

ON OTHER PAGES

"Unser Kampf"
Reviewed. (Page 3.)

A Word to Taxpayers.
(Page 4.)

Restriction of War
Effort. (Page 6.)

After 10 Years of
Communism.
(Page 6.)

THE NEW TIMES

Now, when our I
and to ruin's brink
is verging.

In God's name,
let us speak while
there is time!

Now, when the
padlocks for our
lips are forging.

Silence is crime.

—Whittier (1807-1892).

Vol. 6. No. 49. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, DEC. 6, 1940.

Wheat Problem and National Credit

Riverina's M.P. Speaks Out

The new representative for Riverina in the Federal Parliament, Mr. J. Langtry, delivered his maiden speech in the House on November 22. Although he went out of his way to eulogise the Labor Party, of which he is a member, that he also displayed a very real concern for his electors and a realistic attitude to economic problems is indicated by the following extracts from his speech, which are taken from the "Hansard" report:

"I regard it as a great honour to be standing here in this Parliament as the representative of the electorate of Riverina, an electorate the real interests of which have been so long neglected. I recognise that I, like every other member of this House, must bear a great responsibility in the days ahead of us.



MR. J. LANGTRY, M.H.R.

We are facing the most serious crisis in the history of Australia and of the British Empire.

WHEATGROWERS LET DOWN

"As a representative of the second biggest primary industry in New South Wales, I contend emphatically that the wheatgrowers have been let down badly in the past. The accuracy of that statement no one will venture to deny. The wheat growing industry is now at the lowest ebb in its history. For twenty years, growers have been promised by successive governments that the industry would be stabilised, but nothing practical has ever been done.

"Although some effort to stabilise the industry has been made since the elections, we have not gone far enough, and the relief to be extended to the industry under the latest proposals will not come into operation for twelve months. I cannot stress too earnestly the desperate position of the growers. In my electorate last year, the harvest totalled 14,000,000 bushels; this year the crops will yield only 4,000,000 bushels. Returns from other wheat growing areas report a similar contraction. Those figures should impress upon honorable members the necessity for making an immediate payment in order to tide farmers over one of the worst periods, which have ever been experienced in the history of the industry. In severity, the present drought is equalled only by the ter-

rible drought of 1902. Hundreds of thousands of acres this year will not yield one bushel of wheat, while in many districts farmers will be lucky if the harvest is sufficient to supply their requirements of seed wheat for the next season. In view of those circumstances, I desire to impress upon the Minister for Commerce (Sir Earle Page) the urgent need for making a further advance to farmers of at least 6d a bushel in respect of last year's wheat.

PAYMENT UNFAIR AND INADEQUATE

"I also desire to bring under the notice of the right honorable gentleman the unfairness, in one respect, of the new wheat stabilisation plan, which provides for the payment to farmers of 3/10 a bushel at ports. In my opinion, the payment should be made on the wheat when it is delivered at country sidings, because freight charges vary in all States. By virtue of regulations issued under the National Security Act, the Federal Government has

(Continued on page 7.)

DEMOCRATIC REPRESENTATION OF COBURG ELECTORS

On Thursday, November 28, Mr. C. Mutton, M.L.A. for Coburg, Victoria, addressed a well-attended meeting of his electors. This meeting was convened by Mr. Mutton in fulfilment of his promise to meet his electors from time to time to give an account of his stewardship and to ask the electors what they want him to do. He has promised to call his electors together again two weeks prior to the re-assembly of the State House.

During the course of his remarks he stated that he had interviewed representatives of various Government departments with a view to getting certain works carried out in his electorate, and found that whilst all departments were anxious to put his suggestions into effect, they all had the same reason for refusal, "no money." Mr. Mutton promised to do his utmost to give effect to the requests submitted to him that night, but he said that the first thing was to rectify the monetary system. He believed in decentralisation of government, in that he would abolish State Parliaments and place their powers in the hands of municipalities, leaving national services in the hands of Federal Parliament. Alternatively he suggested that Federal Parliament be abolished and their functions placed in the hands of State Parliaments. The electors present carried the following resolution without one dissentient voice being raised, although ample opportunity for opposition was

"SOLDIERS' CHILDREN ALLOWED LESS THAN ZOO MONKEYS"

Increase Urged in W.A. Parliament

In the West Australian Legislative Assembly on October 30, Mr. H. T. Berry (Independent member for Irwin-Moore) moved the following resolution:

That this House fully endorses the policy of the Federal Labour Party in that the allowance made to the children of soldier dependants be increased forthwith from one shilling per day to one shilling and sixpence per day, in order to conform with rising living costs, high house rent charges, and the pressing need to remove the existing malnutrition too long existent in our midst and threatening to make a "C" class nation of coming generations; and that the Federal Government be notified accordingly.

Supporting his motion, Mr. Berry said:

"I make no apology whatsoever for submitting the motion to the House. Probably it will be argued that this is a Federal matter, but that fact is not sufficient justification for me to refrain from taking an interest in something of vital importance to the coming generations of Western Australians. The motion is merely a third phase of motions already submitted here by the member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver) and

the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald). The motion of the member for Subiaco had for its purpose to make the lot of ward children better, while that of the member for West Perth dealt with the question of relief workers' children. Now my motion comes forward, and I hope it will be carried, to cover a third group of children in Western Australia, the child dependants of soldiers going overseas. It seems to me that what is sauce for the one is sauce for each of the others in this case. I believe that point will be realised. In my opinion the conditions under which live the children on whose behalf I speak are deplorable. That is the reason why I am moving the motion. The member for Subiaco, and also people quite outside this Chamber, have proved to me that the cost of adequately maintaining one child is in the vicinity of 14/- a week. The 7/- being paid for the maintenance of soldiers' children at the moment is, therefore, utterly ridiculous. It might be argued that the increase, which I am endeavouring to secure, still falls sadly short of what is necessary. Then again, there is another class of children in this country—children of internees. I find that in some cases an allowance of 9/- per week is being made on account of those children. That fact is something difficult to comment upon. It strikes at the fundamentals of logic. In fact, it sets a premium on being born a member of an alien race warring with us. That is definitely to be regretted. Again I am given to understand—possibly this can be disproved, but I have not been able to get it disproved—that each and every monkey in the Zoo requires 12/6 a week to maintain it at a proper standard of nourishment and health. Surely, if a monkey is worth 12/6 per week, our children are worth 10/6 a week! The position is quite ridiculous."

Mr. Hughes: "And they are still imperfect."

Mr. Berry: "Who are?"

Mr. Speaker: "Order! The member for Irwin-Moore will proceed."

Mr. Berry: "There were a lot of monkeys in the jungle in the country from which I came to this State, but I have now arrived at the conclusion that there are quite a lot of other monkeys that are not in the jungle! This question is serious. It is ridiculous for us to be in the position of having to stand up and point to such conditions. I shall be only too delighted if my statement is proved to be wrong. I regard it as wicked to think that in a civilised community we are forced to suggest that our children should receive 10/6 a week and

(Continued on page 7.)

TYRANNY AND TAXATION

A Broadcast from 7HO and 7LA on November 10 by Electoral Campaign Speakers

B. —In your discussion last Sunday, you were very hard on Governments; you said that they were evil things—necessary evils, but still evil—and had to be watched very carefully all the time. Now, I think that is a very sweeping statement, and I think it is up to you to justify it.

J. —I didn't think anyone in Australia, at least any taxpayer, would ask me to justify that statement. I thought it was taken for granted.

B. —Well, yes and no. None of us is very fond of Governments; we don't like their endless talk and meaningless phrases, and nothing very helpful happening; we don't like the type of men that get into Governments, and we don't like the way they increase our taxes each year without asking permission. But I don't think we look upon them as essentially evil.

J. — Governments are instruments of power; they can do good, but they can do a tremendous lot of harm. The history of the human race is a history of corrupt and despotic Government preying on a defenceless people.

B. —But they can do some good sometimes.

J. —They have done good, but the good that they have done has always been in the early stages, in the early years of growth, in the pioneer stage. At some time or other, men of outstanding brilliance have come forward and given their service to the people. The people, in return for this service, have given their loyalty and obedience to these men. Around the work done by these pioneers, institutions have been built to carry on the work; these institutions bring glory and prestige and power to those who control them; the spirit of service of the humble pioneer disappears, but the institution remains in its outward show of glory and ancient grandeur, but the spirit of service has gone.

B. —Only the shell remains.

J. — But loyalty and obedience is still demanded by those occupying this ancient shell.

B. —They demand obedience be-

cause they cannot command respect.

