

23rd. January, 2009

The Secretary,
 This Senate Standing Committee on Finance and Public Administration
 Parliament House.
CANBERRA, A.C.T. 2600

Facsimile (02) 6277 5809

Dear Sir,

Re:- Senate "Inquiry" into an Act for a Plebiscite for an Australian Republic.

I make this submission, not in any hope, much less expectation, of having any effect on the closed minds of your committee. In fact, the reason I make any submission at all is to place on the public record my disgust at the disgraceful abuse of process and blatant waste of public money of this so-called inquiry, and of the even greater abuse and waste of money which would be occasioned by the plebiscite proposed by the projected Act.

I say "so-called" advisedly because it is not an inquiry at all, but a culpable misuse of taxpayers' money to promote a divisive and treasonable campaign aimed at the overthrow of the Sovereign. What makes it more disgusting is that it is promoted by members of the Federal Parliament, who are required by s42 of the Constitution to take an oath of allegiance in the following terms. "I, (name), do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Her heirs and successors according to law. SO HELP ME GOD!"— So much for faithfulness and true allegiance.

Furthermore, ss.44-46 of the Constitution provide for the disqualification of members of Parliament and the sanctions to be applied for such disqualification. Among the reasons for disqualification are; being attainted of treason, and being under any acknowledgment of adherence to, or being a citizen of, a foreign power. The principal sanction is to be stripped of office. But we in this country are too soft (and in latter days too politically correct) in regard to our internal security; and we allow these despicable people to promote their treasonable activities with impunity.

It comes as no surprise to me of course, that these people take no regard of their oath ("a mere form of words" is their description), because I believe that decency and honesty are quite foreign to them, and they don't even know what honour means. Oath breaking seems to be a matter of form to them.

1. The Inquiry.

As far as I have been able to determine, no terms of reference or discussion paper have been promulgated by the Committee. Therefore we have only the draft bill and its proposer's explanatory memorandum to go by.

It is clear that this is yet another disingenuous attempt by the already discredited Republicans to reopen an issue that was emphatically decided by the Australian people nine years ago (see 2. below).

A plebiscite is an improper and tendentious method to use for such a serious and fundamental issue as a change to the Constitution, much less a change aimed at the whole basis of Australia's history. A plebiscite has only been used on three previous occasions, none of which impinged on the Constitution. They were presumably used to give the government of the day an excuse for an action it had already determined upon. It is worthy of note that the first two such plebiscites (on the subject of conscription during the First World War) were defeated.

Whether or not voting is compulsory, a plebiscite cannot attract the serious attention that a referendum should and does. This, of itself, would tend to skew the result.

The Bill makes it clear that the proponents of a republic intend to use the discredited methodology of a plebiscite (or more likely a series of plebiscites, with the inevitable trick questions) as part of their brain washing campaign. A plebiscite is a completely inappropriate process for a question of this kind; even if the question itself was legitimate.

History has shown that the only legitimate way of introducing a republic is by revolution; which of course is the way the vast majority of republics have been established - with the consequent bloodshed and loss of life.

If there were a genuine desire by the Australian people for such a complete change in our system of government, it would manifest itself by an overwhelming demand from the vast majority of the population. Instead, it comes from a vocal minority with access to large sums of money and free propaganda, which enables it to insinuate its lies to the wider community; and, for a time, to convert some of them (the more gullible) to its views.

Apart from anything else his estimate of \$10.5 million for the cost of the plebiscite clearly takes no account of labour and material costs, not to mention the enormous costs of promoting and fighting the question.

2. The 1999 Referendum.

Let us consider some facts rather than the self serving assertions of the republicans.

- (iii) 54.87 % voted NO, (45.13 % voted yes). That is to say that 21.6 % more people voted NO than voted yes.

- (iv) 106 federal electorates voted NO, while only 42 voted yes. In electoral terms this would have been the greatest landslide in electoral history. A Prime Minister with that majority could well feel that he held the office for life.
- (iii) Every state and territory, with the exception of the A.C.T. voted NO. Perhaps one could draw the conclusion that the cloud cuckoo land of the A.C.T., heavily populated as it is with public servants, academics, hangers-on of politicians and the media, would be predisposed to vote for such an outdated and discredited form of government.
- (iv) Analysis of the voting pattern in the referendum shows quite clearly that those electorates voting yes were Liberal electorates with a high proportion of "yuppie" (to use the vernacular) residents, and Labour electorates in hard core extreme left areas. The former types (being self styled intellectuals) are more gullible and hence susceptible to the lies and half truths of republican propaganda; while the extreme left would of course vote against any established system. Real Labour and Liberal electorates and all National electorates voted NO.
- (v) In regard to the canard that the referendum was lost due to the vote no republicans, it has to be remembered that Beasley, the then leader of the opposition (five incumbents ago), together with other leading Labour and republican figures urged them to vote yes on the basis that "the sort of republic we want can be decided after winning the referendum".

