



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.46, No.27

July 18th, 2010

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *The death of local government by finance:* *The Shepparton News* has carried three articles on Local Government deserving close scrutiny: July 3rd, "Too small to work", July 5th, "Shortfall 'killing' councils" and July 6th, "Funding agitation".

When the Kennett Liberal Government came to office there were about 240 councils in Victoria and then Victorians had council amalgamations thrust upon them when arbitrary decisions were made to reduce the number of councils to 71. It was claimed that "economies of scale" would be beneficial and lead to more "cost effective" local government.

It is apparent from the *News* articles that for some councils this was an illusion and for the rest there has been a growth of bureaucracy and councillors have to do as they are told, see "Councillors are muzzled", *Weekend News*, June 19th 2010.

I believe there are few ratepayers and residents who could claim they are receiving better value for money today than they did 40 years ago. Why could this be so with increased technology and MBA's running the show?

From the article "Funding agitation", it refers to the Whelan Report and "it (the report) called for a new source of funding to ensure the councils had the resources they needed"... this is interesting for 'money' now comes into the equation!

Let us take Kirwans Bridge as an example. Do we have the know-how to replace the bridge? Do we have sufficient materials and manpower to construct a bridge? Do the people want a bridge? The answer to all three questions is an overwhelming YES... then why is it not possible? Leaving aside that is not a political priority with the major parties, then it is to be found in the realm of funding/finance, so why is what can be physically possible, not financially possible?

Money is a man-made instrument to facilitate the exchange of goods and services and it comes from a bank! It could be done with a Local Government Bank to provide finance for capital works and if councillors really believed in themselves they have the power to make this happen. Right now it matters little what councillors do to halt the continued slide into oblivion, as there will be no change unless inflation is brought to a halt.

It should also be noted that council rate rises, of whatever percentage, are 'compounding' on the last rate rise... how long can ratepayers sustain these imposts? I can assure you... if you continue to vote in all elections as you have done in the past, then nothing will change. – Louis Cook, Numurkah, Vic.

In this issue: • *Thought For The Week* • *It's A Battle Between Tony Rabbit & The Red Lizard*
• *Soviet Style Triumvirate In Canberra* • *Will Cabinet Government Return* • *Toxic Diversity And Law*

IT'S A BATTLE BETWEEN TONY RABBIT & THE RED LIZARD by James Reed: I had bought David Marr's *Power Trip: The Political Journey of Kevin Rudd* (Quarterly Essay, No.38, 2010) because here for the first time was an illuminating exposure of Rudd's anger, something the media had kept relatively quiet about. Why, there were Rudd's comments about the Chinese who refused to play ball on climate change doing strange things with rodents! But now I toss this book and my Rudd file into the trash can to joyfully increase my carbon emissions.

The lad next door hates rabbits and lizards. Tony Abbott, he calls "Tony Rabbit", which falls into his intellectually challenged group of hate objects. But particularly nasty creatures are "lizards". Julia Gillard, dyed-red haired feminist socialist, he calls "the Red Lizard" or just "Julia Lizard". "Mr. Reed", he said, "with that long neck, pointy nose and beady eyes and tilt of the head, she looks like one". "And she is just like all those old female teachers at school", he went on to say. I agreed.

Her assassination of Kevin Rudd was like a silent lizard devouring an unsuspecting insect, performed with true cold blood. And of course the lad is right about the teachers: all that our poor kids were told that day – all day – was what a historic moment this was etc., etc. What a victory it was for feminism etc., etc.

Gillard definitely involved in policy formation: Yet consider Julia Lizard's academy award acceptance speech. She said that she was acting to end Rudd because the party had lost its way. Yet she as Deputy Prime Minister was involved in the formulation of policy with Rudd. As Deputy PM the Red Lizard ran the schools building program that was a disaster. She also approved the \$2.24 billion insulation scheme with Rudd and despite her most recent holier than thou pronouncements on climate change, Rudd, with her agreement, dropped the emissions trading scheme. If Rudd is 100% guilty, she is 99% guilty. She agreed with Rudd's core philosophy and as a creature of the Left is in fact more radical than even Rudd. She said in previous weeks that she was loyal to Rudd and less likely to become PM than (1) going to Mars and (2) playing full forward for The Dogs. But she had to be testing the water all that time until the plot 'politically stab Rudd in back' was hatched because it defies belief to suppose that she was loyal up until Wednesday June 24, 2010.