J. — That is why, as each year passes, more and more compulsion is required to obtain the obedience of the people

B. —And I suppose that is why in one country after another the cloak of democratic government is being torn down revealing the real nature of the Government underneath—Military Dictatorship.

J. —Yes, that shows clearly the real nature of most Governments from the dawn of civilisation.

B. —But you yourself have often stated that financial dictatorship is one of the greatest dangers that civilisation has ever faced. Do you consider it more dangerous than an out-and-out military dictatorship?

J. —Yes, I do.

B. —Why?

J. — Well, in a military dictatorship such as they have in Germany and Russia, one sees it in its stark nakedness; one comes face to face with its grossness, its injustice and its brutality. But a financial dictatorship one doesn't see; many people don't even know it exists. But it is more effective and much more profitable; its work is all underground; and that is why it is difficult to fight. Our task is to force the fight above ground so that everybody can see it.

B. —The financial dictatorship works within the law.

J. —Yes, and uses all our ancient institutions.

B. —But how actually does it work?

J. — Let me see how I can explain, Well, take a 6d.

packet of cigarettes; 3½d. of that 6d is taxation.

B. —I don't suppose many people know that.

J. —That's the trouble—they don't know how they are taxed. Well, supposing that every time a man opened a new packet of cigarettes a Government official dashed into the room and snatched six out of the ten cigarettes. Wouldn't there...

B. —Wouldn't there be a riot!

J. —Do you see how clever the financial method is?

B. —It's a case of what the eye doesn't see, the heart doesn't grieve about.

J. — Even the great Government Services like the Post Office and the Broadcasting, these are used as taxing machines.

B. —But that is a scandal, and a case of misappropriation of funds.

J. —There was a chance for the Government to give a great service to the people, instead of which they use the funds for other purposes.

B. —It is a particularly mean trick, and an ordinary man would be put in gaol for it.

J. —Taxation on the instalment system is another clever trick.

B. —The people don't directly pay the tax.

J. —It's just taken from their wages.

B. —It's clever.

J. —It's what Mr. Dwyer-Gray calls "scientific."

B. —I wonder what will happen if the war goes on for four years.

J. —Most of us will be on war work of some kind.

B. —When we are all in the service of the Government, who will pay our wages?

J. —The Government, of course.

B. —Where will it get the money for that?

J. —Taxes, and savings.

B. —But suppose none of us can save money, what then?

J. —Well, the Government will pay all the wages of all the people out of taxes.

B. —That means that all our wages will have to be taken back again to pay taxes.

J. — It means that the people will have no wages at all.

B. —It sounds stupid, doesn't it.

J. — It is stupid.

B. —But why? There must be something wrong somewhere.

J. —The trouble is that nearly all the income of the people of this country is required to pay for food and clothes and shelter, and to pay interest to the banks. What is left over wouldn't pay for two months of war.

B. —That's what most intelligent people are beginning to realise.

J. —We faced this position in the last depression. There was no money to pay debts; no money to repair roads, build schools and hospitals or paint houses. Then, suddenly there was money.

B. —What happened?

J. — The Banks saw that there was going to be trouble; people were asking questions, and so they created money out of nothing, and lent it to the Government as a loan.

B. —But why didn't the Government create the money itself instead of borrowing from the private banks?

J. — The Banks wouldn't allow it to.

B. —They'd lose the interest on all the money, I suppose?

J. — That's largely what taxes are for: to pay interest on Government loans. That's why the financial fraternity are so keen on taxes.

B. —I have heard you say that it takes all the taxes of Tasmania to pay interest on Government loans.

J. — That's correct, that's why we have no money left for essential services. The money to finance this war does not exist at the present time. What can be collected by taxes and savings is a mere drop in the bucket. The money to finance this war will be created out of nothing by the Banks as the war goes on.

B. —Why doesn't the Government use the Commonwealth Bank to finance this war instead of mortgaging the people's future to the private Banks?

J. — The Commonwealth Bank is supposed to be the people's bank; it is a public institution designed for the benefit of the people, to give service to the people. That's what the pioneers intended. But the pioneers are dead, and the Bank is "dead"—the spirit has gone out of it. It is merely used as an instrument of power and that power is not used for the people's benefit—is not likely to be until the people demand it.

B. —That will only happen when the people are hurt.

J. — Meanwhile, it is a matter of wonder and regret that the war effort of Australia should be restricted by the out-of-date financial methods of a Government which knows what to do, but is afraid to incur the hostility of a few financial interests. After a year of war there is still no place in Tasmania where old men or boys or girls can go to help make munitions.

The people are willing and anxious to give service, but all the Government seems to want is sacrifice for the sake of sacrifice — which is merely another name for self-mutilation, an ancient custom practised by ignorant savages to appease a savage god.

B. —Did you say an ancient custom?

J. —Why, do you think this savage custom still exists?

B. —Well, don't you?

Eric Butler at Colac

Eric Butler addressed a very successful meeting at Colac on Wednesday, November 20. The hall was full, and many stood outside. The speaker gave a comprehensive survey of the real forces behind the war, and the progress towards a change in financial policy. Tremendous interest was aroused in Colac as a result of this meeting, with the result that another meeting is desired in the near future. Mr. Butler says that he is very pleased with the progress being made in this hitherto conservative town, and pays a fine tribute to the great work done by Mr. C. G. Turner, who pioneered the movement for political and economic democracy in this district. Mr. Butler hopes to visit Colac again early in the New Year; he also hopes to address a small country meeting in this area.

He left for Deniliquin, N.S.W., last Tuesday morning, where he hopes to have a meeting tonight. He will also speak in Mathoura, Rochester and Bendigo on the way back next week. After the Melbourne rally on Sunday, December 15, he may pay a flying visit to the Wimmera for a few days. He will then leave for North-East Victoria, where he hopes to arrange a few country meetings over the holidays.

NOW OUT!

"THE WAR BEHIND THE WAR"

By ERIC D. BUTLER

PRICE 3d; Posted, 4d

Every person who desires to gain a thorough knowledge of the real background to the present conflict should read this booklet. The most critical and impartial analysis of the "Jewish Question" to appear in this country.

Is socialism democracy? Where does Russia stand? Is Hitler a tool or an enemy of International Jewry? What are we fighting for?

These, and other questions of great importance, are clearly dealt with in this booklet, which is packed with facts and information. Every reader should obtain a copy.

Obtainable from the "New Times," Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne

"UNSER KAMPF"

A Critical Review by ERIC D. BUTLER

A menace to democracy today is the specious half-truth, no matter by whom it is uttered or written. Many people who prefer to dream about their ideals of how the world should be run, instead of facing realities, snatch eagerly at anything, which seems to indicate that more and more prominent people are demanding a "new order." Then they get very excited and say: "By jove! Did you see what Lord So-and-so, or Sir Somebody-else has to say? Of course, he doesn't go all the way, but..."

"We must compromise," say others. Yet the laws, which govern society, are just as much based on reality as the laws, which govern, bridge building. If you deviate from those laws you have chaos; I have never yet heard of a bridge-builder compromising with ideas not quite correct. He doesn't say: "Those ideas are not quite sound, but I will incorporate them in this bridge." That is **not** the way to build bridges. Neither is it the way to build a stable society of free people.

This journal stands for certain principles of social organisation based on reality; those principles cannot be judged by the number of people, "prominent" or otherwise, who accept them. They would be still correct if no one accepted them. The fact that at one time only a few people believed that the earth was round had nothing whatever to do with reality.

I am very wary of this vague cry for a "new social order." I notice that some of the chief mouthpieces of the international financial oligarchy are among the loudest in the demand for a "new order." So are those "Left-Wing" apologists who have been called Stalin's Fifth Column. Some of these are sincere idealists; others are not. A stream of propaganda is appearing in this and other British countries, which, intentionally or otherwise, is preparing us for the new "international order," which both the Communists and the International Financiers seem to be agreed about.

A book, which has had a wide-spread circulation in Britain and this country, is "Unser Kampf (Our Struggle)," by Sir Richard Acland. He is a "Left-Wing Intellectual," and his book has been widely hailed as something we must read. In fact, it is remarkable the circles in which this cleverly written plea for International Communism has circulated. Even several people whom I thought were conversant with our philosophy have mentioned this book with rapture. For these reasons, I believe that it should be carefully reviewed. Sir Richard Acland is the present representative of a family of Devon and Somerset landowners whose records stretch back well before 1600. The baronetcy was created in 1643 for services rendered to the Royalist cause in the Civil War. The publishers naively tell us that "since those days the family has become steadily more radical and for at least the last hundred years has fought on the side of the people." Which seems to imply that Cromwell fought for the people. Actually, he sold them to the financiers, and Sir Richard Acland's proposals might well increase the stranglehold. His forefathers apparently had more understanding of the Money Power than he has. He is a Member of the Liberal Party with which the Jewish influence in Britain has been closely connected. It therefore seems appropriate that his proposals should be in line with what International Jewry has been working for, for centuries.