Furthermore, the NO campaign, under the influence of the vote no republicans was, to say the least, poorly conceived. For example, the stupid slogan "If you want to vote for a President vote NO" must have cost the NO vote dearly. I, myself, had dozens of people ask me "does that mean we have to vote yes?"

- (vi) Finally, and significantly, millions of dollars were poured into the YES campaign by big business - and foreign owned big business. Recent events have shown just how corrupt big business can be; and clearly, big business sees that corrupt practices are more easily carried on in a republic. Yet, despite the overwhelming financial advantage of the YES campaign and the lies and distortions committed by that campaign, the result, as we have seen, was its resounding defeat.

3. The Advantages of Our Present Constitutional Arrangements.

(i) Our present system of government, a Constitutional Monarchy, is the envy of the world. Since Federation, more than a hundred years ago, and indeed even before then, Australia has been the most stable country in the world. Even the excesses of the Whitlam, Hawke and Keating governments, and the futility of the Fraser government have not been able to destabilise the Commonwealth. For that matter, even the treasonable activities of the republicans, aided and abetted by their adherents in the venal media have not been able to do so.

(ii) On a worldwide basis constitutional monarchies repeatedly and continually prove to be the best form of government.

For example the United Nations from time to time publishes a list of its member states in order of their level of "human development", based on such factors as life expectancy, educational achievement, income etc. In other words, in order of the best places in which to live. Invariably, at least eight of the top ten are constitutional monarchies. In 1999 for example (the year of the referendum), the only republics in the top 10 were Iceland and the United States (and look what has happened to them just recently!), and of the eight monarchies three, Great Britain Canada and Australia, were British Constitutional Monarchies. The only monarchies outside the top 20 are the Arab absolute monarchies and some, but not all, of the small African monarchies. It goes without saying that the worst places in which to live are all republics.

Again, in 1998 the Berlin based organisation *Transparency International* published a list of countries in order of their perceived corruption. The four least corrupt countries were constitutional monarchies, all the monarchies in the United Nations top 20 were in the least corrupt top 20; and of course the most corrupt countries were republics.

If that is not sufficient, researchers at Harvard and the University of Chicago conducted a survey which identified the world's best and worst Governments, based on such criteria as efficiency and levels of freedom. The top seven, New Zealand, Canada, Great Britain, Australia, Denmark, Sweden and Norway are constitutional monarchies. Again, the worst are republics.

(iii) The Queen, as the personification of the Crown, represents the *people* of Australia. This is the crux of Constitutional Monarchy, the Crown is there to protect the people from rogue politicians. This was proved in November 1975; and it was the Governor-General, in his own right and representing the Crown, who acted to protect the people by giving the people their right to decide the issue; which Whitlam was trying to prevent. Decide it they did!

(iv) Furthermore it is made very clear by ss.2, 61 and 62 of the Constitution that the Governor-General's position is an independent one. His powers are subject to the Constitution and are Vice-Regal. The Constitution confers its powers on the Governor-General in his own right; and not as a surrogate, delegate or representative of the Sovereign.

4. Who are the republicans?

It would be interesting to classify the sorts of people who continue to promote a form of government which is redolent of mid-19th century revolution and disenchantment. As I said earlier the vast majority of republics are the result of revolution, or have been established by force majeure after defeat in war. Very few if any, and certainly none that I know of, have resulted from a stealthy campaign of lies and innuendo carried on by vested interests both inside and outside the country. External enemies are relatively easy to cope with in this sort of situation; it is the enemy within, as Cicero said, that is the real danger. Let us examine some of them.

(a) The paranoid Britain haters. These form the intransigent core of the republican movement. For some of them their hatred has ethnic origins, for others it is of a radical left-wing ideological origin, and for others yet again it is simple envy.

They vent the spleen of their nasty little minds on anything British, but particularly on the Royal Family. These cowardly attacks are made in the knowledge that

the Royal Family does not engage in actions for defamation. In these despicable activities they are aided and abetted by the vernal media; in fact the media is very often the initiator of such disgraceful activities.