The political assassination of Kevin Rudd is fitting for a man who was, to date, Australia's worst Prime Minister. What however is disturbing about his demise is the sheer evil of the Labor Party turning on one of its own who was merely reflecting what they all represent. All that was done was to use Julia Lizard as a circuit breaker, to hope that the novelty of a female prime minister will dilute the anger of 'the great unwashed'.

Write – 'REDUCE IMMIGRATION' on ballot papers: In the election to come, let us do what we can to unseat her and as many big figures as possible. Don't sit back on your hands doing nothing. Help independent candidates when you go for a walk, mail drop leaflets. Spread the idea of Denis McCormack's by writing "reduce immigration" on all ballot papers. (I favour "STOP IMMIGRATION NOW!") If you don't fight, then the elites will simply continue to swash you. Julia Lizard today, tomorrow will be our first Asian lesbian prime minister. Then will come the republic with a president specially created in some politically correct genetic deconstruction lab. Let's get to work.

SOVIET STYLE TRIUMVIRATE IN CANBERRA by John Brett: David Flint's column (below) draws our attention by one in the media about the rule of a foursome in Canberra. Note the predominance of the financial members of this foursome and the next step. It is strange that Christopher Pearson has made us aware of this situation and not the opposition – least of all my own "representative" somewhere in the precincts of parliament.

As no Australian Government has ever reversed the mechanisms leading to the centralisation of power we can safely presume, because of his silence, that the leader of the opposition is comfortable

with this change of mechanism. In fact he is probably considering the next step, which is our destiny in this world power structure where we have a soviet style triumvirate at the apex. This had its beginning in the days of the Roman Empire. The Governor General will not be protesting either, being educated in the same corporate organisations of triumvirates.

Appealing now to the 'Westminster system' for help, is akin to appealing to the Church for moral guidance. Like the Parliament at Westminster the great Cathedrals are the empty shells that once echoed a philosophy that was true and delivered us our freedom from the Triumvirate of Rome, but now harbouring the voice of the opposite philosophy, from which we escaped 2,000 years ago.

WILL CABINET GOVERNMENT RETURN? asks Professor David Flint: *An Opinion Column* from the National Convenor ACM. "Cabinet government was undermined in recent years, as the Prime Minister acknowledges. Although this is central to our constitutional system, the cabinet is not mentioned in the Constitution, only the Executive Council. Nor indeed is the office of prime minister. It was an indication of the desperation of the republican case in 1999 that these absences were used as a criticism of what was dismissed as a "horse and buggy" constitution.

As we have pointed out here, the Constitution was never intended to be a constitutional primer. It was a compact between the people of the States to form our indissoluble Federal Commonwealth under the Crown. The Constitution assumes the continuation of the Westminster system, which is underpinned by the requirements in the Constitution concerning proposed laws appropriating revenue or moneys, or imposing taxation.

Responsible government... The cabinet, consisting of the senior ministers of the Crown, is collectively responsible for the conduct of the government. The constitutional principle is that if the government loses the confidence of the House of Representatives it must resign.

Now our Australian cabinets are different from the US Cabinet. Our cabinet effectively governs, while the United States cabinet is advisory. There the executive power is vested in one person, the President.

The President is responsible to no one, not even Congress. No matter how poorly he performs, the President cannot be removed unless he is found guilty of a crime in a trial before the Senate on articles of impeachment approved by the House. The Australian system is more subtle. While the executive power of the Commonwealth is vested in the Queen and exercisable by the Governor-General, he or she is advised by the Federal Executive Council.

Important decisions are thus made in the cabinet, and given legal effect by the Governor-General acting on the advice of the Executive Council. (It would be a mistake to think the Governor-General is a rubber stamp – but that is another issue.)