"ACCEPT THE BIG IDEAS"

Judging Sir Richard by his book, he is one of those idealists who have worked out a nice little scheme for the whole world; all that we have to do is to fit human beings into it. After telling us to accept only the BIG ideas, he proceeds to other phases of his subject. We are told that we need a

"new morality," that the cause of the world's suffering is selfishness on the part of many of us. There is a defence of Russia, and the assertion that Germany may develop "common ownership" under the Nazis. "Common ownership" together with a new "international order" is the solution of all our troubles, we are told.

Although he attacks the "profit motive," he does not once men-



SIR RICHARD ACLAND.

tion the creation of the nation's money-supply by private banks, or the huge interest bill which is piling up with the necessity to further tax the people to pay it. Sir Richard's knowledge of finance appears to be limited to the nonsensical assertion that, at the end of a three or four year's war, "our financial resources" may be strained to the breaking point, or beyond it. As the bulk of our money supply exists as figures in bank ledgers, this statement would seem to imply that we may be short of people to write the figures, or short, perhaps, of pens, ink and paper. Isn't it remarkable how the bankers and many "Left Wing" supporters un-animously agree that there is nothing wrong with the money system? Or isn't it? His suggestion that we must think in really big terms, and forget the small things, is divorced from reality. Democracy is based on the principle that individuals have direct control over their own representatives. It works best in small units, not large ones. The reader will be astounded to learn that the "big argument" between the Opposition and the Government in Britain between 1931 and 1939, was whether Britain should prevent aggression in some other part of the world. Well, here is an example of such "big thinking": While the electors of Britain were encouraged to think on a world-scale about preventing aggression, they overlooked the aggression at home by the bankers against themselves. If the people of Britain had done a little thinking on a world-scale, and

had put their own house in order by tackling things on a small scale, there would have been no doubt about the outcome of this war — in fact there may have been no war.

"THE NEW MORALITY"

The situation which confronts us now has been brought about because we have based all our public life, both national and international, on the principle of selfishness. If this is so, it surely suggests that we would be wise to look for our salvation in the adoption of an entirely new standard of morality."

This is sheer nonsense. What have our morals to do with a faulty distributing system? You will note that bankers and international financiers are apparently not responsible for the present situation. Oh no! We have all been naughty-naughty. We must become "good" and all fit in with Sir Richard's nice little Utopia; then everything will be all right.

The politico-economic problem, which confronts the world today, has nothing to do with individual morality, any more than a breakdown of our electric light system has to do with our morality. And when we get an electrician to fix the electric light, we don't first ask him has he adopted the "new morality." We judge him by results. His morality does not influence his technical ability.

DEMOCRACY?

Sir Richard's views on a "free society" and democracy make interesting reading: "This does not mean that the progressive should ever be content to find out what the majority desires and then offer it to them. It is the right and duty of the progressive not merely to give the people what they do desire, but to teach them what they should desire." Well, there you have the crux of matter. The "progressives," who presumably have also adopted the "new morality," are to tell the rest of the people what they should desire. Sir Richard has, therefore, entered the lists against those fighting for the right of the individual, and has lined up with Stalin, Hitler and Mussolini. They, too, are self-styled "progressive" thinkers, and tell their peoples what they should desire.

"COMMON OWNERSHIP"

The "big idea" with the author is "common ownership"—whatever that means. He writes: **"Today the only form of organisation which allows the economic and moral incentive to coincide is that of common ownership. Only when we, as a people, own the means of production in common can we**

call upon ourselves and each other to work and produce and to use our best endeavours not for ourselves, not of course for others to the exclusion of ourselves, but for ourselves and for the community because we love our neighbours as ourselves." For a piece of woolly thinking this would take some beating. Common ownership means, in practice, that a vast State bureaucracy runs everything. The individual becomes a mere cog in a machine. We have common ownership of our navy; it would be interesting to see some person trying to remove any part, which he thought belonged to him. So far as the means of production are concerned, I am not at all interested in owning them. What we all desire to obtain is the production itself. Private enterprise has not failed to produce sufficient, it has produced "too much"; but private enterprise does not automatically manufacture the money claims to buy the production. If the people have sufficient money claims, Sir Richard will not need to worry about the people lacking incentive to co-operate and produce. Then there is this terrible "profit motive." Our very civilisation has been built on the profit motive. Nature itself recognises the profit motive when one grain of wheat produces dozens more grains. Surely a man who has produced goods or services is entitled to remuneration for his efforts. A brief look at figures over the past few years indicates that, while a few monopolies have been making excessive profits, and a great number of manufacturers have been struggling, many organisations have made no profit at all. There is an over-all shortage of purchasing power, with the result that modern business is based on jungle law. Sir Richard thinks that the poor are poor because the rich are rich. He wants a levelling down; we must divide the poverty. It has apparently never occurred to him that the standard of living for all can be increased.

DEFENCE OF RUSSIA

"A revolution means the violent transfer of power from one group to another. This happened in Russia. Private owners were replaced by representatives of the workers (sic). Say if you like that these representatives have degenerated into a bureaucracy—I have not myself enough evidence to contradict you—but the fact remains that no one in Russia sits back and draws income in respect of the ownership of property."

This member of Stalin's Fifth
(Continued on page 8.)

TO OUR READERS—

You may obtain your copy of the "NEW TIMES" from any authorised newsagent. Should your agent not have supplies, please ask him to communicate direct with New Times Ltd., Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne, C.I. Tel.: MU2834.

If you wish to have your copy posted direct from this office, please complete the form below and mail it, accompanied by remittance payable to New Times Ltd.

SUBSCRIPTION FORM.

To New Times Ltd,
Box 1228, G.P.O., Melbourne, C.I.
Please forward me the "New Times" for.....
Months, beginning with issue dated..... 19.....
I enclose cheque postal note for the sum of.....
 money order
Name.....
Full Postal Address.....
Date.....

Please fill in name and address in block capitals.
The subscription rate to the "New Times" is 15/- for 12 months; 7/6 for 6 months; 3/9 for 3 months. Post-free.

The New Times

A non-party, non-sectarian, non-sectional weekly newspaper, advocating political and economic democracy, and exposing the causes, the institutions and the individuals that keep us poor in the midst of plenty.

Published every Friday by New Times Ltd., McEwan House, Elizabeth and Little Collins Street, Melbourne, C.I. Postal Address: Box 1226 G.P.O. Melbourne. Telephone: MU2834.

Vol. 6. FRIDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1940. No. 49.

WHEN WILL THE WORM TURN?

It may be somewhat uncomplimentary to refer to the taxpayer as a worm, but the way, in which he still allows himself to be trampled on, without turning, seems to justify the metaphor.

The way in which the taxpayer is bled whiter and whiter to make a banker's holiday and provide the wherewithal for the costly blunders of this country's ever-growing bureaucracy is an outrage.

Examples of wasteful muddling and meddling by the bureaucracy now occur with a frequency, which is both alarming and infuriating to citizens who have not succumbed to total apathy. Here are two fresh cases, as reported in the "Argus" of December 3, and the "Bulletin" of November 27, respectively:

£14,000 Wasted. Air Site Mistake. Canberra, Monday. — On arrival in Canberra late tonight from Sydney, Senator Foll (Minister for the Interior) said that his department could not be blamed for the mistake, which had occurred over the selection of a site at Southern Cross (W.A.) for an air-training centre. This was entirely the responsibility of the Air Department. After expenditure estimated officially at £14,000 had been incurred at Southern Cross, the Air Department requested that all work be suspended, stating that it had decided to abandon the site. Senator Foll said that his department had merely carried out work on these establishments by direction of the Air Department. After considerable work had been done at Southern Cross, it was found that the locality was unsuitable because of the effect of dust on aircraft engines. Realising that it had made a mistake in having chosen this site in the first place, the Air Department decided to cut its loss and establish the training centre elsewhere in Western Australia. It is understood that a suitable site has now been selected at Geraldton.