Some of them have come to this country to escape from conditions in their country of origin, a republic. All of them, whatever their (or their parents or grandparents) other reasons for coming to Australia, have come to enjoy the freedom and opportunities offered here. What they don't realise, or prefer to forget, is that this freedom and these opportunities are the fruit of centuries of development of British legal, constitutional and political institutions. Our Australian Constitutional Monarchy and system of responsible government based on democratically elected representation is a direct beneficiary of those institutions. Yet these people, and the ideological left, want to throw all this away for a demonstrably less satisfactory form of government, and to make us accept it on their say so. These people are beneath contempt.

The envious are even more pitiful. These are the ones who force their children into shirts labelled "I can be President when I grow up". It is the parents who need to grow up; they have a flaw in their character and a mental aberration which prohibits them from seeing their own limitations. As a result they delude themselves into thinking that by eliminating the monarchy, they (or presumably their children) could become "the highest in the land". Poor souls, more to be pitied than censured.

(b) The Chattering Classes. These include the "politically correct" self styled intelligentsia, academics (always from the soft disciplines), journalists, the "yuppies", the "greecies", the feminists, the multi-culturalists, the animal libbers, the global warmers, etc etc.

For the most part, these people are so intent on their own self-importance and "correctness" that they will accept anything that panders to their self-esteem. This was amply demonstrated by the propaganda for the YES case in the 1999 referendum; and by the reaction of the defeated republicans who, as part of their puerile response to the defeat, said that "Australians are stupid". The chattering classes were persuaded, and persuaded themselves, that republicanism was the fashionable and politically correct thing. It is interesting to reflect that they were the only ones to be so persuaded. If they weren't so contemptible they'd be laughable.

(c) Big Business. As mention above most big business, both domestic and foreign, contributed countless millions to the YES campaign. To imagine that this was in any way disinterested is absurd. It was an investment. Big business knows that it can "get away" with more in a republic than under our system of government. No further evidence of this is needed than to observe and analyse what goes on in the United States. "What's good for General Motors is good for the USA."

One of the biggest "investors" was that loyal ex- Australian Rupert Murdoch who renounced his Australian citizenship to further his business interests in the US.

Big business is not interested in "the people" except as a source of income; its sole interest is profit (and the personal incomes of the directors and senior executives). Equally, big business regards government simply as another means to its end of making profit. Big business is to be feared as well as despised.

(d) The "we want to be independent and have of one of us as head of state" brigade. These should of course be included in subsection (e) below, and in any case can be found in all categories of republicans. Nevertheless, it is worth putting their ridiculous arguments to rest.

In regard to the first of their cries; Australia has been independent in fact since Federation, for example she declared war as an independent sovereign state in 1914. She became technically (or legally if you want to put it that way) independent in the 1930s. By the Royal Style and Titles Act of 1953 the Queen became Queen of Australia. Australia could never be more independent and sovereign than she is now.

As to the second, the Governor-General (who is "head of state") has been an Australian since Lord Casey's appointment more than a generation ago.

(e) The Lunatic Fringe. Then there are the other republicans, many of whom of course fit into one or other of the above categories, who have an air of unreality about them reminiscent of Alice in Wonderland.

(i) The Heathrow Republicans. Those who became republicans because they had to go through customs at Heathrow with the "the Argentines the Portuguese and the Greeks", and not as privileged citizens of the British Commonwealth. They conveniently forget that it was the Hawke government which agreed with the governments of Great Britain and Canada that they would each regard the others' citizens as aliens. So because they don't get special treatment at Heathrow they become Republicans!

(ii) Anthony Mason, former Chief Justice of the High Court of Australia, in 1997 declared that he had been a republican since 1933 when, at the age of eight, he had been incensed by the "bodyline Tests". A closet republican for 65 years!

HAROLD LAHWOOD to thank for Mason being a republican.

(iii) Al Grassby, a Minister of the Crown in the Whitlam Labour government; said that the monarchy was responsible for the recession of the late 1980s, for the million Australians out of work, for the business excesses of that period and for the exodus of our top scientists! (Of course, what he did not say was that that was the time of "the world's greatest treasurer" Paul Keating, and Prime Minister Bob Hawke.)

(iv) Mrs. Janet Holmes a Court /

in 1998 told a delegation from the British Chamber of Commerce that she wanted a new flag and a new constitution because an Asian Cabinet Minister had told her that his country would help the Australian in their struggle for independence from Britain!