Until the Rudd government, it was understood that cabinet submissions and related material generally had to go to the cabinet office in time for them to be circulated to everyone at least 10 days before the meeting. "The advantages of such an arrangement are obvious," declared Christopher Pearson in "Cabinet found governing a puzzle", *The Weekend Australian*, 3-4 July, 2010.

"There is far more effective scrutiny of contentious matters and plenty of time for ministers to confer with colleagues about anything problematical and to iron out problems before a measure is formally debated, or to ensure delay for further consideration. Everyone has a chance to reflect on the implications of submissions for their own department and for the government's overall priorities."

Cabinet government under Kevin Rudd... Christopher Pearson cites a "memorable" piece on the inner workings of the Rudd government. This was by Laura Tingle in *The Australian Financial Review* where she said:

"When ministers arrive for federal cabinet meetings, they find a folder waiting in their spots which they can look at but not take out of the room. Inside are decisions already taken by the cabinet's expenditure review committee and the ultimate power in the Rudd government, the Strategic Priorities and Budget Committee (SPBC)."

The SPBC was the "kitchen cabinet", "camarilla", "gang of four" or "politburo" made up of Kevin Rudd, his deputy Julia Gillard, Treasurer Wayne Swan and Finance Minister Lindsay Tanner. The initial justification for this was the GFC, the Global Financial Crisis, and an alleged need for urgent action. But it became a habit.

Christopher Pearson says it extended to health and hospitals policy, changes to the home insulation program, the national schools curriculum, the Henry tax review, the emissions trading scheme negotiations with Malcolm Turnbull, the dumping of the ETS and, last but not least, the replaced resource super-profits tax on mining.

According to Laura Tingle, "Ministers are expected to endorse the decisions without discussion, and usually they do. Most are flat out trying to determine whether decisions have an impact on their own portfolio, while attending to what is being discussed in cabinet."

One minister told her: "I really prefer if I'm down the list [of business to be discussed]. It gives me time to have a look at the submission." She makes it clear the minister was talking about submissions that he'd been given, sight unseen, to present to cabinet.

Christopher Pearson says that issuing papers to be read at the last minute – even as they're being considered – and not allowing their removal from the room is a crude tactic to prevent leaks. Its one certain outcome, he says, is dumbing down debate...

Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose. That is, "The more things change, the more things stay the same."

TOXIC DIVERSITY AND LAW by Ian Wilson LL.B: **Against the Lawyers series:** Dan Subotnik's "Toxic Diversity: Race, Gender and Law Talk in America" (New York University Press, New York and London 2005) is an excellent, much needed book. Subotnik argues that the race and gender industry – primarily a U.S. creation – is quick to criticise everything that white males do and say "while refusing to subject women and minorities to similar scrutiny." p.x) Chapter 1 of the book begins with a discussion of postmodern feminism and the law as represented by Mary Joe Frug (1941-1991). I became interested in this person so I decided to research her while reading Subotnik's book. I digress to discuss this.

Mary Joe Frug was a feminist professor of law at New England School of Law from 1981 to 1991. She was murdered on April 4, 1991, on the streets of Cambridge Massachusetts not far from her home. The crime has apparently never been solved. Internet searches reveal that it was probably a random killing, perhaps, ironically enough, by a person of colour. Many feminists believe, with no evidential backing, that Frug was killed because of her radical feminism. After her death in 1992 the Harvard Law Review (said to be one of the world's leading law journals, published her piece "A Postmodern Feminist Legal Manifesto (An Unfinished Draft)" (*Harvard Law Review*, vol. 105, 1991-1992, pp.1045-1075), with a series of commentary articles – Barbara Johnson, "The Postmodern in feminism", *Harvard Law Review*, vol.105, 1991-1992, pp.1076-1083; Ruth Colker, "The example of Lesbians: A Posthumous Reply to Professor Mary Joe Frug", *Harvard Law Review*, vol.105, 1991-1992, pp.1084-1095; Martha Minow, "Incomplete Correspondence: An Unsent Letter to Mary Joe Frug", *Harvard Law Review*, vol.105, 1991-1992, pp.1096-1105. These details are mentioned to show the space taken up in an allegedly world leading law journal by this matter. And what was said?

Continued in The Bulletin

"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 \$45.00 p.a.