"What's Thirty-seven Thousand?" — Dragging a few facts about 'A.B.C. Weekly' finances out of A.B.C. was like pulling an elephant's teeth; but when figures for seven months were published by the Government the reluctance of the Commission to disclose them was understandable. Any private board of directors, which made such a loss on such a project, would seriously consider leaving the task of explanation to its executors after a sharp dive into the harbour. At present, the 'Weakly' consists of 56 10in by 8in, pages; devoted for the most part to rehashes of broadcasting talks and to programmes, including the programmes of private commercial stations. There is no more reason why the Commonwealth Government should advertise these stations than that it should advertise private theatres or private newspapers. But the 'Weakly' prints these programmes, as a measure of competition against a private rival, which, presumably, pays income taxes—the 'Weakly,' of course, doesn't. Nobody with any knowledge of newspapers ever imagined that this strange 'national' enterprise was making a profit. It is admitted that the loss for seven months was £37,000, though, by a process of distributing 'establishment expenses' over five years, it is expected that the first balance sheet will show a gap of a mere £20,000. As the 'Weakly' has no plant, 'establishment expenses' should have been next to nothing. The salient fact is that while the Government is imposing heavy war taxation it is permitting A.B.C. to lose £1,200 or so an issue on an unwanted publication, and has permitted it to lose in seven war months an amount which would have bought five Spitfires for R.A.A.F. squadrons overseas. The situation calls not only for the immediate suppression of the 'Weakly' but for drastic changes in the inept and extravagant A.B.C. and for a general overhaul of the Act under which it took authority to throw away stacks of listeners' money.

But there is, of course, a far more serious and quite unfor-givable way in which taxpayers' money is "wasted" (not reported by the "Argus" or the "Bulletin"). That is the Government's practice of borrowing, at usury; new credit-money counterfeited by the private banks. Every well-informed citizen knows that most of the £28,000,000 loan now being floated will be obtained in that way, although the Government-owned Commonwealth Bank could, and should, be used to manufacture this "fountain-pen money" at not more than the purely nominal **and non-recurring** cost of pen, ink, paper, and a trivial amount of clerical work. This issue is now prominent in the news from Canberra, but it is unlikely that party-politicians will do anything worthwhile towards eradicating this evil. (Mr. Curtin even joined in the broadcast appeal to citizens to put their savings into the latest loan, knowing full well that genuine savings provide only a fraction of such Government borrowings and merely serve as a smoke screen for the counterfeiting activities we have referred to!) It is high time the "worm" turned. Taxpayers are also electors, and if they unite in serving a written demand on their respective members of Parliament, they can make **their** will prevail at any time. Some citizens in the Bundaberg district (Queensland), have

GOLLANCZ AND "THE ECONOMIST"

"REVOLUTION" OR "REFORM"?

By JOHN MITCHELL, in the "Social Crediter" (England).

In July, Victor Gollancz published "Guilty Men," which ran into fifteen impressions. He has now decided to produce a series of such books and to call the series "Victory Books." Eight titles have already been chosen and three books published. "Victory Book No. 2" is entitled "100,000,000 Allies—If We Choose," and its object is to propagandise a new war strategy, the nature of which is what we might expect from such a source—"European Revolution."

We may remember that some Germans in the last war, aided by their international brethren in the U.S.A. and financed by Kuhn, Loeb & Company, won over the German High Command to the strategy of importing revolutionaries into Russia so as to cripple that opponent by undermining Russia from within. It is now proposed that a similar strategy should be adopted by the British Government in respect to Germany and Europe.

It is explained that Hitler's aim is "a war designed to disintegrate the other side entirely, not merely to inflict on it a military defeat." And we are told: "To achieve victory we must turn the revolutionary weapon against the Nazis and disintegrate the social structure of the Third Reich as methodically as Hitler destroyed the spirit of France before he launched his tanks and aeroplanes against the French Army."

"... The alternative is not difficult to see, to continue the blockade and our air offensive on Germany as well as our preparation for a military offensive, but to combine them on the largest possible scale with revolutionary activities inside Europe. One hundred million people suffer under the tyranny of the Nazi" warlords. We can make them, or at least the bravest of them, our allies if we pledge this country to the cause of European, revolution and build here in Britain an organisation through which that revolution can be brought about."

It is evident that Gollancz regards the war as a convenient means of Bolshevising Europe. The Government is urged, "to give form and content to Mr. Churchill's remark about the liberation of Europe. The decision taken that this must be a people's war at home and a revolutionary war abroad, the Minister of Information should set up a propaganda editorial executive to deal with propaganda, just as we already have a General Staff to plan the activities of the fighting services. The executive should work, not as a Government Department with all the routine of the Civil Service, but with the swiftness and discipline of a newspaper office."

The "liberation" of Europe is interpreted as "national liberation, but not a return to national sovereignty . . . it involves centralised

economic institutions combined with personal liberty." A "people's war" involves the abolition of the rights of property and private enterprise. We must be rid of such "failings," for "If we in this country are going to take part in organising revolution in Europe, we must realise certain failings in ourselves."

Mr. Gollancz has a large public, and it would be idle to suppose that such pernicious propaganda as this does not have a wide effect in misleading the public even if there is little chance of his theories being put into effect by the British Government. But, is there?

The "Economist," in reviewing the book at great length, is not averse to the ends which Mr. Gollancz's propaganda serves but disagrees entirely that his strategy of European Revolution is feasible, because for one thing "he asks the British people through their Government to commit themselves to a view of politics and economics which the British people as a whole simply does not accept." The "Economist" thinks Mr. Gollancz's ends can be achieved by other means: "If we are not given to revolutions, we are very definitely given to reforms, and the first step towards an effective foreign propaganda is to put more life into our democratic institutions at home, to meet the cry for greater equality of opportunity, better distribution of the nation's wealth, a better planned and more vigorous productive system."

It should not be taken that the "Economist's" idea of a "better" distribution of the nation's wealth means a greater distribution. Its conception of a "better" distribution of wealth implies levelling down, not up—the liberal use of the taxation weapon to reduce incomes and to make it as difficult as

(Continued on page 5.)

sent the following letter to their Federal representative, and are urging their fellow citizens, with some success, to do likewise. This letter may well serve as a guide to electors elsewhere:

"Dear Sir, —As my representative in the Federal Parliament, I desire you to resist to your utmost any attempt to increase taxation, I am fully aware that the national credit can be used to finance defence and social services without inflation, increased taxation or an enlarged national debt. If the present financial and economic experts refuse to obey the instructions of a democratically elected Government, then it will be the duty of the Government to dismiss them and appoint other experts who will administer the financial policy demanded by the people for the benefit of the people. The time has arrived when the issue is joined between the money power and the people; I expect you, therefore, to oppose in Parliament, as my representative, any attempt to further reduce the living standard and general morale of the people and to demand that the nation's credit be used for the nation's needs. Be assured that I, along with thousands more of your constituents, will offer full support, moral and otherwise, to you and your colleagues who will fight the money monopoly in the interests of the British people and humanity as a whole.— Yours faithfully

GOLLANCZ AND "THE ECONOMIST"

(Continued from page 4.)

possible for capital to be held in private hands, so that private owners are dependent upon bank loans, enabling the banks to discriminate in favour of monopoly and large scale enterprise. Production is to be concentrated in fewer and fewer hands, so that eventually the time will come when a single Authority — the State — can take over everything.

It is not on the question of ends that the "Economist" and the financial interests it represents differ from Gollancz and the Communists; it is on the question of what is the most realistic and sound strategy to employ to achieve those ends, and we have more than a suspicion that there is collusion between the two strategists.

The "Economist" considers there is no hope of rousing the farmers of Norway, the peasants of France or the Catholic opposition in Italy with a programme, which undermines the validity of the rights of property and accepts the inevitability of a Communist Revolution in Europe. But they consider there is a "common term" between their own theory and that of Mr. Gollancz. "The Europe we are to stir up against Hitler is . . . an infinitely complex organisation of social groups, classes and interests" and the appeal to them must be "simple and immediate."

" . . . Bread is one thing we can offer without unduly stressing the economic reorganisation and the measure of centralisation which the task of helping Europe will help to bring in." (Our emphasis.) Freedom is another thing the "Economist" considers we can offer the people

of Europe: "After a year of occupation it is national freedom that will be uppermost in the minds of Hitler's victims. Here, in this nationalism despised of the theorists, we have a weapon whose mighty potency is largely undiminished. Whatever reservations we make about the limits which must be placed upon national sovereignty in post-war Europe, if we begin our European propaganda with a campaign against it, we are weakening the one idea which can make whole communities, not merely isolated enthusiasts, revolt." What an admission. First we must hold out to the people of Europe the only thing they will fight for, and then we must take it away! The same people who under the stress of the realities of war tune admit that the mass of people will fight to maintain or regain national sovereignty, are working ultimately on the alleged assumption that the only way to preserve enduring peace is to take away from these peoples their national sovereignties. If anyone should doubt the power of nationalism, we are told to "look at our own community. Its fundamental unity is based on the feeling of belonging together." The common term between the Right and "reform" and the Left and revolution is, of course, centralisation. Both pin their faith in Mr. Churchill, and neither is satisfied with the progress his Government is making in socialising Britain. In Mr. Gollancz's opinion: "The most successful home propaganda yet done in this war was the announcement made by Mr. Churchill and by Mr. Attlee, when the new Government was formed, that the State would now be as ruthless in conscripting property as it had

already been in conscripting life. Since then not very much has been done to give reality to these fine words."