(v) Richard Butler

said that we should become a republic because, amongst other things, taxi drivers in Manila and New York don't understand our constitution!

(vi) Richard Woolcott, former head of the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, thinks that our Constitution should be altered simply because he found difficulty in explaining it to foreigners. In this he is apparently representative of a number of other diplomats and trade representatives. If these people can't explain and defend our present system of government they should get off its payroll. * *

(vii) Mrs Sallyanne Atkinson, former Lord Mayor of Brisbane and former Australian Trade Commissioner to France, said that she was a republican because she found the French confused by the fact that the Queen of England was also the Queen of Australia! That is not the only thing the French are confused about. (For a start, the Queen is not the Queen of England but the Queen of Britain - or more precisely the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.) The French, after their bloody revolution of 1789 have had the Terror, an Empire, the restoration of the Monarchy, a Second Empire, Republic's 1,2,3 and 4, the Vichy collaboration with the Nazis and now the Fifth Republic! Mrs Atkinson's time would have been better spent teaching the French something of the stability, freedom and absence of violence of our Constitutional Monarchy and the Westminster system of government.

(viii) Peter Collins, a former senior Liberal Minister of the Crown in New South Wales, said he was a republican because he thought that the ultimate decision-making process for Australia rested with the "foreign" British government. This is utter nonsense and ceased to be the case years before he was born.

(ix) Paul Kelly, former editor in chief of the Australian newspaper, let the cat out of the bag when he said that the media supported a republic because it was news, and news is the lifeblood of the media. In other words it doesn't matter whether it is good or bad as long as it sells newspapers. But then of course the media is big business; and who owns the Australian?

5. The people don't count in a republic.

(a) As I mentioned earlier, in the constitutional crisis of 1975 the Governor-General, in the face of Whitlam's attempt to defy the constitution, in effect referred the matter to the people for decision. Of course he had to go about it in the proper constitutional way, but the practical effect was to call an election and let the people declare their decision through the ballot box. All of this took place as a result of the Crown; through the Governor-General, on his sole decision and using the powers vested in him by the Constitution; giving the people their right to make the decision.

(b) In the Republic of India on the other hand, in that same year of 1975 the Prime Minister, Indira Gandhi, had a very similar situation to that which faced Whitlam. What did she do? Having the President in her pocket, she had Parliament prorogued, half the opposition including its leader thrown into gaol, and governed without an opposition for some time. Having had the situation settled to her satisfaction, she

arranged for elections to be held at an opportune time. In this whole process the *people of India* did not get a look in, much less were they consulted.

(c) In the Republic of the USA, President Clinton, facing a Congress controlled by the opposite side of politics, was refused supply. As a result, the process of government suffered an hiatus, all federal employees (including the armed services) went without pay for some considerable time, until a deal of some description was settled between the President and the Congress. Again, at no stage were the people of the United States consulted, much less were they given the opportunity to make a decision between the two warring factions.

In a republic the politicians can and do ride roughshod over the people. In a Constitutional Monarchy the Crown protects the people from rogue politicians.

6. Legality.

Typically, in this slipshod proposed Bill and Explanatory Memorandum, Clause 6 of the proposed Bill is vague. It cites the Referendum (Machinery Provisions) Act 1984 - which citation itself is of dubious legality - but worse, it talks about "such *modifications* as are necessary." Modifications which will no doubt be as tendentious and disingenuous as the Bill itself. In other words, this Bill, if enacted, will give the government a free hand to manipulate the process, no doubt in a manner designed to achieve the result it wants.

7. Epilogue.

After 13 years of intensive propaganda, almost blanket media promotion, nearly \$200 million of taxpayers money wasted on conventions and a referendum, not to mention the millions subscribed by big business, the republicans still don't know what they want - except of course to get rid of the Crown. Presumably your committee hopes that by holding a plebiscite (or a series of plebiscites) some fools might be persuaded to go along with their proposals. The whole process, at a conservative estimate, would cost in excess of \$500 million. In addition, and quite apart from all the other reasons for *not* having a republic, the cost of establishing a republic would run into tens of billions. Then of course, there would be the cost of keeping a President in the style to which he would want to become accustomed. It is worthy of note, for example, that Mandela had a personal staff of 900.

Your committee may not like what I have written, and that is their privilege. I nevertheless wish to give evidence at the public hearings which I understand are to be held. Would you please advise me of the venues and dates of these hearings so that I might in turn advise you of the hearing I wish to attend.

Yours faithfully