

ARE YOU UNDECIDED?

Our fellow Australian "republicans" want to "get rid of the Queen". But if in "getting rid of the Queen, we also "get rid of a democratic system of governance" - The Westminster System - proven over 98 years to have given us the best form of government and lifestyle in the world, undisputedly the envy of the world, why should we vote to remove it?

Before answering, please ask yourself:

"What do we replace it with?"

Well, the February 1998 Convention answered that, 'sort of', because the model it produced:

- was not the model 70- 80% of Australians want, viz., popular election of a President model;
- was voted for by only a MINORITY (the Keating/Turnbull ARM group) which represents less than 20% of the Australian electorate at large, and

HERE IS THE MOST IMPORTANT PART: -

- Is a model now totally discredited by Australia's top REPUBLICAN Constitutional lawyers of integrity, repute and expertise (and by non-republican experts) UNANIMOUSLY?

Examples: - 'FLAWED. 'UNWORKABLE', 'FUTILE'“, 'INCOMPLETE'“, 'VITAL STRUCTURAL WEAKNESS'. There are over 50 such criticisms, mainly by reputable republicans criticising the minority Keating/Turnbull compromise model we must vote on.

This catalogue of criticisms comes from the ONLY competent commentary on the Convention, and the Model it produced The UNSW Law Journal Forum Vol 4 No 2 June 1998. To obtain a copy, phone 02 9385 7237 - fax 02 9385 1175 or E-mail: Law.Journal@unsw.edu.au and a copy will be sent with an invoice for \$10. A must for anyone seeking to make an INFORMED and responsible vote at the referendum.

There are two essentials in considering this matter:

- 1) Obtain a copy of the Model we must vote on, available free of charge, by phoning 02 6271 5534. It is called 'The Communique'. (can also be downloaded free of charge from:
<http://qld.independent.north.net.au/republic.html>)
- 2) Obtain a copy of UNSW Law Journal Forum, now available free of charge, from their website located at:
<http://www.law.unsw.edu.au/unswlj/thematic/index.html>

The following notable quotes must also be considered:

- The Hon. Richard McGarvie, AC, Labor Party Member 1949-1970, Victorian Supreme Court Judge and former Governor of Victoria says of the Model we must vote on: "They (the changes incorporated in the Model) sound innocuous but are really changes of drastic potential" and "the model would immediately corrode and ultimately destroy our democracy";
- Sir Harry Gibbs, Chief Justice of Australia 1981-87: "It would be a disaster for Australia";
- Republican Professor Winterton: "Flawed";
- Republican Moira Rayner: "A cobbled Constitution dressed up with a poetic meaningless preamble";
- Republican Professor Galligan: "It is not properly a republican model at all";
- Republican Professor Saunders: "Unworkable". And so it goes on.

Separately, UNANIMOUS CONDEMNATION from REPUBLICIANS:

- Sir Anthony Mason (former Chief Justice of Australia);
- Mr Harry Evans, Clerk of the Senate;
- Republican Linda Kirk
- NSW Governor Samuels, and the list goes on

Do Australians want to replace our proven system with one not even tried anywhere else in the world?

Some questions **MUST** be asked of our Republican fellow Australians:

- Would you vote for this FEDERAL Model without knowing whether the six STATES will present THEIR Constitutional Models (following six more State referenda) for voting on simultaneously, or will all power be centralised in Canberra, leaving the States' problems to be an ongoing, complex, divisive and unresolved Constitutional mess.
- What happens if some States (as is their right) refuse to become republics?
- What if the PM does not accept the candidate presented to him? He does not have to.

- What happens if the leader of the Opposition disagrees with the PM's nomination? The Model makes no provision for that.
- What happens if, having agreed on a candidate, a two-thirds majority support of both Houses is not achieved? Mr McGarvie says it has not happened in fifty years.
- Why do both Houses vote on appointment, yet the Senate (the States' House) is totally ignored on dismissal? More power to Canberra?
- Why are no reasons for dismissal included?
- Why no provision for a Vice President?
- Who deputises if a President dies is sick or overseas? Mr Turnbull says the "Senior State Governor" (WHO determines who is the 'Senior State Governor')
- But that 'Senior State Governor' would have been elected by his State electors. Wouldn't his primary allegiance be to those who elected him? Will their powers vary from the existing State Governor powers?
- What happens in a crisis when the PM dismisses the President and simultaneously the President dismisses the PM? Who is in charge of the Armed Forces then?
- How much will all this change to a republic cost? Will you happily pay extra taxes to pay for it? One reliable estimate exceeds \$1.5 Billion - ONE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS. Who KNOWS HOW MUCH?
- Will the 100% republican Ausflag Ltd, of which Mr Turnbull was, an early Director and whose sole aim is to change our flag, achieve its aim in a republic? (Which Anzac Day will be the first not to display our Australian National flag?
- Is a "vote for a republic a vote to change our flag"?

Republicans cry "We want an Australian Head of State", but do we want a POLITICIAN as head of a proposed republican State now publicly, vehemently and unanimously criticised by responsible republican leaders of integrity?

Some (irresponsible) republicans say "Let's vote for it and change it later" - an immediate admission that it is flawed.

Would YOU buy a faulty car after having been told "we'll fix it later"?

NO!

A change must be at least equal to if not better than our present system. Surely the GOOD present Westminster system is better than a BAD republic, especially when it is even BAD in the opinion of republican experts.

If you share a love of this wonderful country and want to protect it from these MINORITY groups' attempts to downgrade our system of governance, so that your children and their children's children can enjoy in future what we have enjoyed for 98 years.

PLEASE CONSIDER CAREFULLY - EVER SO CAREFULLY

Remember, we are not voting for "republicanism" - we are voting on a specific republican MODEL denigrated UNANIMOUSLY by Australia's Constitutional experts on BOTH SIDES.

"Not properly a republican model at all"

Republican, Professor Galligan.

"The model would immediately corrode and ultimately destroy our democracy"

Republican, The Hon. Richard McGarvie, AC