As if by mistake, one phrase has slipped into the book, which strikes a discordant note with the rest of the book. It is the only phrase in the book containing any promise. It refers to the European Order promised after the war: "Europe . . . will not return to the economy of artificial scarcity which marked the epoch between the last war and this." Significantly, it is, with one exception, the only phrase for which the "Economist" reserves a harsh comment. It is described as "a sweeping and nonsensical generality," and this tells us how worthless is the high-sounding offer which the "Economist" would have us make to the people of Europe: "we give you . . . the proof positive in our present manner of living and in our present policy that our aim is not the privileges of our island and of its Empire, but the cause of freedom for which we are now fighting, and which we can achieve if you join us in the battle."

The hope of achieving a peace worth having lies not in the promises of a "New Order," which are being so generally propagandised today, but where it has always lain—in the electorate demanding insistently the results they want, results which can be achieved only along the lines which social creditors have been advocating for so many years.

The people of this country are in need of a defence against propaganda as much as they are in need of defence against bombs. Beware of the propaganda of our Real Enemy speaking through many mouths, for, says Gollancz: "Lies and contradictions do not damage propaganda value! No, on one condition—that the general trend of propaganda has in it

enough substantial truth to convince those to whom it is addressed. For propaganda is the art of persuasion, and we are all ready enough to be persuaded of things we want to believe." Now recall what the "Economist" has said: "If we are not given to revolutions..."

United Democrats' Report

From Headquarters, 17 Waymouth Street, Adelaide.

DON'T FORGET: Saturday evening, December 7, will be the last monthly rally for the year, when a large attendance of members and friends is expected. The attraction of the evening will be an address by Mr. Wilson, a New Zealander, on "New Zealand and Her People." Mr. Wilson has not only travelled in many other countries, but has spent eight years recently in New Zealand, and knows the whole length and breadth of his country. This talk should be of especial interest to us.

Members are particularly requested to attend this meeting if possible, as an announcement may be made concerning action to be taken presently by way of a rejoinder to the taxation "blitzkrieg" of Messrs. Menzies and Fadden.

On Friday, November 29, the second of the Friday lunch-hour discussions was led by Rev. C. D. Brock. The subject was, "Common Factors in the Present World Unrest." So interesting did the audience find the topic, that the discussion was continued long after the usual time to disperse, and many hope that Mr. Brock will resume the subject at a later date.

THE BOOK YOU HAVE BEEN WAITING FOR!

"THE MONEY POWER VERSUS DEMOCRACY."

by ERIC D. BUTLER. Price, 10d, posted

This is the first really comprehensive book of its kind in Australia. In forty-eight pages, the author has crystallised the philosophy, history and application of democratic principles. A handbook with a chapter on every aspect of the case for political and economic democracy. Some of the chapters are:

THE PRESENT CRISIS

An analysis of the clash between opposing forces. The individual versus the institution.

THE MONEY POWER

A list of outstanding quotations on the Money Power from the early Greek civilisation. Valuable for reference purposes.

THE PARTY SYSTEM EXPOSED.

A damning indictment and exposure of Party politics. Reveals the undemocratic machinations of the Party machines and how they are used by the Money Power.



THE ELECTORAL CAMPAIGN

A comprehensive statement of every aspect of the Electoral Campaign and its application.

THE INDIVIDUAL VERSUS THE STATE

A clear, well-reasoned exposition of one of the most important questions confronting civilisation today. Includes a splendid article from a German opposition paper, written before the outbreak of war.

HISTORY VINDICATES DEMOCRACY.

Covers the historical growth of the democratic principle—particularly in Great Britain.

Apart from the above, Mr. Butler has dealt with the growth and history of the Electoral Campaign. The story of the famous Pink-Slip Strike in America is most interesting. In the chapter, "Britain Experiments With Democracy," he outlines what has been accomplished by the Electoral Campaign in Britain—such as the very successful Lower Rates Campaign. A chapter on Canada outlines the struggle in Alberta and the attitude and action of the Federal Government, acting on behalf of the Money Power.

The last part of the book deals in detail with the growth of the Electoral Campaign in Australia. The history of the now-famous Anti-National-Insurance Campaign is given in some detail; also the Campaign against the Commonwealth Bank Act Amendment Bill. The Conclusion is an appeal for individual action to save Democracy, and suggests a demand letter to be sent to Members of Parliament.

This book should have a tremendous sale; it fills a very real gap in Australian political and economic literature.

Order Your Copies Now from "The New Times," Box 1226, G.P.O., Melb.

RESTRICTION OF THE WAR EFFORT

By JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc.

The reorganisation of the industry of this country for purposes of war should not be a difficult business. We have plenty of capable businessmen and plenty of capable engineers and producers. But when it comes to economists . . .

The most we can say about those economists who have acquired publicity is that they each differ with the other, and the least we can say about them is that on no important issue have they ever been right, even by accident. When we consider the tremendous advances made in all branches of knowledge, the mediaeval rubbish that still masquerades under the name of economics requires some explanation.

Many of the statements made by prominent economists are so outrageous and so lacking in any basis of fact that one wonders how they are not challenged in every newspaper in the country.

The results of these ancient and false theories introduced into a modern and fast-moving world have been disastrous: the results for the British and French empires have been one disaster after another.

In spite of these disasters, and although military and political leaders have been changed, the same persons still occupy the position of economic experts, still pronouncing the ancient ritual.

The economic theories, which have been ruthlessly imposed upon the unsuspecting British peoples, have all been based on considerations of money, and generations have grown up in the belief that nothing is permissible in this land of ours unless someone "makes money available."

Even the Prime Minister said last week that we must pay, pay, pay. He didn't say I want your service; I want you to work overtime; I want you to give your best; I want you to produce more. He said you must pay, pay, pay—in money.

We are continually told that money is not available for this or that, in spite of the fact that the best business and engineering brains in the world have told us again and again that money should not come into the picture as long as we have the men and material at our disposal to do the job.

Viscount Milner, one of the last of the old Conservative statesmen in England, learned this lesson in the last war. He said:

"If anyone had suggested in 1913 that our own country could by any possibility raise £10,000 million, or even half, or even a quarter of that sum, in order to carry on the war, he would have been regarded as a madman. Yet, not only did we raise that amount and more—over £3000 million out of revenue, and over £7000 million by loan—but we were prepared to go on raising money. I can speak from personal experience in this matter for I was in the centre of affairs at that time, and I well remember that in the early summer of 1918, even with America throwing her whole weight into the scale, none of us foresaw the early termination of the struggle . . .

"And no one any longer suggested that we should not be able to go on, even till 1920, from inability to raise the necessary money. For by that time it had become evident from experience that mere financial embarrassments were never going to put a stop to the war. It might, indeed, be terminated—as to a certain extent it was terminated—by an absolute shortage of indispensable things, food in the first place, but also coal and various materials necessary for the manufacture of munitions. But as long as the things themselves could be produced in adequate quantities, the counters for dealing with them would always be forthcoming."

We who know what happened in the last war believed that the tremendous resources made available during the war would still be available in time of peace. But after two years of peace the same old gang gained control and the Bank of England started restricting the

money supply and produced bankruptcies, unemployment and chaos, which many people had thought could never again be possible.

But the trick was repeated again in 1930, both in Australia and in England.

On both these occasions, the people were told that they must make sacrifices; there was a shortage of money, and although there was a glut of goods of all kinds, still they, the people, must make sacrifices, as there was no money available.

Even in 1938, when every man in Germany was working hard and hundreds of thousands of workers were being imported there from other countries, there were one million unemployed in England and not a single Spitfire available for the defence of the country.

There was no money available!

Even now in England, there are over 800,000 able-bodied persons out of a job and a great deal of equipment is not being used for purposes of war.

The tremendous effort made by Germany before the war is still

being continued, and increased, and Germany today is still spending more on her war effort than England.

