in Victoria and significantly reduce the number of politicians in this state...(including) the members of the Legislative Assembly... (will result in, the electors can) get local representation by local people who live in local areas."

Government by party dictatorship is the name of the game: The most telling was this: "Governments of the day should be put to the test when they are elected to govern, they should be allowed to get on with the job and be judged by the people every four years at election time."

In other words, when it comes to the wielding of power there should be no checks and no balances on these 'models of perfection and unsparing service' to their people!

Quite obviously the people of California believe in their right to bring their political representatives to account because it is enshrined in their State Constitution; as it is in the Constitutions of 15 of the other states of the USA. The people of California can petition for the recall of an elected representative

and he can be held accountable to the electorate even in mid-term. They recently used this *democratic mechanism* to oust their State Governor. They can also initiate referenda to abolish current legislation or introduce new legislation.

Shock, horror: Politicians like Naphine and his Fabian-Socialist fellow-travellers hate this idea of party politicians being held accountable by and to the *people*, that is *real* people, like you, like me, considered collectively. They hate the idea they should have to give local *representation* to local people who live in local areas.

Victorians should never forget: It was the Liberal and Country (now Nationals) parties using their numbers, who rammed through the legislation giving Parliament, not the People, the POWER to amend the State Constitution.

The people were not given any say – not even by referenda. The Lib/Nats reasoning was: Don't let the peasants have a say – they just may say NO! Every sporting club or association I have ever belonged to has a constitution – and it is the members of the club or association who have the final say. WHY IS THIS NOT THE CASE FOR OUR STATE'S CONSTITUTION?

Who remembers Jeff Kennett? In league with the Nationals, then LIBERAL premier Jeff Kennett sold out the Victorian people to the Fabians' agenda when he sacked all the councils in Victoria, and then brought in his 'commissars' and forced the state wide amalgamations of municipalities – he said for more 'efficiency'. Perhaps Dr. Naphine, (qualified veterinarian) member of the Kennett cabinet at the time, would like to survey the people of Victoria and ask them what they now think of the power-bloated centralised municipalities which they can judge by *experience*?

What about the Cain government and Kennett's words? In case memories are fading, it was in 1986 that the Cain Labor Government promoted the same program. It was stopped in the Upper House by a one-vote majority by the Lib/Nats opposition. At the time, the front page story in the *Bendigo Advertiser* (22/07/86) reported a stormy hearing of the Cain Government's Local Commission in the Eaglehawk Town Hall.

Jeff Kennett and other Liberal and National party colleagues attended that meeting and on the same front page of the *Bendigo Advertiser* a headline ran: "NO ALGAMATION WHILE I'M LEADER, KENNETT PROMISES". He stated: "... not one forced amalgamation will proceed in Victoria while I lead the Liberal Party."

This whole seedy story was published in a special 4-page brochure published by the ALR. Obtain your copy @ \$2.00 per copy posted from the Heritage Bookshop, Box 1052, GPO, Melbourne, 3001.

Another proposed step by this coalition of power-hungry centralisers is for the Upper House representative-members being stripped of their power to block supply, that is, their right (or power) to vote for or against Money Bills.

Victorians must exercise their own freedom: A suggestion is they send a letter of instruction to their own representative, freeing him from the rather erroneous belief he has been elected to Parliament to do just what the Party Whip wants. At the same time, the voter should insist he wants the retention of the Upper House of the Parliament of Victoria and yes, he does want to keep the powerful check on the power-hungry parties by retaining the right of his representative in the Upper House to vote for or against Money Bills.

It's a funny thing about this thing called 'freedom' – there are other aspects to it, they are called 'accountability' and 'responsibility'. Use it or lose it!