

2925.1

## DISTRIBUTING POVERTY.

The scheme of social security for Britain, described by Lord Woolton as "blazing the trail for a higher standard of living," does not stand critical examination.

Take the case of the "retirement pension" for a married couple—35/- a week, or £91 a year. The contributions are made up as follows: Employee 3/10 a week, employer 3/1 a week, Government 8/7 a week, a total of 15/6 a week, or £40/6/- a year. Contributions start at 18 years of age and pension at 65, so that the total contributions for 47 years amount to £1,894/2/-.

Assuming that the couple live 10 more years, which is a generous estimate, they will receive £910. Assuming further, that they receive maximum allowance for sickness, 152 weeks at £2, and for unemployment 30 weeks at £2, plus two funerals at £20 each, they would draw an additional £412, making a grand total of benefits £1,322, out of total contributions of £1,894/2/-.

It may be argued that the employee only contributes £10 a year, or £470 in all, up to the retiring age. But factually the contributions of the employer and the Government are paid by equivalent increased costs of goods and services. That is to say, the whole cost is borne by the recipients of the pension.

Boiled down, the scheme means that the pensioners have to accept a greatly reduced standard of living for 47 years in order to have nothing more than a subsistence dole of 17/6 a week each for the last few years of their lives, and a free funeral to make their earthly exits respectable.

Surely this does not represent what we know to be the capacity of an age of science and machinery to produce abundance for all.

—WILLIAM STONES.

Arthursleigh Street, Burwood.

(Issued by the Social Credit Movement of Australia,  
N.S.W. Division, 88 Pitt Street, Sydney)

22/10/44.