In Germany, all the skill available is being used; all the small workshops are being used. And even the homes of the people have been electrified and supplied with machine-tools to be worked by the family.

Here in Tasmania, as elsewhere in Australia, there is no place where a man or woman can go to help make munitions. In every little workshop in the country there are lathes standing idle which could be operating 24 hours a day making simple parts.

Many of us have no money to give to war funds, but we can give our services helping to make munitions. Many would give their weekends free; some would give every night in the week—men, women and boys. But where can they go?

The Government doesn't seem to want service; all it asks for is money, money, money. The position is ridiculous, and I protest against it.

The bombing of English factories means, of course, that Australia's effort in making munitions will have to be organised on a vastly greater scale than at present.

If this increase in production is going to take place in anything like a reasonable time, it will have to be decentralised; it will have to be spread beyond a few big companies.

I, personally, could pick up enough skilled men in Hobart who would make the nucleus of a vast industry, but evidently they are not to be given any part in the war. The skill lying wasted is enormous, and, in my opinion, criminal. There is, too much centralisation; too much red tape, and no desire to experiment

to find out what our resources are.

Australia has got to make itself self-contained, has got to rely more on its own resources; to have faith in its own people and give them a chance to show what they can do and not follow sheepishly in the paths of other people.

This country is different from other countries, and has to act differently; we must experiment and give young men a chance to show what they can do.

The very first thing we have got to do is to remove the financial control which is crippling this country from the private banks and place it in the hands of Parliament. When that is done this war has to be financed without plunging this country into debt to a privileged and irresponsible minority.

Secondly, the financial credit of the country should be used to subsidise the consumption of certain essential goods so that they remain within the reach of the people. This is an essential step to maintain industrial peace.

If prices are forced up by taxation, men on low incomes will have to get an increase in wages, prices will go up again and wages will have to follow, and so on.

The huge increase in taxation proposed by the Federal Government has raised a storm of criticism; evidence that the people are not in the temper to submit to such methods.

No Government in this country has the right to smash industry and cut the incomes of the people without doing something to protect the people from the consequences.

In the first place, it is quite impossible for the vast majority to cut their expenditure by shifting into smaller houses. Secondly, it is absurd to expect us to pay interest on the debts of the last war, and on the debts of the last alleged peace; pay interest on mortgages, and pay insurance policies, and, at the same time, pay for this war. Obviously, something has to go.

We are carrying too many burdens on our backs, and if the Government doesn't shift some of them the people will do it themselves.

It should be apparent by now that we can't wage war "in top gear" if we are going to be tied to the rotten old system of debt and taxation.

AFTER 10 YEARS OF COMMUNISM

The following extract is taken from "The Truth-Revealing Economic Experiments of Barataria," by Silvio Gesell. According to Gesell, Barataria was originally colonised by 500 Spanish families in 1612:

"In the beginning the Baratarians managed their affairs communistically. But the system bred discontent, and within ten years the settlers were called together by the teacher, Diego Martinez, to discuss the introduction of a system, which encouraged private enterprise and offered personal gain. Here is a copy of the manifesto, which convened the meeting: 'MANIFESTO. —The communistic system, to which we have hitherto faithfully adhered, has certainly accomplished much, in that we have no hunger amongst us, but it falls short of the larger production possible under a system which fosters personal freedom, independence, and responsibility. As the shirt is nearer to the skin than the coat, so is egoism nearer to human consciousness than altruism. The instinct of self-preservation and self-expression is more dominant than the instinct of race-preservation and social desire. Responsibility for the actions and inactions, the commissions and omissions of society are not individually realised. If tools are forgotten and lie neglected in the fields; if a sick horse or cow is in need of extra attention after hours; if work is badly done, service indifferently rendered, disservice wantonly inflicted, it is the community which suffers and not the guilty. Daily, goods are lost through negligence. The hay is carelessly hauled and stacked, without personal loss to the careless. The strawberries are frozen because no one will take the extra precaution of strawing them against the summer frost. It is everybody's duty, which means it, is nobody's.

Even if duties are allocated and imposed, the loss is social not personal. In the discharge of collective tasks the pace is set by the slowest man. The moment that Fatty Gomez shouts, "Cease work," all throw down their tools in the mire, none feeling responsibility for the tools. As in a narrow street the ox-cart in front sets the pace for the speedier vehicles in the rear, so does the lazy, the incompetent, set the pace for everyone in communistic society. Much is omitted which would be done if there were personal responsibility and special reward of effort. Much could and would be, done to make things better and better, but consent must first be obtained from everybody, and this requires notices, meetings, talk, dissension, committees, reports, resolutions, amendments, talk, more talk, still more talk, ending in sterility and puerility. The time for action is lost by the need for talking, and the only actions sanctioned are those understandable by the lowest intelligence. For the final decision no one accepts personal responsibility and sustains no special loss. Matters requiring special knowledge or technical skill are sidetracked or thwarted. Inventors despair of securing the consent and support of rag, tag and bobtail. To the unlightened majority the unusual is always fearful, visionary and undesirable.

"The result is that we lose the vast potentialities of skill and efficiency in our men and women, and, despite the wonderful bounties of Nature, we remain, not hungry, but poor. The expression of personality is crushed under the dead-weight of social constraint."

U.E.A. Report

Home Meeting: Last Monday evening a successful home meeting took place in Northcote, at the home of Mr. and Mrs. J. Allen. In welcoming the audience, Mr. Allen outlined the object of the meeting, and invited those present to freely discuss or criticise anything the speaker said. Mr. Eric Butler's address was splendidly received, and the subsequent discussion continued for an hour. Other supporters might remember that a meeting of a few people in the home is one of the best ways of educating their fellow-electors.

Literature: Supplies of Mr. R. Bedford's recent speech in the Queensland Parliament are now to hand at 1/6 per doz. posted, also speeches by Mr. Hollins and Mr. Macgillivray, at 1/6 posted. Obtainable from the United Electors of Australia, McEwan House, Little Collins-street, Melbourne, C.I. Supporters are urged to obtain and circulate these. We will make up Christmas "hampers" of literature to any amount sent.

Waste Paper: Further supplies of waste paper are required; freight will be paid at this end if sent by carrier.

" SOLDIERS' CHILDREN ALLOWED LESS THAN ZOO MONKEYS "

(Continued from page 1.)

at the same time consider it necessary for a small monkey to have the benefit of the payment of 12/6 a week. The situation is appalling. The health of our children is something for which we shall be held responsible as trustees for the nation. Future generations of Australians may conceivably despise us if we do not tackle this problem and correct it. True, the wife of a soldier receives an extra £1/1/- from the Government over and above the £1/1/- that she receives from her husband after he has enlisted. An examination of the mathematics of the daily payments makes us realise that the wife receives from the Federal Government 3/- from her husband plus an allowance of 3/-, and 2/- for her two children. I am taking two children as the average family. That makes 8/- a day, or £2/16/- a week. From that amount has to be found house rent, which is a big item. On going into the question of house rent, I find that the average paid is £1 a week. Certainly it is possible to rent a house for 15/- or 17/6 a week, but such premises are at a distance from the city and transport charges more than counterbalance the reduction in rent. Inquiries elicited the information that many of these women are paying 25/- a week for rent. In the circumstances, it is a fair proposition to regard the average rent paid as £1 per week. When that amount is deducted from the total, we find the woman is left with £1/16/-."

"I also ascertained that the majority, or at any rate a great number of the wives of soldiers are supporting two and in many cases more children, and they have had to leave camps to come to the city in consequence of the enlistment of their husbands. As they must occupy houses, they have to indulge in a higher standard of living, which makes it incumbent upon them to have furniture. I have been appalled to discover that there are probably thousands of instances where the soldiers' wives are paying 10/- a week for the purchase of furniture under the hire-purchase system. We find the mathematical position shows that the wife's £2/16/- is down by £1 a week for rent and 10/- for furniture, and thus 26/- is left to the woman. That is not the last drain on her income. The majority of these people have taken out insurance policies for which they have to pay 1/- a week. That amount may not be much, but when 26/- only is left to meet all expenses, I should think that every penny becomes a matter of serious consequence. Assuming that there were no further overhead expenses, we find that the soldier's wife is left with 25/- with which she has to feed herself and two hungry mouths. There are no free eggs, butter, meat, firewood or, if I may use a double negation, 'no nothing' to alleviate the position these folk find themselves in. As to the insurance policies, the duty devolves upon us as the representatives of the people to ensure that those policies are continued and are not allowed to lapse, as they assuredly will if the weekly payments are not maintained.

"I have now shown, Mr. Speaker, that the soldier's wife's income is down to 25/-. Out of that, the unfortunate woman is expected to make provision for medical and dental treatment, clothing, school books and the hundred and one minor things without the advantage of which the lives of children become a mockery. They will enjoy very few picture shows or any of the other minor attractions that I referred to just now as being so necessary to juvenile joy. The time has come for us to realise that this question must be taken in hand, so that we may have healthy, decent children

throughout the Commonwealth. With 25/- a week only in hand, with which the soldier's wife is expected to do so much, there are bound to be ugly stories of malnutrition current in the near future. Malnutrition is the younger sister of famine, disease, unhappiness and degradation; in fact, malnutrition is famine itself. The fact that it exists in our midst is beyond all doubt. Its presence can be proved and is proved, every day by people whose duty it is to discover it in our city. When a relief worker enlists as a soldier, experience shows that the standard of his health rises in consequence of better feeding and proper care. That it should be so is an insult to our vaunted democracy. Certainly there exists a fund from which these people can be assisted, but I positively assert that the patriotic generosity we see in evidence today must inevitably be governed by the depth of one's pocket. I do not think that generosity can continue indefinitely, and I certainly claim that the duty of assisting these people rests on no one but the members of the Commonwealth Government. For that reason I have submitted my motion. That there should be any possibility of malnutrition becomes all the more amazing when we consider that it exists in the very shadow of huge surpluses of every type of primary product. Notwithstanding that fact, we hear people urging, from public places, that the question of malnutrition be investigated. There is no justification for the presence of malnutrition, and there is certainly no excuse for it. It should not be allowed to be. I say further that in my opinion patriotism the world over will be measured eventually by empty stomachs, or full ones.

"I repeat that the children of this State represent a national trust, and it may well be that if motions dealing with this and correlated matters are not carried, I shall consider we have committed a definite breach of trust. I congratulate the Federal Labour Party on having a plank of this description in its policy. I hope that at the earliest possible date that plank will be implemented by the Government of Australia. For quite long enough has the Federal Government been living in the clouds. The time has arrived when it becomes our duty as a branch of the State Legislature, to do our utmost to bring the Federal Government down to earth. When one contemplates our actions regarding the treatment of the underfed people of Australia, it would seem that in this enlightened age we have everything but common sense.

"In conclusion, I draw attention to another matter that I hope will receive attention. I refer to the initial allotment made to the wives of soldiers. I am given to understand that often, after her husband has joined up, the wife

Wheat Problem and National Credit

(Continued from page 1)

commandeered all wheat produced in Australia. As the Commonwealth owns the grain as soon as it is delivered to the siding, the farmer's responsibility should end there, and handling charges, freight, etc., should be met by the Wheat Board. Every wheatgrower in every State should receive the same return for every bushel that he produces. In asking the Minister for Commerce to reconsider that portion of the plan, I am not making an unreasonable request. Even in the electorate of Riverina, freight charges in respect of wheat vary by 1d or 1½d. a bushel, and that is most unfair to the growers who live a considerable distance from a seaport. The Country Party, particularly, should bring pressure to bear upon the Government in order to rectify this obvious anomaly, and it should insist upon the payment to farmers of a uniform price. Honorable members should realise that the price for wheat has not yet overtaken the cost of production, and the growers are rightly entitled to this consideration. They ask for nothing more than the right to live and to receive a reasonable return from the production of a commodity, which represents, perhaps, our greatest national undertaking.

SECONDARY INDUSTRIES AFFECTED

"The secondary industries have as much to gain as the grower himself from the payment of a profitable price for wheat. The manufacturers of fertilisers and machinery, the State railways systems and many other undertakings, which employ large numbers of men, depend for a big percentage of their revenue upon the wheat-grower. Honorable members have only to cast their minds back to the economic crash, which occurred in 1931, when wheat was practically unsaleable and the greatest industrial stagnation in the history of Australia occurred. Unemployment,

is compelled to wait two or three weeks before she receives any payment at all. Frequently that embarrasses not only the woman, but those administering the fund that has been set up for the purpose of helping soldiers' dependants. Indeed, I understand that women whose husbands have joined up with the R.A.A.F. are often asked to wait for five weeks before they receive their first payment after their husbands have entered the Air Force. That is quite wrong, and as was so aptly stated in the Home Parliament recently, amounts to 'routine rot.' As a matter of fact I could use a much better adjective with 'rot,' but I would not be allowed to do so in this Chamber. I commend my motion to the House. It does not require much debating, and I leave it in the hands of members for their consideration. After my brief experience of them in Parliament, I am convinced that it will be acceptable to all."

poverty and destitution were rife, and foreclosures were reported from all parts of the country. Australia has not yet recovered from the effects of that crash. When the Scullin Government introduced legislation to authorise the payment to the primary producer of 4/- a bushel, the bill was rejected by the Senate, in which the Country Party held the balance of power.

"Some honorable members might contend that the south-western portion of New South Wales, which I represent, is an area in which the rainfall is poorer than it is in the better wheat growing districts. But even wheatgrowers in parts of Australia with a reliable rainfall are in a desperate plight this year. Although the Wimmera in Victoria has a greater yield to the acre than has any other district in Australia, the plight of growers in that area is just as serious as is the position of farmers in the southwestern portion of New South Wales. In making that statement, I do not refer to the extreme southwest, because we should not be attempting to grow wheat there. Generally, however, all wheat growing districts, good and bad alike, are in the same position this season. In plain words, the industry is 'down and out.' I ask the Minister for Commerce to lose no time in making the advance that I suggested; otherwise the desperate plight of the wheatgrower will have repercussions in many secondary industries.

LAND SETTLEMENT

"The policy of land settlement which has been adopted in connection with our wheat growing areas is one of the causes of the downfall of the industry. In some parts, we endeavour to grow wheat on land that should never have been set aside by governments for that purpose. I do not blame any particular government for this mistake; but the damage has been done. In undertaking any reconstructive measures, we much unlock some of the big areas of land which are owned by a relatively few persons. I refer particularly to large tracts of country along the Murrumbidgee River from Gundagai to Narrandera. In a normal season, no irrigation is required in that area to assist settlers to produce good crops. I except the present season, because it has been an extremely bad one, and we cannot be guided by it. Prospective settlers were asked to make their farms in districts outside the wheat belt proper, where the rainfall is fairly reliable, and, in addition, the areas granted to them were too small to give them a reasonable chance of making a success of their efforts. Responsibility for that mistake lies not with the farmers, but with our legislatures.

IRRIGATION

"Another important thing is irrigation. This has been sadly neglected, especially in the west of New South Wales, the country of which I have been speaking. We have always been told there that irrigation is wanted, but it has never been provided to the degree to which it should have been. I speak on this subject with the authority of experience. It is forty-five years since a deputation waited on the Minister for Works in New South Wales at Barunga to ask for the provision of an irrigation scheme from Mullaley to Deniliquin, the 'Berriquin' work which is only now in progress. In the meantime, the settlers there have lost hundreds of thousands of head of stock. If the work had been done when the need of it was first seen, the devastating effects of the droughts of 1902, 1914, 1919 and this year, which is the worst of all, would have been avoided. Today, in that district, people are drinking brackish water which thirsty stock

(Continued on page 8.)

FINAL RALLY FOR 1940
Keep This Date Free:
Sunday, December 15, at 8.15 p.m.
Centenary Hall Cr. Exhibition
and Little Collins Streets
Speaker:
ERIC D. BUTLER
on
"THE NEXT 12 MONTHS"
Chairman: Mr. F. C. Paice

"UNSER KAMPF"

(Continued from page 3)

Column also tells us: "If it be a fact that the world forces of common ownership, under Russian guidance, have now decided to spread their doctrine outwards, if they can, by force of arms, then this is very largely due, I believe, to their reaching the conclusion, since the collapse of Popular Front movements in the Western Democracies, that there is no hope whatever of our conducting ourselves in such a way as to make possible a world based on any land of moral principles. In such a world they decide to look after their own interests." This is the most remarkable statement I have yet read from any Russian apologist. Apparently if "the world forces of common ownership," whatever they are, and wherever they are to be found, decide that we peoples of the British Commonwealth of Nations have not adopted the "new morality," they will show us how to conduct ourselves by similar treatment as that meted out to Finland and Poland. If Sir Richard would only read—he may know all about it—the real history of the Russian Revolution, and the openly declared policy of the group of gangsters, most of whom are not even Russians, who run that country, he would know that Soviet Russia is a menace to everything we hold dear. We all know that there are many things wrong with our society, but there is also a lot of good which we desire to keep. It has taken us many centuries to build it up, and to tear it all down without preserving the good would be analogous to throwing the baby out with the bath water.

THE SOLUTION OF WAR?

In conclusion the author makes a plea for an international order. "Think big" is his theme. We haven't yet learnt to control our State Members of Parliament in this country, but that's only a trifling matter to the internationalists. Russia, of course, although populated by 180,000,000 people who, on the whole, are comparatively uneducated and know very little about real democracy, have obtained control of their representatives in a matter of a few years. At least, that is what we are told. We poor Britishers, although we have been striving to build democracy for centuries, and have led the world to nearly every worthwhile conception of freedom, have not yet been able to reach our ultimate goal. But then, I nearly forgot; we are not practising "the new morality."

Sir Richard's views on the cause of war are indicated in this passage: "We asked, 'what is it that causes wars to be fought?' We answered, 'It is nations fighting for their own private ends that causes wars to be fought. As long as nations fight for their own ends, and as long as nations only concern themselves with an aggressor when their own interests or those of their exclusive allies are attacked, there will be danger of war.'" He then goes on to say that all the nations should make a pledge to unite against any aggressor.

There is no reference to the financial cause responsible for nations like Germany being highly centralised under the domination of men with a gangster mentality. This idea of an international police force is absurd. It arises in the minds of idealists who indulge in too much wishful thinking. Also, it is the product of those international forces — Finance — for which, whether he knows it or not, Sir Richard Acland is paving the way with propaganda just as insidious as anything that has come out of Germany.

We have seen an increasing flood of this type of propaganda for some time; we are being conditioned for the advent of some brand of International Communism. Even our own Government is now prepared to condone Russian aggression. The answer to all this propaganda is for us to base all our activities on inductive reasoning, in contact with reality instead of artificial unreality. Let us remain British.

FREE GIFTS

"... It is all the more satisfactory that in the details of the arrangement there is no hint of charity. Great Britain is giving full value for what she receives; the price of fifty destroyers for a century's lease of six bases might even be called cheap. Indeed, the only free gifts are from Britain to America. One of these free gifts is the northern group of bases. The other is the solemn assurance from the British Government that, come what may, the Royal Navy will be neither surrendered nor scuttled. It is important that the meaning of this should be fully appreciated. It means that in certain unlikely, but not impossible, circumstances the inhabitants of Great Britain would abandon themselves to occupation and starvation and would consent to be blockaded by their own fleet, rather than leave the way to the New World open to the Nazis. The fact that no patriotic Englishman would have it otherwise does not in the least diminish the value to America of this pledge. England 'expects every American to do his duty' was the bitter jibe of a few years ago; in dead earnest, it has been changed to 'America can count on every Englishman doing his duty.'"

—"The Economist," Sept. 7, 1940.

Support Local Talent**IBSEN PLAY.**

"Ghosts," by Henrik Ibsen, will be presented by the Melbourne Arts League at Kelvin Hall on Saturday night, December 15. Miss Grace Iggulden, who is well known to many Melbourne readers of this journal, will appear in the role of Mrs. Alving. Tickets, 2/6 each, may be obtained at the "New Times" office.

Radio Debate on Commonwealth Bank

The subject to be debated in 3DB's "Hackle Hour" session this Saturday night, December 7, 8 p.m., is:

"Should the Commonwealth Bank Provide Interest-free Credit for War Expenditure?"

The case for the affirmative view will be presented by Mr. N. Worrall, and Mr. A. D. G. Adam will be his opponent.

WHY?

The Prime Minister (Mr. Menzies) said today that censorship of "Hansard" was being considered by Cabinet. An early decision would be made.

"It is realised," the Prime Minister, added, "that something must be done about censoring 'Hansard.'"

—Melbourne "Herald," Dec. 2.

Printed by H. E. Kuntzen, 143-151 Beckett Street, Melbourne. (Or New Times Limited, McEwam House, Melbourne.)

Wheat Problem and National Credit

(Continued from page 7.)

would refuse to drink. We call ourselves statesmen, yet we allow such things to exist. Only twelve months ago, hundreds of thousands of cubic feet of water ran into the sea. That water should have been conserved against such a year as we are experiencing. I hope that the wisdom of future governments will not allow such conditions to continue.

NATIONAL CREDIT

"The Treasurer (Mr. Fadden) in his budget speech yesterday, said that national credit would be a very dangerous thing . . . but the very things that I have referred to and a few more that I have not referred to—amongst them wheat stabilisation, housing and slum clearances—are dependent on the proper utilisation of national credit. In the past, all efforts towards the solution of those problems have been met with the reply: "We agree that all those schemes are necessary, but we have no money. Yet, when war broke out, countless millions came from somewhere. If money can be made available in wartime, it can certainly be made available in peacetime. We must use national credit to finance the war, but as soon as someone talks about extending credit, the cry is raised, "Inflation!" If it is inflation to make provision for land settlement, irrigation, clearance of slums, and the security of the Australian people, let it be inflation, but let us have it. We have the Commonwealth Bank. We are not asking for something unconstitutional. We have the Constitution of the Commonwealth and we have a Parliament. We also have the report of the Monetary and Banking Commission, on which both sides of this House were represented. That commission distinctly told us that the Commonwealth Bank could make money available to the Government or any one else free of charge. I am not a constitutional lawyer, but I have enough sense to understand that clause of the report. No one asks for unlimited credit, but while there is unemployment and there is work to be done to develop Australia, money should be made available for that purpose, just as it has to be made available to win the war. We refuse to accent the bygone tale that we cannot do this or that because the money is not there. It is in the Commonwealth Bank's power to provide it. This Parliament, up to a point, can do anything as regards finance, and we are quite entitled to demand that the Government use its powers through the Commonwealth Bank . . ."

"Every day we are doing something to develop the resources of this country, but not nearly so much as could be done, if we did as we are entitled to do and created credit through the central bank. That credit must be used not only for the prosecution of this war but also to make preparations for the absorption of our men when they return from the war. Unfortunately for Australia, however, Sir Denison Miller died too young.

JUST WAKING UP

"Appeal to America. London, December 1.

"In an early morning broadcast to the United States on the subject of the blockade, the Minister of Economic Warfare (Mr. Daiton) pointed out how Americans could give further aid by extending and tightening export control, refusing to trade with firms friendly to the Axis, and denying port facilities to neutral ships likely to be blockade runners." —Melbourne "Age," Dec. 2.

He had an able supporter in King O'Malley, in my opinion, the greatest statesman Australia ever produced. It was he who brought the Commonwealth Bank into being and used it as it should be used for the benefit of the people. Today that bank has been shorn of some of its powers, but it is in the hands of Parliament to restore to it the powers that it should possess in the administration of Australia's credit. If we cannot use the powers of our own bank in this critical period to save Australia from invasion, that bank is a failure. Should there be controversy between the Commonwealth Bank Board and this Parliament this Parliament is supreme. We want no argument with the Commonwealth Bank Board—there is room in the world for all—but we do want power to control national credit. Until we exercise that control we shall get nowhere.

The budget imposes great taxes on the people least able to bear taxation. My belief is that people on £400 a year should not be asked to pay anything in tax—not while we have a Commonwealth Bank with the ability to create credit for the prosecution of the war. This very Parliament can right any problem of finance up to the point that created credit is used for the benefit of the country, and I hope that the Government will see its way clear to amend the budget in order to give relief to men in the lower brackets of income. We do not want to confiscate property or income, but we do want to reduce the profits of some of the big combines, which could pay much more heavily and not feel it, and to lighten the load on men who earn a paltry income and get nothing in the world other than what they eat and wear, on which the indirect taxation is very heavy. We should not be asked to lower the standard of living while credit can be made available through the Commonwealth Bank. The day arrives when "the old school tie" must stand aside. Then, and not until then, will the great mass of the suffering Australian people get the rights, justice, security and happiness that have been so long denied to them."

BENDIGO MEETING**Eric Butler to Speak**

Eric Butler will address supporters and friends on Wednesday, December 11. This will be a special address dealing with vital aspects of our work. Everyone is urged to be in attendance.

Meeting Centre: Local Newspaper building.

SITUATION WANTED.

Reliable Tractor Drivers, Teamsters, Milkers, Fern Cutters, M. Couples waiting. —WILLIAMS' BUREAU, 440 Flinders-street, Melbourne. Phone: MU3423.

Read in Comfort with Glasses Prescribed by—



CERTIFIED
ANDREW C. GADDES
OPTICIAN
STATE SAVINGS BANK BUILDINGS
157-159 ELIZABETH ST., MELBOURNE
TELEPHONE: MU3221